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ABSTRACT

The hotels' success depends on many factors in achieving its goals where the employees' psychological, physiological health are among the most important of these factors. Job stress is one of the main topics that attracted the researchers' attention in the past few years because of its negative effects on the employees' health and the success of the organization. So, the present research aims to examine job stress and its impact on employees' performance and turnover intention through Job satisfaction of employees as a mediator variable in three-star hotels in Alexandria city in Egypt. The research depends on using a quantitative research approach to test the research hypotheses. The primary data were collected via a questionnaire survey from employees at three-star hotels in Alexandria City in Egypt which counted nine hotels according to (EHA, 2018), during the period in June to September of 2021. The sample was randomly selected to be a representation of the population. To achieve the objectives of the research, 200 questionnaire forms were distributed. While 9 were invalid. This made 191 valid forms with a response rate was (95%). Statistical analyses were performed by SPSS version 23 software and the WarpPLS version (5) is used for SEM analysis. Research results are significant at \( p \leq 0.01 \). The results revealed that job stresses significantly affect the job satisfaction of hotels' employees. In addition, employees' job satisfaction has a positive and significant influence on employees' performance and employees' turnover intention. Insights are provided to develop and ensure effective strategies of continuous improvement, training, and learning to enhance employees' competencies for seeking work-related problems and find creative solutions for these problems and relieve their stresses.
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INTRODUCTION

Although the hotel industry is the largest employment sector in the world, the employees are leaving the industry for several reasons (Lam et al., 2002; Sampson & Akyeampong, 2014; Wong et al., 2021). Job stress is one such reason that affects employees' performance, turnover intent, and satisfaction (Tongchaiprasit and Ariyabuddhiphongs, 2016; Park et al., 2020). Teoh et al. (2019) agreed with Tsaur & Tang (2012) and Lee et al. (2011) that hotel employees often work in a really stressful environment and confront various work demands, such as long working hours, late-night work, weekends work, and public holiday work, as well as heavy workload and poor working conditions, are primary antecedents of job stress (Kim et al., 2009; Jung & Yoon, 2014; Cho et al., 2016; Kong & Jeon, 2018; Yang et al., 2020).

The more job demands of the hotel staff are high, the more their ability to perform their roles consequently decrease and this may expose them to experience increased burnout and reduce their ability to behave and respond with customers courteously and politely (Crawford et al., 2010; Van Jaarsveld et al., 2010; Hu & Cheng, 2010; Griffin et al., 2010; Devonish, 2014; Ma et al., 2019; Prentice & Thaichon, 2019). Okumus et al. (2019) indicated that job stress is a major cause of poor physical and mental health, human errors, and minimized productivity in the workplace as well as leads to illness, absenteeism, increased many risks and accidents due to human mistake, emotional eating, and poor job performance (Sanne et al., 2005; Kusluvan et al., 2010; Du et al., 2018; Haver et al., 2019).

Schweiker and Dimitriou (2021) and Ariza-Montes et al. (2018) stated that stressful working circumstances and the environment experienced by employees not only affect staff health, comfort, and welfare but also create clear productivity losses for employers particularly in the hotel industry through decreasing productivity by low performance, discontent, absenteeism, turnover, in addition to lawful, medical and insurance costs to employees (Chiang et al., 2010; Lister, 2018; Nauman et al, 2019). So, Bani-Melhem et al. (2020) and Akgunduz & Gürel (2019) emphasized that work stress is considered as one of the primary issues in the hotel industry, wherever it has been proven at the organizational level that high work pressure and poor job satisfaction and motivation are main reason and source to increase work risks such as interpersonal conflict, leaves and employee turnover (Karatepe and Uludag, 2009). In general, there are many definitions of job stress. Muis et al. (2021) and Bhui et al. (2016) defined job stress as "feelings of massive difficulty, pressure, insecurity, worry, frustration, and anxiety arising from the job requirements and demand". Wu & Zhang (2017) and Griffin et al. (2010) assured that stress
at work is always associated with factors such as employee adherence, satisfaction, health, well-being, and performance that in turn affect hotels' success (O'Neill & Davis, 2011). Stress is also defined as an annoying emotional experience associated with affective states such as fright, worry, outrage, and depression, and it is caused by events (Ekienabor, 2016; Manderson, 2014). In the occupational setting, job stress refers to "the physiological and psychological reactions to different stressors sources that beyond an individual’s instant ability to cope with job requirements and do not range with a person’s knowledge, competencies and skills" (Hwang et al., 2014; Subramanian, 2017; Dartey-Baah et al., 2020; Paje et al., 2020; Wonget al., 2021).

