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Abstract

Background: For teachers and other professionals, occupational self-efficacy is essential to controlling work-related stress and enhancing performance, underscoring the significance of confidence and self-belief.

Methods: The technique section intends to investigate the relationship and moderating of occupational self-efficacy in the link between job stress and job performance among university professors. 180 university professors with various levels of expertise are included in the study. The variables were measured using the Workplace Stress Scale, Job Performance Scale, and Occupational Self-Efficacy Scale. Before distributing questionnaires in teachers' during business hours, practical sampling was used and informed agreement was sought.

Result: The study's findings showed a negative link between workplace stress (WSSC) and job performance (JPSC) \((r = -.51, p .01)\) as well as a negative correlation between workplace stress and occupational self-efficacy (OSESC). Job performance and occupational self-efficacy had a positive connection \((r = -.44, p .01)\). The results of the linear regression analysis showed that with a small effect size \(R^2 = .06\), occupational self-efficacy \(=.24, p .001\) and job stress\(= -.60, p .001\) significantly predicted job performance. Job performance was significantly impacted by the interaction between occupational self-efficacy and job stress \(=.04, p .001\), demonstrating that occupational self-efficacy mediates the link between job stress and performance. Additional research revealed that lower levels of occupational stress have a more pronounced detrimental impact on job performance. Further analysis revealed that the detrimental impact of job stress on job performance was stronger at lower occupational self-efficacy levels \(-1 \text{SD} \) \((b = -1.04, p .001)\), moderate at the mean level \((b = -0.60, p .001)\), and
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lessened at higher levels (+1 SD) ($b = -0.16, p = 0.21$). According to these findings, the impact of job stress on an individual's ability to perform well at work depends on their level of occupational self-efficacy.

**Discussion:** The moderating effect of occupational self-efficacy in the association between job stress and job performance among university professors was examined in this study. The results showed that occupational self-efficacy had a favorable impact on job performance and a negative impact on occupational stress, whereas job stress and job performance were negatively correlated. Additionally, the study found that people with 3 to 5 years of teaching experience had greater levels of workplace stress. These findings emphasize the significance of addressing workload, role conflict, rewards, training, and counseling in the context of university teaching to reduce workplace stress and enhance job performance.

**Introduction**

Teachers play a critical role in society in helping to mould people and build a successful community. Their direction and instruction have a significant influence on people's lives, preparing them to be future leaders. According to Ashraf, Hussain, ul haq, Ullah, and Fatima (2024), work engagement, leads to greater performance related to task and contextual work performance. However, just like everyone else, teachers encounter issues and challenges that may have an impact on how well they perform their jobs and how well their students learn. Teachers frequently suffer stress, which can reduce their productivity. Self-efficacy, or confidence in one's abilities and ability to solve issues, is necessary for managing stress. Teachers can lessen the impacts of stress and perform better by having occupational self-efficacy, which is directly related to handling obligations. The need for stress management is highlighted by the fact that excessive stress can have long-term effects on one's job, family, and health.

**Job stress**

Job stress develops when demands on an employee's time and energy are more than their capacity to handle them (Rothmann, Van Der Cloff, & Rothmann, 2006). According to Kotteeswari and Sharief (2014), Success in work depends on the ability to manage stress. You can manage challenging jobs, enhance performance, and guard against the negative consequences of stress. While moderate stress improves performance, extreme stress has the opposite effect. While stress helps you concentrate, excessive amounts can harm your mental and physical health. Common workplace stressors include job discontent, hard workloads, long hours, hazardous circumstances, job uncertainty, and fear of termination. According to the study's findings, there is a substantial link between teacher self-efficacy and job stress/burnout, indicating that this factor may be mediated by teacher self-efficacy (Schwarzer & Hallum, 2008). The study discovered that self-efficacy, marital status, occupational stressors, personal and work supports are significant predictors of anxiety and job performance, with a stronger relationship between job stress and trait anxiety observed in single women compared to married women, and lower self-efficacy and higher occupational stress negatively affecting job performance (Kahn, & Long, 2007). Stress can be either beneficial (Eustress) or negative (Distress), with Eustress serving as a motivator and boosting performance while Distress lowers performance, induces anxiety, and has a detrimental impact on mental and physical health (Mc Gowan, Gardner, & Fletcher, 2006).

