International Journal of Human Resource Studies
ISSN 2162-3058
2024, Vol. 14, No. 2

Do Employee Wellbeing and Employee Service Performance Affected with Psychological Stress Post Covid 19?

Zuraina binti Dato Mansor

School Of Business and Economics, Universiti Putra Malaysia

Rosmah Mohamed

School of Business and Economics, Universiti Putra Malaysia

Norsiah Jaharudin

School of Business and Economics, Universiti Putra Malaysia

Received: Mar. 20, 2024 Accepted: Mar. 20, 2024 Online published: Aug. 3, 2024

doi:10.5296/ijhrs.v14i2.21772 URL: https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v14i2.21772

Abstract

Given the importance of employee service performance, this study aims to examine the relationship between stress factors and employee well-being, and test whether perceived organization support (POS) can leverage the effect of stress on employee service performance (ESP). Additionally, the study examines the mediating role of employee well-being (EWB) on the relationship between stress factors and ESP. The data were gathered using close-ended, self-administered five Likert scale questionnaires from frontline employees working in retail industries in Klang Valley, Malaysia, through google form surveys. A total of 276 data was collected. Hypotheses were developed based on Job Demand-Resource (JD-R) theory and tested using PLS-SEM technique. Results revealed that stress factors (emotional exhaustion and perceived job insecurity) are not significantly associated with EWB, but EWB significantly related to ESP. The result also shown that EWB does not mediate the relationship between stress factors and ESP, POS does not moderate the relationship between stress factors and EW. Instead of diminishing the stress factors (job demands: emotional exhaustion and perceived job insecurity) among the employees in retail industries, the study anticipated that by increasing the level of job resources, may influence the EWB and motivate a better ESP. The study extends the current literature on EWB by examining the

effect of stress from the psychological perspective with the ESP by focusing on specifically on the influence of perceived job insecurity and emotional exhaustion to EWB.

Keywords: Employee Wellbeing, Stress Factors, Emotional Exhaustion, Perceived Job Insecurity, Employee Service Performance.

1. Introduction

Several studies have proven that employee well-being leads to various individual and organizational outcomes, for example, increased organizational performance and productivity (Hewett et al., 2018), customer satisfaction (Sharma et al., 2016), and employee engagement (Tisu et al., 2020). Further, study also suggested that organizations' performance and productivity can be tied to the performance of its employees (Shin & Konrad, 2017). Employee performance is related to output of an employee in terms of quantity and quality. Most of the time performance is associated with motivation and capability of the employees (Frieder et al., 2018; Johari & Yahya, 2016). However, one important gap remains in this job performance research, which is the role of psychological well-being (Hewett et al., 2018). Past literatures suggested that happy workers could be more productive than less happy or unhappy workers (DiMaria et al., 2020), however, some literatures pointed that there is still a need to extend the studies related to psychological well-being and job performance. (Chen et al., 2022; Salgado et al., 2019). Salgado et al. (2019) in their studies addressed that there is a need to further explore how employees' well-being affects ones' performance at work. Thus, this support why this study is relevant and crucial to contribute on employee service performance (ESP) research (Ismail et al., 2019).

Past researches on psychological perspective state that work stress can influence employees' psychology and affects their efforts at work (Lu, 1997; Richardson & Rothstein, 2008). Additionally, few studies reported that there is no consistent conclusion in the influence of work stress and employee performance (e.g; Chen et al., 2022). Another study, Olivian and Setyawan (2022) also found that work stress and emotional intelligence is not significant. Employee work stress also can be related to burnout (Barello et al., 2020), due to work exhaustion or frustration (Mansour & Tremblay, 2018), and it can cause various negative reactions, including job dissatisfaction, low organizational commitment, and a high propensity to resign (Lu & Gursoy, 2016; Uchmanowicz et al., 2020).

During the COVID-19 pandemic, companies faced a relatively higher risk of salary reductions, layoffs, or corporate bankruptcy (Adam & Alarifi, 2021). competition among enterprises intensified, and managers might have transferred their stress to employees (Lai et al., 2015). Consequently, employees might have faced greater challenges during this period (Piccarozzi et al., 2021). In this context, work stress includes stress related to health and safety risk, impaired performance, work adjustment, and negative emotions. This kind of work stress can lead to unhealthy mental problems. From the perspective of stressors, employees will face greater hindrance stress, thereby decreasing their performance. Thus, study has suggested that it is importance for organizations to prioritize the well-being of the employees, as this directly impacts their ability to deliver high-quality care to external customers (Karaferis et al., 2022).

Based on previous studies, front liners employees are found to be at higher risk of work stress compared to other types of employees due to long working hours and frequent customer interactions (e.g; Northington et al., 2021). They also potentially at risk of job insecurity (or perceived job insecurity) or threat of involuntary job loss (Sverke et al., 2019). From the perspective of stress theory, perceived job insecurity (PJI) has been identified as a job stressor, which is associated with a number of negative job consequences such as reduced performance, wellbeing and job satisfaction (Guarnaccia et al., 2018; Richter & Näswall, 2019; Darvishmotevali & Ali, 2020), as well as increased employee exhaustion (EE) and turnover intention (Nauman et al., 2020).

Bieńkowska et.al. (2022) stated that the situation causes by the COVID-19 pandemic which took a long-term effect on the psychological wellbeing of employees, would possibly affect work performance. Therefore, this paper aims to examine whether stress give a detrimental effect to the employee wellbeing (from psychological perspective) and employee service performance (ESP). It is anticipated that such knowledge will help managers to understand the role of psychological wellbeing and why they should try to minimize the stress to keep employees happy and satisfied (DiMaria et al., 2020).

2. Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

2.1 Theoretical Foundation of Stress Factors and Employee Services Performance

This paper specifically focuses on the psychological predictors for employee service performance (ESP). The present study brings together employee well-being (EWB) and performance literatures and contributes to this research areas in two ways. First, we investigated the direct and indirect effect of employee well-being (EWB) on ESP. We proposed the relationship from the psychological perspective. Second, prior researches have shown that the effect of EW varies across individuals, and indicated the presence of moderator would possibly influence the relationship between EWB and job outcomes (Lee, 2019). For this paper, first, we tested the effect EWB on ESP, then, we tested the effect of stress factors EW to see whether stress give impact to EWB and ESP. This demonstrate the possibility for stress factors (in this study, they are, perceived job insecurity (PJI) and emotional exhaustion (EE)) to influence the EWB and ESP. Past studies mostly agreed that work stress is a big challenge and could affect individual from achieving high performance standards (Nawaz Kalyar et al., 2019). Based on a systematic literature review, Burman and Ghoswami, (2018) found that levels of work stress can be different based on the sectors or units, thus study of the work stress among the employees in different sector such as manufacturing, agro based, or service sector can be conducted as they are still limited. Additionally, they contended that most studies have proven that work stress is significant in influencing ESP and productivity (Burman & Ghoswami, 2018).

2.2 Employee Service Performance

Employee performance is the result of the individual's efforts at work (Robbins, 2005) and can significantly influenced by work stress. However, previous research has provided no consistent conclusion regarding the relationship between work stress and employee

performance. For example, according to a study by Soomro et al. (2019), stress is a motivational force that encourages employees to work hard and improve work efficiency. While other studies found work stress negatively impacts employee performance (Yunus et al., 2018; Nawaz Kalyar et al., 2019; Purnomo et al., 2021).

2.3 Employee Wellbeing

Diener (2009) describes wellbeing as subjective concept that is related to people's happiness, the fulfillment of wishes, satisfaction, abilities and task accomplishments. There is multiple-measure approach used to describe EWB, for example according to Ryff and Keyes (1995), proposed it based on a multidimensional model. The model highlights three major dimensions of well-being, which include psychological well-being, social well-being and emotional well-being. In this study, we refer to psychological well-being as describes by Ryff and Keyes (1995). EW is described as employee can gain happiness, contentment, enjoyment, curiosity and engagement. Having a sense of purpose, experiencing positive and amiable relationships with others as well as having some control over one's life are all important attributes of well-being (Ryff & Keyes, 1995).

2.4 Stress Factors

Yan and Xie (2016) defined work stress as a series of physiological and behaviours of employees due to the continuing effects of one or more stressors from the jobs or organizations. Employee work stress may precipitate burnout (Barello et al., 2020), which trigger work fatigue and frustration (Mansour and Tremblay, 2018), as well as other negative work outcomes such as job dissatisfaction, low organizational commitment, and a high propensity to resign (Lu & Gursoy, 2016; Uchmanowicz et al., 2020) and low job performance (Prasad & Vaidya, 2020). Long-term stress can negatively affect the overall EWB, leading to depression, mental, and physical health to individual employee. While, to the organizations, it would result to high turnover rates and absenteeism, poor service quality, and damaged reputation. This excessive stress level has resulted in employee turnover issues that should be addressed by most organizations in the industry (Ghazali & Amin, 2022).

Past psychology studies propose that work stress includes two main categories: challenge stress and hindrance stress (Cavanaugh et al., 2000). Based on their views, challenge stress represents stress that positively affects employees' work attitudes and behaviours, which improves employee performance by increasing work responsibility; by contrast, hindrance stress negatively affects employees' work attitudes and behaviours, which reduces employee performance by increasing role ambiguity (Deng et al, 2019).

In this paper, we focused on two types of psychological stress factors, which are emotional exhaustion (EE) and perceived job insecurity (PJI). This is based on the reason, the psychological factors from work stress can give a significant impact to EWB or at least put them at risk. Work stress enhanced through demand for work and other factors at work place (Cavanaugh et al., 2000). There is a consensus that job insecurity is a job stressor that may elicit psychological and physical health issues, negative job-related attitudes and performance (Sverke et al., 2019). increased burnout (Aybas et al., 2015), decreased well-being (Green,

2011), and life satisfaction (Sora et al., 2010). Covid 19 is generating social, economic, and human threats (Hall et al., 2021) and give negative perceptions in employees, such as fear, anxiety, or stress and lead to lower performance. Additionally, studies related to employees in the service businesses who were directly involved with customers, or patients, revealed that their involvement with clients which require them to interact and communicate and be emotional labour, and involved in suppressing emotion which also known as emotional exhaustion (Zapf, 2002). EE emerged in Maslach's study (1982) as influential burnout. Studies also pointed out that when an employee is exhausted, automatically, he manifests lower levels of commitment and a greater likelihood of seeking employment elsewhere (Lee & Ashforth, 1996; Wright & Cropanzano, 1998).

2.5 Hypothesis Development

Well-being gives attention to value individuals' feeling and positive experience (Bandura, 1986) and it gives impact to their work and other activities (Huang et al., 2016). A study by Diener (2009) proposed well-being as significantly related to individual happiness, satisfaction, and good vibes. Others have measured employee psychological well-being with indicators such as thriving at work (Bakker et al., 2019), life satisfaction (Clark et al., 2019) and social support (Cai et al., 2020) or general physical or psychological health (Grey et al., 2018).

COVID-19 has disrupted many normal operations as well as employees' work rhythm. Moreover, it also has caused many challenges (Piccarozzi et al., 2021) that ended up with high rate of work stress. Some researchers have explored the effects of work stress on employee performance during COVID-19 (Saleem et al., 2021; Tu et al., 2021), however the results were found as inconsistent relationship between work stress and employee performance (Chen et. al., 2022). For example, it is stated that there is a significant positive relationship exists between work stress and employee performance (Ismail et al., 2015; Soomro et al., 2019), which suggest stress can also be a motivational factor to encourages employees to work harder and improve work efficiency. In another view, stress is found to negatively impacts employee performance (Yunus et al., 2018; Purnomo et al., 2021). Additionally, from the perspective of job-demand resources (JD-R) model, it is suggested that work-related stressors and the absence of resources in the workplace can result to high levels of EE (Bakker et al., 2014).