Hence, this study aims to examine job stress and its impact on employees' performance and turnover intention through job satisfaction of employees as a mediator variable in three-star hotels in Alexandria city in Egypt.

LITERATURE REVIEW

JOB STRESS AND EMPLOYEES' PERFORMANCE QUALITY

Zeb et al. (2018) clarified that as work is very important for everyone to earn money and to maintain the living cost, staff performance is also one of the most primary factors of the organization success as employees are the labor wealth and main assets of any firm and its key to achieving aims as they can raise or destroy it (Kusluvan et al., 2010; Schwpcker & Dimitriou, 2021). Manderson (2014) illustrated that job performance is "the individual's ability to carry out his or her job requirements and tasks successfully under job restrictions using of the available resources". Kore et al. (2019) and Omolayo (2018) also defined job performance as "the real behavior showed by every individual as work performance produced by the employees". According to Trivellas et al. (2015) Job performance is "the level of employee productivity compared to his peers".

Bani-Melhem et al. (2020) stated that job-associated stress can be expected to have a negative influence on employees’ performance, skills, and efficiency toward their work environment (Akgunduz, 2019; Hon, 2013). Researchers have revealed that adverse outcomes to both organizations and employees such as disloyalty, fatigue, failure, depression, and burnout, higher rates of absenteeism, weak performance, and little morale can be returned and attributed to job stress (LePine et al., 2005; Hwang et al., 2014; George and Zakkariya 2015; Omolayo, 2018).

As mentioned previously, job stress in the hotel industry is different from other industries because of the nature of this industry which includes night shift, direct relations with guests, poor working circumstances, and low wages in hotels (Chuang and Lei, 2011; Jung and Yoon, 2014; Wong et al.,
Therefore, stress is an increasing issue for hotel staff and the main source of increased health costs, weak efficiency, low productivity, and an obstacle to organization success and development (Devonish, 2014; Chiang et al., 2010; Bhui et al., 2016; Ekienabore, 2016). Tongchaiprasit and Ariyabuddhiphongs (2016); O'Neill and Davis (2011) showed that employees exposed to higher pressures become more offensive and low helpful and negatively associated to role job performance in the hotel industry, despite the truth that the success of hospitality companies depends on employees who can carry out their jobs under stress (Akgunduz and Gürel, 2019; Bani-Melhem et al., 2020). Thus, the relationship between job stress and staff performance likely hinges on if the stress is regenerating from hindrance stresses or challenge stresses (Kim et al., 2009; Wu & Zhang, 2017; Subramaniam, 2017). Sampson and Akyeampong (2014) displayed that there are two types of stress: hindrance stressors or challenge stressors which determines their effect on performance through job stress. Challenge stresses are obstacles and barriers to be overcome to learn, understand, and accomplish, whereas hindrance stresses are the opposite, stressful requirements that restrain development, growth, and achievement (Cavanaugh et al., 2000; Wong et al., 2021). Hindrance stress reduces employees’ willingness and desire to keep investing in their work relationship (Jung & Yoon, 2014), while challenge stressors positively impact performance through motivation, but negatively through strains (Atteya 2012; Hodari et al., 2014). Jung and Yoon (2013) pointed out that among the various sources of stress studied; four primary sources of stress stand out: role conflict and role ambiguity, as well as workload and decision-latitude or autonomy (Kim & Stoner, 2008; O’Neill and Davis, 2011; Wu & Zhang, 2017). These sources arise due to many factors such as changes in the work environment, inadequate managerial support, poorly communication among leaders, weak work autonomy, family-work conflicts, inadequate work resources, transparency lack of job duties, excessive responsibilities, and work expectations which create many negative outcomes known collectively as symptoms of role strain. Among them poor job satisfaction, high leaves rate, absenteeism, weak commitment, weak job performance, and pressure and worry (Tennant, 2001; Hu and Cheng, 2010; Chiang et al., 2010; Ingram et al., 2011; Atteya, 2012; Young & Corsun, 2010; Cho et al., 2014). Karatepe and Uludag (2009) mentioned that every organization has the key to understand the tools, procedures mean for maximizing employee performance while minimizing the negative effects of job stress (Omolayo, 2018; Agus et al., 2021; Schwepker & Dimitriou, 2021; Muis et al., 2021).
THE MEDIATOR ROLE OF JOB SATISFACTION

