ANALYZING ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS IN GREEK TOURISM SERVICES

Dimitrios Belias *, Ioannis Rossidis **, Panagiotis Lazarakis ***, Christos Mantas ****, Angelos Ntalakos *****

* *Corresponding author*, Hellenic Open University, School of Social Sciences, Patra, Greece; Department of Business Administration and Tourism, Hellenic Mediterranean University, Heraklion, Greece; Department of Business Administration, University of Thessaly, Larissa, Geopolis, Greece
Contact details: Department of Business Administration, University of Thessaly, Larissa, Geopolis 41500, Greece
** University of Nicosia, Nicosia, Cyprus
*** Hellenic Open University, Patras, Greece
**** Business School, Metropolitan College, Athens, Greece
***** Department of Business Administration, University of Thessaly, Larissa, Geopolis, Greece

How to cite this paper: Belias, D., Rossidis, I., Lazarakis, P., Mantas, C., & Ntalakos, A. (2022). Analyzing organizational factors in Greek tourism services [Special issue]. *Corporate & Business Strategy Review, 3*(2), 248–261. https://doi.org/10.22495/cbsrv3i2siart6

ISSN Online: 2708-4965
ISSN Print: 2708-9924

Received: 01.07.2022
Accepted: 21.11.2022

JEL Classification: M1, M10, M12
DOI: 10.22495/cbsrv3i2siart6

Abstract

The purpose of the paper is to investigate the interaction of human resource management, strategic leadership, role conflict, job commitment, and job stress of employees in a public tourism organization. The value of this paper lies in the fact that human resources are undoubtedly the most important asset for both private tourism businesses and public tourist organizations (Ntalakos, Belias, & Koustelios, 2022a; Ntalakos, Belias, & Tsigilis, 2022b; Belias & Trihas, 2022a). The success or failure of the goals set by the respective administration depends on this. The above variables interact with each other and affect employee performance, as strategic leadership decisions will affect job stress and job commitment (Belias, Rossidis, Sotiriou, & Malik, 2022). The empirical data used in this paper has been derived from quantitative research which occurred in a sample of 190 persons working in hotels. The outcome of the research is that strategic leadership has an effect on work stress, while it also affects job commitment and the lack of a sense of belonging to the organization. Furthermore, role conflicts affect both job commitment with work stress, while work stress has also an effect on job commitment. An important conclusion is that work stress is not a moderator variable for the examined relationships. Based on the outcome of the research, the recommendation is that public Greek organizations need to empower their human resource management so to increase the job commitment and the leadership capacity of their employees but also to make sure that the work environment is able to reduce stress.

Keywords: Human Resource Management, Role Conflict, Job Stress, Job Commitment, Hotel Sector

Authors' individual contribution: Conceptualization — P.L.; Methodology — D.B. and I.R.; Validation — A.N.; Formal Analysis — A.N. and C.M.; Investigation — D.B. and C.M.; Writing — Original Draft — D.B., I.R., and P.L.; Writing — Review & Editing — D.B., I.R., and A.N.; Supervision — D.B.

Declaration of conflicting interests: The Authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements: The Authors wish to thank the Central Service of the Ministry in Athens for its valuable help with the participants of the research.

1. INTRODUCTION

There is a growing interest in organizational change, flexible regulation, and autonomous employment conditions that have led to ever-changing job standards, employee stress, and role conflict and ambiguity (Tang & Chang, 2010). Human resource management can respond to problems created in a changing work environment, as organizations are called upon to respond to the current competitive environment, to the changes that have taken place in the needs and expectations of consumers, to technological changes, as well as to changes in the philosophy of labor relations (Itika, 2011). Additionally, in order for an organization to meet the existing challenges of the business environment with technological change and globalization, effective leadership is required (Redmond, 2012; Belias & Trihas, 2022e). In this context, human resource management is important, as it ensures organizational commitment, which, in turn, leads to reduced absenteeism from work, less intent to leave the organization, and improved job performance (Nazari & Emami, 2012). Furthermore, strategic leadership is linked to organizational performance (Jaleha & Machuki, 2018) through organizational commitment (Radosavljević, Ćilerdžić, & Dragić, 2017), while conflict and role ambiguity affect job commitment (Judeh, 2011; Leite, Rodrigues, & de Albuquerque, 2014; Tang & Chang, 2010; Lazarakis, 2020) and increase employee stress (Hashmi, 2015; Ismail et al., 2015; Mosadeghrad, 2014; Quick & Henderson, 2016), thus also affecting job performance (Ee, Teoh, & Yen, 2017; Soltani, Hajatpour, Khorram, & Nejati, 2013).

From the above, it is understood that there is a growing interest in the relationship between human resource management, strategic leadership, role conflict, job commitment, and job stress in organizations. This complex relationship requires a continuous flow of new data and information (Belias, Koustelios, Sdrolias, & Aspridis, 2015; Belias & Koustelios, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c; Belias, Papademetriou, Rossidis, & Vasiliadis, 2020; Belias, Rossidis, Papademetriou, & Lamprinoudis, 2021a). Also, there is a need to confirm the examined relationships in the tourist sector which has some unique features, including the value of front office employees and the high levels of stress during peak times (Belias, Rossidis, Papademetriou, & Mantas, 2021b; Rossidis, Belias, & Aspridis, 2019). Therefore, there is a gap that needs to be filled due to the limited related research on the tourist sector and especially in public tourist organizations.

Regarding the value of this research, it is important to stress the fact that human resources constitute the most important asset that an organization has at its disposal; the success or failure of the goals set by the respective administrations depends on this. The above variables affect each other and impact employee performance, as strategic leadership decisions will affect job stress and job commitment in the hospitality sector (Radosavljević et al., 2017). Also, the existence of role conflict negatively affects work stress and work commitment and respectively, high work commitment can be associated with low levels of work stress and the absence of role conflict. Role conflict, strategic leadership, job commitment, and job stress are some of the key variables in human resource management, and these are everyday issues that concern the management of an organization, in order to maximize the efficiency of employees and at the same time to ensure a quality result from their work (Leite et al., 2014). Hence, understanding how the above variables relate to each other and how they affect employees is key to finding the most effective ways to deal with and mitigate negative outcomes.

The measurement and utilization of data can help to increase the efficiency of the organization's human resources, optimize the working climate, and bring about a qualitative change in management philosophy, in order to meet the modern requirements for a human-centered approach that will also benefit employees and shareholders of the organization (Belias et al., 2021a). A successful strategic leadership must also analyze the external environment, set the right goals, and implement the necessary strategies at the right time.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the human resource management relationships between a number of variables which are job commitment, strategic leadership, job stress, and job commitment in a public tourism organization in Greece. More specifically, the definitions of these terms are the following:

– Human resources management uses a set of functions — such as human resource development, assessment, etc. — which aim at maximizing the output of the human capital that the organization has, but also at retaining a high level of satisfaction among the employees (Bratton & Gold, 2017).

– Strategic leadership is defined as the ability of the organization's leadership to enable its subordinates so to make the required strategic changes (Jaleha & Machuki, 2018).

– Role conflict occurs when the role that has been assigned to an employee or a manager, and his/her relationship with the rest of the organization, is not clear. This leads to a role conflict where the employee is not sure about his or her duties within the organization.

– According to Fornes and Rocco (2004), job commitment is the measure of the extent the employee can identify with the values and goals of the organization and the director. People who are committed to the organization make extra effort, desire organizational participation, protect the assets of the company and share the above values and goals.

– Work stress can be described as an emotion in which the individual cannot adapt his/her skills, resources and requirements to the needs of work (Fink, 2017).