**Job Performance**

Job performance refers to the acts taken while carrying out a task. According to Campbell (1990), job performance is essentially a strategy for achieving a target or set of goals while doing assigned activities, but it does not contain the actual outcomes of those actions. According to Campbell (1990), job performance is a multifaceted activity and behavior that is distinct from the results of a job and involves various independent variables and factors, such as mental phenomena, control, productivity, and utility.
Campbell (1990) identified eight criteria for job performance, including effort, personal discipline, helping behaviour, supervisory or leadership behaviour, and administrative performance. These elements included task-specific and non-task-specific behaviour, communication tasks. According to Murphy (1994), job performance can be broken down into task-focused behaviours, interpersonally oriented behaviours, downtime behaviours, and hazardous behaviours. Task behaviours and contextual behaviours can also be used to describe job performance, effort, and administrative performance.

**Factors Influencing Job Performance**

Both internal and external elements can have an impact on how well a job is done, such as management and team support, personal enjoyment of tasks, and keeping focus and preparation.

**Personal issues**

Personal concerns, such as stress resulting from health, relationship, and financial challenges, can have a big impact on how well one does at work, which results in decreased productivity and an inability to perform at one's best (Bromberger & Mathews, 1996; Ivancevich & Donnelly, 1975).

**Job Suitability**

Suitability for a job considerably improves job performance because those who are qualified for the position exhibit excitement and a drive for excellence in their work.

**Motivation to succeed**

Stress at work has the potential to impair employee performance and sap their drive to achieve (Rose, 2003). However, an organisational culture that acknowledges and rewards accomplishments, whether through money incentives, promotions, or other benefits, motivates individuals to perform at their best and develops a sense of respect and importance, ultimately improving their performance.

**Working Condition**

Working conditions have a big impact on how well employees accomplish their jobs because in good working conditions, employees can produce high-quality work with enough time, the right tools, and the right assistance. On the other hand, poor working circumstances might provide subpar outcomes. As job performance is negatively correlated with job stress, management support is essential to lowering it (Stamper & Johlke, 2003). Performance is positively influenced by low levels of stress.

**Job Tanning**

According to Orpen (1999), self-efficacy serves as a mediator factor between perceived training received by employees and job performance. Employees must receive adequate initial training in order to learn and follow organisational procedures effectively, and experienced incumbents must participate in ongoing education programmes to stay current on industry standards and expectations.

**Performance Feedback**

As the supervisor's feedback helps to clarify if the work fulfils expectations, performance feedback is essential for directing employees by recognising good performance and highlighting areas for development. Declarative knowledge, procedural knowledge, skills, and motivation are four performance determinants that, taken together, contribute to individual variances in performance, according to Campbell (1990).
Occupational self-efficacy

Performance is significantly influenced by a key cognitive element called occupational self-efficacy, which is the confidence in one's capacity to carry out particular behaviours successfully in the job. It determines whether people will act and carry out crucial behaviours, enhancing their intentions. Compared to task-specific self-efficacy, occupational self-efficacy is a larger concept that enables comparisons across occupational groupings to quantify self-beliefs in work environments. Strong occupational self-efficacy is a useful predictor since it is linked to better performance and commitment (Rigotti, Mohr, & Schyns, 2008).

Developing factors of Self-efficacy

Many different elements have an impact on how people acquire their self-efficacy beliefs. Feelings of self-efficacy are strengthened by success and repeated experiences, whereas disappointments, particularly at the beginning, might weaken them (Bandura, 1982). According to Elias and MacDonald (2007), self-efficacy is linked to past performance, and modest successes might raise expectations and make disappointment more likely. Due to the fact that obstacles and challenges highlight the value of perseverance, developing a strong feeling of efficacy necessitates active participation in problem-solving through hard labour (Bandura, 1982). Another strategy to improve self-efficacy beliefs is to observe others, particularly role models. Self-efficacy is improved by imitating successful models, but self-efficacy is diminished by watching others struggle and fail (Bandura, 1982). A person's perception of their own characteristics and those of the models can have an impact on imitation beyond simple comparisons (Bandura, 1982). By displaying practical methods for overcoming obstacles and achieving objectives, role models with persuasive and motivating qualities encourage followers and boost self-efficacy beliefs.

