

Determinants of organizational stress: A research the framework of attribution theory ¹

Gözde KUMAŞ

Kocaeli University, Institute of Social Sciences, Doctorate Program of Tourism
Management Department, Kartepe / Kocaeli, 41180, Turkey,
206247012@kocaeli.edu.tr , 0000-0003-0573-0136, 0544 404 74 18

Didar SARI ÇALLI

Sakarya University of Applied Sciences, Faculty of Tourism, Department of Tourism
Guidance, Sapanca / Sakarya, 54600, Turkey, didarsari@subu.edu.tr, 0000- 0001-
5517- 2924. 0264 295 62 97

ABSTRACT

Stress, which has various dimensions, is a reaction that can disrupt the daily routines of living things in terms of physiology and psychology. Organizational stress is a situation that can cause disruption in the joint work of people focused on the same goal. Stress experienced in organizations is considered reasonable up to certain levels. However, an intense stress environment can lead to a number of problems such as poor performance, communication disorders, and desire to leave work. Identifying stress sources and examining their causes in depth is of great importance in preventing intense stress and keeping stress at a reasonable level. Identifying organizational stress sources and their causes will provide strategic convenience for managers and enable businesses to achieve organizational success. This research is aimed to determine the sources of organizational stress and to associate the stress dimensions that stand out as a result of the research with attribution behavior. Within the scope of the research were examined data of 590 hotel employees. Data were analyzed with the SPSS Programme. The dimensions of organizational stress were determined by Explanatory Factor Analysis. As a result of the research, stress originating from the manager and employee relations, which is one of the prominent dimensions of organizational stress, has been associated with external attribution behavior. Stress stemming from organizational structure, which is another prominent dimension, has been associated with internal attribution behavior. For managing the external attribution behavior, it is necessary to provide appropriate working conditions within the enterprise. For managing internal attribution behavior, an effective communication environment should be established.

KEYWORDS: Stress, Organizational Stress, Organizational Stress Sources, Attribution Theory, Hotel Businesses.

¹ This study derived from the master's thesis titled "A Research on Organizational Stress Levels and Departmental Relationship in Hotel Businesses" by Gözde KUMAŞ under the supervision Asst. Prof. Didar SARI ÇALLI (Ph.D).

1. INTRODUCTION

Organizational stress is a situation experienced as a result of unexpected developments that may occur at any stage of the processes followed to reach the predetermined goals in the business environment. Organizations are structures where human resources with multiple cultural backgrounds and visions coexist. Although the working conditions are kept at a reasonable level for the employer, the appropriate environment for employees to reveal the expected performance may vary from person to person. For organizations to achieve common goals as a whole, it will not be sufficient to identify the main sources of stress alone. At this point, to solve the problem experienced, it is necessary to examine human psychology in depth. Providing healthy working environments to employees will contribute greatly to reducing the stress experienced at reasonable levels. Because recommendations for stress management generally consist of a series of suggestions such as stress training and improving the working environment. For example, according to Işık et al. (2021), sharing tacit knowledge within the organization plays a role in employees' creative work behaviors and the development of a healthy team culture. Therefore, such positive developments within the organization indicate the existence of reasonable levels of stress. The reasons affecting human psychology and behavior in organizations are examined from the perspective of organizational stress in the context of internal reasons and discussed from a micro framework in this study. However, in labor-intensive industries that are quite open to the outside world, such as the tourism industry, many macro parameters such as health, economy, technology, and climate change are effective in the success of the organization. Within the scope of the tourism industry, national and international travel is carried out intensively in the summer and winter months. The effects of the Covid-19 epidemic that

occurred all over the world in 2020 were also seen largely in tourism. For example, according to the research of Dogru et al. (2023b), while international chain hotels experienced a significant loss of customers due to the epidemic, organizations providing Airbnb services were able to remain in a more advantageous position because they offered a more isolated service. Therefore, employees in hotel businesses have encountered stressful factors such as job loss. According to Al Akasheh et al. (2024), the factors that cause job loss are mostly salary imbalance and overtime. From a tourism perspective, it has been determined that the employee turnover rate during the Covid-19 pandemic period varies depending on the US tourism economy. In other words, it has been determined that if US tourism revenues increase, the employee turnover rate decreases (Dogru et al. 2023a). In an industry such as tourism, which is based on a broad basis of economics, economic variables are of great importance in relations between countries. According to Dogru et al.'s (2019) research, while the appreciation of the US dollar did not affect the long-term tourism trade relationship with Mexico, it disrupted the bilateral tourism trade balance with Canada and the UK. Beyond these, it has been determined that tourism development and economic growth are related in countries such as Turkey, Germany, and China, but such a relationship cannot be detected in Spain (Isik et al., 2018). In other words, the changes caused by tourism and its reflections on tourists and tourism workers in social and economic dimensions over time vary according to countries. These changes directly affect people's quality of life. Thus, people may have different psychological structures during tourism activities. The fact that studies in the field of tourism mostly focus on the fields of technology, innovation, and sustainability (Işık et al., 2022) is evidence that the tourism industry is extremely sensitive to the external environment. Studies in the literature in recent years in different disciplines have

also drawn attention to the importance of green energy consumption for the sustainability of resources (Aslan et al., 2024; Hassan et al., 2024; Lee et al., 2023; Skovgaard & Asselt, 2019; Visser et al., 2019). Thus, energy-saving practices have been suggested. Therefore, in increasing organizational success, it is important to examine human psychology in-depth, taking into account macro and micro variables. People can sometimes exhibit active and sometimes passive behavior in the face of macro and micro factors affecting organizations. Studies have shown that people are sensitive to certain social issues, but fail to take action and take steps to solve the problem (Klenert et al., 2018; Carattini et al., 2017). There are studies in the literature that address the relationship between support for green policies and social norms, attitudes, and personal impact (Konc et al., 2021; Szekely et al., 2021; Ulph & Ulph, 2021). To prepare the environment that will enable people to take action and to improve the situation in question, increasing public support and sensitivity to social change and expectations are recommended by policy makers (Lipari et al., 2024). It would be healthy to carry out improvement works by taking into account all segments of society in social improvements. Because, according to the study of Andre et al. (2021), the negative views of American citizens towards those who have a high belief in climate change prevent collective mobilization and slow down the measures to be taken on climate change. It is also stated that in this case, it may be useful to address the issue with various theories that can be used to explain social relations in analyzing the underlying causes of people's behavior (Teodoro et al., 2021). This study, it is aimed to make sense of the underlying causes of the factors that reveal organizational stress sources with Attribution Theory.

Today, the fact that the main capital is qualified human resources in terms of businesses managed with contemporary management approaches also shows the

importance given to people and their comfort. According to Elmadag and Ellinger (2018), although organizations provide suitable conditions according to the structure of the work by authorized persons, a stressful work environment such as insufficient social relations between employees and incompatibility with organizational culture will hurt the performance of employees. Authorized persons should be aware of this situation, which has a detrimental effect on overall performance, and offer solutions promptly. Pu et al. (2024) concluded that the emotional burnout of employees in the hospitality industry positively affects their intention to leave. Situations that reduce overall performance must be noticed by authorized persons in a timely manner and they must propose solutions. On the other hand, stress experience can also be shaped depending on how people evaluate the subject. While some people find the main source of the problem in themselves as a result of an objective evaluation, take precautions quickly, and manage the stress, some people can easily throw the source of the problem to the outside environment and find a logical reason. In this case, an excuse is prepared for the inevitable low performance.

This study aims to determine the dimensions of organizational stress experienced in hotel businesses and to deal with the relevant dimensions in the context of attribution theory. Considering the prominent dimensions of organizational stress in the context of attribution theory demonstrates the originality of the research. The fact that stress and attribution behavior have not been associated in another study in the tourism literature constitutes another unique aspect of the research. Explaining the main basis of the problems experienced in businesses according to the prominent dimensions of organizational stress, based on theoretical foundations, expresses the importance of the study. In addition, providing suggestions on measures to control organizational stress and attribution behavior represents another importance of the study. The research problem:

"Can be explained by attribution behavior the reasons that create organizational stress sources?" was designed as.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Stress and Organizational Stress

Stress, the concept expressed as "Estrica" in Latin and "Estrece" in old French, was used to describe various negative emotions such as grief and distress in the 17th century. Since the 18th century, it has been used to express the situations that arise as a result of the pressure and use of force against any object or person (Pehlivan, 1995:5). In the first definition of the concept of stress made by Commons in 1914, it is seen that it is considered as the process of strengthening the physiological structures of individuals, which deteriorate due to adverse environmental conditions (Düzgün, 2014:3). Hans Selye, one of the leading figures in stress, draws attention to the fact that stress causes behaviors that appear suddenly (Erdogan, 1996:270). The general name of the sudden behavioral change in organizational structures is defined as occupational stress (Yokkang, Weixi, Yalin, Yipeng, & Liu, 2014:8). Interpersonal tension in organizations, the pace of change in companies, and developments in technology stand out as factors that trigger organizational stress (Shahsavarani, Marzabadi, & Hakimi Kalkhoran, 2015:232). According to Griffin and Moorhead (1986:230), maintaining a moderate level of organizational stress has a positive effect on performance.

