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ABSTRACT

Human resources Isa very important factor in an organization, because the quality of organization highly depends on the quality of human resources, including women labours and service performers within an organization. Stress frequently arises due to changes that disturb the balance of human body or it can be due to both physical and psychological pressures. For factors outside the organization, among others, are such as family circumstances that are not harmonious, relationship with the community which is not good, as well as poor financial condition. This study tested several hypotheses dealing with the effects of work stress, work motivation, and work commitment on the level of work productivity of female labours in the fishing industry in Southeast Sulawesi Province. The results of study showed that the level of work stress determined the productivity of female labours. To increase and sustain the productivity of female labours, it needs to consider the balance of women’s role as housewives and workers. There is a significant and negative effect between work stress and work motivation. It means that the lower the work stress is, the higher the motivation of female labours is. There is a significant and negative effect between work stress and work commitment. It means that the lower the work stress is, the higher the commitment of female workers is. There is a significant and positive effect between work motivation and work commitment. It means that the higher the work motivation is, the higher the work commitment is. There is a significant and positive effect between work motivation and work productivity of female labours. It means that the higher the work motivation is, the higher the work productivity of female labours is. On the other hand, there is no significant difference between work commitment and work productivity of female labours.

KEYWORDS: Work Stress, Work Motivation, Work Commitment, Work Productivity, SEM analysis

1. INTRODUCTION

Hagat (1992) in their study on work stress (measured by role ambiguity, role conflict, and role overload) and the performance. In general, it is found that work stress is negatively related to performance.

Stress has an important position in relation to the productivity of human resources. Besides it is influenced by factors existing within the individual, stress is also influenced by environmental and organization factors (Hunter and Thatcher, 2007). Stress or mental stress that happens to female labours is not only due to the conflicts they have experienced, but also due to many other factors. Personally, there is a labour taking advantage of work stress in a positive way that is by making work stress as a driving force or motivation to achieve personal goals. This will certainly have an impact on increasing productivity (Scott, 2006). Work stress experienced by workers can develop into a positive direction if it can be utilized as a positive force for the labours. High encouragement of getting achievement creates higher levels of work stress and higher work productivity and efficiency as well, (Dohrenwend and Martin, 1997). Nevertheless, work stress can be also developed into a negative direction. Work stress faced by labours is associated with decreased job performance, increased work absenteeism and prone to accidents. Similarly, if many of the workers in organizations or companies experience work stress, work productivity and health of the organization will be disturbed (Collins, 1993). This opinion is confirmed by Gitosudarmo and Sudita (1997) stating that stress has positive and negative impacts. The positive impacts of work stress from low to moderate levels are functional in the sense that they act as drivers of increased female labours performance. While the negative impacts of work stress on high level are that most of the energy in the performance of female labours will be used to fight the work stress than to perform her work duties.
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2. LITERATURE

2.1. Sources of Stress

Stress often arises because of the changes that disturb the balance of human body or it can be due to the physical and psychological pressures. For factors outside the organization, among others, are such as family circumstances that are not harmonious, relationship with the community which is not good, as well as poor financial condition.

Work stress is not only caused by one factor alone, but stress can occur due to the incorporation of multiple causes at once. According to Luthans (2006), it is stated that there are several factors causing stress, namely:

1) Extra organization stressors. They come from outside the organization. These stressors can occur in an opened organization, that is the state of the external environment affecting the organization, for instance social and technological changes, globalization, family and others.

2) Organizational stressors. They come from the organization where the female labours work. These stressors focus more on policy or organization regulations causing excessive pressure on female labours.

3) Group Stressors. They come from working groups that every day interact with female labours, e.g. co-workers or supervisors or the direct supervisors of the female labours.

4) Individual stressors. They are derived from individuals within the organization. For example, a female labour who is being in conflict with other female labours, this gives rise to her own stress when that female labour performs the work duties within the organization.