Padmanabhan (2021) pointed out that job satisfaction has close relation with job stress. It becomes obvious when dissatisfied employees leave their jobs (Fiori et al., 2015). So, job satisfaction plays a major role in securing employees' loyalty. In other words, employees with higher job satisfaction believe that in the long term the company will be great, care about the quality of their job, are highly loyal to the company, and are more productive (Goswami & Dsilva, 2019; Cheung et al., 2019). Therefore, an organization which has satisfied employees will be more effective than an organization with dissatisfied employees (Tett & Meyer, 2006; Zopiatis et al., 2014). Thus, DiPietro et al. (2020); Kula, (2017) and George, & Zakkariya (2015) defined "Job satisfaction as a happy or positive feeling state that results from the appreciation of employees' work or work experiences". Job satisfaction is also defined as the interrelated collection of psychological, physiological, and environmental circumstances that allow workers to confess that they are happy with their work (Chuang and Lei, 2011; Zopiatis et al., 2014; Lu et al., 2016; Hoboubi et al., 2017).

There is no doubt that work stress negatively affects employee’s job satisfaction (Shani and Pizam, 2009; Griffin et al., 2020), where job satisfaction is closely related to employees' behavior and performance in the workplace (Okumus et al., 2019; Judge et al. 2001).

Goswami & Dsilva (2019) claimed that employee job satisfaction has effects on employee performance, leaves rate, creativity, productivity, and intent to job turnover (Zopiatis et al., 2014; Ekienabor, 2016; Huang et al., 2018). The organizational adherence of employees can be improved by increasing job satisfaction, which in turn may lower turnover rates (Griffin et al., 2010; Garg & Dhar, 2014).

As a mediator, job satisfaction seeks to enhance positive relations, such as the relationship between employee’s performance improvement and low turnover intent (Tongchaiprasit & Ariyabuddhiphongs, 2016; DiPietro et al., 2020) and decrease negative relations such as the negative relationship between job stress and turnover intention (Huang, 2007; Griffin et al., 2010; Kula, 2017). Thus, job satisfaction has been shown to mediate the relation between motivating job characteristics, chief-member exchange, person fit with the organization, and increasing employees’ understanding and perceptions of the organization’s external reputation, and turnover intention (Tett & Meyer, 2006; Kim et al., 2009; Young & Corsun, 2010; Lee et al., 2011; Wu & Zhang, 2017; Huang, 2018; Cheung et al., 2019; Okumus et al., 2019; Dartey-Baah et al., 2020).
JOB STRESS AND TURNOVER INTENTION