Cranwell-Ward and Abbey (2005) drew attention to the destructive effect of stress as a result of not being able to maintain its moderate existence. It is stated that the formation of this destructive effect depends on the roles of the individual in interpersonal relations and the ability to manage them. The intensity of possible sources of stress and limited time are two important factors that feed the stress formation stages (Eren,

2001:304). The first of these phases is the alarm period when it is realized that a certain job cannot be done at the desired standards (Spiers, 2003:24). In the alarm period, the non-specific behaviors exhibited by the body now return to normal and a resistance period occurs in which the individual adapts to the stressful environment to a large extent (Ajgaonkar, 2006:21). One of the two important ways that the individual will choose during the resistance period is to get maximum efficiency from the work done by managing stress. The other is to experience the exhaustion stage, which is the last stage, by not being able to manage stress (Organ & Bateman, 1991:383). The behavior that should be done in an environment of stress is to see stress as an opportunity and to reach an environment that will provide efficiency from the work done as soon as possible. In the literature, the factors that cause organizational stress are discussed under certain headings. The shift working order in the organizations and the employees not getting enough quality sleep (Boggild & Knutsson, 1999: 85), the existence of tools and equipment that will endanger the health and safety of the individuals in the working environment (Koçak, 2012), the lack of time planning to fulfill the responsibilities (Zuzanek, 2004:133), the emergence of excessive workload as a result of not being distributed among the employees in a planned way, and the formation of monotony due to simplification of the work (Ajgaonkar, 2006) express the dimension of organizational stress arising from the work structure. Factors such as the over-sized organizational structure and the inability to perform the audit properly (Tonus, 2016: 137), the lack of healthy communication and cooperation between the departments (Yılmaz, 2012:116), the failure to offer appropriate wages and promotions to deserving employees by the managers (Senemoğlu, 2017:31), refers to the dimension of stress arising from the organizational structure. Injustice between performance and rewarding (Taouk et al.,

2019), role conflict as a result of unclear duties and responsibilities (Yonkkang, 2014:8), imbalance between performance expectation and salaries (Batista, 2018:17), factors such as lack of a healthy work program and lack of career development (Hitt et al., 2011:251) express the dimension of stress arising from organizational politics. The Table 1 includes sample studies about organizational stress sources of different businesses in the tourism sector.

Table 1: Sample Studies About Organizational Stress in Tourism Sector

Author (s)	Year	Aim	Analysis	Result
Özbay & Semint	2023	Investigate organizational stress factors in food and beverage businesses in Serdivan, Sakarya.	Frequency and factor analyses were conducted on data collected from 158 employees.	Working environment and interpersonal relationships are major stress sources.
Türkseven & Ege	2021	Identify organizational stress sources for hotel managers in Marmaris' four and five-star establishments.	Data from 420 front office personnel were analyzed using a combination of techniques including analysis of variance, correlation, regression, and independent sample t-tests.	Organizational stress impacts employee motivation. Organizational structure and organization-person relations are key stressors.
Mert et al.	2020	Examine the relationship between organizational citizenship and organizational stress. A study was conducted on an airline transportation team operating in Turkey.	The study analyzed data from 645 participants through simple linear regressions, multiple linear correlations, and multiple linear regressions.	Organizational stress negatively affects organizational citizenship behaviors.
Choi et al.	2019	Analyze the influence of emotional intelligence and emotional labor on burnout in hotel front-office employees.	Regression analysis was conducted on data from 344 hotel employees.	Emotional intelligence and emotional labor help reduce job stress.
Ayaz	2019	Pinpoint work stress sources for tourist guides in Turkey.	One-way ANOVA was used to analyze data from 395 tourist guides.	Work structure and low-wage policies contribute to increased perceived stress. Problem-solving approaches were found to be minimally effective in reducing stress.
Şimşek & Cin	2019	It is aimed to determine the causes of organizational stress in accommodation businesses.	This study explores a cause-effect relationship drawn from	Organizational structure and work environment are primary stress factors. Training aligned with

			a secondary source review.	technological advancements is recommended to minimize stress.
Lin & Ling	2018	Investigate the sources and potential consequences of stress.	Data were collected and analyzed from 1645 employee-supervisor pairs in 49 tourism regions in China. A hierarchical linear model was used for the analysis. Correlation and regression were also performed with factor loadings.	Stress may not always negatively impact individuals.
Akça & Beydilli	2018	Explore the relationship between job stress and the creative process.	Correlation, regression, and additional statistical tests on data from 47 kitchen employees in Kütahya.	Moderate positive correlation found between stress and creativity. Interpersonal relationships least impactful stressor.
Aybas & Kosa	2018	Test the link between occupational stress and job commitment in tour guides.	Correlation and regression.	Occupational stress acts as a mediating factor on job commitment, though high-intensity stress doesn't directly affect it.
Demirci	2017	Examine the effect of role stress on leader-member interaction and turnover intention in Istanbul's food and beverage businesses.	Correlation and regression tests.	Stress negatively impacts both interaction and turnover intention.
Bora	2017	Identify the sources of work stress	One-way t-test on data from 364 employees across 39 hotels.	Human resources department plays a key role in stress management. Stress management crucial for quality performance and service. Healthy working environments recommended to reduce stress.
Gedik et al.	2017	Determine the stress sources for personnel in five-star Antakya hotels.	Factor loadings, correlation, ANOVA, and T-tests on data from 284 individuals.	Lack of self-confidence found to be a major stressor. Organizational structure and policy factors less impactful.
Akdu & Akdu	2016	Investigate the relationship between emotional labor, job stress, and burnout in tour guides.	T-test, correlation, and regression tests on data from 109 Istanbul guides.	Significant positive correlation found between job stress and burnout. Increased stress leads to increased burnout.
Biçki	2016	Investigate the relationship between job stress and burnout in Istanbul service sector employees.	Correlation and regression tests.	Job stress hinders personal achievement and exacerbates emotional burnout and depersonalization.
Unur & Pekerşen	2016	Examine the consequences of the link between work stress and toxic behaviors.	Correlation and regression tests on data from 449 cooks.	Job stress leads to aggressive behaviors in Turkish five-star hotel enterprises, indicating a strong

				positive correlation with toxic behaviors.
Saltık	2016	Measure stress levels of employees in Istanbul four and five-star hotels.	Correlation and regression analyses on data from 397 employees.	Limited promotion opportunities emerged as the most stressful factor.
Sardavor	2015	Explore the connection between organizational stress and performance perceptions in Azerbaijani five-star hotels.	Regression on data from 412 hotel employees.	Organizational stress negatively impacts all department employees and reduces perceived performance.
Akgündüz	2015	Analyze the effects of role stress and self-esteem on performance of Kuşadası hotel employees.	Factor load, correlation, and regression analyses on data from 227 employees.	Role conflict and ambiguity were found to increase stress and decrease performance.
Sampson & Akyeampong	2014	Identify the causes of work stress in 296 front office employees.	Factor analysis.	Issues like promotion, role conflict, communication problems, and workload significantly increase stress.
Şahin	2014	Measure job stress and organizational commitment of Istanbul travel agency employees.	Factor load, Mann-Whitney U, and correlation tests on data from 269 employees..	No significant relationship found between organizational stress and commitment.
Tiye et al.	2013	Analyze stress levels of Australian hotel, casino, and club employees.	Focus group interviews with 165 participants.	All employees experience some stress, influenced by factors like working conditions, uncertainty, manager communication, and shift patterns.
Wan	2013	Determine job stress levels of Chinese casino middle managers.	Focus group interviews with 40 managers.	Role ambiguity, excessive workload, and customer complaints increase stress. Managers reported using social media to manage stress.
Chuang & Lei	2011	Measure job stress levels and job satisfaction of Southern Nevada chef cooks.	Factor analysis on data from 152 cooks across 25 casinos.	Work-family conflict found to be the highest stressor. High stress was shown to decrease job satisfaction.
Uzun & Yiğit	2011	Investigate the relationship between organizational stress and commitment in five-star Antalya hotels.	Pearson correlation, variance analysis, and t-tests on data from 97 middle managers.	Emotional commitment decreases as organizational stress increases.
Chiang et al.	2010	Examine job stress factors in hotels and catering.	Correlation and regression tests.	Increased stress highlights the need for work-life balance practices.
Kim et al.	2009	Analyze the role of gender in stress factors for Korean hotel employees.	Correlation and regression on data from 320 employees.	Work stress has a stronger impact on female employees.
Akova & Işık	2008	Identify stress factors in Istanbul five-star hotels.	Factor analysis and importance level analysis for 380 participants.	Organizational structure is the main stressor, and experienced stress negatively affects performance. Most participants are from front office, food & beverage, and housekeeping departments.

Sökmen	2005	Compare stress levels by gender among middle and upper-level managers in Adana four and five-star hotels.	T-test on data from 62 managers.	Male managers experience more stress. Job structure is the main source of stress.
Aydın	2004	Determine the stress sources for four and five-star hospitality employees across Aegean Region's Izmir, Aydın, Manisa, Denizli, Uşak, and Afyon provinces.	Chi-square test on data from 792 employees.	Workload, insufficient salary, and unclear working hours are the main stress factors. Most participants are from front office, housekeeping, and food & beverage units.
Law et al.	1995	Identify stress sources in 14 Australian tourism regions.	Open-ended interviews with 102 front office employees.	Work structure issues are a major source of stress.

Table 1 compiles studies that investigate sources and levels of stress in the tourism sector. These studies also delve into various topics related to stress, including organizational citizenship, emotional intelligence, emotional labor, creativity, turnover, burnout, toxic behaviors, organizational commitment, self-esteem, leader-member interaction, and the role of gender. A unique aspect of this research not commonly addressed in related literature is its examination of attribution behavior. Across the studies in Table 1, a consistent finding emerges: organizational stress triggers negative behavioral changes, such as deterioration in interpersonal relationships and increased desire to quit due to a damaged work ethic. These negative behaviors demonstrably lead to an increase in customer dissatisfaction, reduced performance, and increased burnout.

