



An Empirical Study on the Impact of Covid-19 on Work-Life Stress of Managers

IREEN AKHTER*, MD. BAKTIAR RANA and RAIHAN SHARIF

IBA-JU, Jahangir Nagar University, Dhaka, Bangladesh.

Abstract

Stress is now common word and issues for everyone in this pandemic situation regardless of their age and gender. The aim of this paper is to examine the level of work-life stress among managers, because of work demand from job and support provided by the organization to complete the job. The developmental workplace stressors assessment questionnaire has been used for collecting data from 197 working managers who are working with different organizations, through standard Google form between May to August, 2020. The nature of job in some cases are work from home at this COVID situation. For analyzing data, simple descriptive, inferential and bivariate analysis were done. No signification relationships have been found between age and gender with stress. However, correlations have been found moderate to high among some of the factors responsible for creating stress among managers. This study has been done on entry to the mid-level management with the selective factors of developmental workplace stressors assessment questionnaire which was not found in earlier research on work-life stress measurement in the context of Bangladesh. Future researchers may explore work-life stress with remaining set of factors (variables) with different set of sample composition.



Article History

Received: 2 September 2021

Accepted: 2 November 2021

Keywords

Covid-19; Managers;
Work-Life Stress;
Work Demand;
Work Support.

Introduction


People may feel stress if there is a discrepancy between the work demand from organizations and the support organizations provided to complete that work. Because of recent COVID-19 Pandemic, organizations all over the world realized the unknown challenge for unknown period. Many businesses

had to close their operations for undetermined time, people movement were restricted, maintaining social-physical distance becomes norms, and working from home becomes culture. This new culture has created different types frustration for all ages, from school going children to office going adult, from employed to unemployed,

CONTACT Ireen Akhter ✉ ireen@juniv.edu 📍 IBA-JU, Jahangir Nagar University, Dhaka, Bangladesh.



© 2022 The Author(s). Published by Enviro Research Publishers.

This is an  Open Access article licensed under a Creative Commons license: Attribution 4.0 International (CC-BY).

Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12944/JBSFM.04.01.10>

from junior level positions to upper level positions and from male to female. According to American Psychological Association (APA, 2020), approximately 8 in 10 adults (78%) acknowledged that the coronavirus pandemic is a major source of stress in their life and, 2 in 3 adults (67%) said they have experienced increased stress over the course of the pandemic. The most distress of life in this situation is the fear of death of own self and of family members and friends from corona virus, in one hand and on the other hand, new employment culture has created new types of stress among working people. Increasing high unemployment rate with unstable price level also have made people financially poorer. Though with the time people have started to cope with New Normal situation, still in trauma for their bitter experience with their work and life imbalance. Though, people are staying more time at home, and suppose to give more time to family, but on-line office culture is taking away their personal time. Because of technology, office time has extended to personal time, has created new behavior, new expectations from organizations, blundered between work-life space. According to Jernigan (2020), more than 80% of executives experience modest to severe stress in their roles due to lack of time to finish their work, less sleep, and being constantly tired at work. Out of them 55% of those reported stress, at least one experience with burn out during their career. This research mainly tried to explore the work-life stress level among entry to mid-level managers considering work-demand expected from managers and work support provided by the organizations.

Literature Review

The word stress is not new phenomena to anyone, rather people have dealt with stress since the beginning of civilization. It is a condition of physical or mental strain Hanes (2002). According to Robbins and Sanghi (2006), stress is a dynamic situation in which people encountered with the opportunity, limitations, or demand related to what people desire and for which the outcome is important but uncertain. Homo Sapiens is not the only species that suffer from stress, other non-human species like non-human primates like chimpanzees, savanna baboons, and tamarin monkeys also suffer from stress (Sapolsky, 2005). Researchers focused on stress as the unit of analysis from individuals, to families, to communities. The individual stress theory came

fundamentally from psychobiology, sociology, psychiatry, and anthropology (Cannon, 1929; Lindemann, 1944; Caplan, 1974; Holmes and Rahe, 1967; and Hoff, 1989). However, the concept of stress was first introduced in the Physics and biological science. At that time, researchers were more concern about physical stress, as the word has been derived from the 'stringere', a Latin word, which means the experience of pain, and physical hardship. According to Selye Hans (1956), stress is the non-specific response of the body for any external event or internal drive. Stress is also considered as the dynamic condition where individual's opportunity, constraint or demand related to his/her desire and outcome is perceived as important but uncertain (Stephen, 1999; Robbins and Sanghi, 2006).

Hobfoll (1989) assumes that stress occurs because of three reasons: when people loss their assets, when assets are in danger, or when people invest their assets with unequal benefit. Here, four types of resources are identified: physical resources (such as home, clothing, etc.), condition resources (such as employment, personal relationships), personal resources (such as skills or self-efficacy), and energy resources (which need to facilitate other resources, such as money, credit, or knowledge). Modern theories of stress, give answer of three crucial questions in understanding (Cox & Griffiths, 2010) about stress: why, when and what happens after stress? And how to overcome? Among these theories, four prominent work-related stress theories are: Job Demand-Control (Support) Theory; Effort-Reward Imbalance Model (ERI model), Person-Environment Fit theory (P-E Fit theory); and Transactional Model. All these theories have clarified the causes and mechanisms that underlie work-related stress.