Eventually, the structure of the current paper is as follows. Section 1 consists of the introduction of the paper which contains the aim/purpose of the research, the terms-factors that will be analyzed, as well as the measurement that will be used in the empirical research. Section 2 reviews the relevant literature. More thoroughly, it describes the relations between strategic leadership, work stress, work commitment, and role conflict, according to previous empirical research. Section 3 describes the methodology of this research. It includes the questionnaire, the participants, the procedure, and the data analysis. Section 4 contains the results

of the research, as well as the hypotheses testing which were analyzed with the use of certain statistical methods, such as reliability analysis and exploratory factor analysis. Finally, Section 5 consists of the discussion, and the general conclusion of the research regarding the outcome of the research, practical implementations, and future research perspectives are given in Section 6.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. The relationship between strategic leadership, work stress, and work commitment

Lovelace, Manz, and Alves (2007) reviewed the scientific literature on the relationship between leadership development and job stress, in order to develop a model that illustrates the effect of individuals and of shared leadership on job creation and job stress. The authors report that leaders who operate in complex organizational environments often have to take decisions under various pressures and often with incomplete information. Through their literature review, they find that high job demands and low job control, both individually and in combination, are common in modern work environments and negatively affect the effectiveness of leaders by reducing their health. In particular, leaders working in high-pressure types of work can expect increased risk of illness and distress, as well as increased levels of work stress. In addition, active work environments, the antithesis of high-pressure work, are environments that promote healthy and increased engagement. Hence, the leadership is able to transform a high-pressure business environment into an active business environment, through shared leadership and through the involvement of the subordinates in the decision-making process.

The model developed by Peiró and Rodríguez (2008) emphasizes that leader-subordinate relationships are one of the most common sources of work stress. Finally, Baysak and Yener (2015) investigated the relationship between leadership practices and the perceived stress of 312 nursing staff in Turkey. The results showed that there is only a partial relationship between leadership style perceptions and perceived stress.

A study by Dlamini, Garg, and Muchie (2017) explored the relationship and impact that leadership styles have on employee commitment in 267 employees at a hotel in the city of Tshwane, South Africa. Results showed that transformational leadership is highly and positively related to affective commitment, but moderately related to normative commitment.

Chiang and Wang (2012) examined the relationship between transactional leadership and transformational leadership, as well as the dimensions of trust and organizational commitment, with trust as a mediating variable between leadership and organizational commitment. The survey was conducted with a questionnaire in a sample of 421 hotel employees in Taiwan. The results showed that transformational leadership had a positive effect on employees' cognitive and emotional confidence, while transactional leadership had a negative effect on cognitive confidence. The cognitive and emotional trust had a positive effect on organizational commitment, while the trust was a mediating variable in the relationship between leadership and organizational commitment.

Finally, according to Sajida and Moeljadi (2018), strategic leadership has a significant connection with work stress. Sajida and Moeljadi (2018) have also discovered that job stress mediates the influence between strategic leadership and employee commitment. Similarly, the strong connection between strategic leadership and work commitment was indicated in Lee and Welliver's (2018) research which was conducted on 204 sales employees in a South Korean company.

2.2. The relationship between role conflict, work commitment, and work stress

A study by Palomino and Frezatti (2016) examined the relationship between role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction in 114 auditors in Brazil who were asked to answer a questionnaire. The study found that Brazilian auditors have role conflict and role ambiguity in the performance of their duties. Job satisfaction is strongly and negatively influenced by role ambiguity and even more so by role conflict. This may affect their job commitment, as job satisfaction is linked to employee commitment. Executives were found to be moderately satisfied with their current working conditions.

Karimi, Leggat, Donohue, Farrell, and Couper (2014) investigated the relationship between role overload, role conflict, role ambiguity, and work stress in nurses in Iran. The result showed that the level of work stress was relatively high and that there was a significant, linear, and positive relationship between role overload, role conflict, role ambiguity, and work stress. Role overload, role conflict, and role ambiguity affect work stress, with role conflict being the strongest predictor of work stress.

Wu, Hu, and Zheng (2019) aimed to investigate the effect work stress has on job burnout and job performance in a sample made of 191 construction managers in the Chinese construction sector. This study relied on the job-demands-resources model which introduced career as a mediator. The outcome of this research indicated that role conflict had a negative and significant effect on both job burnout and job performance. The same research indicated that job burnout has a negative effect on job performance. Another finding was that career is mediator in the relationship between role conflict and burnout but also between job performance and role conflict.

The aim of the research by Haque and Aston (2016) was to investigate the relationship between work stress and organizational commitment in employees of various companies, through a questionnaire, in a sample of 403 employees from the United Kingdom (UK) and 422 employees from Pakistan. Findings showed that female employees had less stress than men, with women being influenced more by personal factors and men by organizational factors. Personality often hinders women's organizational commitment, while role requirements and organizational leadership mainly affect male employees in both countries. Due to low social support, employees at a lower hierarchical level were more vulnerable to stress. In addition,

Pakistani employees are more stressed than UK employees, but the causes of stress are not significantly different. Women use support more often than men to overcome stress. Finally, it was found that male executives have higher emotional commitment, while female executives have higher regulatory commitment and continuity commitment.

Hashemi, Jamil, Kiumarsi, and Shno (2015) performed a literature review to investigate the role of stress in organizational commitment focusing on employees working in hotels, with the aim of creating a theoretical model. The study developed a new conceptual framework that considers role stress as an independent variable, job satisfaction as a mediating variable, and organizational commitment as a dependent variable. Using individual employees in the hotel industry as a unit of analysis, this conceptual framework can be used to analyze the direct impact of the relationship between role stress and organizational commitment in the hospitality industry. In addition, it can be applied to determine the indirect effect of job satisfaction on the relationship between role pressure and organizational commitment.

Eventually, Sajida and Moelijandi (2018) indicated the significant effect that role conflict has on work stress and work commitment. In other words, the authors suggested that role conflict has a strong positive relationship with work stress whereas role conflict has a strong negative relationship with employee commitment. Similarly, Ranihusna, Wulansari, and Asiari (2020) pointed out that role conflict has a positive impact on work stress and a negative influence on job satisfaction and hence on work commitment. The participants of their research included 170 nurses who worked in several hospitals.

2.3. Hypothesis development

Sajida and Moeljadi (2018) examined the impact that strategic leadership along with role conflict has upon employee commitment, where work stress was the mediator. The outcome of this research indicated that strategic leadership has a significant impact on job stress, role conflict has an impact on job stress along with employee commitment, and job stress is a variable that has an effect on employee commitment. On the other hand, strategic leadership does not have an impact on employee commitment. A final outcome from this research was that work stress is a mediator in the impact that strategic leadership and role conflict have on employee commitment. On the same point of view, according to the research of Aruldoss, Kowalski, and Parayitam (2020) on 445 employees in the southern part of India, job stress has a mediating role concerning work commitment and quality of work life which can lead to job satisfaction.

Based on the above, ten research hypotheses are formulated, as follows:

H1: Strategic leadership affects work stress.

H2: Strategic leadership affects work commitment.

H3: Role conflict affects work stress.

H4: Role conflict affects work commitment.

H5: Job stress affects employee job commitment.

H6: Work stress is a moderator of the effect of strategic leadership on the commitment felt by the employee.

H7: Stress is a moderator of the influence that comes from role conflict in work commitment.

H8: Role ambiguity affects work stress.

H9: Role ambiguity affects job commitment.

H10: Work stress is a moderator of the influence that comes from role ambiguity in work commitment.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. The measurement tool/Questionnaire

A structured questionnaire was used to collect data in this work. It should be noted that the questionnaire is based on the work of Sajida and Moeljadi (2018). More specifically, the questionnaire consists of the following sections:

1. *Strategic leadership:* The strategic leadership questionnaire was used for the measurement (Davies & Davies, 2004). It is comprised of 10 questions that measure strategic leadership and are answered on a five-point Likert scale from 1 = "rarely" to 5 = "usually". It should be noted that strategic leadership as a variable is determined by organizational skills and personal competencies.

2. *Role conflict and role ambiguity:* The scales developed by Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) were used in the analysis, which are widely used in the scientific literature (Tourbe & Collins, 2000). Both role ambiguity and role conflict were measured using a seven-point scale, from 1 = "absolutely true" to 7 = "absolutely false". Role ambiguity was approached through eight questions (questions 11–18), and role conflict was approached through eight questions (questions 19–24).

3. *Job commitment:* The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was used, based on the study by Allen and Meyer (1990) which focuses on the duration and effectiveness of job commitment, as well as how much it will affect the will of employees to stay in the organization. It consists of 24 questions which are measured on a five-point Likert scale from 1 = "strongly disagree" to 5 = "strongly agree". The questionnaire includes emotional commitment (questions 25–32), follow-up commitment (questions 33–40), and regulatory commitment (questions 41–48) (Meyer & Allen, 1990).

