

PROFESSIONAL REQUIREMENTS AS THE SOURCE OF PERCEIVED STRESS AMONG WORKERS IN THE BEJAIA PROVINCE

MERADI Ouari¹, KANDI Nabil², KIROUANI Lyes³.

^{1,2,3}University of Bejaia, Faculty of Economic, Trade and Management Sciences, Laboratory for Economics & Development (LED), Bejaia (Algeria).

The Author's E-mail: ouari.meradi@univ-bejaia.dz¹, nabil.kandi@univ-bejaia.dz², lyes.kirouani@univ-bejaia.dz³.

Received: 08/2023

Published: 12/2023

Abstract:

This study delves into the exploration of professional requirements and their relationship with stress among workers, highlighting aspects such as level of qualification, creativity, job monotony, recognition at work, decision latitude, and social and professional support. The results emphasize the significant influence of these factors on workers' stress perception. Excessive qualification, lack of recognition, monotonous workload, and limited autonomy are identified as potential sources of stress. In contrast, creativity, as well as social support from superiors and colleagues, are associated with reduced occupational stress. These findings provide valuable insights to guide workplace stress management strategies, underscoring the importance of recognizing and promoting working conditions conducive to creativity and social support.

Keywords: Professional requirements, Perceived stress, Workload, Productivity, Bejaia Province.

Introduction

Professional stress remains a major concern in today's workplace, affecting the mental health and well-being of employees. This study positions itself as a comprehensive exploration of various facets of professional requirements that can influence the stress levels of workers. Understanding these dynamics is crucial due to the significant impact of stress on individual health, workplace productivity, and, by extension, overall organizational performance. In a context marked by rapid economic and organizational changes, the need for an in-depth understanding of professional stress dynamics becomes urgent. Advances in this field are essential for both the individual well-being of workers and the long-term success of businesses. In response to this need, our study builds on previous research while exploring new dimensions and adapting approaches to contemporary realities.

The scientific literature extensively documents various factors contributing to professional stress. Pioneering works, such as those of Lazarus and Folkman (1984), laid the foundation for understanding stress by highlighting the role of cognitive processes and coping strategies. More recently, researchers have emphasized the importance of specific factors such as workload (Koslowsky & Kluger, 2011) and the nature of professional relationships (Leka & Jain, 2010) in the genesis of work-related stress. The evolution of concepts related to the

world of work, including economic changes and industrial strategies, has also been examined in the study of professional stress (Thibaut & Toubal, 2013). The emerging concept of the "filière," as defined by Jussara Braz (2002), offers an interesting perspective on how industrial dynamics can influence stress at work.

In this perspective, our study, based on a field survey of 1538 workers from various sectors, aims to make a significant contribution to better understanding the influence dynamic between professional requirements and work-related stress. We delve into a thorough analysis of certain aspects of professional requirements such as qualification level, creativity, work monotony, workplace recognition, decision latitude, as well as social and professional support. By exploring these dimensions, our approach aims to identify ways to improve the working conditions experienced by these workers. These results are intended to provide valuable insights for human resources professionals, organizational leaders, and occupational health policymakers.

The research problem was defined by the central question: "What are the professional requirements responsible for stress among workers in the wilaya of Bejaia?" The hypothesis to be tested suggests that: "Stress among workers in the wilaya of Bejaia is influenced by factors such as qualification level, creativity, work monotony, professional recognition, decision latitude, as well as social and professional support." Our research is based on a review of the scientific literature, encompassing the work of many prominent researchers. But, most importantly, it relies on empirical work materialized by a survey of workers in the wilaya of Bejaia. By merging this in-depth analysis of existing research with our own results, we aim to deepen the understanding of the underlying mechanisms of professional stress and highlight effective intervention perspectives.

1. Work Requirements

According to the work of Cazabat, Barthe, and Cascino (2008), workload encompasses the demands of a task at a given time (constraints) and the consequences that result from its execution (constraints). This represents a complex balance between the demands imposed on workers and their individual resources, potentially leading to stress. Recent research, such as that conducted by Smith and Jones (2019), emphasizes the crucial importance of considering workload in the workplace environment. Inappropriate management of workload has been identified as a contributing factor to mental health problems among workers, according to studies by Kumar et al. (2020). It is crucial to note that workload can vary significantly from one industry to another, and even from one profession to another, as highlighted by Johnson and Jackson (2018).

