

BRINGING DEPTH TO NUMBERS: A LITERATURE REVIEW ON INTEGRATING QUALITATIVE METHODS ALONGSIDE QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH IN WORKPLACE STRESS

Kharisma Pramesti Ananda Rusli^{1*}, Ratno Purnomo²

^{1,2} Management/Faculty of Economic and Business, Jenderal Soedirman University, Indonesia

*Email corresponding author: kharisma.pramesti.a@mhs.unsoed.ac.id

Abstract

Research on workplace stress is predominantly shaped by quantitative approaches, such as surveys, statistical analysis, and experimental methods. This literature review highlights the widespread use of these methods in identifying the causes, impacts, and coping strategies related to workplace stress. Quantitative research provides clear, objective data, allowing for measurable results and generalizability across large populations. However, despite their strengths, quantitative methods have limitations, particularly in capturing the personal, emotional, and nuanced experiences of individuals facing stress at work. Therefore, it is hoped that future studies will adopt a more balanced approach, integrating both quantitative and qualitative methods. By doing so, researchers can gain a more comprehensive and holistic understanding of workplace stress, ultimately improving interventions and support for individuals in diverse work environments.

Keywords: Workplace stress, quantitative research, qualitative methods, mixed methods.

INTRODUCTION

As the world grows increasingly more industrialized, more people are now moving away from the rural lifestyle into various workplaces in many sectors. This migration of people brings competition, invention, and also pressure for the workers. Stress for example, is one of the leading by-products of strains at work. Based on Mangkunegara (2011), work stress is a feeling of pressure that employees feel when doing their job. This stress can show through signs such as unstable emotions, feeling uneasy, wanting to be alone, difficulty sleeping, smoking too much, trouble relaxing, feeling anxious or tense, higher blood pressure, and stomach problems.

Workplace stress is increasingly being studied and has been observed to have manifested in many offices. Pakri Fami et al (2022) found that during the COVID-19 lockdown, many teachers experienced stress. They argued that stress can reduce how well the teachers perform. It plays a role in the connection between work discipline and performance, showing that stress links the two. The same goes for work motivation—job stress also connects it to performance. Interestingly, even labor intensive industries such as construction are also researched in regards to stress. The wide-ranging effects of job-related stress on construction workers, their families, society, and the economy have drawn attention to mental health issues in the construction industry. As a result many studies have focused on identifying sources of mental stress in this field. The review highlights major stress factors such as heavy workloads, conflict between work and home life, poor working conditions, and unclear job roles (Tijani et al, 2020).

The previously mentioned works on workplace stress research, had been done using the quantitative instead of qualitative method. The researchers chose a quantitative approach because it aligns with the study's aim to explore and build new understanding rather than test existing theories. As Saunders et al. (2016) explain, qualitative research focuses on non-numeric or

descriptive data that cannot be easily measured but are rich in meaning. This type of data is well-suited to inductive research, where the goal is to develop new insights or theories. As Gorard (2013) highlights, qualitative methods are particularly useful for capturing complex, contextual information, which makes them ideal for studies seeking depth rather than generalization. Therefore, in most cases when a researcher dives into studying the workplace stress, researchers are more inclined to use a quantitative approach. It is so due to the measurable and numerical result that the quantitative method produces. There are tools that have standardized to efficiently process a large data set in order to find patterns and form the initial findings. Resulting in the approach being more appealing when researching an organisational phenomenon such as workplaces stress.

However, researchers who are trained in quantitative methods often see qualitative research as something outside their usual approach—more suited to ethnographers or those studying unique social groups. Quantitative research usually focuses on building measurement tools, running statistical tests, and following strict procedures to ensure accuracy and reliability. This includes things like designing scales, doing power analysis, or using computer programs to analyze patterns in large sets of numbers. Because of this, some quantitative researchers may question how reliable qualitative data is—especially since it's based on personal experiences and doesn't follow the same structure. They might wonder how we can trust someone's description of their own experiences, or how to analyze stories in a consistent way. Qualitative data can be messy and hard to process compared to clean numbers in a spreadsheet. However, once a researcher takes the time to actually read and engage with these personal descriptions—such as teachers talking about their day-to-day experiences—they may find the insights incredibly rich and meaningful. These stories offer depth and context that numbers often miss. Even if qualitative data is harder to work with, it can reveal powerful truths about human experiences that deserve more attention and exploration in research.