Tongchaiprasit and Ariyabuddhiphongs (2016) and Kim and Stoner (2008) agreed that employees may have turnover intent due to lower job satisfaction, and job stresses in their daily work environment (Lu et al., 2016; Hwang et al., 2014). The turnover intention may lead not only lower productivity and service disruptions, but also create lower organizational performance and customer dissatisfaction (Huang et al., 2018; Fong et al., 2018; Park et al., 2020). Akgunduz & Gürel (2019) asserted that increased job requirements for the hotel employees, such as role vagueness and role conflict are always associated with high turnover intention (Tett & Meyer, 2006). Turnover intention is considered as an important former of actual turnover, which has fundamental and significant costs for organizations (Karatepe and Uludag, 2009; Zopiatis et al., 2014). Employees' turnover intention has been defined as "the repetition of employee’s intention to change their jobs or companies voluntarily, and search for different or alternative job" (Kim & Stoner, 2008; Lu et al., 2016; Huang et al., 2018). Employee turnover can be categorized into voluntary turnovers such as leaving a job, and involuntary turnover such as being laid off (Lam et al., 2002; Tecipi & Bartlett, 2002; Imtiaz & Ahmad 2009; Lu et al., 2016).

METHODOLOGY

The study framework targets to illustrate the study variables by examining job stress and its effect on employees' performance and turnover intention through job satisfaction of employees as a mediator variable in three-star hotels in Alexandria city in Egypt. Thus, the study framework displays two sets of structures. The first is based on the impact of job stress on employees' job satisfaction. The second structure has represented the impact of employees' job satisfaction on employees' performance and turnover intention of three-star hotels in Alexandria city in Egypt. The above clarification used as a literature base, which is urgently needed to complete this research and test the following three main hypotheses:

H1: Job stress has a significant impact on employees' job satisfaction in three-star hotels in Alexandria.

H2: Employees' job satisfaction has a significant impact on employees' performance in three-star hotels in Alexandria.

H3: Employees' job satisfaction has a significant impact on employees' turnover intention in three-star hotels in Alexandria.

The research depends on using a quantitative research approach by primary data, as the purpose of the quantitative research approach is to examine a prearranged hypothesis and create generalizable results utilizing statistical methods. The primary data were collected via a structured questionnaire...
with a 5-point Likert-style scale (“1=strongly disagree” to “5=strongly agree”), by 200 employees of three-star hotels in Alexandria, to get to the research results and conclusion. Statistical analyses were performed by SPSS version 23 software. Research results are significant at p ≤ 0.01. Random sampling, sample was randomly selected to be an unbiased and representative for the population and used to collect data from hotels’ staff situated in Alexandria, during the period in June to September of 2021(Sekaran and Bougie, 2016; Creswell, 2013).

Questionnaire items were selected from prior studies (Park et al., 2020; Bani-Melhem et al., 2020; Muis et al., 2021; Wong et al., 2021; Schwepker & Dimitriou, 2021) for job stress, whereas as scales for employees' performance Quality (Manderson, 2014; Trivellas et al., 2015; Prentice & Thaichon, 2019; Haver et al., 2019; Kore et al., 2019; Agus et al., 2021; Schwepker & Dimitriou, 2021). While scales for employees' job satisfaction were selected from other studies (Kula, 2017; Goswami & Dsilva, 2019; Cheung et al., 2019; DiPietro et al., 2020; Padmanabhan, 2021). Eventually, employees' turnover intention scales came from (Kim & Stoner, 2008; Lu et al., 2016; Huang et al., 2018; Fong et al., 2018) studies. To examine the research structure 24 items were utilized for the model: ‘Job Stress’ (measured by 6 items), ‘Employees' Job Satisfaction’ (6 items), Employees' performance’ (6 items), ‘employees' turnover intention’ (6 items). Demographic data of respondents were also covered in the questionnaire (i.e., gender, age, education level, and work experience). The questionnaire form was prepared to employ the online survey service of Google forms. The questionnaire link was sent to the selected employees by personal e-mail and WhatsApp.