Each individual placed on similar environmental conditions may show psychological, physical and behaviour responses which are very different. Therefore, stress affects a person in many different ways and in various effects depending on the condition of the individuals concerned as well as certain stressors given in the evaluation, which may be a stressor for someone but not for others. This phenomenon cannot be separated from buffer effects derived from several variable moderators that affect the relationship among stressors, stress and their effects that become weaker for some individuals and stronger for other individuals (Robbins, 2006).

2.2. Work Motivation

Stanford (1969; 173) in Mangkunagara, (2007) suggests that work motivation is as an energizing condition of an organism that serves to direct the organism toward the goal of a certain class. Work motivation can also be stated as the energy to drive arousal, Adelfer’s ERG Theory (1972) in Asnawi (2007; 69). The work motivation variable is measured by a number of indicators including:

a. Existence
b. Relatedness
c. Growth

Existence needs are associated with the lower order of Maslow's theory, and they can be filled with payments, benefits and working conditions which are safe and comfortable. Sutrisno, (2009)argues that existence is a person's need to be fulfilled and the maintenance of someone's existence as a human in the middle of community and companies.

Relatedness needs (brotherhood), in this case are related to the needs of having and can be met by organizing social relationships and group memberships involving representatives of workers, supervisors and even family and friends. Sutrisno (2009) states that kinship is the relatedness between a person and the surrounding social environment.

Growth needs, in this case are related to the needs of a higher order of need level according to Maslow, self actualization which can be fulfilled through searches and personal and career development, as well as through creative work and non-work activities, such as organization. Sutrisno(2009)states that the needs for growth and development are the needs associated with the development of one's self potential.

2.3. Work commitment

Mitchell (1982:136) considers work commitment as a value orientation on work showing that individuals are highly thinking their work. The work gives life satisfaction and status of the individual. Work commitment variable is measured by a number of indicators, they are a. Willingness of female labours(thinking the work), b. Loyalty of female labours(the work provides individual status), c. Pride of female labours(the work provides life satisfaction)

Willingness of female labours has basic word “willing “that means "truly want (to do something) or like something and willingness means “desire” (Poewadarminta, 1984: 639). Willingness of female
labours to work for advancement is manifested by thinking the work well for the success of the work at hand so that the companies gain financial profit.

Loyalty (Echols and Shadily, 1996:367) of female labours in this context can refer to obey, implement and practice something along with awareness and responsibility. The loyalty of female labours emerges because female labours have felt that the work has given them the status of individuals, thus, the female labours will faithfully carry out the work and responsibility for the betterment of the company.

The pride of female labours comes from the word proudly (adverb) which means generously, pride (noun), generosity, sense of pride, self-satisfaction (Daryanto, SS (1997: 72)). In the context associated with the work, the pride of female labours in carrying out the work is because the work provides life satisfaction, so that the female labours will do the work in maximum capacity for the company’s success.

2.4. Work Productivity

Productivity is derived from English, namely product, result, outcome, and then developed into productive which means producing, and productivity which means the ability to make or to create, Moore (1998). Productivity is then defined as the ability to produce goods and services.

Productivity is the universal common concepts in the social and economic system. Productivity concept can be viewed from several aspects, such as work of philosophy, mental attitude, culture, performance, until the measurement (Depnaker (Department of Manpower) of Southeast Sulawesi, 2007; Simanjuntak, 1992; Robbins, 1990).

Based on the view of technical concept, productivity is measured in quantity based on the magnitude, length, width, weight or number of labours. This measurement is called physical productivity. Productivity can also be measured by the value generated in the form of money. This concept is called value productivity, usually labours are used to compare productivity. In addition, it can also be measured by the ratio of goods produced in quantity, which is called physical labours productivity or a value that is resulted from a number of labours used in the production process (value-added productivity).

Based on the concept of economic and social views, the ultimate goal of productivity is to increase the welfare. Economic activities are carried out to provide goods and services as much as possible in an effort to meet unlimited needs by the allocation of limited resources. The economic activities carried out will result in a sense of physical and mental happiness to some extent, as well as the achievement of quality of life and quality of a particular work.

3. PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Research conducted by Yeh, Lester, and Tauber (1986) entitled “Subjective Stress and Productivity in Real Estate Sales People” had objective to determine the relationship between stress and productivity on real estate agents. The conclusion showed a negative relationship between stress and productivity. It had meaning that the lower the level of stress was, the higher the productivity was. Meanwhile, Jamal and Baba (1992) examined the relationship between stressor and productivity. Stress indicators examined included: overload, conflict, ambiguity, and adequacy. The result of the study stated that there was a negative relationship between stress and work productivity, meaning that the higher the stress was, the lower the productivity was.

Rathore and Kaushik (2009) conducted a study entitled “Stress Impact on Industrial Area of Indian Managers”. The objectives were to determine the effect of stress on selected industry executives in India. The samples were 180 manufacturing unit managers. The research results showed that the average managers had lower stress. Increase or decrease in work stress affected the quality, quantity and productivity of work.

Boles (1998) conducted a study entitled “Employee Behaviour in a Service Environment: A Model and Test of Potential Differences Between Men and Women”. This study focused on the role stress variables: role conflict and role ambiguity. Other variables studied were job performance work/non-work conflict, job satisfaction, life satisfaction and quitting intent. By using path analysis, this study showed that the overall models predicted the effects of stress role and work/non-work conflict on contracts employees’ performance with customers, jobs, and satisfaction. The results of multi-sample structural equation analysis showed that the role of stress affected service performance of female labours provider more than male labours, therefore, the job satisfaction was related higher to the desire to quit among male workers. In overall, the results of this study showed interesting similarities and differences between men and women.

Sutrisno, (2006: 115-116) in a study entitled “Effect of organizational culture on work motivation, commitment and performance of lecturers”, a study conducted to lecturers at State Polytechnic of
Pontianak, concluded that: 1) After the testing was conducted using path analysis techniques to the variables of organizational culture, work motivation of lecturers on lecturers commitment, it was obtained that the variables of organizational culture and work motivation of lecturers had significant effects on lecturers commitment variables. The effect was 30.5%. 2) After the testing was conducted using with path analysis techniques to the variables of organizational culture, work motivation of lecturers, lecturers commitment on the performance of lecturers, it was known that the variables of organizational culture, work motivation of lecturers, and lecturers commitment had significant effects on the performance of lecturers. The effects were 15.3%. 3) After the testing was conducted using path analysis techniques, it was known that the variable of lecturers commitment provided the biggest effects on the performance of lecturers equal to 50.1%. Zagladi, (2004: 255) in Sutrisno, (2006: 115-116) stated that both job satisfaction and performance were proven to affect the commitment of lecturers on their higher education institution.


4. RESEARCH METHODS

The analysis technique in this study was Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). Based on the objectives, this study was categorized as an explanatory research, i.e. a research that aimed to find an explanation of the causal relationships or the effects of relationships among variables with other variable through hypothesis testing. The variables in this study were Work Stress, Work Motivation, Work Commitment, and Work Productivity. The SEM analysis model was based on the following conceptual framework:

![Figure 1. Research Hypothesis Model](image)

5. RESEARCH RESULTS

The model in this study was analyzed using descriptive analysis and Structural Equation Modelling by making use of AMOS software version 21.

5.1. Description of Research Variables

The variables in this study included work stress, work motivation, work commitment, and work productivity.

The respondents answers to the questions of each indicator for work stress variable can be seen in Table 1.
Table 1. Description of Work Stress Variable(X)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percentage of Answers</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflicts (X.1)</td>
<td>D 12.3 N 41.2 A 42.2</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workloads (X.2)</td>
<td>D 10.8 N 36.8 A 47.1</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working groups (X.3)</td>
<td>D 6.9 N 47.5 A 42.2</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply of raw materials not timely (X.4)</td>
<td>D 14.2 N 41.2 A 32.8</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data Processed in 2013
Description: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, N = Neutral, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree

Based on Table 1 it can be seen that in general respondents are in a state of sufficient stress. It can be seen that the average value of four indicators reach 3.58. These numbers mean that dual roles attached to workers, physical conditions to support the workload, work group support in completing the work and the adequacy of rest periods, because the supply of raw materials frequently late, in general sufficiently suppress the psychology of female labours.