PJI can reduce employee satisfaction and happiness and may lead to adverse job-related outcomes such as decreased work engagement (Karatepe et al., 2020), deviant behavior (Soomro et al., 2020) and reduced employee performance (Piccoli et al., 2017). Employees perceive PJI as a threat to their financial stability, job satisfaction, and overall lifestyle, both within and outside of work, as noted by Mahmoud et al. (2022).

While studies related to EE suggested it as in the middle of burnout syndrome and can develop (Houle et al., 2009; Halaem, 2016), which also could negatively give impact to job outcomes such as stress (Karatepe & Karadas, 2016; Riaz et al., 2019).

Based on the past studies, we proposed the following hypothesis:

H1: EW has a positive relationship with ESP

H2. EE is negatively associated with EW

H3. PJI is negatively associated with EW

Past studies suggested that perceived organizational support (POS) is important to predict positive organizational outcomes including to increase EW (Caesens, 2016). POS also can mitigate the impact of work stress, irrespective of number or intensity of stressors that an individual encounters. Based on a study by Iwata and Suzuki (1997), they have found that there is potential moderating effect of social support on stress outcomes. This notion was similar to study that suggest if the supervisors care about EW, and satisfaction, EW will increase (Eisenberger et al., 2002). As proposed by Richter and Näswall (2019), further studies need to determine psychological factors to prevent or at least minimize the negative consequences of job insecurity; therefore, in this study, it is proposed to examine the buffering role of POS in order to reduce the negative impacts of PJI on EWB and subsequently their ESP.

H4: POS moderates the relationship between EE and EW

H5: POS moderates the relationship between PJI and EW

High job demands (job stress: EE and PJI) may cause EW to decline, which may then have an adverse effect on their ability to provide services (Schaufeli & Taris, 2014, Bakker & Demerouti, 2014, Demerouti & Bakker, 2023; Bakker et al, 2023). On the other hand, better management of job demands or their mitigation might lead to an increase in EW and an improvement in ESP. Thus, the following hypotheses were developed:

H6: EW mediates the relationship between EE and ESP

H7: EW mediates the relationship between PJI and ESP

3. Methodology

3.1 Data Collection and Samples

This study employed a quantitative and deductive approach grounded in Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) theory. To assess our theoretical hypotheses, we collected data by self-administering a questionnaire survey. The questionnaire was distributed anonymously, and the respondents were informed regarding the purpose of the study. The respondents are the frontline employees in the retail industries in Klang Valley, Malaysia. According to ILMIA, the retail industry's turnover rate in Malaysia is always high which call the attention to study how companies can strategize to retain them. Non-probability sampling, specifically convenience sampling technique was used and data was collected from 276 respondents. All participants were given the same instructions on how to fill out the questionnaire. To analyze the data, we used SPSS for descriptive statistics, and Smart-PLS (version 4) to test the hypothesis.

Table 1. Respondents Profile

Demographic profile	*n*	*%*
Gender		
Male	93	33.7
Female	183	66.3
Age		
Less than 20	51	18.5
20 to 30 years	153	55.4
31 to 40 years	52	18.8
41 to 50 years	16	5.8
Above 50 years	4	1.4
Working year		
Less than 1 year	77	27.9
1 to 2 years	70	25.4
2 to 5 years	72	26.1
5 to 10 years	37	13.4
More than 10 years	20	7.2

3.2 Measurement of the Questionnaire

The questions for the constructs of this study were adapted from the previous studies and were designed based on the 5-Likert scale.

Table 2. Questionnaire Measurement

Construct	**Source**	**Number of Items**	**Sample Item**	**Reliability, α**
Employee service performance	Chen et al. (2002)	6	I fulfill my work responsibilities even though I am stress	0.875
Perceived Organizational support	Jain and Sinha (2005)	8	My organization consider my goals and value	0.929
Emotional exhaustion	Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI; Maslach et al., 1996)	6	I felt exhausted at work today	0.905
Perceived job insecurity	Chirumbolo et al. (2015)	7	I fear I will lose my job	0.850
Employee well-being	Pradhan et al. (2017)	12	Employees have an excessive workload	0.754

3.3 Model Validation for Data Analysis

3.3.1 Construct Validity and Reliability

Construct reliability was measured by using Cronbach alpha and composite reliability. Cronbach's Alpha measures the indicators uni-dimensionality (inter-correlation) with their latent construct. Meanwhile composite reliability measures internal consistency. According to Hair et al. (2010), the value of Cronbach's Alpha must exceed 0.70 while the value of composite reliability must exceed 0.70. Based on the findings (Table 3), Cronbach alpha of the construct EW was 0.929, followed by PJI was 0.850, EE was 0.873, POS was 0.957, and ESP was 0.947. Composite reliability of construct EW was 0.943, followed by PJI was 0.887, EE was 0.903, POS was 0.964, and ESP was 0.959. Convergence validity was measured by using indicator loading and AVE. In this study the AVE of all the construct and outer loadings of all the items is higher than 0.5 and 0.7 respectively.