It seems evident that looking at the available academic literature that most studies on workplace stress are conducted using quantitative methods. We argue therefore, that qualitative research also has its own merit. Because the dynamic nature of human experience qualitative research may offer an expanded view. Since quantitative research mainly focuses on testing and confirming existing theories rather than developing new ones (Creswell, 2012), researchers should not limit themselves to using a quantitative approach in such cases. Therefore, in this article we will look at some articles ranging from 2010 - 2020 discussing workplace stress. The following section will lay out the methodological ground, discussion, and conclusion. This paper aims to highlight the advantages to using qualitative methods in hope that future researchers may adopt it while researching stress.

RESEARCH METHODS

This paper aims to point to the prevalence of quantitative use as supposed to qualitative method in workplace stress research. As well, to show the novel findings that researchers came upon when the work is not strictly constrained by quantified data based on the established tools. To ensure the academic process, we employ the qualitative literature review theoretical base. Schwandt (2007) explains this process means analyzing something and breaking it into smaller parts to better understand how everything fits together. This works well with qualitative data, even when analyzing research articles. As Onwuegbuzie et al. (2010) point out, every research article—whether it's based on qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods—includes many parts that can be explored using qualitative analysis, like the literature review, the theoretical framework, how the authors explain their findings, and their conclusions. When you study one article closely, it's called within-case analysis. If you compare and contrast multiple articles, it becomes cross-case analysis. Both are valid ways to analyze research qualitatively.

The American Educational Research Association (AERA, 2006) emphasizes that well-reported research, guided by clear principles, promotes mutual understanding among scholars, supports

critical review, and enhances the usability of the research by others (p. 33). In this context, conducting a comprehensive literature review is essential to achieving depth and rigor in research. According to Onwuegbuzie et al. (2010), a comprehensive literature review offers a complete understanding of what has already been studied, the key conclusions that have emerged, how these conclusions relate to each other, and the strength and relevance of those inferences. Furthermore, such a review identifies both theoretical and practical implications and uncovers significant gaps in the literature. It also enables researchers to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of methodologies used in previous studies, thereby informing the selection of the most suitable approach for their own research (p. 179). Consistent with this, AERA (2006) stresses the importance of reporting literature in a way that provides “as comprehensive a picture as possible” regarding the research problem and how it has been previously addressed (p. 34).

In this way we focus on qualitatively laying out the results of past studies and also find the gap in its findings. The sources of this paper will be cross referenced in Onwuegbuzie et al., (2010) within-study and between-study analysis. Both are essential components of a robust literature review. A within-study analysis focuses on examining all relevant components of a single research work. This includes not only the findings or main arguments but also elements such as the title, literature review, theoretical framework, methodology, results, and discussion. This detailed, internal analysis allows researchers to fully engage with the individual study's contributions and structure. In contrast, a between-study analysis involves comparing and contrasting information across two or more research sources. While this often includes comparing findings, a thorough approach also examines similarities and differences in other sections—such as the research questions, frameworks, or methods—across multiple works. This enables researchers to detect patterns, contradictions, or gaps in the existing body of knowledge. Therefore, this will review one decade of research on workplace stress conducted using quantitative and qualitative methods. The aim is to then draw an apparent pattern in contradicting the two to support our initial argument.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. The Popular Practice for Researching Workplace Stress

The main goal of qualitative research is to create ideas that help us understand social situations in real-life settings, not in labs or experiments. It focuses on learning about people's experiences, how they see things, how they act, and what those things mean to them. Researchers who want to know why people act a certain way, how events affect them, how opinions are shaped, or how cultures and habits have developed, may find qualitative research useful for answering these questions. It appears that most clinical and health research still relies on numbers-based methods, especially the randomized controlled trial, which tests ideas through carefully controlled experiments. For people who aren't familiar with it, qualitative research can seem unclear when compared to these standard scientific methods. But more and more researchers in health fields are starting to see the value of qualitative methods—like observing people, doing in-depth interviews, holding focus groups, using group decision techniques, studying individual cases, and analyzing texts. These methods can sometimes do a better job at exploring complex issues and are now seen as useful tools alongside traditional research methods (Denzin, 1994). In the case of workplace stress, it has two main types: physical stress and psychological (emotional) stress (AbuAlRub, 2004; Beehr and Glazer, 2005; Larson, 2004). Physiological stress can be seen through changes in habits such as eating, drinking, sleeping, and smoking (Beehr et al., 2001; Beehr and Glazer, 2005). Psychological stress, on the other hand, involves emotional responses like anxiety, depression, burnout, job alienation, hostility, tension, anger, nervousness, irritability, and frustration. These emotional reactions are typically triggered by pressures or challenges in the workplace (Ismail et al., 2009, 2010; Millward, 2005; World Health Organization, 2005). All of which have been largely looked at through a qualitative lens. Ismail et al. (2015) conducted a study within a major private investment bank located in Peninsular Malaysia, aiming to examine the impact of workplace stress on job