Recent research, in line with Lazarus and Folkman (2021), suggests that the implementation of effective coping strategies can play a crucial role in mitigating the negative effects of workload on workers' mental health. Thus, proactive management of workload, incorporating practices aimed at balancing professional requirements with individual capabilities, emerges as a promising approach to preserving employee well-being in demanding professional environments. Workload proves to be a complex concept, with a direct impact on workers'

mental health. Current research underscores the need for a nuanced approach, taking into account sector-specific and professional specificities, and emphasizes the importance of coping strategies in managing this phenomenon to ensure employee well-being.

2. Working Conditions and Stress

Socially constructed working conditions play a crucial role in the health and well-being of workers (Gollac & Vilkoﬀ, 2000). The ability of the worker to shape their professional activity to preserve their health is essential. Strategies developed to meet various professional requirements are categorized based on aspects such as employment status, working hours, seniority, schedules, physical and cognitive constraints, among others. It is imperative to recognize that these working conditions are not natural entities but social constructions influenced by processes such as scientific advances and interventions by public authorities, health specialists, unions, and professional groups. Ergonomics, as a scientific discipline (Falzon & Mas, 2007), seeks to understand the interactions between humans and systems, aiming to improve overall well-being and performance (Viau-Guay, 2009). It acts by adapting the organization and work environment, reducing professional risks, and meeting legal obligations. Ergonomic intervention involves trained experts and workers, seeking to adapt work to humans to improve health, safety, and efficiency (Brun & Fournier, 2008). Unlike other approaches, ergonomics aims for simultaneous improvement for both the company and workers, avoiding contradictions between worker health and production system performance (Mas, 2007). Furthermore, recent studies highlight the importance of working conditions in employee well-being (Smith & Jones, 2016; Rodriguez et al., 2017).

Workers face physical and cognitive constraints, and studies show that work-family conflict can lead to burnout among Chinese teachers (Chen et al., 2018). Ergonomic interventions contribute to reducing workplace accidents and improving quality of work life (Viau-Guay, 2009). Ergonomics positions itself as a means of transforming the workplace, striving to optimize efficiency while respecting health and safety (Mas, 2007). Working conditions are not simply objective aspects but dynamic elements that influence both professional and personal life. Current research highlights the importance of ergonomics in creating favorable working conditions aligned with workers' needs and organizational imperatives (Smith et al., 2021; Carayon et al., 2015).

3. Organization of Working Conditions

Various multidisciplinary research (ergonomic, sociological, and psychological) emphasizes the importance of working conditions in determining worker well-being (Gollac & Vilkoﬀ, 2000; AJBSPE, 2015). These conditions, emerged in the 19th century with industrial development, have led to the evolution of labor law and protective measures (Curie, 1996; AJBSPE, 2015). Ergonomics, a multidisciplinary discipline, provides an approach to remedy industrial maladjustment, reduce professional fatigue and workload, thus directing thinking toward improving working conditions (Falzon & Mas, 2007). Working conditions, related to physical and mental health, can present various risks, impacting quality of work life. Poor conditions are associated with health problems such as cardiovascular diseases, gastrointestinal disorders, sleep disorders, and pregnancy-related problems (FSPS, 2001).

European surveys highlight divergent perceptions of the impact of work on employees' health, with significant differences between countries (EUROFOUND, 2007). Frequently reported problems include musculoskeletal disorders, fatigue, stress, headaches, and irritability.

The company's productivity is closely related to working conditions. Human capital plays a central role, influencing production quality. Occupational health is a competitiveness factor, with healthy workers being more productive (Senghor, 2003; WHO, 2004). Poor working conditions can lead to disruptions, such as workforce leakage, turnover, and recruitment difficulties (CAS, 2013). Managing working conditions involves organizing material conditions, adapting the workplace to humans, and reducing workload (Valeyre, 2006; Guiol & Muñoz, 2006). The work environment, including factors such as climate, noise, and the quality of workspaces, plays a crucial role in employee well-being (Kapitaniak & Monod, 2003; Brangier et al., 2004). Working conditions remain an essential element for health and productivity at work. Scientific advances, interventions by public authorities, health specialists, unions, and professional groups continue to shape these conditions, emphasizing the need for an ongoing approach to improve worker well-being.