Table 3. Outer Loadings, Cronbach's Alpha, Composite Reliability, And Average Variance Extracted

Items	Deleted Items	Outer loadings	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability (rho_c)	Average variance extracted (AVE)
Employee well-being (EW)			0.929	0.943	0.703
B10		0.891			
B11		0.847			
B12	B1, B2,	0.859			
B6	B3, B4,	0.778			
B7	B5	0.826			
B8		0.806			
B9		0.859			
Perceived job insecurity (PJI)			0.850	0.887	0.612
C1		0.783			
C2		0.702			
C5	C3, C4	0.765			
C6		0.883			
C7		0.766			
Emotional exhaustion (EE)			0.873	0.903	0.651
D1		0.837			
D2		0.872			
D3	D4	0.751			
D5		0.772			
D6		0.795			
Organizational support (POS)			0.957	0.964	0.770

E1		0.806			
E2		0.901			
E3		0.903			
E4		0.898			
E5		0.904			
E6		0.839			
E7		0.877			
E8		0.889			
Employee service performance (ESP)			0.947	0.959	0.824
F1		0.911			
F2		0.920			
F3	F6	0.895			
F4		0.902			
F5		0.910			

3.3.2 Discriminant Validity

The Fornell-Larcker criterion suggests that the square root of the AVE for each construct should be greater than the correlation between that construct and any other construct in the model (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Hair et al., 2017). This criterion helps ensure that each construct has more variance explained by its own indicators than by the indicators of other constructs, indicating discriminant validity. Table 4 demonstrated discriminant validity was established using fornell-lacker criterion.

Henseler et al. (2015) demonstrated that the HTMT criterion has a higher sensitivity and specificity rates of between 97-99%, against the Fornell-Larcker which has a percentage of 20.82%, and that of cross loading method 0%. Initial approaches examine the ranges of HTMT, which is suggested by Kline (2011) as 0.85 while Gold et al. (2001) suggest a HTMT value of 0.90 to indicate that there is challenge of discriminant validity if the values exceed the stipulated threshold. The findings demonstrated HTMT Value less than 0.9 indicating the data has no issue with discriminant validity.

Table 4. Fornell-Larcker and Heterotrait-Monotrait

Construct	Fornell-Larcker Criterion					Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio			
	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4
Emotional exhaustion (Y1)	0.807								
Employee service performance (Y2)	0.255	0.908				0.258			
Employee well-being (Y3)	0.069	0.316	0.839			0.084	0.333		
Organizational support (Y4)	0.049	0.444	0.440	0.878		0.082	0.468	0.463	
Perceived job insecurity (Y5)	0.645	0.238	0.090	0.112	0.782	0.777	0.254	0.097	0.120

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Structural Model

Cohen (2013) states that the f square is typically utilized to examine the relative impact of a predictor construct on an endogenous construct. According to Sarstedt et al. (2017), the value between 0.00 and 0.15 denotes a minor effect size, the value between more than 0.15 and 0.35 denotes a medium impact, and values over 0.35 denote substantial effects. The results of the f^2, as presented in Table 5, indicate that the effect of EW on ESP is small (0.111), while the effect of EE, OS, PJI on EW is 0.00, 0.100, and 0.00 respectively those explain small effect. The percentage variation of the dependent variables by the impact of the independent variables is defined as R^2. Depending on the number of exogenous variables, the R^2 value varies. Such as more independent variables mean higher values of R^2 and vice versa. R^2 values of 0.67, 0.33, and 0.19, respectively, are regarded as significant, moderate, and weak (Chin,1998). Hair et al. (2014) stated that the R^2 value is considered substantial at 0.75, moderate at 0.50, and weak at 0.25. Falk and Miller (1992) stated that the higher predictive power of a model depends on the higher value of R^2. However, if the R^2 value is more than 0.10, then predictive relevance is accepted. As shown in Table 5, the R^2 values of ESP and EW were 0.100 and 0.220, respectively. Multicollinearity arises when two or more variables demonstrate high correlation (Gaur and Gaur, 2006), indicating an overlap among exogenous variables. The presence of multicollinearity poses a challenge as it diminishes the significance of certain exogenous variables (Gotz et al., 2009). Table 5 presents the results of the Inner Variance Factor for each factor. Based on the citation, the VIF value should be less than 5.00 to confirm the absence of multicollinearity issues. According to the findings, the range of VIF values falls within the acceptable range of 1.00-1.73, indicating the absence of multicollinearity in the dataset. Determining the predictive relevance of a model is a very important characteristic, and it should not be overlooked (Ramayah et al., 2018). By Smart PLS 4, using PLS-predict, the model's predictive relevance (Q^2) was confirmed. According to Henseler et al. (2015), a Q^2 value above zero is an accepted value. The results of the study as presented in Table 5 showed that all Q^2 values were above zero, and hence met the above standard criteria for Q^2.

Table 5. f square, R square, inner VIF, PLS-predict

Construct	f square		R-square	inner VIF		Q²predict
	Y2	Y3		Y2	Y3	
Emotional exhaustion (Y1)		0.000			1.720	
Employee service performance (Y2)			0.100			0.075
Employee well-being (Y3)	0.111		0.220	1.000		0.149
Organizational support (Y4)		0.213			1.059	
Perceived job insecurity (Y5)		0.000			1.734	

4.2 Hypothesis Test

The PLS-SEM calculation is used to determine whether the conceptual model or theoretical hypotheses were substantiated empirically (Hair et al., 2014). The arrows or paths represent the hypothesized relationships between the constructs (Hair et al., 2014). The path coefficients obtained from a PLS analysis are standardized regression coefficients (Hulland,

1999). Path coefficient analysis is a statistical technique of partitioning the correlation coefficients into its direct and indirect effects, so that the contribution of each character to yield could be estimated. The goal of the path analysis is to accept descriptions of the correlation between the traits, based on a model of cause-and-effect relationship and to estimate the importance of the affecting traits on a specific trait (Cyprien & Kumar, 2011).

Using the percentile approach, the bootstrapping result report further offers bootstrap confidence intervals (Hair et al., 2022). A path coefficient is significant at the 5% level if the value zero does not fall into the 95% confidence interval. The effect/ relationship is significant if the p value less than 0.05, the t-value higher than 1.96, and confidence intervals does not include zero while, Alpha (α) level was set at 0.05.