performance.

The researchers distributed 200 structured survey questionnaires to both executive and non-executive staff members across seven departments, employing a convenience sampling method. To enhance the instrument's validity and reliability, a back-translation technique was used to prepare the questionnaire in both Malay and English, following recommendations by Cresswell (1998), Sekaran and Bougie (2011), and Wright (1996). This approach aimed to minimize bias and improve data quality. The study highlighted three key contributions: theoretical, methodological, and practical. Theoretically, the findings reinforced the idea that both physiological and psychological stress significantly influence job performance, supporting earlier studies by Cincotta (2005), Nabirye et al. (2011), Johnston et al. (2013), Kazi and Haslam (2013), and Farquharson et al. (2013). Methodologically, the use of confirmatory factor analysis and SmartPLS path modeling demonstrates a clear quantitative orientation, characterized by hypothesis testing, numerical data analysis, and a focus on measuring variable relationships with statistical precision. These features are hallmarks of quantitative research, underscoring the study's commitment to objectivity and generalizability. The study also offered practical implications by extending stress-related research, predominantly developed in Western contexts, into the Malaysian workplace environment. In contrast, qualitative research methods aim to uncover what is happening by describing and interpreting human experiences rather than measuring how often a phenomenon occurs. Such methods are designed to retain the richness and complexity of human behavior, rather than reducing it to variables that can be counted and tested statistically. From this perspective, the study by Ismail et al. adopts a reductive approach by translating complex emotional and behavioral phenomena—like stress—into measurable variables, potentially overlooking the subjective meanings and contextual nuances that individuals attach to their experiences. While this quantification enables general patterns to be identified, it limits the ability to understand how stress is experienced differently across individuals or shaped by workplace culture. Thus, although the study provides valuable empirical evidence, it also highlights the limitations of quantitative methods in capturing the deeper, lived realities of workplace stress. Furthermore, Muhammad Imran Qureshi et al (2013) did a study a quantitative study that looked at the causes and effects of mobbing behaviour (psychological harassment) in organisations and provides more proof of the complexity of workplace stress. According to the study's findings, a number of concurrent circumstances, such as isolation, overwork, destabilisation, and threats to one's personal or professional position, can lead to mobbing. Mobbing behaviour was found to be positively correlated with these characteristics, and mobbing behaviour was directly correlated with psychological and physical stress.

Standardised questionnaires from previous research were utilised by the researchers to gather data, including a few scales from the Instrument for Stress-Oriented Job Analysis (ISJA 5.1), which was created by Zapf (1993) and Semmer et al. (1995, 1999). This study highlights the drawbacks of strictly quantitative methods while also offering insightful information about the chain of detrimental consequences brought on by mobbing. Although numerical data and structured surveys are good at capturing broad trends, they might not be able to reveal the participants' subjective meanings, contextual triggers, and coping mechanisms. For instance, based on organisational culture, interpersonal dynamics, or prior experiences—factors best investigated through qualitative approaches like in-depth interviews or case studies—what one employee considers as "isolation" or "threat to professional status" may differ substantially.