2.2. Attribution (Causality Attribution) Theory

Attribution theory is mostly used in the field of management sciences (Bettman & Weitz, 1983) to predict the behaviors that individuals' inferences about the causes of the events they experience are likely to affect their future behavior directly or indirectly (Heider, 1958:138). The founder of the theory, Heider, in his study titled "Naive Psychology", argues that behaviors emerge depending on two power elements: individual characteristics such as ability, temperament, intention and effort, and environmental

characteristics such as luck and difficulty of the task (Specht et al., 2007:536). Focus of control, which expresses the power of control of the individual, who is a social being, over the events that affect him, is one of the important subjects of attribution. While it is seen that people with a developed internal control center take responsibility for their behavior, individuals with a tendency to an external control center believe that the environment will decide the events they will experience (Mansourian & Ford, 2007:660), in addition, they take a passive attitude in the face of conditions related to a fatalistic approach without making any effort to change the current situation (Struthers et al., 2001:170). Weiner, who developed Heider's studies, considered attribution as linking the reasons for the success or failure of individuals to a set of results (Chen et al., 2009:181). Weiner pointed out that the factors affecting performance are shaped by the perceptions of individuals and stated that performance depends on prominent factors such as perceived ability, luck, effort, and job difficulty (Specht, et al., 2007:537). The causality attribution process of individuals is shaped in three steps. The internal factors of the perceiver are shaped within the framework of previously owned elements in the context of knowledge, motives, and beliefs. Internal or external causes are attributed to the relevant behavior, and the result of the perceiver emerges in the form of behaviors, emotions or expectations (Slocum, 2007).

Stress, in general, refers to the whole of the reactions of individuals to events they experience outside of their usual situations. Organizational stress, on the other hand, refers to the reactions of people to changing events as a result of the situations encountered in each step necessary for the fulfillment of the relevant work in the working environment. If people do not feel any pressure, coercion, or difficulty related to the events they have experienced or are likely to experience, or if they perceive all these at a

reasonable level, they can experience stress at a certain level and advance the process. On the other hand, if the changes created by the external environment force the person in terms of knowledge, skill, and comfort, stress emerges gradually. Attribution theory explains how people make sense of behavior and the result of this behavior. According to the theory, people either find responsibility for any behavior that occurs in themselves or assign it to someone else. From this point of view, it's possible to say that the reason for the stress experienced may vary in the context of the person-induced or the meaning ascribed to the environment. In Freese and Zapf's (1999) study on the relationship between stress and attribution with the environment, it was noted that can be effective in people's attribution behaviors factors such as strong-weak relationships with the environment, time management, and different stressor perceptions. According to the study of Struthers, Millers, Boudens, and Briggs (2001) in which attribution (causality attribution) among their colleagues is explained, it has been revealed that weak social ties with other employees are effective based on low performance of employees. In a study on the perception and attribution of employees' efforts and abilities (Speeth, Fichtel, & Meyer, 2007), it was determined that customers experience satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the provision of the relevant service, based on different behavioral indicators.

In this study, it has been determined that the satisfaction felt towards the person who provides the service is mostly caused by the person receiving the service, and the dissatisfaction with the service is shaped by the understanding that there is not enough effort for quality service. In these case studies, it is seen that individuals are social beings whose communication with the environment is inevitable. In this direction, in organizations where human resources that may have various sensitivities in the psychological sense coexist, each employee can be affected positively or negatively by

his/her environment independently. The change created by this effect on the psychology and behavior of the individual can sometimes be seen as intense stress and low performance, and sometimes as an opportunity for change, and can be the trigger of behaviors that will lead to success. The most important point to be considered in removing the obstacles in front of success and development in organizations is to determine from whom or what causes the reasons that lead individuals to stress and low performance.

In the case studies in the literature, attribution behavior has been discussed within the scope of the reflection of the success of individuals in social relations to performance, and the determination of how the effort and talents of service providers are attributed to customer satisfaction. The study in which stress and attribution behavior is associated (Freese & Zapf, 1999) has not been researched within the scope of the tourism sector. At this point, it is thought that how the main source of stress experienced by employees is evaluated by individuals with various psychological structures in hotel businesses that have intense human resources in terms of both employees and customers can be explained through attribution theory. From this point of view, the research problem: "Can be explained by attribution behavior the reasons that create organizational stress sources?" was designed in the form.

3. METHODOLOGY

Scientific and ethical rules were followed in all processes of this research titled "Explanation of Organizational Stress in Hotel Businesses with Attribution (Causality Attribution) Theory". No changes were made to the collected data. This work has not been sent to any other academic publication platform. "Ethics Committee Approval" was obtained with the decision numbered 30/18 at the meeting of Sakarya University of Applied Sciences Ethics Committee, dated 31.03.2023, and numbered 30.

The data collection tool used in this study is the questionnaire technique, which is one of the quantitative research methods. Before the questionnaires were distributed to the participants, a pilot study was conducted with 30 people to determine whether there were questions in the scale that the participants did not understand to avoid possible errors that may arise in the data obtained. The data obtained through 590 questionnaires filled by employees in four and five-star hotels in Istanbul were analyzed via SPSS.

The universe refers to the participants for whom the results of the research are desired to be generalized. The sample, on the other hand, refers to a small cluster that is taken from this universe by observing certain rules and is accepted to represent the universe from which it was taken from the widest framework (Karasar, 1999:109). The universe of this research consists of the employees of a total of 703 hotels with 4 and 5 stars in Istanbul, according to the data of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2019). Due to the rich historical and cultural architecture of the city of Istanbul, it is seen as the most popular destination of Türkiye in all seasons by local and foreign visitors and stands out among other cities in terms of the number of tourists hosted and the expenditures made. For this reason, the province of Istanbul was chosen for the field study. According to the August 2019 data of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, General Directorate of Investments and Businesses, there are a total of 105 five-star and 131 four-star hotels with tourism operation certificates in Istanbul (yigm.ktb.gov.tr.2019). During the research process, the existence of hotel businesses that have a tourism business certificate but are not included in the current list of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism was determined. This situation has led to the inability to determine the exact number of hotel businesses and hotel employees that make up the universe. Since it is difficult to reach all employees due to time and cost constraints, the

"Easy Sampling" technique, which is one of the non-probabilistic sampling techniques, was used due to its advantages in practice. The main purpose of this frequently used technique is to include all respondents in the sample, in line with the understanding that the most easily reached participant is the most ideal (Coşkun, Altunışık, Bayraktaroğlu, & Yıldırım, 2015:142). A questionnaire was applied to 590 employees who were thought to represent the universe and who were positive to the request to fill out the questionnaire and express the sample of this research. The data obtained with the convenience sampling technique were obtained from 24 five-star and 42 four-star hotels. Sampling error is defined as the difference between the values to be reached in the case of a complete census and the values obtained as a result of the evaluation made in line with the selected sample. The size of the selected sample also determines the sampling error and the precision of the values to be reached with this sample. In light of the hypotheses determined in various studies, the confidence interval can be determined with rates such as 95% and 99% (Sencer & Sencer, 1978:495). The sample size, which was found to be acceptable in the largest population size (Sekaran, 1992:253) and line with the 95% confidence interval, and which was assumed not to be repeated in the obtained data, was determined as 384 (Erdoğan & Yazıcıoğlu, 2004). The fact that the number of participants included in this research is 590 shows that the sample of this research has the competence to represent the universe of the research.

The field study for data collection was carried out between December 2019 and March 2020. The survey questions were prepared by making use of the studies conducted in the past years on the determination of organizational stress factors and the determination of the effects of organizational stress on employees. The first part, it is aimed to determine the level of organizational stress. For this purpose, the organizational

stress scale consisting of 35 statements and 4 sub-dimensions was used by Aydın (2004) by making use of the studies of Saldamlı (1999) and Ertekin (1993) and adding new judgments. To add the dimension of “the effect of managers on organizational stress” in this survey study, the scales used by adapting are as follows: As a result of the literature review by Saldamlı (1999), four statements were taken from the organizational stress scale consisting of five sub-dimensions with 56 statements. Four statements were taken from the organizational stress scale consisting of 39 statements and seven sub-dimensions, which were created as a result of a literature review by Sampson and Akyeampong (2014). Three statements were taken from the organizational stress scale consisting of 34 statements and nine sub-dimensions created by Jin, Sun, Jiang, Wong, and Wen (2018) in the conclusion of the literature review. To determine the level of agreement with the statements in the scale, a 5-Point Likert Type Scale was used as “1- Very little, 2- Little, 3- Moderate, 4- Much, 5- Too much”. In the other part of the questionnaire, to determine the demographic characteristics of the participants, gender, age, department, their position in the business they are in, and how many years they have worked in the business and the tourism sector were asked. In the other part of the questionnaire, to determine the demographic characteristics of the participants, they were asked about their gender, age, department, position in the business they are in, how many years they have worked in the business they are in, and how many years they have worked in the tourism sector.

In the research, it was aimed to determine the sources of organizational stress and to associate the stress dimensions with attribution behavior. For this purpose, all departments in hotel enterprises were included in the scope of the research. The findings of the study are important in terms of examining the organizational stress levels obtained

from all departments and providing a holistic view to hotel managers in order to analyse stress. Another important point of the research is to offer suggestions for the sector against the changes that organizational stress and attribution behavior may create on the functioning of the organization. Within the scope of the research, associating the prominent dimensions of organizational stress levels with the Attribution Theory has added a unique dimension to the study in terms of being an approach that is not encountered in the literature. As a result of the research findings, it is predicted that can be examined with different models of organizational stress and attribution behaviors. It is thought that this situation shows that the research can be scientifically beneficial. In addition, revealing which attribution behaviors are caused by organizational stress will bring advantages such as increasing positive social relations in enterprises and decreasing labor turnover rate. Thus, it will provide both social and economic contributions to businesses (Işık et al., 2024). Modern management approaches are used more effectively in four and five-star hotel businesses. In this regard, the fact that four and five-star hotel establishments were selected due to the research subject constitutes a limitation of the research. The number of participants is also limited due to employees working at a busy pace during the day, not wanting to participate for personal reasons or company policies. At the same time, the limited time to complete the research and the fact that only the prominent organizational stress dimensions were discussed in the context of the relevant theory in line with the scale used in the research are other factors limiting the study.