The following table presents a description of the average scores of each indicator, in which there are three indicators of variable gauge of Work Motivation, namely Existence (X3.1-X3.3), Relatedness (X3.4-X3.8), and Growth (X3.9-X3.12) as follows:

Table 2. Average Scores of Indicators on Motivation Work Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Average Scores</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatedness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 2 and Figure 2 above, it can be seen that the three indicators are perceived positively by respondents (the average scores are between 3.41 to 4.20). Of the highest average value, it is obtained that Work Motivation is mainly due to the relatedness in working. It indicates that respondents feel their Work Motivation primarily due to relatedness in working. In the second order, the Existence in working is as a driver of motivation of female labour in working. On the other hand, the lowest indication perceived by respondents is an indication of growth in working.

The following table presents a description of the average scores of each indicator, in which there are three indicators of variables gauge of Work Commitment, they are the Willingness of Female Labours(X4.1-X4.4), Loyalty of Female Labours(X4.5-X4.9), and Pride of Female Labours(X4.10-X3.13) as follows:

Table 3. Average Scores of Indicators on Work Commitment Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Average Scores</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willingness of Female Labours</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty of Female Labours</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride of Female Labours</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3. Comparison of Average Score of Indicators on Work Commitment Variable

Table 19, 20 and chart 13 above show that these three indicators are perceived positively by respondents (average scores are between 3.41 to 4.20). Of the highest average value, it is indicated that Work Commitment is primarily because of Willingness of female labours. This shows that respondents feel the Work Commitment is primarily because of the willingness of the female labours themselves. In the second order the Pride of female labours is as a driver of female labours' commitment in working. On the other hand, the lowest indication perceived by the respondents is the indication of female workers' loyalty. Although the indication of female labours' loyalty is perceived as the lowest by respondents than the other two indicators, these indicators are positively perceived by female labours.

The answer to each indicator for Work Productivity (Y) variable can be seen in Table 5.16. Based on Table 5.16, it can be seen that the work productivity of female labours is good in general. The average respondents answers to all indicators of work productivity variable reach 4.07. It means that female labours are able to provide the work in accordance with the company's expectations, with good quality and always respond the regulations wisely. They are able to adapt well because they work carefully with high responsibility.

Table 4. Description of Work Productivity Variable (Y)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percentage of Answers</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of work (Y.1)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of work (Y.2)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiatives to respond the changes of regulation (Y.3)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability (Y.4)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working speed and accuracy (Y.5)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility (Y.6)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data Processed in 2013

5.3 Analysis of Structural Equation Modelling

The results of Structural equation modeling analysis are presented in the following table and figure:
Figure 4. Structural Model of SEM Analysis