Work life stress may be result of work overload, unsupportive colleagues, unhealthy competition and role conflict in workplace (O'driscoll, *et al.*, 1992; Safaria *et al.* 2011). According to Frese and Zapf (1988), work life stress refers to the process through employee's perception and respond to any adverse or challenging job situation. It is a condition of perceived tension between demands and support in work environment (Doble, N. and Supriya, M.V, 2011). Work-life stress also can

be result of interpersonal relationship with supervisor or the support get from supervisor. Relationship among the co-workers and with supervisor is important in order to sustain the harmonious environment (Razak *et al.*, 2014). Managers may also feel work overload when work demands exceed work support (Elloy and Smith, 2003), and ultimately it may reduce the productivity as a whole.

National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH, 1999)- the US federal research organization on Occupational Safety and Health defined job stress as the harmful emotional and physical responses which do not match the capabilities, resources, or needs of the worker and finally results poor health and even injury. On the other hand, in terms of physiology, Sapolsky (2004) defined stress as the state of homeostasis imbalance where homeostasis stands for various physiological endpoints—body temperature, blood pressure, heart rate, and so on—are at their optimal levels. Sapolsky (2004) also defined stressor as any physical or psychological factor that agitate this homeostasis inside human. Whether stress only exists in post industrialized human or it has prehistoric legacy is an area of academic debate. But Webb *et al.* (2010) showed the historical legacy of stress in human. In their study, fossilized human hair was tested for cortisol level which is a biomarker of stress and found 1.5 times more cortisol level which indicates human were exposed to stress historically. According to Webmd (2021), cortisol is a nature's built-in alarm system which is human body's main stress hormone and works with certain parts of human brain to control mood, motivation, and fear. It's best known for helping fuel human body's "fight-or-flight" instinct in a crisis. Barsade *et al.* (1997) research revealed that about 29% workers feel quite a bit or extremely stressed at work. According to NIOSH, acute and chronic post-traumatic anxiety, reaction to stress, panic disorders, and other neurotic disorders are associated with Anxiety, stress, and neurotic disorders. These are more severe than the average injury or illness. Down the line the affected workers experience a much greater work loss than those with all nonfatal injuries or illnesses—25 days away from work compared with 6 in 2001.

According to National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (1999), the primary causes

of job stress are worker characteristics and working conditions. Here worker characteristics may include biological factors such as age and gender. Age is a widely used biological indicator which can be a good predictor of cognitive maturity. Cognitive abilities can be divided into several specific cognitive domains including attention, memory, executive cognitive function, language, and visuospatial abilities which typically experience measurable declines with age (Murman, 2015).

According to Fifth Bangladesh Population and Housing Census 2011, where population was grouped into different age group such as 0-4, 5-9, 10-14, 15-19, 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49, 50-54, 55-59, 60-64, 65+ and each age group has 10.45%, 12.60%, 11.55%, 8.90%, 9.25%, 9.35%, 7.25%, 6.65%, 5.75%, 4.45%, 3.85%, 2.45%, 2.75%, 4.75% percentile composition respectively. This also reflects that 43.5% of the population belongs to within 19 age whereas 39.75% of the population belong to the age band 25-59 which is suitable age range for pursuing managerial career (Alam *et al.*, 2015). Here Bangladesh is going through a flipped age distribution in comparison to developed world where demography is facing aging problem. But very small percent of the population is engaged in managerial career in Bangladesh. Country specific stress data is not available more specifically for the managerial positions in Bangladesh. Whereas the workplace stress picture is grim where systematic study results are available such as USA. The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) (2003) of USA -assessed anxiety, stress, and neurotic disorder cases involving days absent from work in 2001 and in the majority of the cases, younger age groups have been found accounted for the majority of cases.

Workers aged <25 accounted for 7.6% of cases, workers aged 25–34 accounted for 25.5% of cases, workers aged 35–44 accounted for 28.2% of cases, workers aged 45–54 accounted for 24.6% of cases, and workers aged >54 accounted for 14.1% of cases. Literature is also supporting the reality such as Rauschenbach *et al.* (2012) in their study discussed the notion that older workers acquire better jobs the longer they proceed in their career which inevitably leads to better jobs entail fewer work-related stressors.

Academic investigations and debates are also focusing on gender differences in stress and coping behavior. In this 21st century, more participation of women in all different types of economic activities intensifying the curiosity of gender difference in stress. Although the research didn't find any statistical significance of stress among gender in ancient times (Webb *et al.*, 2010). But in modern days studies are showing the differences. Women scored significantly higher than the men on chronic stress (Matud, 2004). Female professionals experience unique stressors (Nelson & Quick, 1985). Jick & Mitz's (1986) bibliographical study showed that nineteen studies indicate that women tend to report higher rates of psychological distress compare to men. Kristina and Stephen (2005) also echoed in same way. Different factors found responsible for work-life stress among female managers, such as multiple roles, discrimination, stereo types, increased workload, work-family responsibilities, lack of career progress, etc. (Kristina & Stephen, 2005; Maryyam *et al.*, 2010; and Iwasaki *et al.*, 2004). As the economy of Bangladesh is experiencing a take-off stage and increased participation of women in diverse economic activities so women are exposed to typical work place stress. And things should be explored further to find a gender difference in work-related stress.

Bangladesh has experienced different life pattern because of COVID from beginning of 2020, though the Government declared lockdown for all organizations including educational institute at the end of March. This epidemic disease started to spread from end of 2019 from Wuhan, China to all over the world. From fear of death from CORONA virus, people started to maintain social and physical distance and started to work from their home. Though people have started to coop with new normal situation, however, until vaccine reach to everyone, counting death has become the common phenomena to everyone all over the world.

Research Question

It is assumed that work demand and (lack of) support from the organization may create work-life stress among managers. Thus, the main research question of this paper is:

- Is work-demand and work support create work-life stress among entry to mid-level managers?