Cognitive Process

Self-efficacy beliefs affect psychological processes and have an impact on a person's behaviour, objectives, and sense of responsibility (McDonal & Siegall, 2012). Technological self-efficacy has a negative correlation with withdrawing behaviours and a positive correlation with dedication, quality of work, reduced absenteeism, and work performance. Thinking, planning, and motivation are all influenced by efficacy beliefs. An increase in efficacy produces confidence and a pleasant mental image of accomplishments, whereas a drop in efficacy produces a focus on failure and disappointment. Gaining control over significant life events requires confidence in one's abilities, and depending on insight to forecast and evaluate activity results requires both.

Motivational Process

The motivational process incorporates people's perceptions of their own potential and ideas about what actions might be taken, which affects their confidence in their own talents and hopes for successful outcomes, which motivates them to plan and establish goals. Three different types of motivators, connected with the theories of attribution, expectancy-value, and goal theory, respectively, have an impact on this process: causal attributions, result anticipations, and cognized aims. Each motivator is influenced by self-efficacy beliefs, which have an effect on how people ascribe failures. Self-efficacy affects motivation and performance results because people with high self-efficacy ascribe failures to lack of effort, whereas people with low self-efficacy attribute failures to their talents (Bandura, 1991).
Processes of Emotions
Motivation is influenced by beliefs in one's capacity for resiliency, which affect how unhappy and anxious one feels under pressure. In contrast to feeling that one can handle obstacles, thinking about one's abilities to control stress can make one feel uneasy. Anxiety levels rise as a result of a focus on inferiority and perceived threats brought on by a feeling that one is unable to handle situations. This kind of thinking increases anxiety and makes work more difficult. But such unfavourable thought patterns can be avoided with self-belief in one's ability to handled difficulties (Bandura, 1997).

Processes of Selection
A person's environment and behaviour are influenced by efficacy beliefs, which help them avoid difficult situations and make choices that strengthen their social networks and personal development (Rigotti, & Mohr, 2008). Self-efficacy comes in two flavours: general and specific. While specific self-efficacy is task-specific and attainable, general self-efficacy is constant. Although some research find no association, job performance is positively correlated with self-efficacy, and self-efficacy promotes behaviour results more than other personal factors (Judge & Bono, 2001; Mitchell & Gist, 1992). The accomplishment of training goals is facilitated by strong efficacy beliefs (Mourtay & Muldoon, 2007; Fisher, Weisburg, 2007).

Literature Review
Numerous research have looked at the connection between job stress, self-efficacy, and different outcomes in diverse professional contexts. In Qatar's banking industry, Alkubaisi (2015) discovered a negative relationship between job stress and performance, with workload and position ambiguity serving as mediators. Another study (Mahdizadeh, Daihimfar, & Kahouei, 2016) examined the relationship between job stress and self-efficacy among Iranian nurses and discovered that job stress had a detrimental effect on both self-efficacy and efficiency. The authors suggested strategies to lessen workplace stress. The relevance of self-efficacy in stress management and boosting job happiness was highlighted by Klassen and Chiu (2010) as they investigated the impacts of teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress on self-efficacy and job satisfaction. Other studies have shown that self-efficacy and control have moderating impacts on a variety of outcomes (Reddiyoor, Rajeswari, and Ajitha, 2017). Larissa and Catherine (2017) also found that instructors who selected teaching as a second profession reported greater job satisfaction and reduced job stress, and self-efficacy played a more important role among second career teachers. In an environment where English is a foreign language, Suleman (2012) discovered that teachers' self-efficacy predicted job happiness and that job satisfaction was inversely connected to job stress. In other studies (Muhamad, Norashkin, & Norazamimah, 2016; Sui et al., 2005), the links between job performance, locus of control, and self-efficacy were examined. The results showed that job performance and self-efficacy had positive relationships, while locus of control had a moderately good association. Additionally, Duysal, Hakki, and Olcay (2016) discovered that the association between turnover intentions and justice judgements was modulated by self-efficacy. Robert and Ming (2011) looked at the effects of job stress, self-efficacy, and the teaching environment on commitment to one's career and intentions to leave it among in-service and practising teachers. Teachers in the Yukon region of Canada were the subjects of Klassen, Foster, Rajani, and Bowman's (2009) investigation of the relationship between job stress, job satisfaction, and geographic and cultural characteristics. Finally, Yu et al. (2014) discovered that job burnout among school teachers was substantially correlated with work stress and self-efficacy. These studies shed important light on the intricate relationship that exists between job stress, self-efficacy, and various outcomes, emphasising the role of self-efficacy in stress management and improving job satisfaction and performance.
Rational