Table 2. Results of Hypothesis Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships Among Variables</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress ( \rightarrow ) Productivity</td>
<td>-0.270</td>
<td>-2.582</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress ( \rightarrow ) Work Motivation</td>
<td>-0.213</td>
<td>-2.321</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress ( \rightarrow ) Work Commitment</td>
<td>-0.201</td>
<td>-4.721</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Motivation ( \rightarrow ) Work Commitment</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>6.021</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Motivation ( \rightarrow ) Productivity</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>3.344</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Commitment ( \rightarrow ) Productivity</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>1.423</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress ( \rightarrow ) Motivation ( \rightarrow ) Productivity</td>
<td>(-0.231 \times 0.275 = -0.064)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress ( \rightarrow ) Commitment ( \rightarrow ) Productivity</td>
<td>(-0.201 \times 0.036 = -0.007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Motivation ( \rightarrow ) Commitment ( \rightarrow ) Productivity</td>
<td>(-0.213 \times 0.488 = -0.113)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation ( \rightarrow ) Commitment ( \rightarrow ) Productivity</td>
<td>0.488 \times 0.036 = 0.018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First hypothesis. The low level of job stress can increase productivity of female labours in the fishing industry in Southeast Sulawesi Province. Of the results of SEM analysis on the direct effect path coefficient of Work Stress variable on Work Productivity, it is obtained Standardize values equal to -0.270 with Critical Ratio (CR) equal to -2.583 with a P-value of 0.010. Because the value of CR > 1.96 and P-value < 0.05, then the first hypothesis is accepted. Based on the direct effect path coefficient which is negative, equal to -0.270, it indicates that the relationship between Work Stress on work productivity is negative. It means that the lower the Work Stress is, the higher the Work Productivity is. Otherwise, the higher the Work Stress is, the lower the Work Productivity is.

Second hypothesis. Of the effect of work stress on work motivation, the results of SEM analysis shows a coefficient equal to -0.213, with Sig value of 0.020. Because the Sig value is smaller than 5%(0.020 < 0.05), it indicates that the second hypothesis is accepted. Because SEM coefficient is negative (-0.213), it indicates that the relationship is negative or in opposite direction. It means the higher the work stress is, the lower the work motivation is. Conversely, the lower the work stress is, the higher the work motivation of female labours is.
Third hypothesis. Of the effect of work stress on work commitment, the results of SEM analysis shows standardized coefficient equal to -0.201, with the Sig of 0.000. Because the Sig value is smaller than 5% (0.000 < 0.05), it indicates that the third hypothesis is accepted. Because SEM coefficient is negative (-0.201), it indicates that the relationship is negative or in opposite direction. It means that the higher the work stress is, the lower the work commitment is. Otherwise, the lower the work stress is, the higher the work commitment of female labours is.

Fourth hypothesis. Of the effect of work motivation on work commitments, the results of SEM analysis shows a coefficient equal to 0.448, with the sig value of 0.000. Because the Sig value is smaller than 5% (0.000 < 0.05), it indicates that the fourth hypothesis is accepted. Because SEM coefficient is positive (0.448), it indicates that the relationship is positive or in the same direction. It means that the higher the work motivation is, the higher the work commitment is. Otherwise, the lower the work motivation is, the lower the work commitment of female labours is.

Fifth hypothesis. Of the effect of work motivation on work productivity, the results of SEM analysis shows a coefficient equal to 0.275, with the sig value of 0.001. Because the Sig value is smaller than 5% (0.001 < 0.05), it indicates that the fifth hypothesis is accepted. Because SEM coefficient is positive (0.275), it indicates that the relationship is positive or in the same direction. It means that the higher the work motivation is, the higher the work productivity is. Otherwise, the lower the work motivation is, the lower the work productivity of female labours is.

Sixth hypothesis. Of the effect of work commitment on work productivity, the results of SEM analysis shows SEM coefficient equal to 0.036, with sig value of 0.155. Because the Sig value is greater than 5% (0.155 > 0.05), it indicates that the sixth hypothesis is rejected. This shows that no matter how high the work commitment value, it will not result in changes in the level of productivity of female labours.

Seventh hypothesis. Of the indirect effect of Work Stress on work productivity through motivation, its obtained indirect coefficient equal to -0.064. Due to the direct effect of work stress → work motivation and work productivity → work productivity, both of them are significant. So, there is a significant indirect effect of work stress on work productivity through work motivation. Negative coefficient indicates that the higher the work stress is, the lower the work productivity is if the motivation is increased.

Eighth hypothesis. Of the indirect effect of Work Stress on work productivity through commitments, its obtained indirect coefficient equal to -0.007. Due to the direct effect of work stress → work commitment, and work commitment → work productivity, one of them is not significant. So, there is no significant indirect effect of work stress on work productivity through work commitment. This shows that no matter how high the value of female labours’ work stress, it will not result in changes in labours productivity even though work commitment changes.