4. *Work stress:* The Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) questionnaire was used, which consists of 14 questions that are answered through a five-point Likert scale from 1 = "never" to 5 = "very often". This instrument measures how stressful certain situations are in a person's life (Cohen, Karmarck, & Mermelstein, 1983).

5. In addition to the above, the questionnaire features 13 questions that measure the socio-demographic and work characteristics of the respondents.

Eventually, an alternative method of research that could have been suitable for conducting this research was qualitative method. More specifically, the researchers could visit the organization in order to observe by recording or hearing, or seeing the employees in their working environment. Besides, the researchers could have used the method of interviews where they could have one-in-one conversation with the employees. Also, the authors could conduct surveys that would contain open-ended questions where the employees could analyze anonymously their points of view.

3.2. The sample

The survey included 190 out of a total of 526 employees of the Ministry of Tourism, which is the main public tourism organization in Greece. Participants were employed in the Central Service of the Ministry in Athens, in the 14 Regional Tourism Services throughout Greece, in the Vocational Training Institutes, and in the Schools of Guided Supervision.

3.3. The procedure

An e-mail was sent with an invitation to fill in the questionnaire through Google Forms to most employees (491 employees). The e-mail could not be sent to all members of staff, because there are employees with auxiliary staff specialties, such as workers, cleaning staff, maintenance technicians, etc., who do not have a service e-mail account. The sample was thus approached by sending an e-mail message to all employees who have an official e-mail, as well as through the Directorate of the Ministry, after verbal approval, as written consent was not necessary. The survey was conducted during the period March 2–April 15, 2020. This period coincided with the beginning of the summer tourist season, but also with the outbreak of the coronavirus pandemic, which made it difficult for officials to complete the questionnaire due to special purpose permits, the implementation of the rotating work program, etc.

3.4. Data analysis

For the research hypotheses, *H1* to *H5* and *H8* to *H9*, simple linear regressions were used between the relevant independent and dependent variables. In addition, the first five hypotheses used non-parametric Spearman rho correlations between variables, with this test selected because it does not require the data to follow the normal distribution. In general, the research hypotheses were confirmed, however, in all cases, the proportion of the variance in the respective dependent variables that was explained by the respective independent variables was small. This finding indicates that there are other factors not included in the present study that may contribute, as independent predictor variables, to explaining the proportion of the variance of each dependent variable. In hypotheses *H6, H7,* and *H10*, hierarchical linear regressions were used.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Demographics of the sample

More than one out of two participants were female (50.5%). More than one out of two participants were aged from 46 to 60 years (50.5%); 41% were aged from 31 to 45 years; 4% were from 18 to 30 years old, and 4% were over 60 years old. Most participants were married (54%); 32% were unmarried; 13% were divorced, and 2% were widowed. Two out of five participants had no children (40%); 26% had one child; 27% had two children, and the remaining 6% had three or more children. Many participants had a university degree (43%); 33% had a master's degree and 5% had a doctorate, while 18% were high school graduates and 1% were college graduates. Almost one in three participants had a family income of up to €15,000 (30.5%); 67% had a family income of up to €30,000, and 2% had a family income of over €30,000.

4.2. Exploratory factor analysis of strategic leadership, role conflict, role ambiguity, job commitment, job stress

The data for strategic leadership was suitable for use in exploratory factor analysis (KMO = 0.77, Bartlett's $\chi^2 = 723.33$, $p < 0.01$). The model extracted three factors, which explained 66.1% of the observed variance in strategic leadership. In the final solution of the exploratory factor analysis one factor was accepted, which was named "Strategic leadership" (Table 1).

Table 1. Final factor solution for strategic leadership

Factor	*Items*	*Loadings*
Strategic leadership	1	0.720
	2	0.468
	3	0.623
	4	0.757
	5	0.843
	7	0.879
	8	0.759

Role conflict data were suitable for use in exploratory factor analysis (KMO = 0.86, Bartlett's $\chi^2 = 600.01$, $p < 0.01$). The model extracted two factors that explained 64.5% of the observed variance in role conflict. The final solution comprises two factors, named "Incongruous tasks and lack of cooperation" and "Contradictions, limitations, and shortcomings" (Table 2).

Table 2. Final factor solution for role conflict

Factors	*Items*	*Loadings*
1. Role conflict with incongruous tasks and lack of cooperation	11	0.917
	12	0.798
	13	0.567
	14	0.711
2. Role conflict with contradictions, limitations, and shortcomings	15	0.713
	16	0.800
	17	0.576
	18	0.827

Role ambiguity data were suitable for incorporation in exploratory factor analysis (KMO = 0.77, Bartlett's $\chi^2 = 665.58$, $p < 0.01$). The exploratory factor analysis extracted two factors, which explained 78.2% of the observed variance in the role ambiguity data. The final solution consists of one factor, named "Role ambiguity" (Table 3).

Table 3. Final factor solution for role ambiguity

Factor	*Items*	*Loadings*
Role ambiguity	19	0.656
	21	0.968
	22	0.977
	23	0.781

The data on job commitment were suitable for use in the exploratory factor analysis (KMO = 0.76, Bartlett's $\chi^2 = 2319.07$, $p < 0.01$). The exploratory factor analysis model extracted seven factors, which explained 69.9% of the observed variance in job

commitment. The final solution includes four factors, named "Change of work unit", "Lack of sense of belonging to the organization", "Lack of faith and commitment to the organization" and "Satisfaction with the work unit" (Table 4).

Table 4. Final factor solution for work commitment

Factors	*Items*	*Loadings*
1. Job commitment and change of work unit	34	0.664
	35	0.696
	36	0.535
	37	0.556
	38	0.818
	39	0.801
	40	0.805
2. Job commitment and lack of sense of belonging to the organization	27	0.520
	29	0.884
	30	0.781
	32	0.734
3. Job commitment and lack of faith and commitment to the organization	42	0.651
	43	0.749
	46	0.490
	48	0.692
4. Job commitment and satisfaction with the work unit	25	0.756
	26	0.861
	31	0.449
	47	0.729

Regarding work stress, the data were suitable for use in exploratory factor analysis (KMO = 0.79, Bartlett's χ^2 = 1410.66, p < 0.01). The model extracted four factors, which explained 71.6% of the observed variance in the data on work stress. The final solution contains three factors named "Emotional and practical difficulties at work", "Fear of job assessment or layoff", and "Stress of self-efficacy" (Table 5).

Table 5. Final factor solution for work stress

Factors	*Items*	*Loadings*
1. Work stress and emotional and practical difficulties at work	49	0.922
	50	0.719
	51	0.863
	54	0.646
	57	0.766
	58	0.695
2. Work stress and fear of evaluation or layoff	59	-0,839
	60	-0,877
	61	-0,819
3. Work stress of self-efficacy	52	0.832
	53	0.640
	56	0.856

4.3. Reliability, normality, and means for overall scales and individual dimensions

As shown in Table 6, reliability scores for the overall scales were high and acceptable, with values ranging from α = 0.74 to α = 0.86. On the subscales or dimensions, the reliability scores were sufficient with values ranging from α = 0.66 to α = 0.89.

The data in most cases did not follow the normal distribution (Table 7).