Research Objectives

The main objective of this paper is to assess the overall work-life stress among entry to mid-level managers at workplace because of work from home during COVID 19 Pandemic situation. Considering the primary objective, the specific objectives of this research have been developed as following:

- To see the level of work-life stress among entry to mid-level managers.
- To see the impact of age and gender on work-life stress of managers due to the demand for and support of work at workplace.
- To see the correlation among different factors responsible for work-life stress.

Research Hypotheses

Following hypotheses were developed to address the above specific objectives.

H_{0wd_age} : Stress level from WD is not equal for two different age groups.

H_{0ws_age} : Stress level from WS is not equal for two different age groups.

H_{0wd_gender} : Stress level from WD is not equal for both male and female.

H_{0ws_gender} : Stress level from WS is not equal for both male and female.

Research Methodology

Variables for the study were identified based on the literature review. For quantitative analyses, a questionnaire survey was done on employees of different organizations who are in their mid-level career. The primary focus of this research was to identify the demand from and support of the organizations towards their employees, and if there is any stress for that. Participants were initially briefed on the aims and objectives of the study along with its confidentiality. Questionnaires link was then sent to the participants and given twenty minutes time for completion.

The secondary data are taken from journals, websites, and other references.

Responses were collected from Employees of different organizations who are in their mid-level career. Though all the respondents, however, almost everyone among them is feared about losing their

job because of COVID-19. In total 200 managers were surveyed, but ultimately 197 were considered for research as 3 respondents did not fulfill the questionnaire properly. Among 197 respondents, majority are male 136(69.01%). Following table shows respondents' gender-based profile:

Table 1: Respondents Age and Gender-based Profile

Age and Gender		Number of respondents	Total
<30	Male	45 (61.64%)	73 (37.06)
	Female	28 (38.36%)	
31-40	Male	91 (73.39%)	124 (62.94)
	Female	33 (26.61%)	
	Total	197	

This research followed the smaller item pool, 38 items, aka "Developmental Workplace Stressors Assessment Questionnaire". The 38 items represented eight scales: demands (10 items), control (6 items), support (5 items), role (4

items), relationships (4 items), rewards (5 items), change (3 items), and communications (1 item) (Maysaa *et al.*, 2010). For this research, only the demands (10 items), and support (5 items) items have been used.

Table 2: Factors Responsible for Work -life Stress

Demand Factors (10)		Support Factors (5)	
D1	Number of meetings	S1	Supervisor is deceitful to employees' concerns
D2	Demands affect personal relationships	S2	Ability to talk to supervisor is less
D3	Difficulty to unwind at home	S3	Do not get help by colleagues
D4	Too much work	S4	Performance feedback is not clear and timely
D5	Conflicting demands	S5	Supervisors is not helpful with work out problems
D6	Neglected tasks	--	--
D7	Work long hours	--	--
D8	Unrealistic time pressures	--	--
D9	No space for other activities	--	--
D10	Too much pressure	--	--

A 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (1= strongly disagree) to 5 (5= strongly agree) has been used to measure the level of work-life stress among managers.

For our study, both descriptive and inferential analysis have been used. Descriptive analysis (mean) has been used to measure work life stress and the Independent Samples T- test has been used for hypotheses testing. A bivariate analysis was also

done to find correlations among 15 factors of work demand and work support.

Scope of The Study

The study mainly attempts to find out the impact of work life stress among entry level to mid-level managers. Although there are many factors responsible to develop stress among managers. However, for the purpose of this study only two biological factors, age and gender as independent

variables and 15 factors of stress as dependent variables have been considered. This research can be address again with more factors both dependent and independent and in different work settings.

Findings and Analysis

Reliability Test

A reliability test is important to check the appropriateness of the tool used in the research. Higher value of Cronbach alpha indicates the more reliability of the scale generated and scales having Alpha value more than 0.7 can be considered as reliable (Nunnally, 1978). We have conducted reliability test and found Cronbach's alpha 0.790.

Descriptive Analysis

Analysis have been done to investigate factors, responsible for development of employee's stress at the time of COVID-19 considering age and gender as independent variables.

Impact of Age on Work Life Stress(Work Demand)

From the descriptive analysis, we may conclude that stress from work demand was higher among all age groups, however between 30 to 40 years age are more stressed in all cases except in the case of perceived workload, conflicting demand and time pressure. Among 10 factors of work demand responsible for stress, unnecessary work pressure scored highest (3.538) and time pressure is lowest (3.208), means managers stressed most from unnecessary work pressure (See table 1 in Appendices).

Impact of Age on Work Life Stress(Work Support)

From the descriptive analysis, we may conclude that stress from work support was higher among all age group, however between these two age groups, employees between 30 to 40 years age are more stressed in all cases except in the case of supervisor's sensitivity. It is very alarming that work-life stress is more from work support. Average score is (3.583) and support from supervisor scored highest (3.725), means it is necessary to train and motivate supervisor to provide support for their subordinate (See table 2 in Appendices).

Impact of Gender on Work Life Stress (Work Demand)

From the descriptive analysis, we may conclude that overall stress from work demand was higher

among female employees, though for individual factors the result is mixed. In some cases male stressed more, again in some cases female stressed more. Among all 10 factors female stressed most from unnecessary work pressure (3.538). (See table 3 in Appendices).

Impact of Gender on Work Life Stress (Work Support)

From the descriptive analysis, we may conclude that overall stress from work support was higher among male employees, however average score (3.596) is very much alarming (See table 4 in Appendices).

Hypotheses Testing

The analysis of major hypotheses of this research are (Table 3)

H_{0wd_age} : Stress level from work demand (WD) is not equal for two different age groups.