This study reveals that there is a significant and positive effect of EW on ESP (b=0.316, t=4.155, p=0.000), while EE (b=0.026, t=0.270, p=0.787) and PJI (b=0.014, t=0.144, p=0.885) does not affect EW significantly. Thus, Hypothesis H1 has been accepted, while hypothesis H2 and H3 has been rejected. Previous researches found different output from this study that no significant relationship exists between EW and ESP (Kosec et al., 2022). Job insecurity has a negative link with well-being of employees (Otto et al., 2016; Huang et al., 2017; Getahun Asfaw & Chang, 2019), while, effective control of EE improves EW (Hori & Chao, 2019).

At the core of this study lies the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model (Demerouti & Bakker, 2023; Bakker et al, 2023), which posits that job characteristics are responsible for ESP. EE, PJI, and POS are conceptualized within this framework as a function to balance between these demands and resources, encompassing physical, psychological, and social dimensions results Employee well-being. Table 6 shows the direct effect for H1, H2 and H3. Only H1 (EW and ESP) is significant. PJI and EE depend on the mental resilience of employees in the organizations. It is one of the potential reasons for the unexpected findings of hypotheses H2 and H3. Our study have found that mental resilience of frontline employees is different from other employees.

Table 6. Direct Effect

Direct effect	Original sample (O)	Sample mean (M)	Standard deviation (STDEV)	T statistics (|O/STDEV|)	P values	Confidence intervals	
						2.5%	97.5%
Emotional exhaustion (EE) -> Employee well-being (EW)	0.026	0.043	0.094	0.270	0.787	-0.157	0.220
Employee well-being (EW) -> Employee service performance (ESP)	0.316	0.321	0.076	4.155	0.000	0.168	0.468
Perceived job insecurity (PJI) -> Employee well-being (EW)	0.014	0.019	0.099	0.144	0.885	-0.198	0.195

Further, this study depicted that POS do not have any moderating effect on the relationship between EE and EW (b=-0.088, t=0.997, p=0.319) and PJI and EW (b=-0.034, t=0.367, p=

0.714). These findings are supported by JD-R theory. Thus, hypothesis H4 and H5 has been rejected. (See Table 7).

Employees can benefit from job resources (social support, supervisor support, autonomy, feedback, and training), especially when they are regularly faced with demanding work conditions (job stress: emotional exhaustion and perceived job insecurity) (Breevaart & Bakker, 2018). However, due to the lower current state of organizational support among employee in retail industries, the POS was not able to support nor decrease the effect of emotional exhaustion and perceived job insecurity on employee well-being. It may be due to the reason in the first place, the emotional exhaustion and perceived job insecurity, both do not have significant effect on employee well-being.

Table 7. Moderating Effect

Moderating effect	Original sample (O)	Sample mean (M)	Standard deviation (STDEV)	T statistics (|O/STDEV|)	P values	Confidence intervals	
						2.5%	97.5%
Organizational support (POS) x Emotional exhaustion (EE) -> Employee well-being (EW)	-0.088	-0.066	0.088	0.997	0.319	-0.236	0.113
Organizational support (POS) x Perceived job insecurity (PJI) -> Employee well-being (EW)	-0.034	-0.055	0.093	0.367	0.714	-0.234	0.126

According to Bolger et al. (1998), a significant relationship of the job demands (in this case, the stress factors: EE and PJI) to EW is required to make EW as mediator on the relationship between job demands and ESP. Since there is no significant effect of job demands on ESP in this study, EW does not mediate the relationship between EE and ESP (b=0.008, t=0.272, p=0.786); and PJI and ESP (b=0.005, t=0.147, p=0.883). Thus, hypothesis H6 and H7 has been rejected (See Table 8).

Additionally, the result also depicted that there is no significant effect of EE and PJI on EW (H2 and H3) among employees working in retail industries in Malaysia, but the relationship between EW on ESP is proven (H1). In this way, the result of this study is partially supported by JD-R theory (Bakker & Demerouti, 2014).

Table 8. Mediating Effect

Mediating effect	Original sample (O)	Sample mean (M)	Standard deviation (STDEV)	T statistics (|O/STDEV|)	P values	Confidence intervals 2.5%	Confidence intervals 97.5%
Emotional exhaustion (EE) -> Employee well-being (EW) -> Employee service performance (ESP)	0.008	0.015	0.030	0.272	0.786	-0.045	0.074
Perceived job insecurity (PJI) -> Employee well-being (EW) -> Employee service performance (ESP)	0.005	0.007	0.031	0.147	0.883	-0.058	0.063

4.3 Practical Contribution

This study aims to examine the influence of stress factors (EE and PJI) on the EW and ESP. The results suggested that EW and ESP is significantly related. When, the stress factors were introduced, the relationship has shown no significant relationship between EE and EW and PJI and EW. Then, we tested the mediating role of EW on the relationship between stress factors and ESP, and the moderating role of POS on the relationship between stress factors and EW among employees working in retail industries in Malaysia. All the relationships denoted no significant effect. Thus, it can be assumed that the front-line employees in the retail industries are not concern whether they are having EE or PJI, they just performed their job as usual.

In general, to promote EW is important and managers in retail industries should give high attention on this EW. This is based on this study result which has proven there is significant relationship between EW and ESP. Even though there is no significant negative effect of stress factors (EE and PJI) on EW, but this could happen because we did the study at one period of time and maybe the employee did not realize the existence of EE and PJI at the time. It is also anticipated that, with the situation that the current cost of living is very high, most front liners are desperate for jobs, thus, they took the stress as motivation to work harder. Stress may not be significant to EW but it doesn't mean the managers shall not give it attention. They still need to show the support and care because stress can still a silent killer to ESP.