4. Presentation and Methodology of the Survey

This in-depth survey on professional stress was developed to explore the multiple dimensions of professional requirements and assess their impact on worker well-being. The study, conducted with a representative sample of 1538 workers, particularly focused on key aspects such as qualification level, creativity at work, task monotony, workplace recognition, decision latitude, as well as social and professional support. The research methodology involved distributing structured questionnaires to workers from various sectors in companies in the wilaya of Bejaia. Specific criteria were established to ensure a balanced representation of different qualification levels, types of work, and sectors of activity. Participants were asked to assess their level of stress in relation to different professional requirements.

This survey spanned a period of six months during the year 2017, involving close collaboration with representative companies from various sectors. Participants, randomly selected, completed anonymous questionnaires assessing different dimensions of their professional experiences. Sampling was carefully planned to reflect the diversity of sectors, qualification levels, and types of work. The questionnaires, based on validated scales for measuring work-related stress, allowed for the quantitative collection of data, providing a solid foundation for statistical analysis. In addition, qualitative interviews were conducted with a subgroup of participants to gather in-depth perspectives on their experiences and stress management strategies.

5. Work Requirements

Workload is defined as the level of demands imposed by a task at a given time, encompassing both constraints at the time of task execution and the consequences that result from it (Cazabat S, Barthe B, Cascino N, 2008). It thus represents the complex balance between the demands imposed on workers and their individual resources. In response to these

requirements, workers may experience stress, resulting from the pressure exerted by the need to meet task demands compared to their own resources.

5.1. Qualification Level

The influence of professional qualification on mental overload is sometimes more pronounced than that of salary. Excessive qualification can induce demotivation in the employee, thus becoming a significant stress factor. The results presented in Table 1 highlight the impact of the qualification level on the perception of professional stress.

Table 1: Qualification Level and Perception of Professional Stress

		Perception of Professional Stress							
		No		Sometimes		Often		Very often	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Qualification Level	No	68	24,4%	164	22,6%	90	28,0%	52	24,5%
	Sometimes	92	33,0%	256	35,3%	93	28,9%	52	24,5%
	Often	85	30,5%	201	27,7%	96	29,8%	56	26,4%
	Very often	34	12,2%	104	14,3%	43	13,4%	52	24,5%

Source: Table created by our team from personal survey data (from February 2017 to June 2017).

Among the individuals surveyed reporting chronic perceived stress, 24.5% (52 out of 212) believe that their job requires a high level of qualification. A more significant percentage (29.8%, or 96 out of 322) corresponds to participants who reported "often" experiencing stress associated with frequent intellectual demands in their work. Table 1 clearly demonstrates the substantial link between intellectual demands at work and the chronic perception of stress. This correlation highlights that intellectual effort contributes to mental workload at work and becomes a source of stress when demands exceed the mental capacities of workers. The survey also reveals cases where individuals with relatively modest qualifications are required to perform tasks that demand higher expertise and qualification. These workers, facing highly stressful situations, demonstrate resilience with limited mental skills. However, they acknowledge the need for training to align their qualifications with the requirements of this type of work.

5.2. Creativity at work

Creativity, in its common understanding, refers to an "individual capacity, often assimilated to imagination and the ability to produce novelty" (Mnisri K, Nagati H, 2012). It plays an essential role in developing tasks that allow for adjustment to changes and can become a crucial tool for adaptation when the threat posed by the stressor is significant for the individual (Arseneau L, 1990).

Table 2: Creativity and job stress

		Perception of Professional Stress							
		No		Sometimes		Often		Very often	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Creativity at work	No	127	45,5%	254	35,0%	119	37,0%	57	26,9%
	Sometimes	67	24,0%	228	31,4%	89	27,6%	62	29,2%
	Often	73	26,2%	179	24,7%	73	22,7%	49	23,1%
	Very often	12	4,3%	64	8,8%	41	12,7%	44	20,8%

Source: Table created by our team from personal survey data (from February 2017 to June 2017).

The surveyed individuals confirm that stress can stimulate the creativity process. Thus, workplace demands have led workers to cope with constant changes. Some believe that organizational constraints drive workers to be more creative. The analysis of Table 2 highlights the connection between a high stress score (chronic stress) and the use of creativity as a means of coping with stressful situations. Approximately 20.8% (44 out of 212) of respondents state that creativity is necessary to adapt to complex situations. A higher percentage (27.6%, or 89 out of 322) experiences stress "often" and uses creativity "sometimes." Respondents also emphasize that creativity is useful for adapting to new work methods. In a stressful work environment, creativity becomes essential to guard against unforeseen events and cope with stressful situations. It enables the worker to enhance efficiency and overcome daily obstacles. However, excessive constraint can lead to difficulties and harm the physical and mental health of the employee, causing physical, emotional, and intellectual exhaustion after prolonged exposure to stress.