The p-value of Levene's test is 0.854 ($p > 0.05$). So, we look at the t-test (Assuming equal variance). The value of t-test is 0.602 (> 0.05); hence, we rejected the null hypothesis H_{0wd_age} at 5% level of significance. Thus, stress level from work demand from any organization is same for all age group.

H_{0ws_age} : Stress level from work support (WS) is not equal for two different age groups.

The p-value of Levene's test is 0.969 ($p > 0.05$). So, we look at the t-test (Assuming equal variance). The value of t-test is 0.283 (> 0.05); hence, we rejected the null hypothesis H_{0ws_age} at 5% level of significance. Thus, stress level from work support from any organization is same for all age group.

H_{0wd_gender} : Stress level from work demand (WD) is not equal for two male and female.

The p-value of Levene's test is 0.978 ($p > 0.05$). So, we look at the t-test (Assuming equal variance). The value of t-test is 0.870 (> 0.05); hence, we rejected the null hypothesis H_{0wd_gender} at 5% level of significance. Thus, stress level from work demand from any organization is equal for both male and female.

H_{0ws_gender} : Stress level from work support (WS) is not equal for two male and female. The p-value of Levene's test is 0.286 ($p > 0.05$). So, we look at the t-test (Assuming equal variance). The value of t-test is 0.089 (> 0.05); hence, we rejected the null hypothesis H_{0ws_gender} at 5% level of significance. Thus, stress level from work support from any organization is equal for both male and female.

Table 3: Independent Samples Test

Factors responsible	Assumption of variances	LTEV*		t	Df	Sig.(2-tailed)	t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.				Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Age_Work	EVA	.034	.854	-.523	195	.602	-.06169	-.29431	.17093
Demand	EVNA			-.520	148.166	.604	-.06169	-.29623	.17285
Age_Work	EVA	.001	.969	-1.077	195	.283	-.15460	-.43766	.12847
Support	EVNA			-1.078	151.394	.283	-.15460	-.43798	.12879
Gender_Work	EVA	.001	.978	-.164	195	.870	-.02017	-.26331	.22298
Demand	EVNA			-.166	120.192	.868	-.02017	-.26030	.21997
Gender_Work	EVA	1.144	.286	1.711	195	.089	.25533	-.03903	.54969
Support	EVNA			1.638	104.617	.104	.25533	-.05372	.56438

*LTEV means Levene's Test for Equality of Variances.

**EVA= Equal variances assumed; and EVNA= Equal variances not assumed

For individual factors under work demand and work support, 15 working hypotheses under two main headings: Age and Gender have been discussed below:

Impact of Age on Work Life Stress (Factors of Work Demand)

The p-value of Levene's test is more than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$) for every factors under work demand from organizations. So, we look at the t-test (Assuming equal variance). The values of t-test are also more than 0.05 (> 0.05) for very factors under work demand from organizations; hence, we rejected all 10 working hypothesis under work demand at 5% level of significance. Thus, stress level from any organization for each factor under work demand (WD) is same for all age groups (Table 5 in Appendices).

Impact of Age on Work Life Stress (Factors of Work Support)

The p-value of Levene's test is more than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$) for every factors under work support from organizations. So, we look at the t-test

(Assuming equal variance). The values of t-test are also more than 0.05 (> 0.05) for very factors under work support from organizations, except the case of performance feedback ($.05 = 0.05$); hence, we rejected all 5 working hypothesis under work support at 5% level of significance. Thus, stress level from any organization for each factor under work support (WS) is same for all age groups, except performance feedback (Table 6 in Appendices).

Impact of Gender on Work Life Stress (Factors Of Work Demand)

The p-value of Levene's test is more than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$) for every factors under work support from organizations. So, we look at the t-test (Assuming equal variance). The values of t-test are also more than 0.05 (> 0.05) for very factors under work support from organizations; hence, we rejected all 10 working hypothesis under work demand at 5% level of significance. Thus, stress level from any organization for each factor under work demand (WD) is same for both male and female (Table 7 in Appendices).

Impact of Gender on Work Life Stress (Factors of Work Support)

The p-value of Levene’s test is more than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$) for every factors under work support from organizations except the cases of ‘Supervisory sensitivity’ and ‘Access to supervisor’. In these two cases, p-value of Levene’s test are ($.028 < 0.05$) and ($.001 < 0.05$). So, we look at the t-test (Assuming equal variance). The values of t-test are more than 0.05 (> 0.05) for every factors under work support from organizations; hence, we rejected all 5 working hypotheses under work

support at 5% level of significance. Thus, stress level from any organization for each factor under work support (WS) is same for both male and female (Table 8 in Appendices).

Bivariate Correlation Analysis

A Bivariate correlation analysis was also done among 15 factors responsible for work-life stress among managers at the 0.05 and 0.01 level of significant. Details of analysis has been presented in Table 9 in Appendices.

Table 4: Summary Table of Correlation at 0.05 Level of Significant

Factors	D1	D2	D3	D5	D6
D3	Pear Corr Sig. (2-tailed)	.150* .036			
D7	Pear Corr Sig. (2-tailed)				.160* .025
S1	Pear Corr Sig. (2-tailed)			-.140* .049	
S3	Pear Corr Sig. (2-tailed)	.148* .037			
S4	Pear Corr Sig. (2-tailed)		.150* .036		

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed);
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Correlation at 0.05 level of significance: Correlation has been found significant (at the 0.05 level) and positive between meetings and supportive colleagues; between relationship and relax between relax and performance feedback and between neglected tasks and long working hours, however, negative between conflicting demands and supervisory sensitivity.