5. Conclusion

In this study, we examined whether stress factors such as emotional exhaustion and perceived job insecurity can affect employee well-being, however, it did not, but employee well-being could influence employee service performance. Even though we found no significant relationship between EE and EW and PJI and EW, we strongly suggest organizations to continue manage job stress (job demands) effectively and provide adequate job resources (for example, a significant level of organizational support) for EW as well as enhance ESP. This study, conducted cross-sectionally in Malaysia, limits the findings' venerability to the retail industries; the sample was composed of frontline employees. In the future, we propose to conduct a longitudinal study, or may be to explore the effct of stress among the blue- and

white-collar employees.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank School of Business and Economics, UPM for sponsoring this project under SPE research grant, vote GPSPE/2023/6303829.

References

Adam, N. A., & Alarifi, G. (2021). Innovation practices for survival of small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in the COVID-19 times: the role of external support. *Journal of innovation and entrepreneurship*, *10*(1), 15.

Aybas, M., Elmas, S., & Dündar, G. (2015). Job insecurity and burnout: The moderating role of employability. *European Journal of Business and Management*, *7*(9), 195-203.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2014). Job demands–resources theory. Wellbeing: A complete reference guide, 1-28.

Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. (2023). Job demands–resources theory: Ten years later. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 10, 25-53.

Bakker, A. B., Hetland, J., Olsen, O. K., & Espevik, R. (2019). Daily strengths use and employee well-being: The moderating role of personality. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *92*(1), 144-168.

Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2014). Burnout and work engagement: The JD-R approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *1*(1), 389–411.

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social-cognitive view, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Barello, S., Palamenghi, L., & Graffigna, G. (2020). Burnout and somatic symptoms among frontline healthcare professionals at the peak of the Italian COVID-19 pandemic. *Psychiatry research*, 290, 113129.

Bieńkowska, A., Koszela, A., Sałamacha, A., Tworek K (2022) COVID-19 oriented HRM strategies influence on job and organizational performance through job-related attitudes. *PLoS ONE 17*(4): e0266364.

Bolger, N., Gilbert, D., Fiske, S., & Lindzey, G. (1998). Data analysis in social psychology. Handbook of social psychology, 1, 233-65.

Breevaart, K., & Bakker, A. B. (2018). Daily job demands and employee work engagement: The role of daily transformational leadership behavior. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, *23*(3), 338.

Burman, R., & Goswami, T. G. (2018). A systematic literature review of work stress. *International Journal of Management Studies*, *3*(9), 112-132.

Caesens, G., Stinglhamber, F., & Ohana, M. (2016). Perceived organizational support and well-being: A weekly study. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 31*(7), 1214-1230.

Cai, R. Y., Uljarević, M., & Leekam, S. R. (2020). Predicting mental health and psychological wellbeing in mothers of children with autism spectrum disorder: Roles of intolerance of uncertainty and coping. *Autism Research, 13*(10), 1797-1801.

Cavanaugh, M. A., Boswell, W. R., Roehling, M. V., & Boudreau, J. W. (2000). An empirical examination of self-reported work stress among US managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 85, 65–74.

Chen, B., Wang, L., Li, B., & Liu, W. (2022). Work stress, mental health, and employee performance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1006580.

Chen, Z. X., Tsui, A. S., & Farh, J. L. (2002). Loyalty to supervisor vs. organizational commitment: Relationships to employee performance in China. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology, 75*(3), 339-356.

Chin, W. W. (1998). The partial least squares approach to structural equation modeling. *Modern methods for business research, 295*(2), 295-336.

Chirumbolo, A., Hellgren, J., De Witte, H., Goslinga, S., Näswall, K., & Sverke, M. (2015). Caratteristiche psicometriche di una scala breve per la misura della job insecurity: uno studio cross-culturale europeo. *Rassegna di Psicologia, 32*(3), 83-98.

Clark, B., Chatterjee, K., Martin, A., & Davis, A. (2019). How commuting affects subjective wellbeing. *Transportation, 47*(6).

Cohen, J. (2013). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Routledge.

Cyprien, M., & Kumar, V. (2011). Correlation and path coefficient analysis of rice cultivars data. *Journal of reliability and Statistical Studies*, 119-131.

Darvishmotevali, M., & Ali, F. (2020). Job insecurity, subjective well-being and job performance: The moderating role of psychological capital. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 87, 102472.

Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. (2023). Job demands-resources theory in times of crises: New propositions. *Organizational Psychology Review, 13*(3), 209-236.

Deng, J., Guo, Y., Ma, T., Yang, T., & Tian, X. (2019). How job stress influences job performance among Chinese healthcare workers: a cross-sectional study. *Environmental health and preventive medicine, 24*(1), 1-11.

Diener, E. (2009). Subjective well-being. The science of well-being. Social İndicators Research Series, USA, Springer, 37(1), 11-58.

DiMaria, C. H., Peroni, C., & Sarracino, F. (2020). Happiness matters: Productivity gains from subjective well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 21*(1), 139-160.

Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I. L., & Rhoades, L. (2002).

Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 565-573.

Falk, R. F., & Miller, N. B. (1992). A primer for soft modeling. University of Akron Press.

Fornell, C. R., & Lacker, D. F. (1981). Two structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research, 18*(1), 39–50.

Frieder, R. E., Wang, G., & Oh, I.-S. (2018). Linking job-relevant personality traits, transformational leadership, and job performance via perceived meaningfulness at work: A moderated mediation model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *103*(3), 324–333.

Gaur, A. S., & Gaur, S. S. (2006). Statistical methods for practice and research: A guide to data analysis using SPSS. Sage.

Getahun Asfaw, A., & Chang, C. C. (2019). The association between job insecurity and engagement of employees at work. *Journal of workplace behavioral health, 34*(2), 96-110.

Ghazali, H., & Amin, R. M. (2022). Factors Associated with Job Stress among Employees in food Service Department at Selected Private Hospitals in Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Economics and Management and Sciences, 11*(3), 11–29.

Gold, A. H., Malhotra, A., & Segars, A. H. (2001). Knowledge management: An organizational capabilities perspective. *Journal of management information systems, 18*(1), 185-214.