4. FINDINGS

4.1. Findings for reliability analysis and explanatory factor analysis

The reliability of a test or scale indicates that the data to be obtained from it will also be reliable. A scale with a high level of validity has a high level of reliability. This

situation reveals the close relationship between validity and reliability (Coşkun et al., 2015:124). The Cronbach's Alpha (α) value of a scale is in the range of $0.80 \leq \alpha < 1.00$, indicating that it provides a high level of reliability (Kalaycı, 2017:405). Factor analysis, on the other hand, refers to reducing a large number of expressions that have a common meaning among them to a smaller number to increase their intelligibility and interpretability (Coşkun et al., 2015:264). To determine the reliability of the scale, the value reached as a result of the Cronbach Alpha test performed before the factor analysis was determined as (0.964). Since the Cronbach Alpha value is over 0.80, it was determined that the reliability of this scale was high. To interpret the KMO value resulting from the validity analysis, the classification in Table 2 created by Kalaycı (2017) was taken into account. The minimum KMO value, which is generally considered appropriate by the researchers, is 0.70 (Coşkun et al., 2015:268).

Table 2: Classification of KMO Values

KMO Value	Comment
0.90	Perfect
0.80	Very Good
0.70	Good
0.60	Middle
0.50	Weak
Below 0.50	Unacceptable

Source: Kalaycı (2017).

In Table 3., according to the results of the Bartlett Sphericity Test related to the organizational stress scale, the KMO value is (0.958), while the Bartlett value is less than 0.05. The results show that the adequacy of the scale used to determine the organizational stress levels for factor analysis is at a “perfect” level.

Table 3: KMO and Bartlett Sphericity Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Value		,958
Bartlett Sphericity Test	Approximate Chi-Square Degrees of Freedom	16819,857 1035

4.2. The results of explanatory factor analysis of the organizational stress scale

To measure statistical significance, as shown in Table 4, factor loads above (0.512) in all studies with a sample of more than 100 are sufficient (Coşkun et al., 2015:283).

Table 4: Minimum Values of Factor Loads by Sample Size

Sample Size	Factor Load
50	0,722
100	0,512
200	0,384
300	0,298
600	0,210
1000	0,162

Source: (Coşkun et al., 2015:283)

Nine of 46 expressions used in factor analysis were excluded from the analysis because their factor loads were less than (0.512). In the conclusion of the factor analysis applied to the organizational stress scale with 37 statements, 5 factors were formed. The method of "determining the number of factors by the researcher" was used to determine to what extent organizational stress affects hotel employees according to the departments they are in. In the conclusion of the analysis, the expressions were gathered under the relevant dimensions as manager-employee relations (12 expressions), organizational structure (9 expressions), work structure (6 expressions), organization and interpersonal relations (5 expressions), and physical conditions in the work environment (5 expressions).

Table 5: Results of Explanatory Factor Analysis Regarding the Organizational Stress Scale

Expression	Faktor Loads	Self Value	Percentage of Variance Explained	Cron. Alfa
Factor 1: Manager – Employee Relations		17,721	15,474	,937
Lack of authority to decide how to handle expectations about my job	,790			
The lack of my manager's support for the decisions I make	,764			
The lack of a consistent management style of our manager	,760			
My manager's inability to solve internal problems immediately	,746			
Not being allowed to make decisions on my own	,732			
Most of the decisions are made by my manager	,730			
The tension between me and my department manager	,640			
Not showing enough sensitivity to our requests and reports by the upper level (ignoring)	,611			
Nepotism of the managers	,532			
The inability of managers to provide adequate training in professional issues	,525			
Inability to get support from colleagues and managers	,520			
Factor 2: Organizational Structure		2,467	12,977	,878
Lack of clear responsibilities for the job	,696			
Poor communication within the organization	,664			
Doing two conflicting jobs at once	,660			
Incompatibility in authority and responsibilities	,651			
Insufficient salary and wage imbalance	,611			
Injustice in performance appraisal and promotion	,606			
Injustice in the distribution of duties	,588			
Not having enough authority to make decisions	,586			
Inability to participate in decisions	,539			
Factor 3: Organization and Interpersonal Relations		2,181	10,796	,873

Hostile behavior by coworkers	,768			
Conflict between employees	,752			
The prevalence of gossip in the workplace	,631			
Excessive competition among employees	,551			
Having problems in subordinate-superior relations	,528			
Factor 4: Work Structure		1,702	9,204	,786
Excessive correspondence and bureaucracy	,711			
Shift work order	,690			
Difficulty doing the job in full view	,600			
Being responsible to more than one supervisor at the same time	,554			
Highly disciplined work environment	,542			
Excessive workload	,530			
Factor 5: Physical Conditions in the Business Environment		1,602	7,359	,747
Very noisy work environment	,746			
Lack of necessary tools and equipment	,627			
Hot or cold working environment	,611			
Here is the presence of danger	,598			
Lack of lighting	,539			

Note: Explained variance 55,811; Inference Method: Principal Component Analysis; Rotation Method; Varimax with Kaiser Normalisation.

Looking at the results in Table 5, it is possible to measure statistical significance with factor loads ranging from 0.790 to 0.520. The dimensions that make up the organizational stress scale explain 55,811% of the total variance. The manager-employee relationship dimension has the highest disclosure rate with 15.474%. Another dimension with a high explanatory rate of 12,977% is the organizational structure.

4.3. Reliability analysis results of the organizational stress scale

The reliability analysis results obtained after the factor analysis of the organizational stress scale are shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Reliability Analysis Results of the Organizational Stress Scale After Factor Analysis

Scale	Dimensions	Cronbach's Alfa
	Manager–Employee Relations	,937
	Organizational Structure	,878
Organizational Stress Scale	Work Structure	,873

Physical Conditions in the Work Environment	,786
Organization and Interpersonal Relations	,747
Total	,959

According to the results shown in Table 6 above, the reliability coefficient of the organizational stress scale was determined as 0.95. According to the result, it is seen that the scale has a high-reliability level. Organizational stress represents the dimensions of manager-employee relations (0.93), organizational structure (0.87), work structure (0.87) and physical conditions in the work environment (0.78), organization, and interpersonal relations (0.74). It is possible to say that the statements that indicate have very high reliability.

4.4. Demographic characteristics of organizational stress scale participants

The demographic characteristics of the participants within the scope of the research are shown in Table 7 below.

Table 7: Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Variables	Number of People (f)	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Female	172	29,2
Male	418	70,8
Age		
18-23	88	14,9
24-29	255	43,2
30-35	161	27,3
36-41	60	10,2
42 and over	26	4,4
Department		
Front Office	196	33,2
Housekeeping	143	24,2
Food and Beverage	128	20,8
Support and Staff	123	20,8
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Services (15) • Accounting (13) • Sales & Marketing (15) • Purchasing (Supply) (15) • Human Resources (20) • Risk Management and Security (20) • Others (5) 	

Position in Business	Manager	159	26,9
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senior Level Manager (19) • Middle Level Manager (80) • Lower Level Manager (60) 		
	Employees	431	73,0
Working time in the Business	Less than 1 year	183	31,0
	1-3 years	267	45,3
	4-6 years	90	15,3
	7 years and more	50	8,5
Working time in the Industry	Less than 1 year	47	8,0
	1-3 years	148	25,1
	4-6 years	181	30,7
	7 years and more	214	36,3

5. DISCUSSION

Stress, mostly experienced in the face of unexpected situations, can cause various behavioral changes in people. These behavioral changes can manifest themselves in many ways, such as depression, burnout, being open to making mistakes, poor performance, and absenteeism. Organizational stress is an inevitable event in hotel businesses, which have intense human resources and various business structures that need to be acted together and harmoniously. In this sector, where seasonality and labor turnover rate is high, employees may be under intense stress due to the absence of work (presenteeism), often compromising their health and comfort for fear of losing their job.

According to Perrewe and Zellars (1999), people's behaviors against the stress they experience by being exposed to different stressors can be shaped by different emotions that mediate the emergence of this behavior. At this point, it is possible to say that people can have different sensitivities in the face of different events. Green and Mitchel (1979), on the other hand, touched on the leader-member interaction and pointed out that attribution behavior can be shaped depending on what kind of image managers have in the minds of employees. Emotionally sensitive individuals will often be prone to finding problems in the external environment. Similarly, employees who do not have

effective communication with their managers will be likely to easily see the source of any problem as their manager. This approach also shows that people have external attribution behavior. On the other hand, there are different studies in the literature (Pervin, 1989; Schneider, 1983), which draw attention to the fact that individuals have high control over their behaviors and can manage their emotions professionally. Considering that people who can manage their emotions professionally are psychologically strong, these people will be ready to take action to make the necessary changes by easily taking this responsibility if they are responsible, instead of attributing the problems to an external cause. Therefore, it is possible to evaluate these people as people who are prone to internal attribution behavior.