The scope of this research is restricted to employees at three-star hotels in Alexandria city in Egypt which counted nine hotels according to (EHA, 2018), and 420 employees nearly as stated by general managers of these hotels. So, the sample is taken from three-star hotels' employees are calculated according to Hair et al., (2017).

\[
N = \text{Study Population} = 420.
\]

\[
Z = 0.95 = 1.96
\]

\[
d = 0.05 \quad p = 0.50
\]

\[
n = \frac{N \times p(1-p)}{\left[N-1 \times (d^2 + z^2)\right] + p(1-p)}
\]

\[
n = 200
\]

The sample size formula revealed 200 employees as a sample size.

A pilot study was conducted to validate methods of data collection, and to examine collected data for giving the necessary information to reach the research aim. The questionnaire was checked by three hotels’ general managers, and three academic experts in the field. Then, few amendments related to vocabulary and design was done to improve questionnaire flow, clarity, and validity. 200 questionnaire forms were distributed, while 9 of
them were invalid. This made 191 valid forms with a response rate was (95%). Research structure’s reliability was tested by running Cronbach’s alpha coefficient which calculated and exceeded 0.70 for all structures indicating reliable results (Hair et al., 2010).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of the respondents (n=191)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-40 years</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 years</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med level</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University education</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 years</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEASUREMENT MODEL ASSESSMENT

According to Hair et al. (2019) and Ali et al. (2018) the extracted mean-variance (AVE) should be more than 0.5. The convergent validity of each structure, standard factor loadings, CR, and AVE has been studied to illustrate the validity of the structures (Fong et al., 2018; Prentice & Thaichon, 2019; Schwepker & Dimitriou, 2021; Agus et al., 2021; Wong et al., 2021; and Padmanabhan, 2021). Factor loading for all structures ranged from 0.701 to 0.881, the CR results ranged from 0.702 to 0.851, and the AVE results ranged from 0.540 to 0.678 as shown in table 2. Results emphasized that all structures measured in this model have achieved validity.

Table 2: Measurement Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>St. Deviation</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS1</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>1.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS2</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS3</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS4</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees' Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Employees' Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS5 0.813</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS6 0.727</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJS1 0.717</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJS2 0.801</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJS3 0.768</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJS4 0.713</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJS5 0.787</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJS6 0.809</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees' performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP1 0.803</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP2 0.766</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP3 0.818</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP4 0.822</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP5 0.813</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP6 0.727</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees' Turnover Intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETI1 0.751</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETI2 0.701</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETI3 0.815</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETI4 0.763</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETI5 0.869</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETI6 0.754</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: AVE: average variance extracted. AVE is calculated using the given formula: \( AVE = \frac{\sum K^2}{n} \)

\( CR = \frac{(\sum K)^2}{(\sum K^2 + (\sum 1-K^2)).} \)

VIF: variance inflation factor.

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).**

Table 3: Spearman's Correlation Matrix among Research Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Employees' Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>Spearman's Correlation</td>
<td>-0.713**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. P-value</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Employees' performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees' Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Spearman's Correlation</td>
<td>0.681**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. P-value</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).  *  
Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Employees' Turnover Intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees' Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Spearman's Correlation</td>
<td>-0.601**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. P-value</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).  *  
Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The findings in table (3) showed that the analysis of the full sample size of 191 responses showed that there is negative and significant relationship between job stress and employees' job satisfaction; this means that if job stress increases, job satisfaction of hotel employees will decrease. In addition, the table showed that employees' job satisfaction has a positive and significant relationship with employees' performance; this means the higher employees' job satisfaction, the more hotel employees' performance. Lastly there is negative and significant relationship between job satisfaction of hotel employees and employees' turnover intention. Correlation measures the relationship between research variables. In this research, the significance level is less than 1% (99% confidence). The coefficient of correlation of research variables has been recorded .713, .681, -.601 correspondingly. Hence, the three research hypotheses were supported. Each hotel to succeed and continue going in the current global competitive environment, it is necessary to minimize the high rates of job stress which lead to many adverse outcomes such as disloyalty, fatigue, depression, and burnout, higher rates of absenteeism, weak performance, and little morale that can be considered as the main obstacle of hotel's success and development and this is consistent with what mentioned by (Hwang et al., 2014; George & Zakkariya 2015; Omolayo, 2018). Whereas achieving more employees' job satisfaction and maintaining psychological, physiological health for employees will generate more excellent hotels' success and profitability rates through creating and developing long-term employees' commitment, trust, high performance, and improving retention and this agreed with mentioned by (Prentice & Thaichon, 2019; Muis et al., 2021; Wong et al., 2021; Agus et al., 2021; Padmanabhan, 2021; Schwepker & Dimitriou, 2021). Thus, our findings confirmed that job stresses have a significant impact on employees' performance and employees' turnover intention. Moreover, Job Satisfaction as a mediator
plays an essential role in seeking to enhance positive relations, such as the relationship between employee’s performance improvement and low turnover intent, and decrease negative relations such as the negative relationship between job stress and turnover intention and this agreed with that mentioned by (Huang, 2007; Griffin et al., 2010; Tongchaiserit & Ariyabuddhiphong, 2016; Kula, 2017; DiPietro et al., 2020).