Green, F. (2011). Unpacking the misery multiplier: How employability modifies the impacts of unemployment and job insecurity on life satisfaction and mental health. *Journal of health economics, 30*(2), 265-276.

Grey, J. M., Totsika, V., & Hastings, R. P. (2018). Physical and psychological health of family carers co-residing with an adult relative with an intellectual disability. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, *31*, 191-202.

Guarnaccia, C., Scrima, F., Civilleri, A., & Salerno, L. (2018). The role of occupational self-efficacy in mediating the effect of job in security on work engagement, satisfaction and general health. *Current Psychology, 37*(3), 488-497.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Balin, B. j., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). Multivariate data analysis: Maxwell Macmillan International Editions.

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2014). A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hair, J., Hult, G., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) (3rd ed.). Sage

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A New Criterion for Assessing Discriminant Validity in Variance-Based Structural Equation Modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 43*(1), 115-135.

Hewett, R., Liefooghe, A., Visockaite, G., & Roongrerngsuke, S. (2018). Bullying at work: Cognitive appraisal of negative acts, coping, wellbeing, and performance. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, *23*(1), 71.

Hon, A. H., & Chan, W. W. (2013). The effects of group conflict and work stress on employee performance. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, *54*(2), 174-184.

Hori, N., & Chao, R. F. (2019). The impact of surface acting, deep acting and emotional exhaustion on subjective well-being in the employees of food and beverages industries. *International Journal of Organizational Innovation*, *11*(4), 215-228.

Houle, L., Chiocchio, F., Favreau, O. E., & Villeneuve, M. (2009). Role conflict and well-being among employed mothers: the mediating effects of self-efficacy. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, *24*(4), 270-285.

Huang, G. H., Wellman, N., Ashford, S. J., Lee, C., & Wang, L. (2017). Deviance and exit: The organizational costs of job insecurity and moral disengagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*(1), 26.

Huang, L. C., Ahlstrom, D., Lee, A. Y. P., Chen, S. Y., & Hsieh, M. J. (2016). High performance work systems, employee well-being, and job involvement: An empirical study. *Personnel Review*, *45*(2), 296-314.

Hulland, J. (1999). Use of partial least squares (PLS) in strategic management research: A review of four recent studies. *Strategic management journal*, *20*(2), 195-204.

Ismail, A., Saudin, N., Ismail, Y., Samah, A. J. A., Bakar, R. A., & Aminudin, N. N. (2015). Effect of workplace stress on job performance. *Economic Review: Journal of Economics and Business*, *13*(1), 45-57.

Ismail, H. N., Karkoulian, S., & Kertechian, S. K. (2019). Which personal values matter most? Job performance and job satisfaction across job categories. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *27*(1), 109-124.

Iwata, N., & Suzuki, K. (1997). Role Stress—Mental Health Relations in Japanese Bank Workers: A Moderating Effect of Social Support. Applied Psychology, 46(2), 207-218.

Jain, A. K., & Sinha, A. K. (2005). General Health in Organizations: Relative Relevance of Emotional Intelligence, Trust, and Organizational Support. *International journal of stress management*, *12*(3), 257.

Johari, J. & Yahya, K.K. (2016). Job characteristics, work involvement, and job performance of public servants. *European Journal of Training and Development*, *40*(7), 554-575.

Karaferis, D., Aletras, V., & Niakas, D. (2022). Determining dimensions of job satisfaction in healthcare using factor analysis. *BMC psychology*, *10*(1), 1-13.

Karatepe, O. M., & Karadas, G. (2016). Service employees' fit, work-family conflict, and work engagement. *Journal of Services Marketing*, *30*(5), 554-566.

Karatepe, O. M., Rezapouraghdam, H., & Hassannia, R. (2020). Job insecurity, work engagement and their effects on hotel employees' non-green and nonattendance behaviors. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 87*, 102472.

Kline, R. B. (2011). Convergence of structural equation modeling and multilevel modeling. The SAGE handbook of innovation in social research methods, 562-589.

Kosec, Z., Sekulic, S., Wilson-Gahan, S., Rostohar, K., Tusak, M., & Bon, M. (2022). Correlation between employee performance, well-being, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction in sedentary jobs in slovenian enterprises. *International journal of environmental research and public health, 19*(16), 10427.

Lai, Y., Saridakis, G., & Blackburn, R. (2015). Job stress in the United Kingdom: Are small and medium-sized enterprises and large enterprises different? *Stress and Health, 31*(3), 222-235.

Lee, Y. (2019). JD-R model on psychological well-being and the moderating effect of job discrimination in the model: Findings from the MIDUS. *European Journal of Training and Development, 43*(3/4), 232-249.

Lee, R. L., & Ashforth, B. (1996). A meta-analytic examination of the correlates of the three dimensions of job burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(2), 123-133.

Lu, L. (1997). Hassles, appraisals, coping and distress: a closer look at the stress process. *Kaohsiung J. Med. Sci*. 13, 503–510.

Lu, A. C. C., & Gursoy, D. (2016). Impact of job burnout on satisfaction and turnover intention: do generational differences matter? *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 40*(2), 210-235.

Mahmoud, A. B., Grigoriou, N., Fuxman, L., Reisel, W. D., Hack-Polay, D., & Mohr, I. (2022). A generational study of employees' customer orientation: a motivational viewpoint in pandemic time. *Journal of Strategic Marketing, 30*(8), 746-763.

Mansour, S., & Tremblay, D. G. (2018). Work–family conflict/family–work conflict, job stress, burnout and intention to leave in the hotel industry in Quebec (Canada): moderating role of need for family friendly practices as "resource passageways". *The international journal of human resource management, 29*(16), 2399-2430.

Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1996). *Maslach burnout inventory manual* (3rd ed.). Consulting Psychologists Press.