Correlation at 0.01 level of significance: Correlation also has been found significant (at the 0.01 level) between different factors responsible for creating stress among managers (Table 9 in Appendices):

Conclusion

Whether managers perceive job conditions as stressful or not depends on individual and situational factors-conditioning variables (House and Wells, 1978), and it may be changing

life pattern of individuals (Holmes and Rahe, 1967). Therefore, it is important to know the sources of stress before deciding how to manage individual or work-life stress. This study started with the mission to explore managers who is in their early to mid-level stage of their life (less than 40 years) and passing through stress (assumption) because of work demand and work support. This research did not find any significant relations between work-life stress and age or gender, however, managers on average were found to be stressed. Mean average of work-life stress was more than 3.3 for male or female, and for managers, age less than 30 or managers, age 30 to 40. Work demand and work support in both cases, managers, age 30 to 40 were found to be more stressed. In case of gender, the result is mixed. In case of work demand, female are more stressed and in case of work support, male stressed more. Among all factors all managers regardless their

age and gender focused more on unnecessary work pressure and lack of support from supervisor. Organizations may find out the way to avoid all unnecessary work pressure, which may ultimately reduce the work load and time pressure of managers. And managers will be able to concentrate more on important jobs. It is also important to improve interpersonal relationship between supervisors and subordinate. If needed organizations can arrange training program for supervisors on how to support and keep good relations. Though, the different factors responsible for stress were found to be moderate to highly correlated, all the hypotheses regarding stress were accepted and proved to be insignificant. Thus, the research might be misleading if the result is generalized for all level of management. Therefore, there must be more research on this issue considering stress is harmful, and sometimes devastating for individual life as well as work-life. On the other hand, this study has been done only on the mid-level management with the selective factors of developmental workplace stressors assessment questionnaire which was not found in earlier research on work-life stress

measurement in the context of Bangladesh. Future researchers may explore work-life stress with remaining set of factors (variables) with different set of sample composition.

Acknowledgement

The study is totally self-funded. There is not any conflict of interest among three authors. However, we convey our special thanks to all 40 students of executive program, who were doing their Executive MBA. They individually collected information from 5 employees of mid-level career including themselves. Therefore, thanks to all 200 sample employees who had voluntarily support us by giving their time to fill out the survey questionnaire, though 197 were usable.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Conflict of Interest

The authors do not have any conflict of interest.

References

1. Alam, M., Roy, D., Alam, S., Ashrafuzzaman, M., Ahmed Miah, M., Alam, K., ... Abdullah, M. (2015). *Age-sex Composition of Bangladesh Population. Population Monograph of Bangladesh*. Dhaka.
2. American Psychological Association (2020). *Stress in America™ 2020: A National Mental Health Crisis*.
3. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics. (2011). Bangladesh population and housing census 2011.
4. Barsade S, Wiesenfeld B, The Marlin Company (1997). *Attitudes in the American workplace III*. New Haven, CT: Yale University School of Management.
5. BLS (2003). Census of fatal occupational injuries. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Safety and Health Statistics Program. Fatal Injuries.
6. Cannon, W. B. (1929). *Bodily changes in pain, hunger, fear and rage*. New York: D. Appleton & Co.
7. Caplan, G. (1974). Support systems and community mental health. New York: *Behavioral Publications*.
8. Cox, T. and Griffiths, A. (2010) Work-Related Stress: A theoretical Perspective. In: Leka, S. and Houdmont, J., Eds., *Occupational Health Psychology*, Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester, 31-56.
9. Doble, N., & Supriya, M.V. (2011). Student Life Balance: Myth or Reality? *International Journal of Educational Management*, 25 (3), 237-251.
10. Elloy, D. F., & Smith, C. R. (2003). Patterns of stress, work-family conflict, role conflict, role ambiguity and overload among dual-career and single-career couple: An Australian study. *Cross Cultural Management*, 10 (1), 55-66.
11. Frese, M., and Zapf, D. (1988). "Methodological issues in the study of work stress": Objective vs. subjective measurement of work stress and question of longitudinal studies. In: C.L. Cooper and R. Payne (Eds.) *Causes, Coping*