The goal of the study is to add to the body of knowledge already available about the connection between job stress and job performance, particularly in the particular setting of Quetta. It focuses on university professors, a group that hasn't been the subject of much in-depth study in this field. Policymakers will benefit from the research's insightful suggestions regarding the need for workshops, research, and improved stress management among university instructors. While taking into account the moderating effect of occupational self-efficacy, the study additionally evaluates the association between job stress and job performance. The research will help organisations and educators become more aware of these connections and help them make improvements to their practices. In order to plan trainings and put effective plans into action, human resource development departments and governing bodies in universities can make use of the research's findings. The linkages that were looked at and the function of occupational self-efficacy can also be considered by organisational and educational psychologists. The results might also be used as a starting point for more study in the topic.

Theoretical Framework
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Figure No. 1. Job stress's effects on performance and the moderating effect of occupational self-efficacy.

Method Objectives:
- To investigate the link between job stress and performance among university professors.
- To ascertain how occupational self-efficacy influences the link between job stress and performance.
- The objective is to further knowledge of the connection between job stress and performance while taking occupational self-efficacy into account.
- To examine how job stress affects various groups based on experience, age, and employment position in terms of how well they perform at work.
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**Hypothesis**
- There is a link between job stress and poor work performance.
- A high level of occupational self-efficacy enhances job performance.
- Stress at work is a result of low occupational self-efficacy.
- Teachers with less experience will face more stress than those with more experience.

**Sample**
There were 200 university instructors who were employed permanently and had at least one year of experience (of those, 180 returned the questionnaires). To see if there were any differences in their levels of occupational self-efficacy, job stress, and job performance, the sample was divided into three groups: group 1 included participants with 1-2 years of job experience (n=56), group 2 included participants with 3 to 5 years of experience (n=58), and group 3 included participants with 6 or more years of teaching experience (n=66). Data was gathered from both male (n=90) and female (n=90) teachers with these three distinct categories depending on job experience, including lecturers (n=92), assistant professors (n=88), and university teachers. Teachers' degrees ranged from master's (n=83), master's (n=69), and doctoral (n=28) degrees. The survey includes professors from a variety of universities, including Sardar Bahadur Khan Women University (n=57), University of Balochistan (n=47), and Balochistan University of Information Technology, Engineering, and Management Sciences (n=76).

**Inclusion Criteria.** The inclusion criteria for the study required teachers to have at least a year of experience. Three groups, ranging from group one from one year finished but within the second year, group two from three years to five years, and group three from six years and above, were developed to investigate the connection of factors depending on experience. Full-time teachers are included in the study.

**Exclusion Criteria.** Teachers employed on a temporary or contract basis were excluded from the study. The study did not include people with experience of less than a year.

**Measurements**
The relationship between them is investigated using scales of workplace stress, job performance, and occupational self-efficacy.

**The Workplace Stress Scale.** The American Institute of Stress created the Workplace Stress Scale, a questionnaire with eight statements and rating options to assess several aspects of working environment, the effects of stress on emotional health, meeting deadlines, and having control over one's workload.

**The Job Performance Scale.** Goodman and Svyantek, created job performance scale. It is a self-rating scale with 16 items and four rating points that is used to assess the contextual performance and task-related performance of university professors.

**Occupational Self-Efficacy Scale.** Contain 20 items of the Schyns and Von Collani-created, which has six self-rating alternatives, are used to assess a variety of self-efficacy traits, including goal-setting, problem-solving, self-reliance, and job readiness.

**Procedure**
Approval from universities taken, the correlational study used practical sampling to collect data from university lecturers during working hours. Before distributing questionnaires in the teachers' offices, informed consent was acquired and demographic data was gathered to maintain privacy.
Results

Table 1 The analysed variables' psychometric characteristics (N = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Potential</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. WSSC</td>
<td>22.06</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>10-39</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. JPSC</td>
<td>44.62</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>22-63</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. OSESC</td>
<td>56.42</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>37-87</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.19s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Workplace Stress Scale, Job Performance Scale, and Occupational Self-Efficacy Scale are acronyms for the same scale.