Study respondents ascertain the construct of job stress has a significant negative impact on employees' job satisfaction in three-star hotels in Alexandria according to the coefficient table (β= -0.369 and p<0.01) (H1). On the other hand, employees' job satisfaction has a positive and significant impact on employees' performance (β= 0.280 and p<0.01) (H2). Lastly, employees' job satisfaction has a negative and significant impact on employees' turnover intention (β= -0.603 and p<0.01) (H3). In general, hotels’ employee's performance, and employees' turnover intention (as a dependent variable) are determined by employees' job satisfaction rates (as a mediator Variable). This job satisfaction is also determined by job stresses (as independent variables). Consequently, the three hypotheses are supported statistically, and factors are significantly affecting hotels’ employees' performance and employees' turnover intention.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTION

The research purpose is to examine job stress and its impact on employees' performance and turnover intention through job satisfaction of employees as a mediator variable in three-star hotels in Alexandria city in Egypt. The research has tested three main hypotheses of how job stress affects the mediating variable employees' job satisfaction consequently how job satisfaction affects employees' performance and turnover intention. The sample was randomly selected to be a representation of the population. To achieve the objectives of the research, 200 questionnaire forms were distributed. While 9 were invalid. This made 191 valid forms with a response rate was (95%). Statistical analyses were performed by SPSS version 23 software. Research results are significant at p ≤ 0.01. Primary data was collected during the period in June to September of 2021. The findings of the research showed following: (1) there is negative and significant relationships between job stress and employees' job satisfaction; this means that if job stress increases, job satisfaction of hotel employees will decrease. (2) Employees' job satisfaction has a positive and significant relationship with employees' performance; this means the higher employees' job satisfaction, the more hotel employees' performance. (3) There is a negative and significant relationship between job satisfaction of hotel employees and employees' turnover intention.
The current study revealed that job stress has adversely affected the satisfaction, performance, and turnover intention of hotels' employees. Therefore, these hotels' management needs to deal with and tackle this issue by implementing all measures and procedures that decrease job stress types through hiring employees who could manage stress well when under pressure. Also, the study results give hotel management important insights to exploit and prepare appropriate job descriptions for every position and revise the existing ones. Lastly, hotel managers should develop and ensure a strong culture of continuous improvement, training, and learning to enhance employees' competencies for seeking work-related problems and find creative solutions for these problems and relieve their stresses. Consequently, this will generate greater hotels’ competitiveness through improving its long-term employees' satisfaction, performance, and retention.

It is important to address the limitations of this research, and these might be examined in further research. First, this study sampled only 9 three-star hotels in Alexandria city in Egypt; thus, the results may not be representative of all the different types of hotels in Egypt. Second, further research could be done in other hotels kinds and hospitality organizations. Lastly, further important insights might be acquired through qualitative research.
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