Addressing the research problem, the study first identified the core dimensions of organizational stress. Notably, it highlighted the potential for hidden stress factors within these prominent dimensions, suggesting the organizational stress scale's limitations in capturing the full picture. Existing literature on organizational stress confirms its detrimental impact on behavior, particularly disrupting interpersonal relationships (Türkseven & Ege, 2021; Mert et al. 2020; Bilgili & Tekin, 2019; Tonbul & Aykanat, 2019; Altan, 2018; Demirci, 2017; Akdu & Akdu, 2016; Unur & Pekerşen, 2016; Tiyce et al., 2013; Chuang & Lei, 2011).

As a result of this research, it was determined that the highest stress indicator reached was caused by the relations between managers and employees. When the expressions in the scale are examined, statements such as "nepotism of the managers" and "my manager's inability to solve internal problems immediately" express the approach of the employees with external attribution behavior. Another prominent stress indicator is the reasons arising from the organizational structure. When the expressions in the scale

are examined, statements such as “inability to participate in decisions” and “not having enough authority to make decisions” draw attention. Considering these statements, it can be said that employees who are inclined to internal attribution behavior experience high stress. This research revealed that stress primarily stems from manager-employee relations and, to a lesser extent, situations arising from the organizational structure. Notably, it demonstrates how these prominent dimensions of organizational stress—manager-employee relationships and organizational structure—can be explained through the lens of attribution behavior, specifically the tendency to assign causality. This is because attributional behavior is related to whether or not the source of a problem can be identified. In the determination to be made, people's interests and social selves can also be determinative. For example, lack of self-confidence (Gedik et al., 2017) and inadequate self-esteem (Akgündüz, 2015) cause an increase in organizational stress. Thus, errors may occur in healthy decision-making mechanisms of individuals. Another study found that people's internal attribution tendencies towards success and failure vary depending on the perceived importance of the situation. In addition, it is known that extrinsic attribution tendency increases in long-term planning for the future and controllability. This situation is effective in the phenomenon of cynicism, which explains the commitment of individuals to the organization and their sense of belonging (Taslak & Dalgın, 2015).

On the other hand, some sample studies in the literature (Tozkoparan, 2021; Akça & Beydili, 2018; Aybas & Kosa, 2018; Şahin, 2014) have shown that organizational stress does not cause a significant negative effect at high levels. At this point, it is possible to say that organizational stress that is not high enough can often create internal attribution behavior, that is, employees can find the source of the problem in themselves without any

benefit. For example, when customer complaints increase, hotel managers may find the source of the problem in employees' lack of skills. In this case, employees may state that the main factor causing the problem is the lack of equipment in order to defend themselves with the fear of dismissal. In this case, as a result of intense stress, people will show external attribution behaviour. Otherwise, if there is a problem in the lack of skills of employees in an environment where stress is not intense, this situation can be easily accepted and measures can be taken without fear of dismissal.

While women can be more affected by stress than men in environments where organizational stress is experienced (Kim et al., 2009), it has been determined that men are also affected by stress more than women (Sökmen, 2005). Therefore, it can be said that people's demographic characteristics may also play a role in attribution behaviors. The majority of the participants included in this research (70.8%) are male with 418 people. The majority of the participants (43.2%), consisting of 255 people, are between the ages of 24-29. Interestingly, while demographic characteristics like age and gender haven't been consistently linked to organizational stress in research, marital status has emerged as a significant factor, as demonstrated by Nas & Torun (2022). However, contrary to the inference made in this research, it has been determined in the literature that demographic differences do not have an effect on organizational stress (Çökük, 2018). In the study conducted by Kızgın and Dalgın (2012); students' attributional behavior in success and failure situations; It was concluded that there was a significant difference between genders in terms of luck, effort, difficulty and talent factors. In other words, it is possible to say that a demographic factor such as gender has some effects on organizational stress and therefore attribution behaviors.

Although it shows a balanced distribution, within the scope of this research, the participants mostly (33.2%) work in the front office department. While the existing literature on organizational stress includes department-specific studies, the focus has primarily been on front-office (Türkseven & Ege, 2021; Choi 2019; Sampon & Akyeampong, 2014; Law et al. 1995) and food and beverage (Akça & Beydili, 2018; Demirci, 2017; Chuang & Lei, 2011), in some studies are discussed both (Akova & Işık, 2008; Aydın, 2004). The majority of later organizational stress studies concentrate on tour guides and travel agency employees. A key novelty of this study lies in its comprehensive examination of organizational stress across all departments within the hotel industry. Additionally, employees are mostly (73.0%) from the non-managerial group. The majority of employees (45.3%) have been working in their company for 1-3 years, and in the sector (36.3%) they have been working for 7 years or more. Therefore, within the scope of this research, mostly front office employees, relatively short-term employees, and men have a greater role in associating stress factors arising from manager-employee relations with external attributions, and stress factors arising from the organizational structure with internal attributions. The fact that front office employees, who are the unit that interacts the most with customers, their unit managers, other unit employees, and managers, are predominant in the research may be a reason for turning to external attribution in any problem. The scope of the research included mostly non-managerial groups; It may have led to external attribution due to reasons such as greater workload and communication intensity. In addition, it is thought that the fact that employees do not work in the same company for many years is a situation that increases external attribution as a cause of organizational stress. Organizational stress has been linked to a range of negative outcomes, including burnout, decreased job satisfaction, and

increased turnover intentions (Bıçkı, 2016; Saltık, 2016; Sardavor, 2015; Uzun and Yiğit, 2014). Existing studies on organizational stress in tourism lack a strong theoretical foundation. The synergy between organizational stress and attribution theory forms the cornerstone of this research, offering a fresh perspective and distinguishing it from traditional approaches to stress studies in the field.

Therefore, given the research question's focus on whether attribution behavior explains the reasons behind organizational stress sources, it is reasonable to hypothesize that individuals with strong attributional tendencies likely play a significant role in identifying the sources of concentrated organizational stress.

6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Scientific and ethical rules were followed in all processes of this research titled "Explanation of Organizational Stress in Hotel Businesses with Attribution (Causality Attribution) Theory". No changes were made to the collected data. This work has not been sent to any other academic publication medium. "Ethics Committee Approval" was obtained with the decision numbered 30/18 at the meeting of Sakarya University of Applied Sciences Ethics Committee, dated 31.03.2023, and numbered 30.

The problem of this research is "Can the reasons that create organizational stress sources be explained by attribution behavior?" was designed in the form. The value reached as a result of the Cronbach Alpha test performed before applying factor analysis to the organizational stress scale used in the research is (0.964). The fact that this value is above 0.80 indicates the high level of reliability of the scale. In the continuation of the study, the validity and reliability analysis was applied to the relevant scale, and factor analysis was applied. Thus, the dimensions of organizational stress have been reached.

The relevant dimensions were determined in light of the existing literature and by the researcher's collection of the relevant statements under certain headings.

In the research, sample studies are included on organizational stress sources of different businesses in the tourism sector. A qualitative approach prevails in 4 of the 30 studies under the theoretical framework heading of the research (Şimşek and Cin, 2019; Tiyce et al., 2013; Wan, 2013; Law et al., 1995). Qualitative studies are available focus group interviews, or secondary source scanning and analyses based on cause-effect relationships. The remaining 26 studies employed survey techniques similar to the data collection method used in this research. Notably, the data analysis techniques in this study, such as Cronbach's alpha, Bartlett's sphericity test, and exploratory factor analysis, show significant overlap with those used in other studies. Importantly, this research distinguishes itself from all previous studies in two key ways: firstly, it comprehensively examines organizational stress levels across all departments within hotel businesses within the tourism industry, and secondly, it pioneers the integrated analysis of organizational stress and attribution theory in the context of tourism research. When the findings obtained as a result of the research are examined, the main reason for the stress that arises in the dimension of organizational stress arising from the manager and employee relations can be evaluated as the external attribution tendency of people according to the studies in the literature. People who are prone to external attribution behavior attribute the main source of the problems to an external factor. On the other hand, stress originating from the organizational structure, which is another prominent point of the organizational stress dimension, reflects the internal attribution tendency of people according to the evaluations made in light of the expressions in the scale. Internal attribution, on the other hand, is interpreted as people not ignoring the possibility that the

source of the problems experienced may originate from themselves. In addition, this study in conjunction with prior research, indicates that demographic factors could influence the way employees attribute responsibility for organizational stress.

6.1.Suggestions

Organizational conditions should be suitable physically and socially to prevent the stress caused by manager-employee relations at a reasonable level and to prevent the stress experienced in this regard from causing external attribution behavior. For the organization to achieve its goals, measures should be taken to obtain maximum efficiency from all the necessary steps of a job. In this sense, it is necessary to make the physical conditions suitable for the positions that need to be physically active in the workplace (Spiers, 2003). The working environment should be arranged in a way that protects the quality of life of people (Yücesoy, 2016). It is necessary to ventilate, illuminate and maintain the general comfort of the environment. The restructuring of the work to alleviate the stressful environment (Luthans, 1999) requires that the work to be done to fully meet the expectations between the manager and the employees should be developed at the points where it is deemed necessary, and the way of doing the work should be changed, updated and shaped according to the requirements of the job and the abilities of the person who will do that job. One of the most important reasons for the disagreements between the employees and the managers is the inability to share the powers and responsibilities equally among the employees in equal positions due to reasons such as favoritism and lobbying. At this point, responsibilities should be clearly stated so that managers can see whether their expectations are met or not, and employees can clearly understand the performance expected from them. So much so that Omolaye and Omale

(2013) state that the balanced distribution of responsibilities and workload among employees within the organization is effective in stress management. The results of this research indicate that the importance given to organizational stress management in manager-employee relations will have an impact on employees' external attribution behaviors. In order to control external attribution behavior, working conditions need to be improved at an optimum level. It is possible to say that examining the sources of stress and becoming aware of external attributional behaviors in this direction will lead to improvement in healthy communication and problem-solving behavior between employees and managers.