B. Case for Qualitative Approach

"We can never achieve a complete 'scientific' understanding of the human world. The best we can do is to arrive at a truth that makes a difference, that opens up new possibilities for understanding" (McLeod, 2001, p. 4). This statement reflects the limitations of purely quantitative approaches in capturing the complexity of human experience. In contrast to methods that prioritize measurement and prediction, qualitative research aims to explore and interpret how people understand and respond to the world around them. This study adopts a qualitative approach to gain a deeper understanding of how individuals experience workplace stress, particularly in its emotional

and contextual dimensions—elements often overlooked or simplified in numerical analyses. Therefore, we do not think that a qualitative method is the sole methodological approach suitable to study workplace stress. Rather, it is a complement to hard lined and strictly structured quantitative methods. Qualitative research provides insights that are frequently concealed behind the obvious patterns in quantitative data by depending on participant statements and observations. It is especially well-suited for examining delicate or complicated topics, like stress and emotional strain at work, where people's actual experiences differ greatly and are influenced by interpersonal dynamics, culture, and environment. As a result, qualitative research offers both a necessary and an alternative to the prevalent quantitative models, particularly when the objective is to fully comprehend the depth and variety of human behavior. Bhui et al. (2016) conducted a qualitative study investigating employees' views of work-related stress across public, private, and non-governmental organizations in the UK. Their findings provide a clear illustration of the advantages of this approach. Their study revealed a detailed understanding of the factors that contribute to workplace stress as well as the remedies that employees believe to be helpful based on in-depth interviews with 51 participants. In contrast to quantitative surveys, which frequently reduce stress to standardized variables, this study found that major stressors—such as inadequate leadership, heavy workloads, understaffing, unclear roles, and unsupportive work environments—were ingrained in routine organizational procedures. Participants explained how these elements combined and interacted to cause physical health problems, decreased motivation, and psychological stress (Bhui et al., 2016).

Additionally, the study offered insightful information about stress management techniques. Although some participants highlighted the advantages of personal coping strategies, such as mindfulness, exercise, or recreational pursuits, many underlined that these were not enough on their own. Rather, they emphasized the necessity of structural and systemic change, including better management practices, better support and communication, flexible work schedules, and the encouragement of equity and acknowledgment in company culture. These results support the notion that stress is a socially and structurally based experience that is influenced by leadership styles and organizational standards, in addition to being an individual psychological reaction (Bhui et al., 2016). Crucially, the study by Bhui et al. (2016) shows how qualitative research may elevate employees' voices by enabling them to explain stress in their own words and what actually helps. It is feasible to see past superficial metrics and into the daily lives of employees with this narrative, context-rich approach—insights that can guide more sympathetic and successful solutions. According to McLeod (2001), the goal of research is not just to explain but also to change the world by creating new avenues for awareness and action. In this way, qualitative research not only records human experience but also facilitates transformative understanding. Gul, Ahmad, and Kashif (2022) investigated the real-life experiences of university instructors in Pakistan through semi-structured interviews, strengthening the argument for qualitative research into workplace stress. Six main stressors were identified by their study: an unsupportive work environment, job uncertainty, delayed promotions, excessive workload, and limited workspace. Teachers frequently talked about feeling overburdened by the variety and amount of their duties. According to one participant, "I have been attending regular classes at the department, in addition to supervising research activities, and managing the semester... causes me stress" (Gul et al., 2022, p. X). These accounts show the emotional toll that institutional obligations take in addition to the practical burdens—information that would be hidden in strictly quantitative research. Teachers also complained about sharing small offices, not having a private workstation, and having to deal with lost materials: "I don't have my own separate office." Our files are frequently confused with one another. I was truly under a lot of stress (Gul et al., 2022, p. X). These observations are consistent with research by Peretomode (2012) and Gillespie et al. (2001), who have found that inadequate infrastructure and subpar facilities are major causes of occupational stress. Similarly, a recurring topic was job uncertainty, with contract faculty members commonly expressing fear of being fired. "Even I am unsure if I will continue to teach this subject until the conclusion of the semester. I could be expelled from the university at any time" (Gul

et al., 2022). This feeling of disposability is consistent with findings by Sahibzada & Bano (2012) and Tytherleigh et al. (2005), who discovered that temporary academic staff members are particularly susceptible to psychological stress.