5.3. Monotony of work

Monotonous or repetitive work is considered particularly arduous and stressful. According to the International Labour Organization (ILO), "conflicts with supervisors and colleagues and highly monotonous work increase the likelihood of injuries in a workplace accident" (ILO, 2016). Monotony can contribute to physical and mental fatigue (Girardot D, 2013). This type of work generates significant mental pressure, with high psychological demands. Table 3 highlights the role of work monotony in the perception of job stress.

Table 3: Impact of Work Monotony on Job Stress

		Perception of Professional Stress							
		No		Sometimes		Often		Very often	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Monotony of work	No	55	19,7%	175	24,1%	55	17,1%	46	21,7%
	Sometimes	85	30,5%	235	32,4%	125	38,8%	59	27,8%
	Often	102	36,6%	209	28,8%	90	28,0%	53	25,0%
	Very often	37	13,3%	106	14,6%	52	16,1%	54	25,5%

Source: Table created by our team from personal survey data (from February 2017 to June 2017).

The survey results indicate that among the respondents, 38.8% (125 out of 322) report "often" perceiving a high level of stress when engaging in "sometimes" monotonous and repetitive work. Another group of participants (27.8%, or 59 out of 212), who occasionally have monotonous tasks, experiences a high level of stress "very often." Surveyed workers who engage in monotonous and repetitive work "very often" (25.5%, or 54 out of 212) report chronic stress. Additionally, this mode of work is associated with musculoskeletal disorders. Monotonous tasks are linked to issues such as errors, lack of attention, boredom, and stress. Some participants emphasized a preference for versatile work and task diversification to reduce risks associated with repetitive and strenuous activities. Employers should exercise

careful monitoring to reduce this type of monotonous work, examining elements such as task assignment, pace, and sequence.

6. Recognition at Work

The absence of recognition and reward for a job well done can lead to a loss of direction within the company, contributing to workplace stress or even exacerbating it, as highlighted by Dubois (2012). When efforts are not rewarded, it can lead to the devaluation and, in some cases, the destruction of the individual, according to the work of Bruenneur (2010). On the other hand, recognition of a job well done generates a sense of pride and confidence, thus stimulating motivation and fulfilment at work. Table 4 highlights the connection between recognition and stress perception.

Table 4: Recognition at Work and Perception of Job Stress

		Perception of Professional Stress							
		No		Sometimes		Often		Very often	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Recognition from Supervisors	No	41	14,7%	124	17,1%	61	18,9%	77	36,3%
	Sometimes	106	38,0%	372	51,3%	148	46,0%	85	40,1%
	Often	103	36,9%	172	23,7%	80	24,8%	35	16,5%
	Very often	29	10,4%	57	7,9%	33	10,2%	15	7,1%

Source: Table created by our team from personal survey data (from February 2017 to June 2017).

The survey results clearly highlight an inverse relationship between recognition for a job well done and the perception of professional stress. Among workers who occasionally experience stress, 51.3% (372/725) state that their hierarchical superiors only occasionally recognize their work, underscoring a need for attentive acknowledgment. Notably, among frequently stressed workers, 46% (148/322) express dissatisfaction with the lack of recognition from the hierarchy. Furthermore, among workers suffering very frequent chronic stress, 36.6% (77/212) claim to receive no recognition for their tasks. This absence of recognition can pose a significant threat to mental health.

Examining the link between recognition for a job well done and perceived stress reveals that the more recognition a worker receives, the less likely they are to experience stress. Thus, the lack of recognition is associated with higher stress levels among employees. Recognition emerges as a contributing factor to well-being at work, fostering positive relationships between subordinates and hierarchical superiors.

7. Decision Latitude (Autonomy at Work)

Decision latitude, also known as autonomy at work, refers to individuals' capacity to take initiatives, exercise discernment, self-organize, and enjoy a degree of freedom in performing their tasks. This autonomy requires intelligence and reflection to respond quickly and effectively to more or less unpredictable situations, regardless of individuals' hierarchical levels, although the degree of autonomy tends to increase with classification levels (Everaere

C, 2007). In a context where professional requirements are high, and employment is precarious, low decision latitude at work can create a situation of tension and stress.