Table 6. Reliability test (Cronbach) and means for overall scales and subscales

Variables (Scales & subscales)	*Reliability*	*No. of items*	*Mean*	*S.D.*
Overall strategic leadership	0.799	10	3.59	0.569
Strategic leadership	0.860	7	3.58	0.716
Overall role conflict	0.856	8	4.00	1,158
Incongruous tasks and lack of cooperation	0.806	4	4.46	1,255
Contradictions, limitations, and shortcomings	0.789	4	3.54	1,332
Role ambiguity	0.861	6	3.38	1,588
Overall job commitment	0.799	24	3.25	0.448
Change of work unit	0.879	7	3.14	0.867
Lack of sense of belonging	0.674	5	2.57	0.644
Lack of faith and commitment	0.659	4	3.01	0.720
Satisfaction with the work unit	0.800	4	3.28	0.812
Overall work stress	0.737	14	2.97	0.516
Emotional and practical difficulties at work	0.886	6	3.17	0.864
Fear of assessment/layoff	0.854	3	2.27	1,051
Stress of self-efficacy	0.765	3	3.28	0.757

Table 7. Kolmogorov–Smirnov normality tests for overall scales and subscales

Variables (Scales & subscales)	*Value*	*df*	*p*
Overall strategic leadership	0.116	190	0.000
Strategic leadership	0.127	190	0.000
Overall role conflict	0.088	190	0.001
Incongruous tasks and lack of cooperation	0.086	190	0.002
Contradictions, limitations, and shortcomings	0.078	190	0.006
Role ambiguity	0.153	190	0.000
Overall job commitment	0.064	190	0.058
Change of work unit	0.060	190	0.095
Lack of sense of belonging	0.139	190	0.000
Lack of faith and commitment	0.118	190	0.000
Satisfaction with the work unit	0.121	190	0.000
Overall work stress	0.062	190	0.068
Emotional and practical difficulties at work	0.089	190	0.001
Fear of assessment/layoff	0.139	190	0.000
Stress of self-efficacy	0.137	190	0.000

4.4. Hypothesis testing

In the first research hypothesis (*H1*), there was a statistically significant and moderate positive correlation between strategic leadership and "Stress of self-efficacy" (rho = 0.33, p < 0.01). Overall work stress and its subscales of "Emotional and practical difficulties in work" and "Stress of self-efficacy" as

dependent variables, were not significantly affected by overall strategic leadership as an independent variable ($p > 0.05$).

Overall strategic leadership statistically significantly predicted "Stress of self-efficacy" with $F(1,188) = 27.272$, $p < 0.01$. The proportion of the observed variance explained by the model was low at 12.7%. A one-unit increase in strategic leadership corresponded to an increase of 0.38 units in "Stress of self-efficacy" (Table 8). Hypothesis *H1* was thus accepted for the effect of strategic leadership on the dimension of work stress "Stress of self-efficacy".

Table 8. Hypothesis *H1* results

Model		*B*	*Std. error*	*Beta*	*t*	*Sig.*
1	(Constant)	1.935	0.263		7,349	0.000
	Strategic leadership	0.377	0.072	0.356	5,222	0.000

In the second hypothesis (*H2*), there was a statistically significant and small negative correlation of strategic leadership with the subscales "Lack of sense of belonging to the organization" (rho = -0.20, $p = 0.006$) and "Lack of faith and commitment in the organization" (rho = -0.22, $p = 0.002$). Strategic leadership statistically significantly predicted a "Lack of sense of belonging to the organization" ($p = 0.031$), with a one-unit increase in strategic leadership corresponding to a decrease of 0.14 in "Lack of sense of belonging to the organization" (Model 1, Table 9).

The second regression model was statistically significant ($F(1,188) = 4,593$, $p = 0,003$), and the proportion of the variance in "Lack of faith and commitment to the organization" that was explained by strategic leadership was very low with 4.7%. Strategic leadership had a statistically significant effect on "Lack of faith and commitment to the organization" ($p = 0.003$), where a one-unit increase in strategic leadership corresponded to a decrease of 0.22 in "Lack of sense of belonging to the organization" (Model 2).

Consequently, hypothesis *H2* was accepted for the effect of strategic leadership on the two subscales of work commitment, "Lack of sense of belonging to the organization" and "Lack of faith and commitment to the organization".

Table 9. Hypothesis *H2* results

Model		*B*	*Std. error*	*Beta*	*t*	*Sig.*
1	(Constant)	3.071	0.237		12.969	0.000
	Strategic leadership	-0.141	0.065	-0.157	-20.175	0.031
2	(Constant)	3.788	0.261		14.492	0.000
	Strategic leadership	-0.218	0.072	-0.217	-30.043	0.003

Regarding the third hypothesis (*H3*), there was a statistically significant and moderate positive correlation between overall role conflict and overall work stress (rho = 0.4, $p < 0.01$). Moreover, the role conflict subscale "Incongruous tasks and lack of cooperation" had statistically significant and small positive correlations with work stress subscales "Emotional and practical difficulties at work" and "Stress of self-efficacy". The role conflict subscale "Contradictions, limitations, and deficiencies" had statistically significant moderate correlations with "Emotional and practical difficulties at work" and "Fear of job assessment or layoff" (Table 10).

Table 10. Hypothesis *H3* results

Variables	*Overall job stress*	*Emotional and practical difficulties*	*Fear of job assessment/layoff*	*Stress of self-efficacy*
Overall role conflict	0.402**	0.294**	0.274**	0.034
Incongruous tasks and lack of cooperation		0.177*	0.117	0.174*
Contradictions, limitations, and shortcomings		0.342**	0.365**	-0.091

*Note: * $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$.*

The model of overall role conflict (independent variable) and overall job stress (dependent variable) was statistically significant ($F(1,188) = 44.893$, $p < 0.01$), and the proportion of the observed variance explained by the model was small with 19.3%. Overall role conflict affected overall work stress, where a one-unit increase in role conflict corresponded to a 0.2 increase in work stress (Model 1, Table 11).

The second model of role conflict with subscale "Incongruous tasks and lack of cooperation" (independent variable) and work stress subscale "Emotional and practical difficulties in work" (dependent variable) was statistically significant ($F(1,188) = 10.901$, $p = 0.001$) and the proportion of the variance explained by the model was small, with 5.5%. A one-unit increase in "Incongruous tasks and lack of cooperation" corresponded to an increase of 0.16 in "Emotional and practical difficulties at work" (Model 2).

The third model of "Role conflict with incongruous tasks and lack of cooperation" (independent variable) and "Work stress and fear of job assessment or layoff" (dependent variable) was statistically significant ($F(1,188) = 5.486$, $p = 0.020$), and the proportion of the variance explained by the model was very low with 2.8%. A one-unit increase in "Incongruous tasks and lack of cooperation" corresponded to an increase of 0.14 units in "Fear of job assessment or layoff" (Model 3).

The fourth model with "Inconsistencies, limitations, and shortcomings" (independent variable) and "Emotional and practical difficulties at work" (dependent variable) was statistically significant ($F(1,188) = 41,384$, $p < 0.01$), and the proportion of the variance explained by the model was low

with 18%. A one-unit increase in "Contradictions, limitations and shortcomings" corresponded to an increase of 0.28 unit in "Emotional and practical difficulties at work" (Model 4).

In the fifth role conflict model, of "Contradictions, limitations, and shortcomings" (independent variable) and "Fear of job assessment or layoff" (dependent variable) was statistically significant ($F(1,188) = 30.361$, $p < 0.01$), while the proportion of the observed variance explained by the model was low with 13.9%. A unit increase in "Contradictions, limitations, and shortcomings" corresponded to an increase of 0.29 unit in "Fear of job assessment or layoff" (Model 5).

The sixth and final model of "Contradictions, limitations, and shortcomings" (independent variable) and "Stress of self-efficacy" (dependent variable) was statistically significant ($F(1,188) = 7.741$, $p = 0.006$), with the proportion of the observed variance explained by the model being very low at 4%. A one-unit increase in "Contradictions, limitations, and shortcomings" corresponded to a decrease of 0.11 units in "Stress of self-efficacy" (Model 6, Table 11).

Based on the above, hypothesis *H3* was accepted and role conflict was found to affect work stress, both on the overall scales and on the subscales.

Table 11. Hypothesis *H3* results (Models)

Model		*B*	*Std. error*	*Beta*	*t*	*Sig.*
1	(Constant)	2.187	0.121		18.007	0.000
	Overall role conflict	0.195	0.029	0.439	60.700	0.000
2	(Constant)	2.450	0.226		10.844	0.000
	Role conflict with incongruous tasks and lack of cooperation	0.161	0.049	0.234	3.303	0.001
3	(Constant)	1.645	0.279		5.904	0.000
	Role conflict with incongruous tasks and lack of cooperation	0.141	0.060	0.168	2.342	0.020
4	(Constant)	2.191	0.162		13.511	0.000
	Role conflict with contradictions, limitations and shortcomings	0.276	0.043	0.425	6.433	0.000
5	(Constant)	1.230	0.202		6.085	0.000
	Role conflict with contradictions, limitations and shortcomings	0.294	0.053	0.373	5.510	0.000
6	(Constant)	3.685	0.154		23.949	0.000
	Role conflict with contradictions, limitations and shortcomings	-0.113	0.041	-0.199	-2.782	0.006

For the examination of the fourth hypothesis (*H4*), Spearman correlations showed small statistically significant positive relationships of "Contradictions, limitations, and shortcomings" with the subscales of job commitment "Change of work unit" ($rho = 0.3$, $p < 0.01$) and "Lack of sense of belonging to the organization" ($rho = 0.25$, $p < 0.01$).