As noted above, various mean, standard deviation, alpha reliability, skewness and kurtosis scores as well as minimum and maximum values have been determined.

Table 2 Correlation among the explored Variables (N = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. OSESC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. JPSC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. WSSC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Workplace stress scale, job performance scale, occupational self-efficacy scale ** = .01.

Using Pearson correlation, the research's variables were compared for correlation. According to the findings, as shown in table 2, OSESC shows a favourable association with JPSC (r = -.44, p < .01) and a negative correlation with WSSC (r = -.23, p < .01). JPSC and WSSC have a r = -.51 (p < .01) negative association.

Table 3 Employing occupational self-efficacy, job stress, and their relationship as variables in a linear regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>45.23</td>
<td>[44.18, 46.28]</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>85.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.24 [.15, .33]</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>-.60 [-.77, -.42]</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-6.90</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Self-Efficacy x Job Stress</td>
<td>.04 [.02, .05]</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R^2 = .06$

According to Table 3's substantial interaction effect (b = 0.04, 95% CI [0.02, 0.05], t = 6.04, p < .001) Occupational self-efficacy moderates the connection between job stress and job performance.
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Table 4: Job stress's conditional impact on job performance depends on the level of occupational self-efficacy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values of Occupational Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>Effects of Job Stress on Job Performance (b)</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10.29 (-1 SD)</td>
<td>-1.04 [-1.23, -.84]</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-10.51</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00 (M)</td>
<td>-.60 [-.77, -.42]</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-6.90</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.29 (+1 SD)</td>
<td>-.16 [-.40, .09]</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through straightforward slope analyses, as shown in Table 4, the researcher investigated the occupational self-efficacy moderating effect. The outcomes revealed three possibilities: (1) There is a substantial inverse connection between job stress and job performance when occupational self-efficacy is poor ($b = -1.04$, 95% CI [-1.23, -0.84], $t = -10.51$, $p < .001$). (2) A negative correlation between job stress and job performance was found at the mean occupational self-efficacy level ($b = -0.60$, 95% CI [-0.77, -0.42], $t = -6.90$, $p < .001$). (3) The connection between job stress and job performance is weakened if occupational self-efficacy is high ($b = -0.16$, 95% CI [-0.40, 0.09], $t = -1.25$, $p = .21$). These data imply that at low and mean levels of occupational stress, the effects of job stress on job performance are more pronounced.

Figure 2: Regression of job stress on job performance at the level of occupational self-efficacy using basic slope equation. The graph shows that there is a significant negative correlation between job stress and job performance at the mean level of occupational self-efficacy (green line), but that relationship weakens as occupational self-efficacy increases (orange line). Job stress is negatively correlated with job performance when occupational self-efficacy is low (blue line).
Discussion
The role of occupational self-efficacy in mediating the relationship between job stress and job performance among university professors was investigated in this study. The findings supported earlier studies by demonstrating a negative relationship between job stress and job performance. Additionally, it has been discovered that occupational self-efficacy has a negative impact on job stress and a favourable impact on job performance. The study also looked at how much teaching experience affected job stress, and it found that those with 3 to 5 years of experience felt more stress on the job. The findings imply that reducing workload, addressing role conflict, supplying suitable rewards, giving training and counselling, and improving job performance can all help reduce workplace stress. The study advances our knowledge of how job stress, occupational self-efficacy, and job performance interact when applied to university teaching. (Ali, I., 2014)

Implications and Recommendations:
The research study's implications for university teachers are twofold: first, it adds to the body of knowledge regarding the connection between job stress, job performance, and occupational self-efficacy; second, it offers helpful suggestions for raising teachers' occupational self-efficacy. The results can serve as a guide for further study in this area, and human resource development offices can set up training sessions to increase instructors' self-efficacy, which can enhance performance and lessen stress. Researchers should explore additional characteristics as modifiers in the stress-performance link and be aware of potential difficulties when collecting data from busy teachers.

Limitation:
Due to the university lecturers' hectic schedules, the research study had trouble gathering data, necessitating time-consuming efforts to enlist them as participants. The research questionnaires were also periodically lost by the participants, which added to the delay in data gathering. The short six-month research timeframe added to the strain to finish the study before the deadline. Despite these challenges, the study with a highly qualified sample of university professors was carried out successfully.
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