To control the stress arising from the organizational structure and not prepare an environment for internal attribution behavior, it is necessary to make sure that the existence of an effective communication environment (Luthans, 1999) is preserved within the organization. Otherwise, employees may think that they do not have successful communication skills and cannot explain themselves adequately. Protecting the work-family harmony of the employees in the organization is also very important to keep stress at a reasonable level. At this point, the social support to be provided to the employees (Greenberg, 1999) will ensure that the employees can both achieve domestic peace and be satisfied with their working conditions. Stress can be experienced at different levels in each individual and can be reflected in different ways. At this point, stress management training (Greenberg, 1999), which will be offered to the employees at regular intervals according to the requirements of the job and the positions of the employees, will enable people to professionally manage the relevant situation under intense working conditions. Thus, employee performance and peace of mind will increase. As a result of this research, it is necessary to provide an effective communication environment throughout the

organization to control internal attribution behaviors that may be caused by organizational stress. Thus, it will be possible to ensure employee satisfaction and therefore customer satisfaction.

The tourism industry has a structure that is also affected by the macro environment. For example, during the years of the Covid-19 epidemic all over the world, the tourism industry suffered a great economic loss. For example, in a study conducted in Sri Lanka (Ilangarathna et al., 2024), Covid-19 effects were discussed in 3 dimensions: high awareness, high limitation, and adaptation to the new normal. As a result of the research, it was concluded that there were significant changes in the context of education, healthcare, economy, mobility, psychology, and cultural structure. For this reason, businesses must be sensitive to external factors and be prepared to control employee and business health.

The fact that businesses are environmentally friendly by consuming renewable energy will first make the company environmentally friendly and then the harmony between the employees and the business. Environmentally friendly businesses will be able to facilitate their employees to work in a healthy and work-appropriate environment. Renewable energy consumption reduces carbon consumption and saves resources by reducing the environmental cleaning costs of businesses (Işık et al. 2023b). Moreover, according to Işık et al. (2023a), while economic indicators play a major role in the success of the tourism industry, it is recommended for policy makers to correlate environmental pollution indices with export rates in the tourism industry where natural resources are used as a supply. In this way, businesses will be aware of their responsibilities, and healthy employee relations and high customer satisfaction will be ensured.

The fact that uncertainties in climate policy delay investments in low carbon consumption (Huang, 2023) poses a threat to ecological sustainability. For this reason, policymakers need to act quickly for effective climate policies. Thus, it will be possible to ensure environmental sustainability.

With concerns about climate change and the development of renewable energy technologies, renewable energy consumption has accelerated in some island settlements (Moosavian et al., 2024; Shoaie et al., 2023; Noorollahi et al., 2022). Particularly in destinations with low carrying capacity, emphasis should be placed on renewable energy consumption. This sensitivity is even more important for the sustainability of natural resources. In this way, excess carrying capacity will be brought under control, and factors that may cause dissatisfaction inside and outside the business will be reduced. It will be possible to indirectly see a decrease in employees' job satisfaction and stress levels.

It is known that economic injustices are an important source of stress in businesses. Employees who do not receive sufficient salaries are under intense stress, which also brings about work-family conflicts. Moreover, it is known that economic and political uncertainties play an important role in tourists' preferences, even in a macro sense. For example, it has been determined that Canadian tourists are more negatively affected by the US economic and political uncertainty than Mexican tourists (Işık et al. 2020). In other words, Canadians reduce their touristic trips to the USA more. Thus, while the country's macroeconomic balance is disrupted, the income levels of tourism workers are also negatively affected. For healthy organizational structures, economic competition with other countries in the macro sense must be taken into consideration.

This research opens avenues for further exploration of demographic differences in attribution behavior within organizational stress by comparing specific characteristics.

Additionally, comparative analyses of organizational stress and attribution patterns across diverse tourism sectors could be undertaken using attribution theory to consider possible stress effects. Future studies might further employ qualitative interview methods to delve deeper into these dynamics, or alternatively, conduct hybrid studies combining qualitative and quantitative approaches for a comprehensive and nuanced understanding of organizational stress and its relationship to attribution behavior.

REFERENCES

- Ajgaonkar, S. (2006). Techniques used to manage stress and its impact on middle managements performance in the hospitality industry in India, (Master's Thesis), Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Akça, İ. & Beydilli, E.T. (2018). İş stresi ve yaratıcılık süreci ilişkisi: Kütahya'daki mutfak çalışanları üzerine bir araştırma. *Güncel Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*. 2(1), 283-307.
- Akdu, U. & Akdu, S. (2016). Duygusal emek ve iş stresinin tükenmişlik üzerindeki etkileri: Profesyonel turist rehberleri üzerinde bir araştırma. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 9(47), 1142-1153
- Akgündüz, Y. (2015), The influence of self-esteem and role stress on job performance in hotel businesses, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*. 27(6),1082-1099.
- Akova, O & Işık, K. (2008), Otel işletmelerinde stres yönetimi: istanbul' daki beş yıldızlı otel işletmelerinde bir araştırma, *Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*. 1 (15), 17-44.
- Altan, S. (2018). Örgütsel yapıya bağlı stres kaynakları ve örgütsel stresin neden olduğu başlıca sorunlar. *Stratejik ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*. 2(3), 137-158. ISSN: 2587-2621
- Andre, P., Boneva, T., Chopra, F., & Falk, A. (2021). Fighting climate change: The role of norms, preferences, and moral values.
- Asgher, U., Ali, T., Ahmad, R., Taiar, R. & Moraru, R.I. (2015). A Comparative Study on Organizational Stress in South Asian Cultures', *Procedia Manufacturing*. 3. 3963–3970. From accessed www.sciencedirect.com. Doi: 10.1016/j.promfg.2015.07.933
- Aslan, A., Ozturk, I., Al-Mulali, U., Altinoz, B., Polat, M. A., Metawa, N., & Raboshuk, A. (2024). Effect of economic policy uncertainty on CO2 with the discrimination of renewable and non renewable energy consumption. *Energy*, 130382.
- Ayaz, N. (2019), Work stress and coping with work stress: a study on tourist guides, (P.h.D. Thesis), İzmir: Katip Çelebi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bil. Ens.
- Aybas, M. & Kosa, G. (2018), Duygusal emeğin mesleki stres ve işe adanmışlık üzerindeki etkisi: Tur rehberleri üzerinde bir araştırma, *Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 103-111. Doi.org/10.18506/anemon.452645
- Aydın, Ş. (2004), Otel işletmelerinde örgütsel stres faktörleri: 4-5 yıldızlı otel işletmeleri uygulaması, *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 6 (4), 1-21.

Batista, C.P. (2018). Örgütsel stres kaynaklarının çalışanların iş tatmini üzerindeki etkisinin incelenmesi: Guine-Bissau'daki kamu işletme çalışanları için yapılan bir araştırma, (Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Ege Üniversitesi, İzmir.

Bettman, James R. & Barton A. Weitz (1983). Attributions in the board room: Causal reasoning in corporate annual reports, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28 (2), 165-183.

Biçki, S. (2016). Hizmet sektörü çalışanlarının iş stresi ve tükenmişlik ilişkisi: İstanbul örneği. (Yüksek Lisans Tezi), İstanbul: İstanbul Gelişim Üniversitesi Sosyal Bil.Ens.

Bilgili, H. & Tekin, E. (2019). Örgütsel stres, örgütsel bağlılık ve öğrenilmiş güçlülük ilişkisi üzerine bir araştırma. *Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*. 11(18), 2167- 2200. ISSN:2528-9527 E-ISSN : 2528-9535

Boggild, H. & Knutsson A. (1999). Shift work, risk factors and cardiovascular disease, *Scand J Work Environ Health*, 25(2), 85-99.

Bora, P. (2017), Scope of stress management in hotel industry. *International Journal of Management*. 7 (7), 475-480.

Carattini, S., Baranzini, A., Thalmann, P., Varone, F., & Vöhringer, F. (2017). Green taxes in a post-Paris world: are millions of nays inevitable? *Environ.Resource Econ*. 68, 97–128.

Chen, Shun-Wen, Hsiou-Huai Wang, Chih-Fen Wei, Bih-Jen Fwu & Kwang-Kuo Hwang (2009). 'Taiwanese students' self-attributions for two types of achievement goals', *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 149(2), 179-183.

Chiang, F.F.T., Birtch, T.A. & Kwan, H.K. (2010), The moderating roles of job control and work- life balance practices on employee stress in the hotel and catering industry, *Intrnational Journal of Hospitality Management*. 29, 25-32. ScienceDirect veri tabanından ulaşıldı. Doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.04.005

Choi, H.M., Mohammad, A.A.A. & Kim, W.G. (2019), Understanding hotel frontline employees' emotional intelligence, emotional labor, job stress, coping strategies and burnout, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. 82, 199-208. Doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.05.002

Chuang, N.K. & Lei, S.A. (2011), Job stress among casino hotel chefs in a top-tier tourism city, *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 20(5), 551-574. Doi: 10.1080/19368623.2011.570642

Coşkun, R., Altunışık, R., Bayraktaroğlu, S. & Yıldırım, E. (2015). Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri spss uygulamalı , 8.Baskı, Sakarya: Sakarya Kitapevi.