Overall role conflict did not affect overall work commitment ($p = 0.714$), while there was a statistically significant effect of "Incongruous tasks and lack of cooperation" on "Satisfaction with the work unit", with the model being statistically significant ($F(1,188) = 4,082$, $p = 0.045$) and the proportion of the variance explained by the model was very small with 2%. A one-unit increase in "Incongruous tasks and lack of cooperation" corresponded to a very small reduction of 0.09 units in "Satisfaction with the work unit", with $B = -0.094$, $p = 0.045$ (Model 1, Table 12).

In the second linear regression, there was a statistically significant effect of "Contradictions, limitations, and shortcomings" on "Change of work unit", with the model being statistically significant ($F(1,188) = 16.259$, $p < 0.01$) and the proportion of variance explained by "Contradictions, limitations, and shortcomings" being small with 8%. A one-unit increase in "Contradictions, limitations and shortcomings" corresponded to an increase of 0.18 units in "Change of work unit" (Model 2).

The third model of "Contradictions, limitations, and shortcomings" (independent variable) and "Lack of a sense of belonging to the organization" (dependent variable) was also statistically significant ($F(1,188) = 16,582$, $p < 0.01$), with the proportion of variance explained by the model being small with 8.1%. A one-unit increase in "Contradictions, limitations, and shortcomings" corresponded to a small increase of 0.14 units in "Lack of sense of belonging to the organization" (Model 3, Table 12).

Therefore, hypothesis *H4* was accepted and role conflict affected job commitment, not in the overall scales, but in the subscales.

Table 12. Hypothesis *H4* results

Model		*B*	*Std. error*	*Beta*	*t*	*Sig.*
1	(Constant)	3.704	0.216		17.146	0.000
	Role conflict with incongruous tasks and lack of cooperation	-0.094	0.047	-0.146	-2.020	0.045
2	(Constant)	2.488	0.172		14.436	0.000
	Role conflict with contradictions, limitations, and shortcomings	0.184	0.046	0.282	4.032	0.000
3	(Constant)	2.078	0.128		16.225	0.000
	Role conflict with contradictions, limitations, and shortcomings	0.138	0.034	0.285	4.072	0.000

In the fifth research hypothesis (*H5*), there was a statistically significant, moderate, positive relationship between overall work stress and overall work commitment ($rho = 0.35$, $p < 0.01$).

In addition, "Change of work unit" had a positive low correlation with "Emotional and practical difficulties at work" (rho = 0.22, p = 0.003) and a positive moderate correlation with "Fear of job assessment or layoff" (rho = 0.49, p = 0.01). "Lack of sense of belonging to the organization" had a negative low correlation with "Stress of self-efficacy" (rho = -0.27, p < 0.01). "Lack of faith and commitment to the organization" had a statistically significant low negative relationship with "Fear of job assessment or layoff" (rho = -0.26, p < 0.01) and "Stress of self-efficacy" (rho = -0.17, p = 0.0017). "Satisfaction with the work unit" had low positive relationships with "Emotional and practical difficulties at work" (rho = 0.15, p = 0.038) and "Fear of job assessment or layoff".

The model of overall work stress (independent variable) and overall work commitment was statistically significant (F(1,188) = 19.788, p < 0.01) and predicted 9.5% of the observed variance in overall work commitment. A one-unit increase in overall work stress corresponded to an increase of 0.27 units in overall work commitment (Model 1, Table 13).

The second model of linear regression was statistically significant (F(1,188) = 11,343, p = 0.001), and "Emotional and practical difficulties at work" predicted 5.7% of the variance in "Change of work unit". A one-unit increase in "Emotional and practical difficulties at work" corresponded to an increase of 0.24 units in "Change of work unit" (Model 2).

The third model, with "Fear of job assessment or layoff" (independent variable) and "Change of work unit" (dependent variable) was statistically significant (F(1,188) = 50,131, p < 0.01) and predicted 21.1% of the variance in "Change of work unit". A one-unit increase in "Fear of job assessment or layoff" corresponded to an increase of 0.38 units in "Change of work unit" (Model 3).

The fourth linear regression model with "Fear of job assessment or layoff" (independent variable) and "Lack of faith and commitment in the organization" (dependent variable) was statistically significant (F(1,188) = 12,041, p = 0.001), and explained 6% of the observed variance in "Lack of faith and dedication to the organization". A one-unit increase in "Fear of job assessment or layoff" corresponded to a decrease of 0.17 units in "Lack of faith and commitment to the organization" (Model 4).

The fifth model, with "Fear of job assessment or layoff" (independent variable) and "Satisfaction with the work unit" (dependent variable), was statistically significant (F(1,188) = 12,676, p < 0.01) and the model predicted 6.3% of the variance in "Satisfaction from the work unit". A one-unit increase in "Fear of assessment/layoff" corresponded to an increase of 0.19 units in "Satisfaction with the work unit" (Model 5).

The sixth model with "Stress of self-efficacy" (independent variable) and "Change of work unit" (dependent variable) was statistically significant (F(1,188) = 5.390, p = 0.021) and explained only 2.1% of the observed variance in "Change of work unit". A unit increase in "Stress of self-efficacy" corresponded to a decrease of 0.19 units in "Change of work unit" (Model 6).

In the seventh regression model, "Stress of self-efficacy" was the independent variable, and "Lack of sense of belonging to the organization" was the dependent variable. The model was statistically significant (F(1,188) = 9,845, p = 0.002) and predicted 5% of the observed variance in "Lack of sense of belonging to the organization". A one-unit increase in "Stress of self-efficacy" corresponded to a reduction of 0.19 units in "Lack of sense of belonging to the organization" (Model 7).

The eighth and last model with "Stress of self-efficacy" (independent variable) and "Lack of faith and commitment to the organization" (dependent variable), was statistically significant (F(1,188) = 4.506, p = 0.035). The model predicted only 2.3% of the observed variance in "Lack of faith and commitment to the organization". The increase of one unit in "Stress of self-efficacy" corresponded to a decrease by 0.15 units to "Lack of faith and commitment to the organization" (Model 8, Table 13).

Therefore, hypothesis *H5* is accepted and work stress was found to affect work commitment, not on the overall scales, but on all subscales of work stress.

Table 13. Hypothesis *H5* results

Model		*B*	*Std. error*	*Beta*	*t*	*Sig.*
1	(Constant)	2.457	0.182		13.522	0.000
	Overall work stress	0.268	0.060	0.309	4.448	0.000
2	(Constant)	2.381	0.233		10.209	0.000
	Work stress: Emotional and practical difficulties at work	0.239	0.071	0.239	3.368	0.001
3	(Constant)	2.278	0.134		17.037	0.000
	Work stress: Fear of being evaluated or fired	0.378	0.053	0.459	7.080	0.000
4	(Constant)	3.390	0.121		27.974	0.000
	Work stress: Fear of being evaluated or fired	-0.168	0.048	-0.245	-3.470	0.001
5	(Constant)	2.843	0.137		20.820	0.000
	Work stress: Fear of being evaluated or fired	0.194	0.055	0.251	3.560	0.000
6	(Constant)	3.766	0.277		13.583	0.000
	Work stress: Self-efficacy	-0.191	0.082	-0.167	-2.322	0.021
7	(Constant)	3.190	0.204		15.646	0.000
	Work stress: Self-efficacy	-0.190	0.060	-0.223	-3.138	0.002
8	(Constant)	3.485	0.231		15.104	0.000
	Work stress: Self-efficacy	-0.145	0.068	-0.153	-2.123	0.035

For the sixth hypothesis (*H6*), the relationship between overall work stress as an independent variable and overall work commitment, as a dependent variable, was obtained earlier ($p < 0.01$) in *H5*. In the hierarchical regression, the effect of strategic leadership as an independent variable on overall work commitment as a dependent variable (Model 1) and the moderating effect of overall work stress in this relationship (Model 2) was investigated.