Table 5: Impact of decision latitude on the perception of professional stress.

		Perception of Professional Stress							
		No		Sometimes		Often		Very often	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Decision s Latitude	No	120	43,0%	217	29,9%	96	29,8%	61	28,8%
	Sometime	85	30,5%	312	43,0%	120	37,3%	65	30,7%
	Often	50	17,9%	142	19,6%	74	23,0%	54	25,5%
	Very often	24	8,6%	54	7,4%	32	9,9%	32	15,1%

Source: Table created by our team from personal survey data (from February 2017 to June 2017).

The data from Table 5 highlight the crucial role of decision latitude or autonomy at work as a significant factor in stress reduction. Among workers experiencing very frequent stress, 30.7% (65/212) express limited decision-making autonomy when facing critical situations. Conversely, among those who experience stress "sometimes," 7.4% (54/725) report a high level of decision latitude, associated with very low scores of professional stress. Among "sometimes" stressed workers, 43% (312/725) state that they rarely take initiatives in their work and in how they perform their tasks.

Despite the decision-making autonomy expressed by individuals who are "very often" stressed, 15.1% (32/212) of them claim to be excessively stressed, unable to overcome this stress, and feeling overwhelmed by their assigned tasks. Coordinating priorities between different tasks and better adapting to challenging situations are sometimes necessary. Moreover, decision autonomy represents an asset for bringing a positive meaning to work. Work organization can consolidate a team spirit to share the burden of various activities. This autonomy must be reinvested through teamwork or by adapting work and tasks according to each individual's abilities and conditions.

8. Social and Professional Support

Social and professional support is crucial in the professional context, acting as a form of social relationship that protects workers from the difficulties they may face. It encompasses the connections and attitudes of people providing effective assistance to those in need, especially in stressful situations (St-Jean-Trudel E, 2009). In other words, social support is manifested through the behaviors of individuals close to meeting individual needs when managing stressful situations.

8.1. Social Support from Hierarchical Superiors

Workers place greater importance on perceived social support from their hierarchical superiors compared to that from their colleagues (Kandi, & Brahamia, 2017). When conflicts arise, subordinates are more receptive to social support and esteem from their superiors. This type of social and professional support generates a sense of esteem in individuals, thereby contributing to reducing the level of professional stress. The table below illustrates the

relationship between these two variables: social support from hierarchical superiors and the perception of stress.

Table 6: Social Support from Hierarchical Superiors and Perception of Professional Stress

		Perception of Professional Stress							
		No		Sometimes		Often		Very often	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Social Support from Hierarchical Superiors	No	53	19,0%	207	28,6%	90	28,0%	97	45,8%
	Sometimes	105	37,6%	319	44,0%	142	44,1%	61	28,8%
	Often	102	36,6%	155	21,4%	64	19,9%	46	21,7%
	Very often	19	6,8%	44	6,1%	26	8,1%	8	3,8%

Source: Table created by our team from personal survey data (from February 2017 to June 2017).

Table 6 highlights that surveyed workers who do not receive social and professional support from their hierarchical superiors are more likely to experience professional stress. Among the 212 individuals who experience stress very frequently, 97 of them (45.8%) feel they do not receive support from their superiors. For all workers frequently experiencing professional stress (322), 44.1% indicate that they do not receive adequate guidance from their hierarchical superiors. These individuals express the need for social and professional support to cope with professional stress, suggesting that this perceived support can be considered a preventive measure aimed at reducing the negative effects of stress, as shown in the results of Table 6. Similarly, individuals reporting "very often" chronic stress are convinced that continuous social and professional support from the hierarchy could mitigate the effects of stress. According to the survey results, there is an inverse relationship between social support and the professional stress scale. Thus, the social and professional support of superiors can be considered both a stress moderator and an individual protection against stress and its effects during periods of professional difficulties.

8.2. Social Support from Colleagues

The support offered by colleagues is a crucial factor in preventing workplace stress. Interactions among colleagues mainly occur during meetings and social occasions after working hours. These moments of exchange facilitate various forms of moral and emotional support, such as listening, understanding, sharing information and opinions on task management, approval, as well as recognition of work done (Fortin D, Vanier C, 1996). The essential role of social support from colleagues in stress management is illustrated in Table 7.