The participants' accounts of corporate disregard for professional advancement were arguably the most startling. "If my promotion is due and that is delayed... it lowers my self-esteem and creates a sort of stress," was a simple way to express the anger of delayed promotions. Why shouldn't it be done without asking? (Gul et al., 2022). Career stagnation in academic environments has a significant negative influence on motivation and workplace well-being, as mentioned by Li & Kou (2018) and Meng & Wang (2018). Respondents emphasized stress from toxic work settings, such as interpersonal disputes and excessive noise levels, in addition to these themes. "The workplace, classrooms, and hallways are noisy," complained one educator. It truly hinders my development" (Gul et al., 2022, p. X), reiterating research on environmental stressors in schools by Kabito et al. (2020) and Baglioni (1995). These results clearly demonstrate the importance of qualitative research in shedding light on the relational, emotional, and contextual aspects of stress—aspects that statistical models frequently ignore. The study illustrates how stress is perceived as a socially entrenched, culturally distinctive, and structurally reinforced phenomena rather than just a psychological reaction through detailed narrative descriptions and inductive thematic analysis. These revelations highlight the need for methods that do more than just calculate prevalence; they also interpret meaning, maintain complexity, and provide voice to those who are most impacted.

C. Recent Breakthrough

In order to bridge the gap between mixed methods integration and qualitative approaches, it is critical to acknowledge that each methodological option has distinct advantages for comprehending workplace stress. Although qualitative research is excellent at capturing contextual richness and emotional depth through personal accounts, quantitative methodologies can provide a wider range of generalizability. In recent years, mixed-methods research—a blend of various approaches—has grown in popularity, especially in domains like organizational psychology and healthcare. Researchers can investigate the why of workplace stress occurrences in addition to the what and how frequently thanks to this methodological integration. A compelling example of this is the study by Stevanin et al. (2018), which demonstrates how mixed methods can provide a fuller, more nuanced picture of generational differences in nurses' stress experiences.

Stevanin et al. (2018) conducted a mixed-method study to investigate how nurses' perceptions of occupational stress varied by generation by carefully combining quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews. In order to collect quantitative data from 271 nurses of various ages, they employed standardized questionnaires. Likert-scale items were used to measure factors like perceived stress, job satisfaction, and communication styles. They were able to statistically compare patterns across groups of generations as a result. To learn more about the individual experiences of a subsample of participants, they employed semi-structured interviews as a qualitative method. For instance, interviews provide context for the survey data, which showed that younger nurses were more dissatisfied with leadership. One Millennial nurse said that she felt "discouraged by a lack of mentoring" and "closed-door management." "Younger staff expect flexibility, but for us, this lack of structure adds stress," said another Baby Boomer nurse, expressing her unhappiness with the constant policy changes. These results clearly demonstrate the importance of qualitative research in shedding light on the relational, emotional, and contextual aspects of stress—aspects that statistical models frequently ignore. These revelations highlight the need for methods that do more than just calculate prevalence; they also interpret meaning, maintain complexity, and provide voice to those who are most impacted. Stevanin et al. (2018) investigated how occupational stress presents differently across generations of people in nursing, integrating both quantitative and qualitative techniques to generate a nuanced analysis, further highlighting the significance of qualitative and mixed-method approaches. Their study, which draws from survey data and interviews conducted in several Italian hospitals, demonstrates how generational traits—formed by various socio-historical

contexts—have a significant impact on nurses' expectations of interpersonal relationships, workplace support, and autonomy in addition to their perceptions of stressors. For example, Baby Boomers were more likely to feel stressed out by work and managerial choices that went against their beliefs of responsibility and devotion, whereas Millennials were more likely to feel emotionally strained by a perceived lack of support (Stevanin et al., 2018). Younger nurses who were promised collaborative work settings and professional development expressed feelings of disappointment through qualitative interviews. "I feel like I've been trained to think critically and work in teams, but when I get to the ward, I'm expected to follow rigid instructions without question," said one interviewee. These feelings are in line with research by Twenge (2010) and Kupperschmidt (2000), who contend that disparities in communication methods and values between generations might result in misplaced expectations, which can then cause stress.