- and Consequences of Stress at Work. (pp. 375-411). New York. Wiley
12. Hanes, T. (2002, June 30). *Stress is funny... haha; Former 911 dispatchers uses humor to teach coping strategies*. Toronto Star, p.F07.
 13. Hobfoll, S E, (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44, pp. 513–524.
 14. Hoff, L. A. (1989). *People in crisis: Understanding and helping* (3rd Ed.). Menlo Park, CA: Addison Wesley.
 15. Holmes, T. H., & Rahe, R. H. (1967). The social readjustment rating scale. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 11, 213–218.
 16. House, James S., and James A. Wells. (1978). *Occupational stress and social support*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
 17. Iwasaki, Y., MacKay, K. J., & Ristock, J. (2004). Gender-based analyses of stress among professional managers: An exploratory qualitative study. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 11, 56–79.
 18. Jick, T. D., & Mitz, L. F. (1986). Sex differences in work stress. *Journal of library administration*, 7(1), 135-152.
 19. Jernigan, J.(2020) Executive Wellness in 2020:Resilience and Relationships, Contentment, Volume 9 (2), 18-22.
 20. Kristina, G. and Stephen P. (2005). The role of gender in workplace stress: A critical literature review. *Health Education Journal*, Vol. 64, No. 3, 2005.
 21. Lindemann, E. (1944). Symptomatology and management of acute grief. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 101, 141–148.
 22. Maryam, Z. N., Ali, M. G., Leila, H., and Khadijeh, R. (2010). Occupational stress and family difficulties of working women”, *Current Research in Psychology* 1 (2): 75-81.
 23. Matud, M. P. (2004). Gender differences in stress and coping styles. *Personality and individual differences*, 37(7), 1401-1415.
 24. Maysaa, H. M., Coons, S.J., Guy, M.C., and Pelletier, K. R. (2010). Development and testing of the workplace stressors assessment questionnaire, *Journal of occupational and environmental medicine (JOEM)*, Volume 52, Number 11.
 25. Murman, D. (2015). The impact of age on cognition. *Seminars in Hearing*, 36(03), 111–121. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0035-1555115>
 26. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, Stress at Work. (1999), DHHS (NIOSH) Publication No. 99-101, <http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/stresswk.html>: Cincinnati, OH.
 27. Nelson, D. L., & Quick, J. C. (1985). Professional women: Are distress and disease inevitable?. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(2), 206-218.
 28. Nunnally J. C. (1978). “Psychometric theory”, *Applied Psychological Measurement*, New McGraw-Hill, pp.279-280.
 29. O'driscoll, M. P, Ilgen, D. R. Hildreth, K. (1992) Time devoted to job and off-job activities, interrole conflict, and affective experiences.
 30. Rauschenbach, C., Krumm, S., Thielgen, M., & Hertel, G. (2013). Age and work-related stress: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 28(7/8), 781–804. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-07-2013-0251>
 31. Razak, M. I., Yusof, N. M., Azidin, R. A. Latif, M. M. R., Ismail, Irzan., (2014). The impact of work stress towards work life balance in Malaysia. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, VolIII, Issue 11.
 32. Robbins PR, Sanghi S., (2006). *Organizational Behavior* (11th edn.). Dorling Kindersley, India.
 33. Safaria, T., Ahmad, & Nubli, M. (2011). Role ambiguity, role conflict, the role of job insecurity as mediator toward job stress among Malay academic staff: A SEM analysis. *Current Research Journal of Social Sciences*, 3 (3), 229-235.
 34. Sapolsky, R. M. (2004). Social status and health in humans and other animals. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 33(1), 393–418. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.33.070203.144000>
 35. Sapolsky, R. M. (2005). The influence of social hierarchy on primate health. *Science*, 308(5722), 648-652.
 36. Selye H (1956). The stress of life. McGraw Hill, New York.
 37. Stephen R (1999). *Organizational Behaviour* (8th edn.). Prince Hall of India, New Delhi.
 38. Webb, E., Thomson, S., Nelson, A., White, C., Koren, G., Rieder, M., & Van Uum, S. (2010). Assessing individual systemic stress

- through cortisol analysis of archaeological hair. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 37(4), 807–812. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2009.11.010>
39. What is cortisol? (n.d.). WebMD. Retrieved January 15, 2021, from <https://www.webmd.com/a-to-z-guides/what-is-cortisol>
40. Worker health chartbook, 2004. (2004). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. <https://doi.org/10.26616/NIOSH PUB2004146>.

Appendices

Table 1: Impact of Age on Work Life Stress (WLS) because of Work Demand (WD)

Demand Factors	Age	Mean	Std	Std. Error	Average Mean
Meetings	< 30 Years	3.2466	1.2448	.1457	3.279
	30 - 40 years	3.2984	1.2163	.1092	
Relationship	< 30 Years	3.0411	1.3275	.1554	3.269
	30 - 40 years	3.4032	1.2423	.1116	
Relax	< 30 Years	3.1370	1.2055	.14119	3.233
	30 - 40 years	3.2903	1.2990	.1167	
Workload	< 30 Years	3.5753	1.1657	.1364	3.347
	30 - 40 years	3.3306	1.3049	.1172	
Conflicting demands	< 30 Years	3.3973	1.2554	.1469	3.340
	30 - 40 years	3.3065	1.3921	.1250	
Neglected_tasks	< 30 Years	3.3151	1.2897	.1509	3.330
	30 - 40 years	3.3387	1.3608	.1222	
Work_long_hours	< 30 Years	3.2740	1.3151	.1539	3.381
	30 - 40 years	3.4435	1.4044	.1261	
Time_Pressure	< 30 Years	3.2329	1.3387	.1567	3.208
	30 - 40 years	3.1935	1.3891	.1248	
Other_activities	< 30 Years	3.2603	1.3440	.1573	3.320
	30 - 40 years	3.3548	1.3804	.1240	
Pressure	< 30 Years	3.4521	1.2023	.1407	3.538
	30 - 40 years	3.5887	1.3253	.1190	
Overall Demand	< 30 Years	3.2932	.81160	.0950	3.332
	30 - 40 years	3.3548	.79238	.0712	

Table 2: Impact of Age on Work Life Stress (WLS) because of Work Support (WS)

Support Factors	Age	Mean	Std	Std. Error	Average Mean
Supervisor's deceitfulness	< 30 Years	3.6438	1.2289	.1438	3.599
	30 - 40 years	3.5726	1.2242	.1099	
Access to supervisor	< 30 Years	3.4247	1.4134	.1654	3.604
	30 - 40 years	3.7097	1.2801	.1150	
Supportive colleague	< 30 Years	3.5068	1.1196	.1310	3.568
	30 - 40 years	3.6048	1.1605	.1042	
Performance feedback	< 30 Years	3.2603	1.2805	.1499	3.482
	30 - 40 years	3.6129	1.1736	.1054	

Support from supervisor	< 30 Years	3.6575	1.2717	.1488	3.725
	30 - 40 years	3.7661	1.1695	.1050	
Overall Support	< 30 Years	3.4986	.97132	.1137	3.583
	30 - 40 years	3.6332	.97384	.0875	