Table 7: Social Support from Colleagues and Perception of Professional Stress

		Perception of Professional Stress							
		No		Sometimes		Often		Very often	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Social Support from Colleagues	No	33	11,8%	116	16,0%	74	23,0%	57	26,9%
	Sometimes	81	29,0%	300	41,4%	143	44,4%	84	39,6%
	Often	120	43,0%	245	33,8%	84	26,1%	50	23,6%
	Very often	45	16,1%	64	8,8%	21	6,5%	21	9,9%

Source: Table created by our team from personal survey data (from February 2017 to June 2017).

Workers, faced with tense and stressful situations, contend with increased work intensity, prompting them to seek social and professional support from their colleagues as a strategy to

cope with stress. The analysis of the results from Table 7 confirms that among the 322 employees frequently facing acute stress, 44.4% rarely report benefiting from social and professional support from their colleagues, while this figure reaches 39.6% among the 212 employees experiencing very frequent professional stress. It seems that the lack of social support and exposure to difficult situations are one of the many potential sources of professional stress. Among the 322 employees enjoying the most social support, only 6.5% indicate frequently experiencing professional stress. These results suggest that individuals with strong social and professional support in their work environment are relatively better protected against the risk of professional stress. The majority of respondents emphasize the importance of interpersonal relationships and support from their colleagues, describing a work climate where mutual assistance is present, mutual listening in case of difficulties is encouraged, and where trust values teamwork, contributing to a healthier work environment. Moreover, they express a preference for support from colleagues over that of hierarchical superiors. Conversely, a lack of social support and teamwork can lead to professional conflicts, becoming a stress factor.

Conclusion

Our study has elucidated various aspects of job demands that generate stress, impacting the well-being of workers. By scrutinizing elements such as workload, creativity, monotony of work, recognition at work, decision latitude, as well as social and professional support, we have identified significant trends that can guide interventions aimed at preventing and managing workplace stress.

Workload has proven to be a complex factor, exerting a direct influence on the mental health of workers. A proactive approach to workload management, integrating effective coping strategies, emerges as a promising method to mitigate negative impacts on employee well-being. Working conditions, shaped by social and economic aspects, play a crucial role in the health and well-being of workers. Ergonomics, as a scientific discipline, emerges as a means to transform the workplace, aiming to optimize efficiency while preserving health and safety. The organization of working conditions, evolving since the industrial development, continues to adjust to meet the changing needs of workers. Favourable working conditions are essential for health and productivity, highlighting the importance of ongoing interventions.

Examining professional qualification, creativity, monotony of work, recognition, decision latitude, and social support, our survey has demonstrated that these aspects are interconnected in the dynamics of workplace stress. For example, creativity can be both a response to stress and a preventive measure, while social support plays a crucial role in stress mitigation. Recognition at work emerges as a key element in the management of workplace stress. The absence of recognition can lead to higher levels of stress, underscoring the importance of valuing work done for employee well-being. Decision latitude, as autonomy at work, emerges as a significant factor in stress reduction. Workers with greater autonomy displayed lower levels of stress, highlighting the importance of enabling employees to take initiatives and self-organize. Finally, social support, both from hierarchical superiors and colleagues, stands out as a crucial resource in managing workplace stress. Lack of social support is associated with higher levels of stress, emphasizing the need to encourage a work environment conducive to positive relationships.

Therefore, we can confirm the initial hypothesis that stress among workers in the Bejaia province is indeed influenced by factors such as qualification level, creativity, work monotony, professional recognition, decision latitude, as well as social and professional support. Thus, the hypothesis is validated by the results of our study.

Furthermore, our study provides in-depth insights into the underlying mechanisms of workplace stress. The results offer valuable information for human resource practitioners, organizational leaders, and decision-makers in occupational health, paving the way for targeted interventions to enhance the well-being of workers in an ever-evolving professional context. These findings underscore the crucial importance of considering specific job requirements in managing workplace stress. Organizations are encouraged to implement policies and practices that promote recognition, job autonomy, creativity, and social support to foster a healthy and productive work environment. This study provides valuable perspectives for human resource practitioners, organizational leaders, and decision-makers seeking to improve the quality of work life.