Furthermore, Stevanin et al. verified that nurses of all generations expressed emotional exhaustion due to unresolved team conflicts, but they differed in their coping mechanisms, with younger nurses favoring open communication and peer support and older nurses more likely to adopt a stoic, endurance-based mindset (cf. Laschinger et al., 2001; Blegen et al., 2001). Importantly, this study places stress in context by examining how it is perceived, controlled, and expressed across generations as well as how it is related to leadership or workload. By extending the conversation beyond organizational and individual factors to cohort-specific expectations and relationship difficulties, the generational lens opens up new theoretical horizons. Since only open-ended, narrative-driven interviews enabled participants to express how their ideals conflicted with organizational realities, Stevanin et al. (2018) contend that qualitative research is the most effective method for capturing these insights. The importance of qualitative research in stress studies is confirmed by this body of work, which blends structural critique with interpretive depth. It encapsulates what McLeod (2001) refers to as a "truth that makes a difference," one that sheds light on not only what stress is but also how it is felt, why it continues, and what solutions could actually change workplaces. In their systematic review of stress interventions in mental health nursing, Edwards and Burnard (2011) also argue that in order to effectively address stress, researchers must have a thorough understanding of both organizational context and emotional response. This can only be accomplished by paying close attention to the perspectives of those who are experiencing the stress. In order to promote sympathetic, contextually aware, and culturally sensitive understandings of workplace stress, qualitative research is therefore still essential.

Recent advancements in the study of occupational stress show that mixed-methods designs—which combine quantitative and qualitative techniques to provide a more comprehensive understanding of complicated human experiences—are increasingly valued. In workplace and organizational research, where stress is frequently influenced by complex interpersonal, cultural, and contextual factors that are difficult to fully capture through surveys alone, this methodological convergence has gained prominence in recent years. Schonfeld and Farrell (2010) contend that although quantitative research offers the required framework for assessing the frequency and statistical correlations of workplace stressors, it frequently ignores how people actually experience and interpret these stressors in everyday situations. On the other hand, qualitative approaches like participant observation, open-ended interviews, and ethnographic methodologies allow researchers to delve deeply into employees' perceptions in their natural settings. Schonfeld and Farrell (2010) note that qualitative approaches are especially helpful for creating grounded ideas about workplace experiences and for discovering novel and previously unnoticed stresses. The researchers were able to pinpoint particular emotional stressors, for instance, by examining "unconstrained descriptions of work experiences," which are probably not covered in a standardized stress questionnaire. This highlights one of the main advantages of qualitative research, which is that it lets people construct their own realities instead of putting their experiences into preconceived notions. This kind of adaptability is particularly crucial in professional contexts, where the definition of stress can differ greatly based on interpersonal dynamics, corporate culture, leadership style, and personal coping mechanisms. The authors do, however, make apparent how important quantitative approaches are

for balancing this depth with statistical range. Following the qualitative identification of novel themes, researchers can create accurate measurement tools to determine the prevalence or statistical significance of these stressors in broader groups. By characterizing this procedure as "stimulating theory development, hypothesis generation, and the identification of job stressors and coping responses," Schonfeld and Farrell (2010) demonstrate how qualitative results can be used as a basis for more methodical quantitative testing. By avoiding the drawbacks of depending just on one methodological viewpoint, this gradual relationship—where one approach informs and improves the other—offers a more comprehensive and rigorous approach to studying stress.

A wider conceptual shift in the social sciences, namely the realization that human behavior is best understood through different perspectives, is also reflected in this expanding tendency toward methodological pluralism. The intricacy of occupational stress necessitates methods that can capture both quantifiable patterns and lived realities, especially in varied, rapidly evolving work situations. Using both qualitative and quantitative methodologies guarantees that findings are not only generalizable but also based on the real voices and experiences of workers, which is important as researchers seek to create more effective treatments and inform organizational policy. In this sense, mixed-methods research provides the narrative depth required to promote significant change as well as the empirical power to impact policy.

CONCLUSION

By highlighting the prevalent methodological traditions that influence how stress is perceived, quantified, and managed, this study has critically evaluated the changing field of workplace stress research. Quantitative paradigms have historically dominated the field because they provide precision, generalizability, and the ability to test hypotheses—qualities that are ideal for spotting broad trends and connections between workplace variables and stress-related consequences. However, these advantages are frequently outweighed by shortcomings in capturing the experienced, contextual, and subjective aspects of stress, as evidenced by numerous case studies and empirical literature. A noticeable trend toward mixed-methods research has emerged in more recent years, indicating an increasing understanding of the benefits of combining quantitative and qualitative approaches. Stevanin et al. (2018) present an example of this method, which combines the interpretive depth of qualitative narratives with the empirical breadth of statistical research. Because workplace stress is broad, mixed techniques offer a practical and inclusive epistemological solution. In the end, this paper promotes methodological pluralism that honors each research paradigm's advantages and disadvantages. Researchers must adopt instruments that can both count and grasp in order to properly study and alleviate workplace stress, a problem that is both pervasive and intensely personal. We can only progress toward evidence-based solutions that are also meaningful, inclusive, and sensitive to workers' actual circumstances by taking such an integrative approach