Table 3: Impact of Gender on Work Life Stress (WLS) because of Work Demand (WD)

Demand Factors	Gender	Mean	Std	Std. Error	Average Mean
Meetings	M	3.2794	1.1969	.1026	3.279
	F	3.2787	1.2927	.1655	
Relationship	M	3.3382	1.3008	.1116	3.269
	F	3.1148	1.2396	.1587	
Relax	M	3.3088	1.2443	.1067	3.233
	F	3.0656	1.3022	.1667	
Workload	M	3.4853	1.2531	.1075	3.421
	F	3.2787	1.2666	.1622	
Conflicting_demands	M	3.2353	1.3783	.1182	3.340
	F	3.5738	1.2310	.1576	
Neglected_tasks	M	3.3162	1.2864	.1103	3.330
	F	3.3607	1.4380	.1841	
Work_long_hours	M	3.3529	1.3906	.1192	3.381
	F	3.4426	1.3357	.1710	
Time_Pressure	M	3.1471	1.4012	.1202	3.208
	F	3.3443	1.2895	.1651	
Other_activities	M	3.2721	1.347	.1155	3.320
	F	3.4262	1.4078	.1803	
Pressure	M	3.5221	1.2879	.1104	3.538
	F	3.5738	1.2709	.1627	
Overall Demand	M	3.3257	.81030	.0699	3.332
	F	3.3459	.77644	.0994	

*M=male, F=Female

Table 4: Impact of Gender on Work Life Stress (WLS) because of Work Support (WS)

Support Factors	Gender	Mean	Std	Std. Error	Average Mean
Supervisors deceitfulness	M	3.6765	1.1475	.0984	3.599
	F	3.4262	1.3719	.1757	
Access to supervisor	M	3.7132	1.2347	.1059	3.604
	F	3.3607	1.5169	.1942	
Supportive colleague	M	3.6029	1.1174	.0958	3.568
	F	3.4918	1.2059	.1544	
Performance feedback	M	3.5809	1.1710	.1004	3.482
	F	3.2623	1.3153	.1684	
Support from supervisor	M	3.8015	1.1790	.1011	3.726
	F	3.5574	1.2586	.1612	
Overall Support	M	3.6750	.93268	.0799	3.596
	F	3.4197	1.0448	1.338	

*M=male, F=Female

Table 5: Independent Samples Test of Work Demand on ES

Factors resp- onsible	Assum- ption of variances	LTEV*				t-test for Equality of Means			
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Diff- erence	95% Confidence Inter- val of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Meetings	EVA	.089	.766	-.286	195	.775	-.0518	-.4088	.3051
	EVNA			-.285	148.265	.776	-.0518	-.41163	.3080
Relationship	EVA	.623	.431	-1.926	195	.056	-.3621	-.7329	.0087
	EVNA			-1.893	143.119	.060	-.3621	-.7402	.0160
Relax	EVA	2.176	.142	-.821	195	.412	-.1533	-.5215	.2148
	EVNA			-.838	160.248	.404	-.1533	-.5149	.2082
Workload	EVA	1.763	.186	1.321	195	.188	.2447	-.1205	.6099
	EVNA			1.361	164.888	.176	.2447	-.1104	.5998
Conflicting_ demands	EVA	2.184	.141	.458	195	.647	.0908	-.3000	.4816
	EVNA			.471	163.737	.638	.0908	-.2901	.4717
Neglected_ tasks	EVA	.398	.529	-.120	195	.905	-.0236	-.412	.3648
	EVNA			-.122	157.668	.903	-.0236	-.4072	.3600
Work_long_ hours	EVA	.449	.504	-.838	195	.403	-.1696	-.5688	.2296
	EVNA			-.852	159.145	.395	-.1696	-.5626	.2234
Time_Pressure	EVA	.200	.655	.194	195	.846	.0393	-.3595	.4381
	EVNA			.196	155.608	.845	.0393	-.3563	.4350
Other_activities	EVA	.024	.876	-.469	195	.640	-.0946	-.4923	.3032
	EVNA			-.472	154.354	.637	-.0946	-.4902	.3011
Pressure	EVA	.689	.408	-.723	195	.471	-.1367	-.5094	.2361
	EVNA			-.741	163.013	.459	-.1367	-.5006	.2273

*LTEV means Levene's Test for Equality of Variances.

**EVA= Equal variances assumed; and EVNA= Equal variances not assumed

Table 6: Independent Samples Test of Work Support on ES

Factors respon- sible	Assum- ption of variances	LTEV*				t-test for Equality of Means			
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Diffe- rence	95% Confidence Inter- val of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Supervisors deceitfulness	EVA	.020	.887	.394	195	.694	.0713	-.2854	.4280
	EVNA			.394	150.611	.694	.0713	-.2865	.4290
Access to supervisor	EVA	1.966	.162	-1.452	195	.148	-.2850	-.6722	.1022
	EVNA			-1.415	139.309	.159	-.2850	-.6833	.1133
Supportive colleague	EVA	.611	.435	-.580	195	.563	-.0980	-.4313	.2353
	EVNA			-.585	155.474	.559	-.0980	-.4287	.2327
Performance feedback	EVA	.933	.335	-1.969	195	.050	-.3526	-.7059	.0006
	EVNA			-1.925	140.683	.056	-.3526	-.7149	.0096
Support from supervisor	EVA	1.389	.240	-.609	195	.543	-.1086	-.4601	.2429
	EVNA			-.596	141.07	.552	-.1086	-.4687	.2515

*LTEV means Levene's Test for Equality of Variances.