In the first step of the model, overall strategic leadership did not significantly predict overall job commitment ($p = 0.101$) and the model was not statistically significant ($F(1,188) = 2,717$, $p = 0.101$). The second step was statistically significant ($F(1,188) = 11,457$, $p < 0.01$) and explained 10.9% of the observed variance in overall job commitment. In addition, in the first and second steps of the hierarchical regression, overall strategic leadership did not have a statistically significant effect on work commitment (Table 14).

Consequently, hypothesis *H6* is rejected, as the dependent and the independent variable have no statistically significant relationship in each step of the model. However, it is observed that in the second step of the model, overall work stress had a significant effect on job commitment, with Model 2 being statistically significant ($F(1,187) = 11.457$, $p < 0.01$).

Table 14. Hypothesis *H6* results

Model		*B*	*Std. error*	*Beta*	*t*	*Sig.*
1	(Constant)	2.916	0.207		14.068	0.000
	Overall strategic leadership	0.094	0.057	0.119	1.648	0.101
2	(Constant)	2.125	0.265		8.004	0.000
	Overall strategic leadership	0.093	0.054	0.118	1.710	0.089
	Overall work stress	0.268	0.060	0.308	4.464	0.000

In the seventh hypothesis (*H7*), hierarchical regression was performed, and the effect of role conflict as an independent variable on overall work commitment as a dependent variable (Model 1), as well as the possible moderating effect of overall work stress in this relationship (Model 2) was examined.

In the first step of the model, overall role conflict was not a significant predictor of overall job commitment ($p = 0.714$) and the model was not statistically significant ($F(1.188) = 0.135$, $p = 0.714$). In the second step, the model with role conflict and work stress as predictive variables of work commitment was statistically significant ($F(1,187) = 13,705$, $p < 0.01$), with ΔR^2 greater than 0.05 (0.126) and F-change greater than 1. Also, in the first step of the hierarchical regression, overall role conflict did not have a statistically significant effect on job commitment. In the second step, role conflict ($p = 0.009$) and work stress ($p < 0.01$) had a statistically significant effect on job commitment, with the effect of role conflict being very small and negative ($B = -0.08$) and the effect of overall work stress on work commitment being small ($B = 0.35$, Table 15).

Therefore, hypothesis *H7* was rejected, since work stress was not a moderator of the effect of role conflict on job commitment, since in the first step of the hierarchy regression the independent variable of role conflict and the dependent role of employment were not statistically significant ($p = 0.714$).

Table 15. Hypothesis *H7* results

Model		*B*	*Std. error*	*Beta*	*t*	*Sig.*
1	(Constant)	3.295	0.117		28.048	0.000
	Overall role conflict	-0.010	0.028	-0.027	-0.367	0.714
2	(Constant)	2.540	0.182		13.986	0.000
	Overall role conflict	-0.078	0.029	-0.201	-2.644	0.009
	Overall work stress	0.345	0.066	0.397	5.221	0.000

In the eighth hypothesis (*H8*), Spearman correlations showed that role ambiguity had small statistically significant and positive correlations with overall work stress ($rho = 0.27$, $p < 0.01$) and with the subscales of "Emotional and practical difficulties at work" ($rho = 0.22$, $p = 0.002$) and "Fear of assessment or layoff" ($rho = 0.31$, $p < 0.01$). Role conflict had a statistically significant and small negative correlation with "Stress of self-efficacy" ($rho = -0.18$, $p < 0.01$).

The first model of role ambiguity (independent variable) and overall work stress was statistically significant ($F(1,188) = 14,447$, $p < 0.01$) and predicted 7.1% of the observed variance in the model. A one-unit increase in role ambiguity corresponded to a small increase of 0.09 units in work stress (Model 1, Table 16).

The second linear regression model was also statistically significant ($F(1,188) = 8,491$, $p = 0.001$) and role conflict explained only a small proportion, 6% of the observed variance in "Emotional and practical difficulties at work". A one-unit increase in role conflict corresponded to an increase of 0.13 units in "Emotional and practical difficulties at work" (Model 2).

The third linear regression model was also statistically significant ($F(1,188) = 19,184$, $p < 0.01$), and role conflict explained 9% of the observed variance in "Fear of assessment or layoff". A one-unit increase in role ambiguity corresponded to an increase of 0.2 units in "Fear of assessment or layoff" (Model 3).

The fourth regression model was statistically significant ($F(1,188) = 6.946$, $p = 0.009$), and role ambiguity explained only 4% of the variance in "Stress of self-efficacy". A one-unit increase in role ambiguity corresponded to a small decrease of 0.1 units in "Stress of self-efficacy" (Model 4, Table 16).

Consequently, hypothesis *H8* was accepted and role conflict was found to affect work stress, both on the overall scale and on the three subscales.

Table 16. Hypothesis *H8* results

Model		B	Std. error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	2.675	0.085		31.376	0.000
	Role ambiguity	0.087	0.023	0.267	3.801	0.000
2	(Constant)	2.717	0.144		18.897	0.000
	Role ambiguity	0.133	0.038	0.245	3.469	0.001
3	(Constant)	1.592	0.172		9.265	0.000
	Role ambiguity	0.201	0.046	0.304	4.380	0.000
4	(Constant)	3.589	0.128		28.118	0.000
	Role ambiguity	-0.090	0.034	-0.189	-2.635	0.009

In the ninth hypothesis (*H9*), Spearman correlations showed that role ambiguity was statistically significant and positively correlated to "Change of work unit" (rho = 0.15, p = 0.043) and to "Lack of sense of belonging and commitment to the organization" (rho = 0.17, p = 0.019). These correlations were small in size. Role ambiguity was not significantly correlated with overall job commitment, nor with its subscales of "Lack of faith and commitment to the organization" and "Satisfaction with the work unit" (p > 0.05).

Based on the above results, two linear regressions were performed with role ambiguity as an independent variable and "Change of work unit" and "Lack of sense of belonging to the organization" as separate dependent variables. The first linear regression model, with role ambiguity (independent variable) and "Change of work unit" (dependent variable), was statistically significant (F(1,188) = 3,938, p = 0.049) and predicted only 2.1% of the observed variance in "Change of work unit". A one-unit increase in role conflict corresponded to a small increase of 0.08 units in "Change of work unit" (Table 17).

The second model with role ambiguity (independent variable) and "Lack of sense of belonging to the organization" (dependent variable), was not statistically significant (F(1,188) = 1,982, p = 0.161). Consequently, hypothesis *H9* is accepted only for the work commitment subscale of "Change of work unit".

Table 17. Hypothesis *H9* results

Model		B	Std. error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	2.874	0.147		19.529	0.000
	Role ambiguity	0.078	0.039	0.143	1.985	0.049

In the tenth hypothesis (*H10*), the relationship of overall work stress as an independent variable with overall work commitment as a dependent variable has been confirmed as part of research hypothesis *H5*.

Hierarchical regression was performed to study the effect of role ambiguity, as an independent variable, on overall work commitment as a dependent variable (Model 1), as well as to examine the possible moderating effect of overall work stress in the above relationship (Model 2). In both the first and second steps of the hierarchical regression, role ambiguity had no statistically significant effect on job commitment (p > 0.05, Table 18).

Consequently, hypothesis *H10* was rejected, since, in the two steps of the hierarchical regression model, the dependent and the independent variable were not statistically significant. However, as in the case of hypothesis *H6*, it was observed that in the second step of the model, overall work stress had a statistically significant effect on work commitment (p < 0.01).

Table 18. Hypothesis *H10* results

Model		B	Std. error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	3.196	0.077		41.622	0.000
	Role ambiguity	0.017	0.021	0.061	0.833	0.406
2	(Constant)	2.463	0.183		13.450	0.000
	Role ambiguity	-0.007	0.020	-0.023	-0.325	0.745
	Overall work stress	0.274	0.063	0.315	40.363	0.000

5. DISCUSSION

In the present research, ten research hypotheses were formulated and tested based on the relevant theory and the purpose of the study. The results showed that strategic leadership significantly influences work stress. It was also found that strategic leadership affects work commitment through a lack of sense of belonging to the organization and a lack of faith and commitment to the organization. Role conflict was found to affect work stress, which agreed with the study of Sajida and Moeljadi (2018), but role conflict also affected work commitment, in contrast to the study of Sajida and Moeljadi (2018). These findings do not contradict the findings of previous studies on the relationship between role conflict and work stress (Alam, Haerani, Amar, & Sudirman, 2015; Ingram, 2013; Judeh, 2011; Karimi et al., 2014; Soltani et al., 2013; Tang & Chang, 2010), but also between role conflict and organizational commitment (Judeh, 2011; Leite et al., 2014; Tang & Chang, 2010). Work-related stress has also been found to affect work commitment, which does not contradict the findings of previous studies (Ismail et al., 2015; Mosadeghrad, 2014; Quick & Henderson, 2016). On the other hand, work stress is not a moderator on the effect that strategic leadership has on work commitment, while work stress is not a moderator on the effect that role conflict has on work commitment.