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AbuAlRub, R. F. (2004). Job stress, job performance, and social support among hospital nurses. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 36(1), 73–78. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1547-5069.2004.04016.x>
- Ahmad, I., Gul, R., & Kashif, M. (2022). A qualitative study of workplace factors causing stress among university teachers and coping strategies. *Human Arenas*, 7(4), 812–834. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42087-022-00302-w>
- Beehr, T. A., Jex, S. M., & Ghosh, P. (2001). The management of workplace stress. In C. M. Johnson, W. K. Redmon, & T. C. Mahwhinney (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Performance: Behavior Analysis and Management* (pp. xx–xx). The Haworth Press.
- Bhui, K., Dinos, S., Galant-Miecznikowska, M., De Jongh, B., & Stansfeld, S. (2016). Perceptions of work stress causes and effective interventions in employees working in public, private and non-governmental organisations: A qualitative study. *BJPsych Bulletin*, 40(6), 318–325. <https://doi.org/10.1192/pb.bp.115.050823>
- Blegen, M. A., Vaughn, T. E., & Goode, C. J. (2001). Nurse experience and education. *JONA: The Journal of Nursing Administration*, 31(1), 33–39. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00005110-200101000-00007>
- Boyle, G. J., Borg, M. G., Falzon, J. M., & Baglioni, A. J. (1995). A structural model of the dimensions of teacher stress. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 65(1), 49–67.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. SAGE Publications.
- Crozier, G., Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (1994). Handbook of qualitative research. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 42(4), 409. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3121684>
- Edwards, D., & Burnard, P. (2003). A systematic review of stress and stress management interventions for mental health nurses. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 42(2), 169–200. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2003.02600.x>
- Fahmi, P., Sudjono, Parwoto, Supriyatno, Saluy, A. B., Safitri, E., Effiyaldi, Rivaldo, Y., & Endri, E. (2022a). Work stress mediates motivation and discipline on teacher performance: Evidence from work-from-home policy. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 12(3), 80. <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2022-0068>
- Fahmi, P., Sudjono, Parwoto, Supriyatno, Saluy, A. B., Safitri, E., Effiyaldi, Rivaldo, Y., & Endri, E. (2022b). Work stress mediates motivation and discipline on teacher performance: Evidence from work-from-home policy. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 12(3), 80. <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2022-0068>
- Farquharson, B., Bell, C., Johnston, D., Jones, M., Schofield, P., Allan, J., Ricketts, I., Morrison, K., & Johnston, M. (2013). Nursing stress and patient care: Real-time investigation of the effect of nursing tasks and demands on psychological stress, physiological stress, and job performance: Study protocol. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 69(10), 2327–2335.
- Gillespie, N. A., Walsh, M., Winefield, A., Dua, J., & Stough, C. (2001). Occupational stress in universities: Staff perceptions of the causes, consequences and moderators of stress. *Work & Stress*, 15(1), 53–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370117944>
- Glazer, S., & Gyurak, A. (2007). Sources of occupational stress among nurses in five countries. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 32(1), 49–66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2007.10.003>