**EVA= Equal variances assumed; and EVNA= Equal variances not assumed

Table 7: Independent Samples Test of Work Demand on ES

Factors responsible	Assumption of variances	LTEV*		t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.				Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Meetings	EVA	.500	.481	.004	195	.997	.0007	-.3722	.3737
	EVNA			.004	107.918	.997	.0007	-.3853	.3868
Relationship	EVA	.762	.384	1.131	195	.259	.2235	-.1662	.6132
	EVNA			1.152	120.810	.252	.2235	-.1606	.6075
Relax	EVA	.067	.797	1.250	195	.213	.2433	-.1404	.6269
	EVNA			1.229	110.943	.222	.2433	-.1490	.6355
Workload	EVA	.034	.854	1.066	195	.288	.2066	-.1755	.5887
	EVNA			1.062	114.437	.290	.2066	-.1788	.5920
Conflicting_ demands	EVA	1.947	.164	-1.646	195	.101	-.3385	-.7441	.0672
	EVNA			-1.718	128.407	.088	-.3385	-.7283	.0513
Neglected_ tasks	EVA	1.170	.281	-.216	195	.829	-.0445	-.4502	.3612
	EVNA			-.207	104.805	.836	-.0445	-.4701	.3811
Work_long_ hours	EVA	.484	.487	-.424	195	.672	-.0897	-.5072	.3279
	EVNA			-.430	119.921	.668	-.0897	-.5025	.3231
Time_Pressure	EVA	.699	.404	-.936	195	.351	-.1972	-.6129	.2185
	EVNA			-.966	124.821	.336	-.1972	-.6013	.2069
Other_ activities	EVA	.166	.684	-.732	195	.465	-.1542	-.5693	.2610
	EVNA			-.720	111.064	.473	-.1542	-.5784	.2701
Pressure	EVA	.022	.883	-.262	195	.794	-.0517	-.4416	.3381
	EVNA			-.263	116.972	.793	-.0517	-.4412	.3378

*LTEV means Levene's Test for Equality of Variances.

**EVA= Equal variances assumed; and EVNA= Equal variances not assumed

Table 8: Independent Samples Test of Work Support on ES

Factors responsible	Assumption of variances	LTEV*		t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.				Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Supervisors deceitfulness	EVA	4.921	.028	1.330	195	.185	.2502	-.1208	.6213
	EVNA			1.243	99.225	.217	.2502	-.1492	.6497
Access to supervisor	EVA	11.180	.001	1.723	195	.086	.3526	-.0510	.7562
	EVNA			1.594	97.146	.114	.3526	-.0865	.7916
Supportive colleague	EVA	.744	.389	.630	195	.530	.1111	-.2370	.4592
	EVNA			.612	107.997	.542	.1111	-.2490	.4713
Performance feedback	EVA	2.147	.144	1.698	195	.091	.3186	-.0513	.6885
	EVNA			1.625	104.379	.107	.3186	-.0702	.7074
Support from supervisor	EVA	1.452	.230	1.316	195	.190	.2441	-.1218	.6100
	EVNA			1.283	109.013	.202	.2441	-.1330	.6211

LTEV means Levene's Test for Equality of Variances.

**EVA= Equal variances assumed; and EVNA= Equal variances not assumed

Table 9: Bivariate Analysis

		Pearson's Correlations														
Factors***		D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	D7	D8	D9	D10	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5
D1	X	1														
	Y	.423**	1													
D2	X	.000	.150*	1												
	Y	.608	.036		1											
D3	X	.225**	.302**	-.040		1										
	Y	.001	.000	.579			1									
D4	X	.262**	.383**	-.002	.296**			1								
	Y	.000	.000	.978	.000				1							
D5	X	.259**	.360**	-.085	.252**	.557**				1						
	Y	.000	.000	.233	.000	.000					1					
D6	X	.417**	.374**	-.040	.448**	.229**	.160*					1				
	Y	.000	.000	.579	.000	.001	.025						1			
D7	X	.343**	.358**	-.025	.388**	.451**	.553**	.461**						1		
	Y	.000	.000	.724	.000	.000	.000	.000							1	
D8	X	.264**	.329**	-.197**	.284**	.356**	.461**	.426**	.421**							1
	Y	.000	.000	.005	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000							
D9	X	.444**	.399**	-.084	.366**	.449**	.392**	.487**	.504**	.649**						
	Y	.000	.000	.239	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	1					
D10	X	.099	.001	.288**	.074	-.140*	-.019	.009	.020	-.027	.015	1				
	Y	.166	.991	.000	.302	.049	.795	.896	.784	.710	.838		1			
S1	X	.037	-.045	.285**	.003	-.098	-.098	-.006	-.036	.014	.027	.618**	1			
	Y	.608	.533	.000	.971	.169	.169	.929	.619	.847	.709	.000		1		
S2	X	.148*	.097	.049	.092	-.187**	-.094	.102	.074	.086	.198**	.357**	.439**	1		
	Y	.037	.176	.495	.201	.009	.191	.154	.301	.232	.005	.000	.000		1	
S3	X	.087	.086	.181*	.089	-.023	.040	.039	.129	.036	.094	.474**	.586**	.463**	1	
	Y	.225	.230	.011	.211	.751	.580	.586	.071	.620	.188	.000	.000	.000		1
S4	X	.097	.045	.199**	.056	-.081	-.048	.033	-.009	.097	.113	.589**	.661**	.517**	.633**	1
	Y	.175	.534	.005	.432	.259	.501	.650	.905	.175	.115	.000	.000	.000	.000	

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) ;
*** X = Pear Corr, Y= Sig. (2-tailed).