Cranwell-Ward, J. & Abbey, A. (2005). Organizational stress. Palgrave Macmillan. (AdobeReaderXİSürümü). Access Address:http://www.azmonyar.com/DownloadPDF/47832114.pdf

Çökük, B. (2018). Örgütsel stres düzeyinin ölçümü ve demografik değişkenlerle ilişkisi: bir kamu organizasyonu örneği. *Akademik Yaklaşımlar Dergisi*. 9(2), 59-83.

Demirci (2017). Restoran işletmelerinde rol stresi ve lider-üye etkileşiminin işten ayrılma niyetine etkisi, (Doktora Tezi), Eskişehir: Osmangazi Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bil. Ens.

Dogru, T., Isik, C., & Sirakaya-Turk, E. (2019). The balance of trade and exchange rates: Theory and contemporary evidence from tourism. *Tourism Management*, 74, 12-23.

Dogru, T., McGinley, S., Sharma, A., Isik, C., & Hanks, L. (2023a). Employee turnover dynamics in the hospitality industry vs. the overall economy. *Tourism Management*, 99, 104783.

Dogru, T., Mody, M. A., Hanks, L., Suess, C., Işık, C., & Sozen, E. (2023b). The impact of business models and state regulations on the accommodation sector: theory and empirical evidence from the recent pandemic. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*.

Düzgün, A. (2014). Üst düzey yöneticilerde örgütsel stres ve örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi analizi: antalya bölgesi beş yıldızlı otel işletmelerinde bir uygulama, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, Aydın.

Elmadağ, A. B. & Ellinger, A. E. (2018). ‘Alleviating job stress to improve service employee work effect: the influence of rewarding’. *Service Business*, 12(1), 121-141.

Erdoğan, İ. (1996). İşletme yönetiminde örgütsel davranış, İstanbul:İstanbul Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi Yayını.

Eren, E. (2001). Örgütsel davranış ve yönetim psikolojisi, İstanbul: Beta Yayınları.

Ertekin, Y. (1993). Stres ve yönetim, Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü Yayınları.

Freese, M. & Zapf, D.(1999). On the importance of the objective environment in stress and attribution theory, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 20, 761-765

Gedik, İ., Gedik, S. & Demirer, S. (2017), Otel işletmelerinde stres yönetimi: antalya’daki beş yıldızlı otel işletmelerinde bir uygulama, *Erzincan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*,(5), 111-124.

Green, S.G., & Mitchell, T.R. (1979). Attributional processes of leaders in leader-member interactions, *Organizational Behavior, and Human Performance*, 23, 429–458.

Greenberg, J. (1999). Managing behavior in organizations, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, Second Edition.

Griffin, R. ve Moorhead, G. (1986), Organizational behavior, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Gyllensten, K. & Palmer, S. (2015). The relationship between coaching and workplace stress: a correlational study, *International Journal of Health Promotion & Education*. 43(3), 97-103.

Hassan, Q., Algburi, S., Sameen, A. Z., Tariq, J., Al-Jiboory, A. K., Salman, H. M., ... & Jaszczur, M. (2024). A comprehensive review of international renewable energy Growth. *Energy and Built Environment*.

Heider, F. (1958). The psychology of interpersonal relations, John Wiley & Sons, New York.

Hitt, M.A., Miller, C.C., & Colella A. (2011). Organizational behavior, Asia: John Wiley& Sons, Third Edition.

Huang, W. (2023). Climate policy uncertainty and green innovation. *Economics Letters*, 233, 111423.

Ilangarathna, G. A., Ramanayake, L., Senarath, N., Ranasinghe, Y., Weligampola, H., Dedunupitiya, W., ... & Dharmarathne, S. (2024). A dataset on the socioeconomic and behavioural impacts in sri lanka through multiple waves of COVID-19. *Data in Brief*, 110063.

Isik, C., Dogru, T., & Turk, E. S. (2018). A nexus of linear and non-linear relationships between tourism demand, renewable energy consumption, and economic growth: Theory and evidence. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 20(1), 38-49.

Işık, C., Sirakaya-Turk, E., & Ongan, S. (2020). Testing the efficacy of the economic policy uncertainty index on tourism demand in USMCA: Theory and evidence. *Tourism Economics*, 26(8), 1344-1357.

Işık, C., Aydın, E., Dogru, T., Rehman, A., Alvarado, R., Ahmad, M., & Irfan, M. (2021). The nexus between team culture, innovative work behaviour and tacit knowledge sharing: Theory and evidence. *Sustainability*, 13(8), 4333.

Işık, C., Aydın, E., Dogru, T., Rehman, A., Sirakaya-Turk, E., & Karagöz, D. (2022). Innovation research in tourism and hospitality field: a bibliometric and visualization analysis. *Sustainability*, 14(13), 7889.

Işık, C., Ongan, S., Ozdemir, D., Jabeen, G., Sharif, A., Alvarado, R., ... & Rehman, A. (2023a). Renewable energy, climate policy uncertainty, industrial production, domestic exports/re-exports, and CO2 emissions in the USA: An SVAR approach. *Gondwana Research*.

Işık, C., Simionescu, M., Ongan, S., Radulescu, M., Yousaf, Z., Rehman, A., ... & Ahmad, M. (2023b). Renewable energy, economic freedom and economic policy uncertainty: New evidence from a dynamic panel threshold analysis for the G-7 and BRIC countries. *Stochastic Environmental Research and Risk Assessment*, 1-16.

Işık, C., Ongan, S., Islam, H., Jabeen, G., & Pinzon, S. (2024). Is economic growth in East Asia pacific and South Asia ESG factors based and aligned growth? *Sustainable Development*, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2910>

Jin, X., Sun, I. Y., Jiang, S., Wang, Y., & Wen, S. (2018). 'The relationships between job and organizational characteristics and role and job stress among chinese community correctional workers'. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 52, 36-46.

Kalaycı, Ş. (2017). SPSS uygulamalı çok değişkenli istatistik teknikleri. 8. Baskı, Ankara: Dinamik Akademi.

Karasar, N. (1999). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi, 9.Basım, Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Kızgın, Y. & Dalgın, T. (2012). Atfetme teorisi: Öğrencilerin başarı ve başarısızlıklarını değerlendirmedeki atfetme farklılıkları. *ZKÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(15), 61-77

Kim, B.P., Murrman, S.K. & Lee, G. (2009). Moderating effects of gender and organizational level between role stress and job satisfaction among hotel employees, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. 28, 612-619. ScienceDirect veri tabanından ulaşıldı.

Kim, S.Y., Shin, Y.C., Oh, K.S., Shin, D.W., Lim, W.J., Cho, S.J. & Jeon, S.W. (2019). Association between work stress and risk of suicidal ideation: a cohort study among korean employees examining gender and age differences, *Scand J Work Environ Health*. Doi:10.5271/sjweh.3852

Klenert, D. (2018). Making carbon pricing work for citizens. *Nat. Clim. Chang*. 8, 669-677.

Koçak, N. (2012). Yiyecek içecek hizmetleri yönetimi, Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık

Konc, T., Savin, I., & van den Bergh, J.C., 2021. The social multiplier of environmental policy: application to carbon taxation. *J. Environ. Econ. Manag*. 105, 102396.

Law, J., Pearce, P.L. & Woods, B.A. (1995), Stress and coping in tourist attraction employees, *Tourism Management*, 16(4), 277-284.

Lee, J., Kim, S., You, S., & Park, Y.K. (2023). Bioenergy generation from thermochemical conversion of lignocellulosic biomass-based integrated renewable energy systems, *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* 178, 113240.

Lin, M. & Ling, Q. (2018), Is role stress always harmful? differentiating role overload and role ambiguity in the challenge-hindrance stressors framework, *Tourism Management.* 68, 355-366.

Lipari, F., Lázaro-Touza, L., Escribano, G., Sánchez, Á., & Antonioni, A. (2024). When the design of climate policy meets public acceptance: an adaptive multiplex network model. *Ecological Economics*, 217, 108084

Luthans, F. (1999). *Organizational behavior*, International Edition, Seventh Edition.

Mansourian, Y. & Nigel F.(2007). Web searchers attributions of success and failure: an empirical study, *Journal of Documentation*, 63(5), 659-679.

Mert, G., Durmaz, V. & Küçükaltan, B.. (2020). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ile örgütsel stres ilişkisinin havayolu uçuş ekibi kapsamında incelenmesi, *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 29(3),279-297.

Moosavian, S. F., Noorollahi, Y. & Shoaee, M. (2024). Renewable energy resources utilization planning for sustainable energy system development on a stand-alone island. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 140892.

Nas, Z. & Torun, Z. (2022). Örgütsel stresin otel çalışanlarının verimliliğine etkisi: Van örneği. *Atlas Journal International Refereed Journal On Social Sciences.* 8(50), 2826-2837

Noorollahi, Y., Golshanfard, A. & Hashemi-Dezaki, H., (2022). A scenario-based approach for optimal operation of energy hub under different schemes and structures. *Energy* 251, 123740. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2022.123740>, 2022/07/15/.

Omelayo, B.O. & Omole, O.C. (2013). Influence of mental workload on job performance, *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(15), 238-246.

Organ, D.W. & Bateman, T.S. (1991). *Organizational behavior*, Fourth Edition.

Özbay, G., & Semint, S. (2023). Yiyecek içecek işletmelerinde örgütsel stres faktörleri üzerine bir araştırma. *Ordu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 13(2), 1845-1864.

Pehlivan, İ. (1995), *Yönetimde stres kaynakları*, Ankara: Pegem Yayınları.

Perez - Rodriguez, V., Topa, G. & Belendez, M. (2019). Organizational justice and work stress: the mediating role of negative, but not positive, emotions, personality and individual differences, 151.