Overall, the findings of this study agree with the findings of previous studies as discussed above. In this context, this study identifies the need to implement human resource management strategies to reduce work stress and role conflict, as well as to strengthen strategic leadership, in order to reduce the extent of work stress and increase organizational commitment that are factors involved in employees' intention to leave an organization, reduced productivity and reduced overall organizational performance.

6. CONCLUSION

In a conclusion, the current research indicates a strong relationship between strategic leadership and work stress, and work commitment. Also, the authors suggest that role conflict affects work stress as well as a work commitment.

However, it is important to mention that working in the public sector today means that there are much more responsibilities, especially in a public tourist organization which is responsibility for the smooth operation of the most productive sector of the Greek economy (Belias et al., 2021b; Grigoriou & Belias, 2022; Koustelios, Belias, & Zournatzi, 2021). This requires the management of public tourist organizations to make a number of interventions based on the above results with the aim to improve its effectiveness.

First of all, the management should be able to identify the potential stressors found within the organization. As a result, the identification of the stressors can help the management of the organization to move on to the next step which is to reduce its negative effect. Secondly, the organization's management should strengthen the employees' emotional strength and utilize their emotional intelligence. In this way, the employees will learn to cope much better with job stress and hence improve their performance. In addition, the employees should have certain roles. In order to avoid role conflict, a variable that has a negative impact on other variables including job commitment and job stress, it is important to define an exact job description for each employee including their role within the company (Belias et al., 2022; Belias & Trihas, 2022b, 2022c, 2022d). Finally, job commitment is a very important factor. As indicated by Haque and Aston (2016), an organization that "listens to its employees" may boost job commitment. In this case, the company can provide a number of perks and policies which will indicate its care for its employees, especially when they are in trouble. Also, it has to include them in the decision-making processes so to make sure that their voice is not only heard but also that it is taken into consideration in the decisions made.

Besides the above, it is crucial to focus on the training and development of the personnel. This can occur by creating individual and group development programs which will be based on the needs of the employees but also they will be associated with the aims and goals of the organization.

These findings also demonstrate the need for further studies in this field, given the constantly changing conditions in the labor market and the importance of the examined variables in individual and organizational work efficiency. It must be noted that the sample of the present research is relatively small and therefore the generalization of the results is uncertain. In addition, in the future, it would be interesting to combine this type of quantitative approach with a qualitative component in a sample of executives working in the human resource department of organizations, in order to investigate the implementation of strategies that lead to a reduction of work stress, to increased organizational commitment, but also that related to increased strategic leadership ability. In this context, job satisfaction is another relevant variable that was examined in this paper and could therefore be included in further study.

REFERENCES

1. Alam, S., Haerani, S., Amar, M. Y., & Sudirman, I. (2015). Role conflict and role ambiguity in higher education. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention, 4*(1), 1–7. Retrieved from https://www.ijbmi.org/papers/Vol(4)1/Version-2/A4120107.pdf
2. Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x
3. Aruldoss, A., Kowalski, K. B., & Parayitam, S. (2021). The relationship between quality of work life and work-life-balance mediating role of job stress, job satisfaction and job commitment: Evidence from India. *Journal of Advances in Management Research, 18*(1), 36–62. https://doi.org/10.1108/JAMR-05-2020-0082
4. Baysak, B., & Yener, M. I. (2015). The relationship between perceived leadership style and perceived stress on hospital employees. *Procedia — Social and Behavioral Sciences, 207,* 79–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.159
5. Belias, D., & Koustelios, A. (2014a). Organizational culture and job satisfaction: A review. *International Review of Management and Marketing, 4*(2), 132–149. Retrieved from https://www.econjournals.com/index.php/irmm/article/view/746
6. Belias, D., & Koustelios, A. (2014b). Transformational leadership and job satisfaction in the banking sector: A review. *International Review of Management and Marketing, 4*(3), 187–200. Retrieved from https://econjournals.com/index.php/irmm/article/view/766
7. Belias, D., & Koustelios, A. (2014c). Job satisfaction and job burnout among Greek bank employees. *International Journal of Management, 5*(1), 33–45. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260289067_JOB_SATISFACTION_AND_JOB_BURNOUT_AMONG_GREEK_BANK_EMPLOYEES
8. Belias, D., & Trihas, N. (2022a). How can we measure the "success of change management?": An exploratory factor analysis in a sample of employees in the Greek hotel industry. In V. Katsoni (Ed.), *IACUDIT 2022 Conference Proceedings*.