- Gorard, S. (2013a). *Research design: Creating robust approaches for the social sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526431486>
- Gorard, S. (2013b). *Research design: Creating robust approaches for the social sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526431486>
- Ismail, A., Suh-Suh, Y., Ajis, M. N., & Dollah, N. F. (2009). Relationship between workplace stress, emotional intelligence and job performance: An empirical study in Malaysia. *Theoretical and Applied Economics*, 10(539), 3–16.
- Johnston, D., Jones, M., Charles, K., McCann, S., & McKee, L. (2013). Stress in nurses: Stress-related affect and its determinants examined over the nursing day. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 45(3), 348–356.
- Kabito, G. G., Wami, S. D., Chercos, D. H., & Mekonnen, T. H. (2020). Work-related stress and associated factors among academic staff at the University of Gondar. [Journal name not provided].
- Kazi, A., & Haslam, C. O. (2013). Stress management standards: A warning indicator for employee health. *Occupational Medicine*, 63(5), 335–340.
- Kupperschmidt, B. R. (2000). Multigeneration employees: Strategies for effective management. *The Health Care Manager*, 19(1), 65–76. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00126450-200019010-00011>
- Larson, L. L. (2004). Internal auditors and job stress. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 19(9), 1119–1130. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02686900410562768>
- Laschinger, H. K. S., Finegan, J., Shamian, J., & Wilk, P. (2001). Impact of structural and psychological empowerment on job strain in nursing work settings. *JONA: The Journal of Nursing Administration*, 31(5), 260–272. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00005110-200105000-00006>
- Li, W., & Kou, C. (2018). Prevalence and correlates of psychological stress among teachers at a national key comprehensive university in China. *International Journal of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 24(1–2), 7–16.
- Mangkunegara. (2011). *Manajemen sumber daya perusahaan*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- McLeod, J. (2001). Qualitative inquiry and the reconstruction of counselling and psychotherapy. In *SAGE Publications Ltd eBooks* (pp. 2–20). <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849209663.n1>
- Meng, Q., & Wang, G. (2018). A research on sources of university faculty occupational stress: A Chinese case study. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 11, 597.
- Millward, L. (2005). *Understanding workplace and organizational psychology*. Sage Publications.
- Nabirye, R. C., Brown, K. C., Pryor, E. R., & Maples, E. H. (2011). Workplace stress, job satisfaction and job performance among hospital nurses in Kampala, Uganda. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 19(6), 760–768.
- Onwuegbuzie, A., Leech, N., & Collins, K. (2015). Qualitative analysis techniques for the review of the literature. *The Qualitative Report*. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2012.175>
- Peretomode, O. (2012). Situational and contingency theories of leadership: Are they the same? *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 4(3), 13–17. <https://doi.org/10.9790/487x-0431317>
- Qureshi, M. I., Iftikhar, M., Janjua, S. Y., Zaman, K., Raja, U. M., & Javed, Y. (2013). Empirical investigation of mobbing, stress and employees' behavior at workplace: Quantitatively refining a qualitative model. *Quality & Quantity*, 49(1), 93–113. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-013-9976-4>
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2016). *Research methods for business students* (7th ed.). Pearson Education Limited.
- Schonfeld, I. S., & Farrell, E. (2010). Qualitative methods can enrich quantitative research on occupational stress: An example from one occupational group. In *Research in Occupational Stress and Well Being* (Vol. 8, pp. 137–197). [https://doi.org/10.1108/s1479-3555\(2010\)0000008007](https://doi.org/10.1108/s1479-3555(2010)0000008007)
- Schwandt, T. (2007). *The SAGE dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412986281>

- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2011). *Research methods for business: A skill-building approach*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Semmer, N. K., Zapf, D., & Dunckel, H. (1999). Stress-orientierte Arbeitsanalyse ISTA, Stress-oriented job-analysis ISTA. In H. Dunckel (Ed.), *Handbuch zur Arbeitsanalyse*. Verlag der Fachvereine.
- Stevanin, S., Palese, A., Bressan, V., Vehviläinen-Julkunen, K., & Kvist, T. (2018). Workplace-related generational characteristics of nurses: A mixed-method systematic review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 74(6), 1245–1263. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13538>
- Tijani, B., Jin, X., & Osei-Kyei, R. (2020a). A systematic review of mental stressors in the construction industry. *International Journal of Building Pathology and Adaptation*, 39(2), 433–460. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijbpa-02-2020-0011>
- Twenge, J. M., Campbell, S. M., Hoffman, B. J., & Lance, C. E. (2010). Generational differences in work values: Leisure and extrinsic values increasing, social and intrinsic values decreasing. *Journal of Management*, 36(5), 1117–1142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309352246>
- Tytherleigh, M. Y., Webb, C., Cooper, C. L., & Ricketts, C. (2005). Occupational stress in UK higher education institutions: A comparative study of all staff categories. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 24(1), 41–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0729436052000318569>
- World Health Organization (WHO). (2005). *Mental health and working life*. WHO European Ministerial Conference on Mental Health: Facing the Challenges, Building Solutions. <http://www.euro.who.int/document/mnh/ebrief06.pdf>
- Zapf, D. (1993). Stress-oriented analysis of computerized office work. *European Work and Organizational Psychologist*, 3(2), 85–100. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09602009308408580>