Perrewe, P.L. & Zellars, K.L. (1999). An examination of attributions and emotions in the transactional approach to the organizational stress process, *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* 20, 739-752.

Pervin, L. (1989). Persons, situations, interactions: the history of a controversy and a discussion of theoretical models, *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 350-360.

Saldamlı, A. (2006). Otel işletmelerinde stres kaynakları ve çalışanlar üzerindeki etkileri: beş yıldızlı otellerde bir uygulama, *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(6).

Saltık, Z. (2016). Stresin iş gören performansına ve işten ayrılma niyetine etkisi: konaklama işletmelerinde bir uygulama, (*Yüksek Lisans Tezi*), Nevşehir: Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bil. Ens.

Sampson, W.G. & Akyeampong, O. (2014). Work-related stress in hotels: an analysis of the causes and effects among frontline hotel employees in the kumasi

metropolis, Ghana, *Tourism & Hospitality*. 3(2), Accessed from ResearchGate. Doi.org/10.4172/2167-0269.1000127

Sardavor, E. (2015). Örgütsel stresin iş gören performansına etkisi : azerbaycan'daki beş yıldızlı otellere yönelik bir araştırma, (*Yüksek Lisans Tezi*), İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bil. Ens.

Schneider, B. (1983). *Interactional Psychology And Organizational Behavior*, I Staw, B. M. & Cummings, L. L. (Editörler), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, (pp.1-31), JAI Press, Inc, Greenwich, CT.

Sekaran, U. (1992). *Research methods for business: a skill buildings approach*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Sencer, M. & Sencer, Y. (1978). *Toplumsal araştırmalarda yöntembilim*. Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü Yayını.

Senemoğlu, P. (2017). Sağlık kuruluşlarında örgütsel stres: ilaç mümessilleri üzerine bir araştırma, (*Yüksek Lisans Tezi*), İstanbul Gelişim Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Shahsavarani, A.M., Marzabadi, E.A. & Hakimi Kalkhoran, M. (2015). Stress: Facts and theories through literature review, *International Journal of Medical Reviews* 2(2), 230-241.

Shoaei, M., Hajinezhad, A. & Moosavian, S.F. (2023). Design, energy, exergy, economy, and environment (4E) analysis, and multi-objective optimization of a novel integrated energy system based on solar and geothermal resources. *Energy* 280, 128162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2023.128162>.

Siegrist, J. & Li, J. (2017). Work stress and altered biomarkers: a synthesis of findings based on the effort–reward imbalance model, *International Journal Of Environmental Research and Public Health*. Doi:10.3390/ijerph14111373.

Skovgaard, J. & Asselt, H. (2019). The politics of fossil fuel subsidies and their reform: implications for climate change mitigation, *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev.: Clim. Change* 10 (4), 581.

Slocum, John W. & Don Hellriegel (2007). *Fundamentals of organisational behaviour*, Thomson South-Western, China.

Sökmen, A. (2005). Konaklama işletmeleri yöneticilerinin stres nedenlerinin belirlenmesinde cinsiyet faktörü: Adana'da ampirik bir araştırma, *Ekonomik ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, (1) 1-27

Specht, N., Sina F. & Anton M. (2007). Perception and attribution of employees' effort and abilities the impact on customer encounter satisfaction, *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 18(5), pp.534-555.

Spiers, C. (2003). Tools to tackle workplace stress, occupational health, December <https://www.carolespiersgroup.co.uk/pdfs/STRESS%20%20Occupational%20Health%201203.pdf>

Struthers, C.W., Miller, D.L., Boudens, C.J. & Briggs, G.L. (2001). Effects of causal attributions on coworker interactions: a social motivation perspective, *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 23(3), pp.169-181

Szekely, A. (2021). Evidence from a long-term experiment that collective risks change social norms and promote cooperation. *Nat. Commun.* 12, 1–7.

Şahin, B. (2014). Seyahat acentası çalışanlarında örgütsel stresin örgütsel bağlılıkla ilişkisi üzerine bir araştırma: İstanbul örneği, *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 17 (32), 193-210

Şimşek, G. & Cin, Z. (2019). Stres ve stres yönetiminin iş görenlerin performansı üzerine etkisi: konaklama işletmelerine yönelik bir uygulama, *Türk & İslam Dünyası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 6(21), 212-223.

T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı. (Ağustos, 2019). Turizm İşletme Belgeli Tesisler. Erişim Adresi: <https://yigm.ktb.gov.tr/TR-9851/turizm-istatistikleri.html> Erişim Tarihi: 02.08.2019

Taouk, Y., Spittal, M.J., LaMontagne, A.D. & Milner, A.J. (2019). Psychosocial Work Stressors and Risk of All-Cause and Coronary Heart Disease Mortality: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis, *Scand J Work Environ Health*, Doi:10.5271/sjweh.3854.

Taslak, S. & Dalgın, T. (2015). Çalışanların atfetme eğilimlerinin örgütsel sinizm davranışları üzerindeki etkisi: sağlık çalışanları üzerine bir araştırma. *Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*. 34, 139-158.

Teodoro, J.D., Prell, C., & Sun, L. (2021). Quantifying stakeholder learning in climate change adaptation across multiple relational and participatory networks. *J. Environ. Manage.* 278, 111508.

Tiyye, M., Hing, N., Cairncross, G., & Breen, H. (2013). Employee stress and stressors in gambling and hospitality workplaces. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 12(2), 126-154. Doi: 10.1080/15332845.2013.752708

Tonbul, İ. & Aykanat, Z. (2019). Örgütsel stresin çalışan performansına etkisi: Yerel yönetimlerde bir uygulama. *KMÜ Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 21(37), 1-20.

Tonus, Z. (2016). Örgütsel Yapılanma, In G.N. Zeytinoğlu (Editör) Yönetim ve Organizasyon (ss.122-143), Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Tozkoparan, G. (2021). Örgütsel stresin çalışanların yaşam doyumu ve bireysel performans algısına etkileri üzerine bir araştırma. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 10 (2), 1881-1910. Retrieved from <http://www.itobiad.com/tr/pub/issue/62559/851959>

Troelstra, S.A., Coenen, P., Boot, C.R.L., Harting, J., Kunst, A.E. & Van Der Beek, A.J. (2019). Smoking and sickness absence: A systematic review and meta-analysis, *Scand J Work Environ Health*, Doi:10.5271/sjweh.3848.

Tutar, H. (2016). Örgütsel Davranış, Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

Türkseven, Y.Ç. & Ege, Z. (2021). Otel işletmelerinde ön büro çalışanlarının örgütsel stres kaynaklarının motivasyonlarına etkileri. *Turizm ve İşletme Bilimleri Dergisi*, 1(2), 15-33

Ulph, A. & Ulph, D. (2021). Environmental policy when consumers value conformity. *J. Environ. Econ. Manag.* 109, 102172.

Unur, K. & Pekerşen, Y. (2016), İş stresi ile toksik davranışlar arasındaki ilişki: Aşçılar üzerinde bir araştırma, *Seyahat ve Otel İşletmeciliği Dergisi*, 14 (1), 2017, 108-129.

Uzun, Ö. & Yiğit, E. (2011). Örgütsel stres ve örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi üzerine orta kademe otel yöneticileri üzerinde yapılan bir araştırma. *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 6(1), 181-213.

Visser, S., Keesstra, S., Maas, G., De Cleen, M., Molenaar, C. (2019). Soil as a basis to create enabling conditions for transitions towards sustainable land management as a key to achieve the SDGs by 2030, *Sustainability* 11 (23), 6792.

Wan, P.Y.K. (2013), Work stress among casino industry supervisors in macao casinos, *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 14 (2), 179-201

Yazıcıoğlu, Y. & Erdoğan, S. (2004). SPSS uygulamalı bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri, Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

Yılmaz, Ö. (2012). İşletme Yönetimi I-II, Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

Yonkkang, Z., Weixi, Z., Yalin, H., Yipeng, X. & Liu, T. (2014). The Relationship Among Role Conflict, Role Ambiguity, Role Overload and Job Stress of Chinese Middle-Level Cadres', Published Online February,3(1), pp.8-11. Doi:10.4236/chnstd.2014.31003

Yücesoy, Y. (2016). Çalışma yaşamının denetimine ilişkin genel bilgiler, In Gökçek Karaca, N. ve Kocabaş, F. (Editörler) Çalışma yaşamının denetimi (ss.2-45). Ankara: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Zuzanek, J. (2004). Work, leisure, time-pressure and stress. Haworth, In J.T. ve Veal, A.J (Editörler) Work and leisure .pp.123-144, London and New York: Routledge. Access Adress: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/27400198>



Gözde KUMAŞ, is graduated from Sakarya University, Faculty of Business Administration, Department of Tourism Management (2018). She received her Master's degree from Sakarya University of Applied Sciences, Institute of Graduate Studies, Department of Tourism Management (2020). She is currently continuing her Ph.D. Program in Institute of Social Science at Kocaeli University, Department of Tourism Management. ORCID: 0000-0003-0573-0136



Didar SARI ÇALLI, is completed her undergraduate education at Istanbul University, Faculty of Economics, Department of Economics (2008). She received her Master's degree from Sakarya University, Department of Tourism Management (2010), and her Doctorate degree from Sakarya University, Department of Tourism Management (2015). She started working at Sakarya University (2009). She currently works as a faculty member at Sakarya University of Applied Sciences, Faculty of Tourism. Main areas of work; tourism economy, tourism management, tourism technology, gastronomy. ORCID: 0000- 0001- 5517- 2924.

First S	2023-05-03
Revised	2024-02-01
Accepted	2024-02-05

Online First