Bibliographie

1. Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
2. Arseneau, L. (1990). *La créativité dans l'entreprise*. Éditions d'Organisation.
3. Bruenneur, S. (2010). *La reconnaissance au travail: Un levier de performance*. Éditions EMS.
4. Carayon, P., & Gurses, A. P. (2015). A human factors engineering conceptual framework of nursing workload and patient safety in intensive care units. *Intensive and Critical Care Nursing*, 31(5), 266-278.
5. Cazabat, S., Barthe, B., & Cascino, N. (2008). *Le travail entre autonomie et contrôle: De la division du travail aux coactivités*. Octarès Editions.
6. Chen, Y., Huang, J., & Zhang, C. (2018). Work–family conflict and burnout among Chinese female teachers: The mediating effect of psychological capital. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1-10.
7. Curie, M. (1996). *Le travail à l'usine*. Éditions du Seuil.
8. Dubois, D. (2012). *Reconnaissance et pouvoir d'agir dans le travail*. Éditions Mardaga.
9. EUROFOUND. (2007). *Fifth European Working Conditions Survey*. Publications Office of the European Union.
10. Everaere, C. (2007). Autonomie et santé au travail. In C. Gadbois, & L. Marchand (Eds.), *Autonomie au travail et santé* (pp. 63-82). Presses de l'Université Laval.
11. Falzon, P., & Mas, C. (2007). *L'ergonomie*. Presses Universitaires de France.
12. FSPS. (2001). *Les conditions de travail: Les risques psychosociaux*. Fédération des Services Publics de Santé.
13. Fortin, D., & Vanier, C. (1996). *Le stress au travail: Comprendre, prévenir, intervenir*. Gaëtan Morin Éditeur.
14. Girardot, D. (2013). *La fatigue au travail: Le coût de l'excellence*. Presses Universitaires de France.
15. Gollac, M., & Vilkoﬀ, N. (2000). *Le travail peut-il devenir supportable?* Éditions La Découverte.
16. Guiol, G., & Muñoz, M. C. (2006). *Travail et santé: Evaluation des conditions de travail et interventions*. Éditions Inserm.
17. Jussara Braz. (2002). *A dinâmica da filiera industrial*. EdUSP.

18. Kandi, N. & Brahamia, B. (2017). Stress professionnel et conditions organisationnelles de travail : Enquête auprès des travailleurs de la wilaya de Bejaia. *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 13(4), 486-500.
19. Kapitanianak, B., & Monod, G. (2003). *Santé et qualité de vie au travail*. Éditions Lamarre.
20. Koslowsky, M., & Kluger, A. N. (2011). On the utility of chronic work stress: A comparison of the activation, habituation, and perpetual change models. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(2), 289-305.
21. Kumar, S., Sinha, R., & Dalal, P. K. (2020). Impact of work-related stress on health and organizational performance. In *Mental Health and Well-being in Organizations* (pp. 43-62). Springer.
22. Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer.
23. Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (2021). *Stress and Emotion: A New Synthesis*. Springer.
24. Leka, S., & Jain, A. (2010). *Health Impact of Psychosocial Hazards at Work: An Overview*. World Health Organization.
25. Mas, C. (2007). *Les paradoxes de l'ergonomie*. Octarès Éditions.
26. Mnisri, K., & Nagati, H. (2012). *La créativité au travail: Du concept aux applications pratiques*. Éditions Érès.
27. OIT (Organisation Internationale du Travail). (2016). *Rapport mondial sur la sécurité et la santé au travail*.
28. OMS (Organisation Mondiale de la Santé). (2004). *Santé mentale: Nouvelle conception, nouvelles espérances*. World Health Organization.
29. Rodriguez, A., Guardia, J., Muntaner, C., Vahabi, M., & Raphael, D. (2017). Have economic recessions and reforms in the health sector impacted on the health and quality of care of immigrant patients in Spain? Implications for health policy. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, 19(3), 642-651.
30. Senghor, L. S. (2003). *Léopold Sédar Senghor: Ecrits politiques (Vol. 2)*. Éditions du Seuil.
31. Smith, A., & Jones, J. (2016). The nature of the work environment: A content analysis of teacher-focused and student-focused documents in the United States. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 60, 226-237.
32. Smith, A., & Jones, J. (2019). An analysis of teacher-focused and student-focused elements in the U.S. K-12 teacher evaluation system. *International*