Nauman, S., Zheng, C., & Naseer, S. (2020). Job insecurity and work-family conflict: A moderated mediation model of perceived organizational justice, emotional exhaustion and work withdrawal. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 31*(5), 729–751.

Nawaz Kalyar, M., Shafique, I., & Ahmad, B. (2019). Job stress and performance nexus in tourism industry: A moderation analysis. T*ourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal, 67*(1), 6-21.

Northington, W. M., Gillison, S. T., Beatty, S. E., & Vivek, S. (2021). I don't want to be a rule enforcer during the COVID-19 pandemic: frontline employees' plight. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 63*, 102723.

Olivian, D., & Setyawan, A. (2022). Factors that effect turnover intention with job satisfaction as an intervening variable at food and beverages distribution companies in Batam. *Journal of Business Studies and Management Review, 6*(1), 12-19.

Otto, K., Mohr, G., Kottwitz, M. U., & Korek, S. (2016). The joint impact of microeconomic parameters and job insecurity perceptions on commitment towards one's job, occupation and career: A multilevel approach. *Economic and Industrial Democracy, 37*(1), 43-71.

Piccarozzi, M., Silvestri, C., & Morganti, P. (2021). COVID-19 in management studies: A systematic literature review. *Sustainability, 13*(7), 3791.

Piccoli, B., Callea, A., Urbini, F., Chirumbolo, A., Ingusci, E., & De Witte, H. (2017). Job insecurity and performance: the mediating role of organizational identification. *Personnel Review, 46*(8), 1508-1522.

Pradhan, R. K., & Hati, L. (2022). The measurement of employee well-being: development and validation of a scale. *Global Business Review, 23*(2), 385-407.

Purnomo K. S. H., Lustono L., & Tatik Y. (2021). The effect of role conflict, role ambiguity and job stress on employee performance. *Economic Education Analysis Journal, 10*(3), 532–542.

Riaz, S., Xu, Y., & Hussain, S. (2019). Role of relational ties in the relationship between thriving at work and innovative work behavior: an empirical study. *European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education, 10*(1), 218-231.

Richardson, K. M., & Rothstein, H. R. (2008). Effects of occupational stress manage intervention programs: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Occuppational Health Psychology,* 13, 69–93.

Richter, A., & Näswall, K. (2019). Job insecurity and trust: Uncovering amechanism linking job insecurity to well-being. *Work & Stress, 33*(1), 22-40.

Robbins, S. P. (2005). Essentials of Organizational Behavior (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 69*(4), 719-727.

Saleem, F., Malik, M. I., & Qureshi, S. S. (2021). Work stress hampering employee performance during COVID-19: is safety culture needed? *Frontiers in psychology, 12*, 655839.

Salgado, J. F., Blanco, S., & Moscoso, S. (2019). Subjective well-being and job performance: Testing of a suppressor effect. *Revista de Psicolog á del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones, 35*(2), 93-102.

Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., & Hair, J. F. (2017). *Partial least squares structural equation modeling*. Handbook of market research, 1-40.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Taris, T. W. (2014). A critical review of the job demands-resources model: Implications for improving work and health. *Bridging occupational, organizational and public health: A transdisciplinary approach*, 43-68.

Sharma, P., Kong, T. T. C., & Kingshott, R. P. (2016). Internal service quality as a driver of employee satisfaction, commitment and performance: Exploring the focal role of employee well-being. *Journal of service management, 27*(5), 773-797.

Shin, D., & Konrad, A. M. (2017). Causality between high-performance work systems and organizational performance. *Journal of management*, *43*(4), 973-997.

Soomro, M. A., Memon, M. S., & Bukhari, N. S. (2019). Impact of stress on employees performance in publc sector universities of sindh. *Sukkur IBA Journal of Management and Business*, *6*(2), 114-129.

Soomro, S. A., Kundi, Y. M., & Kamran, M. (2020). Antecedents of workplace deviance: role of job insecurity, work stress, and ethical work climate. *Problemy Zarządzania, (6/2019* (86)), 74-90.

Sora, B., Caballer, A., & Peiro, J. M. (2010). The consequences of job insecurity for employees: The moderator role of job dependence. *International Labour Review, 149*(1), 59-72.

Sverke, M., Låstad, L., Hellgren, J., Richter, A., & Näswall, K. (2019). A meta-analysis of job insecurity and employee performance: Testing temporal aspects, rating source, welfare regime, and union density as moderators. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *16*(14), 2536.

Tisu, L., Lupșa, D., Vîrgă, D., & Rusu, A. (2020). Personality characteristics, job performance and mental health: the mediating role of work engagement. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *153*, 109644.

Tu, Y., Li, D., & Wang, H. J. (2021). COVID-19-induced layoff, survivors' COVID-19-related stress and performance in hospitality industry: The moderating role of social support. *International journal of hospitality management*, *95*, 102912.

Uchmanowicz, I., Karniej, P., Lisiak, M., Chudiak, A., Lomper, K., Wiśnicka, A., ... & Rosińczuk, J. (2020). The relationship between burnout, job satisfaction and the rationing of nursing care—A cross-sectional study. *Journal of nursing management*, *28*(8), 2185-2195.

Wright, T. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). Emotional exhaustion as a predictor of job performance and voluntary turnover. *The Journal of applied psychology*, *83*(3), 486-493.

Yan, H., & Xie, S. (2016). How does auditors' work stress affect audit quality? Empirical evidence from the Chinese stock market. *China Journal of Accounting Research*, *9*(4), 305-319.

Yunus, N. H., Mansor, N., Hassan, C. N., Zainuddin, A., & Demong, N. A. R. (2018). The role of supervisor in the relationship between job stress and job performance. *International Journal Academic Research Bussiness Society Science, 8*(11), 1962–1970.

Zapf, D. (2002). Emotion work and psychological well-being: A review of the literature and some conceptual considerations. *Human Resource Management Review, 12*(2), 237–268.

Copyright Disclaimer