9. Belias, D., & Trihas, N. (2022b). Human resource training of front office employees and change management in hospitality sector during crisis. In M. Arami, P. Baudier, & V. Chang (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Finance, Economics, Management and IT Business* (pp. 101–106). SciTePress. https://doi.org/10.5220/0011060000003206
10. Belias, D., & Trihas, N. (2022c). Investigating the readiness for organizational change: A case study from a hotel industry context/Greece. *Journal of Tourism & Management Research, 7*(2), 1047–1062. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/363644497_Investigating_the_Readiness_for_Organizational_Change_A_Case_Study_from_a_Hotel_Industry_ContextGreece
11. Belias, D., & Trihas, N. (2022d). How can we measure the "Resistance to Change?": An exploratory factor analysis in a sample of employees in the Greek hotel industry. In V. Katsoni (Ed.), *IACUDIT 2022 Conference Proceedings*.
12. Belias, D., & Trihas, N. (2022e). The concept and the measurement of strategic leadership. The case of Greek hotel employees. In *Proceedings of 18th European Conference on Management Leadership and Governance*.
13. Belias, D., Koustelios, A., Sdrolias, L., & Aspridis, G. (2015). Job satisfaction, role conflict and autonomy of employees in the Greek banking organization. *Procedia — Social and Behavioral Sciences, 175,* 324–333. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.1207
14. Belias, D., Papademetriou, C., Rossidis, I., & Vasiliadis, L. (2020). Strategic management in the hotel industry: Proposed strategic practices to recover from COVID-19 global crisis. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies, 9*(6), 130–138. https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2020-0117
15. Belias, D., Rossidis, I., Papademetriou, C., & Lamprinoudis, N. (2021a). The Greek tourism sector: An analysis of job satisfaction, role conflict and autonomy of Greek employees. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism, 21*(1), 156–174. https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2021.1959825
16. Belias, D., Rossidis, I., Papademetriou, C., & Mantas, C. (2021b). Job satisfaction as affected by types of leadership: A case study of Greek tourism sector. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism, 23*(2), 299–317. https://doi.org/10.1080/1528008X.2020.1867695
17. Belias, D., Rossidis, I., Sotiriou, A., & Malik, S. (2022). Workplace conflict, turnover, and quality of services. Case study in Greek seasonal hotels. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/1528008X.2022.2065655
18. Bratton, J., & Gold, J. (2017). *Human resource management: Theory and practice*. London, England: Palgrave.
19. Chiang, C.-F., & Wang, Y.-Y. (2012). The effects of transactional and transformational leadership on organizational commitment in hotels: The mediating effect of trust. *Journal of Hotel & Business Management, 1*(1), 1–11. Retrieved from https://www.longdom.org/open-access/the-effects-of-transactional-and-transformational-leadership-on-organizational-commitment-in-hotels-the-mediating-effect-of-trust-2169-0286.1000103.pdf
20. Cohen, S., Karmarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 24*(4), 386–396. https://doi.org/10.2307/2136404
21. Davies, B. J., & Davies, B. (2004). Strategic leadership. *School Leadership and Management, 24*(1), 29–38. https://doi.org/10.1080/1363243042000172804
22. Dlamini, N. N. N., Garg, A. K., & Muchie, M. (2017). The impact of transformational leadership style on organisational commitment in the hospitality industry. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure, 6*(3), 1–21. Retrieved from http://www.ajhtl.com/uploads/7/1/6/3/7163688/article_32_vol_6__3__2017.pdf
23. Ee, M. J. Y., Teoh, M. M.-Y., & Yen, Y. Y. (2017). Role conflict, role ambiguity and role overload: The strains of work-family conflict. *The Social Science, 12*(9), 1566–1576. Retrieved from https://medwelljournals.com/abstract/?doi=sscience.2017.1566.1576
24. Fink, G. (2017). Stress: Concepts, definition and history. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Psychology*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-809324-5.02208-2
25. Fornes, S. L., & Rocco, T. S. (2004). *Commitment elements reframed (antecedents & consequences) for organizational effectiveness*. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED492195.pdf
26. Grigoriou, A., & Belias, D. (2022). The effect of role conflict on work commitment and work stress: The case of Greek public educational institution. *Public Management Review, 2*(1), 48–73. Retrieved from https://www.lawjournals.unic.ac.cy/index.php/pareview/article/view/32
27. Haque, A. U., & Aston, J. (2016). A relationship between occupational stress and organisational commitment of it sector's employees in contrasting economies. *Polish Journal of Management Studies, 14*(1), 95–105. Retrieved from https://cutt.ly/ENI8vVO
28. Hashemi, S. M., Jamil, J., Kiumarsi, S., & Shno, M. (2015). Exploring the role of stress on organizational commitment among employees in hospitality industry: The mediating role of job satisfaction. *International Journal of Information Research and Review, 2*(9), 1144–1150. Retrieved from https://www.ijirr.com/sites/default/files/issues-pdf/0556.pdf
29. Hashmi, M. I. (2015). Causes and prevention of occupational stress. *IOSR Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences, 14*(11), 98–104. Retrieved from https://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jdms/papers/Vol14-issue11/Version-8/S01411898104.pdf
30. Ingram, J. R. (2013). Supervisor-officer fit and role ambiguity: Re-assessing the nature of the sergeant-officer attitudinal relationship. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 36*(2), 375–398. https://doi.org/10.1108/13639511311329750
31. Ismail, A., Saudin, N., Ismail, Y., Abu Samah, A. J., Abu Bakar, R., & Aminudin, N. N. (2015). Effect of workplace stress on job performance. *Economic Review: Journal of Economics and Business, 13*(1), 45–57. Retrieved from https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/193846/1/econ-review-v13-i1-p045-057.pdf
32. Itika, J. S. (2011). *Fundamentals of human resource management*. Leiden, Netherlands: African Studies Centre.
33. Jaleha, A. A., & Machuki, V. N. (2018). Strategic leadership and organizational performance: A critical review of literature. *European Scientific Journal, 14*(35), 124–149. https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2018.v14n35p124
34. Judeh, M. (2011). Role ambiguity and role conflict as mediators of the relationship between socialization and organizational commitment. *International Business Research, 4*(3), 171–181. https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v4n3p171
35. Karimi, L., Leggat, S. G., Donohue, L., Farrell, G., & Couper, G. E. (2014). Emotional rescue: The role of emotional intelligence and emotional labour on well-being and job-stress among community nurses. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 70*(1), 176–186. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.12185

36. Koustelios, A., Belias, D., & Zournatzi, E. (2021). Leadership in the Greek public sector. *Public Management Review, 1*(1), 43–55. Retrieved from https://www.lawjournals.unic.ac.cy/index.php/pareview/article/view/10
37. Lazarakis, P. (2020). *Human resource management, strategic leadership, role conflict, job commitment and job stress of employees in a public tourism organization* (Master's thesis, Hellenic Open University).
38. Lee, J. Y., & Welliver, M. C. (2018). The role of strategic leadership for learning on the relationship between training opportunities and salesperson job performance and commitment. *European Journal of Training and Development, 42*(9), 558–576. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-08-2017-0068
39. Leite, N. R. P., Rodrigues, A. C. A., & de Albuquerque, L. G. (2014). Organizational commitment and job satisfaction: What are the potential relationships? *BAR, Rio de Janeiro, 11*(4), 476–495. https://doi.org/10.1590/1807-7692bar2014276
40. Lovelace, K. J., Manz, C. C., & Alves, J. C. (2007). Work stress and leadership development: The role of self-leadership, shared leadership, physical fitness and flow in managing demands and increasing job control. *Human Resource Management Review, 17*(4), 374–387. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2007.08.001
41. Mosadeghrad, A. M. (2014). Occupational stress and its consequences: Implications for health policy and management. *Leadership in Health Services, 27*(3), 224–239. https://doi.org/10.1108/LHS-07-2013-0032
42. Nazari, K., & Emami, M. (2012). Antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, 3*(9), 484–493. Retrieved from https://journal-archieves14.webs.com/484-493.pdf
43. Ntalakos, A., Belias, D., & Koustelios, A. (2022a). The relationship between leadership styles & communication — Effect on team efficiency: The case of Greek hotel businesses' employees. In V. Katsoni (Ed.), *IACUDIT 2022 Conference Proceedings*.
44. Ntalakos, A., Belias, D., & Tsigilis, N. (2022b). Leadership styles and group dynamics in the tourism industry. In V. Katsoni (Ed.), *IACUDIT 2022 Conference Proceedings*.
45. Palomino, M. N., & Frezatti, F. (2016). Role conflict, role ambiguity and job satisfaction: Perceptions of the Brazilian controllers. *Revista de Administração (São Paulo), 51*(2), 165–181. Retrieved from https://daneshyari.com/article/preview/1033513.pdf
46. Peiró, J. M., & Rodríguez, I. (2008). Work stress, leadership and organizational health. *Papeles del Psicologo, 29*(1), 88–99. Retrieved from https://www.psychologistpapers.com/English/1540.pdf
47. Quick, J. C., & Henderson, D. F. (2016). Occupational stress: Preventing suffering, enhancing wellbeing. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 13*(5), 459. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph13050459
48. Radosavljević, Z., Ćilerdžić, V., & Dragić, M. (2017). Employee organizational commitment. *International Review, 1*(2), 18–26. https://doi.org/10.5937/intrev1702018R
49. Ranihusna, D., Wulansari, N. A., & Asiari, D. K. (2020). Role conflict relationships that can increase the satisfaction of hospital nurses. *KnE Social Sciences*, *4*(6), 1231–1241. https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v4i6.6673
50. Redmond, J. (2012). *Strategy and the importance of strategic leadership*. Retrieved from https://cutt.ly/WNOrKHV
51. Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 15*(2), 150–163. https://doi.org/10.2307/2391486
52. Rossidis, I., Belias, D., & Aspridis, G. (2019). *Change management and leadership*. Athens, Greece: Tziolas Publishing.
53. Sajida, P. W., & Moeljadi. (2018). The effect of strategic leadership and role conflict to employee's commitments with work stress as mediation. *Journal of Applied Management (JAM), 16*(3), 440–447. Retrieved from https://jurnaljam.ub.ac.id/index.php/jam/article/view/1323
54. Soltani, I., Hajatpour, S., Khorram, J., & Nejati, M. H. (2013). Investigating the effect of role conflict and role ambiguity on employees' job stress: Articulating the role of work-family conflict. *Management Science Letters, 3,* 1927–1936. https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2013.06.036
55. Tang, Y.-T., & Chang, C.-H. (2010). Impact of role ambiguity and role conflict on employee creativity. *African Journal of Business Management, 4*(6), 869–881. Retrieved from https://academicjournals.org/journal/AJBM/article-full-text-pdf/8F7ED1023503.pdf
56. Tourbe, C. T., & Collins, J. M. (2000). A Jackson and Schuler (1985) revised: A metaanalysis of the relationships between role ambiguity, role conflict, and job performance. *Journal of Management, 26*(1), 115–169. Retrieved from https://tarjomefa.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/6396-English-TarjomeFa.pdf
57. Wu, G., Hu, Z., & Zheng, J. (2019). Role stress, job burnout, and job performance in construction project managers: The moderating role of career calling. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 16*(13), 2394. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16132394