Ninth hypothesis. Of the indirect effect of Work Stress on work commitment through motivation, it is obtained indirect coefficient equal to -0.113. Due to the direct effect of work stress → work motivation and work motivation → work commitment, both of them are significant. So, there is a significant indirect effect of work stress on work commitment through work motivation. The negative coefficient indicates that the higher the work stress of female labours is, the lower the work commitment is if the motivation increases.

Tenth hypothesis. Of the indirect effect of Work Motivation on work productivity through commitments, it is obtained indirect coefficient equal to -0.018. Due to the direct effect of work motivation → work commitment, and work commitment → work productivity, one of them is not significant. So, there is a significant indirect effect of work motivation on work productivity through work commitment. This shows no matter how high the value of work motivation of female labours, it will not result in a change in work productivity even though the work commitment changes.

6. DISCUSSION

The SEM analysis results of the effect of work stress on work productivity shows a significant negative coefficient. With a negative path coefficient, it means that there is an opposite relationship between work stress and work productivity. Therefore, the higher the workload experienced by female labours in the fishing industry is, the lower the responsibility of the workers in finishing the jobs is.

Based on the results of descriptive analysis, the work stress and all of the indicators are perceived highly by female labours in the fishing industry. This shows that the workers experience sufficient workload in carrying out their job. Of the descriptive analysis, it also appears that female labours perceive the work stress and its indicators as high. This indicates that female labours in the fishing industry experience high role conflict, high workload, less conducive work relationships and supply of raw materials that is frequently late.
Meanwhile, the results of analysis on work productivity indicators, namely the results of work, quality of work, initiative responding to regulation changes, adaptability, work speed and accuracy and responsibility show a high perception. Based on the result of descriptive analysis, it appears that female labours perceive that they have a high perception on the productivity indicators. This means that female labours have high work results (4.09), good quality of work (4.10), quite high initiatives responding to regulation changes (3.94), high adaptability (4.12%), high working speed (4.10) and high responsibility and (4.05).

There is a negative effect between work stress and work motivation. It means that the higher the work stress experienced by female labours is, the lower the work motivation possessed by female labours is. Otherwise, the lower the work stress is, the higher the work motivation of female labours is. If the average scores of all work stress equal to 4.01 is compared to the average score of work motivation equal to 3.88, it can be proven that the low work stress can lead to high work motivation.

This is in line with the theory stating that the higher the work stress experienced by a person is, the lower the motivation to work is, and vice versa. Karasek et al., (1979) in Torp et al., (2009) have developed a model of the job demands control support (DCS) of organization perspective, specifically focused on how social and organizational work factors affecting the stress are associated with health and behaviours. The focus of this model is how the social support and control may have a negative effect on work demand excess for female labours' health and how the combination of demand with high control can result in increased learning, motivation and behaviour of workers.

There is a negative effect between work stress and work commitment. It means that the higher the work stress experienced by female labours is, the lower the work commitment that will be possessed by female labours is. Otherwise, the lower the work stress will result in higher female labours commitment to work. If the average scores of all work stress equal to 4.01 is compared to work commitment equal to 3.92, it can be concluded that the low work stress will lead to high work commitment.

This is in line with the theory stating that the higher the work stress experienced by a person is, the lower the work commitment is, and vice versa. Armenakis et al., (1999 p.307) in Vakola et al., (2005) consider stress as a barrier to change planning and implementation, and they argue that: receiver power, resistance, commitment, cynical attitude, stress, and relationship of individual reactions are clearly related to the variables criteria to be considered in the planning and implementation framework on organizational change. The changes can be definitely caused by cynical attitude and stress as factors inhibiting success.

There is a positive effect between work motivation and work commitments. It means that the higher the work motivation perceived by female labours is, the higher the work commitment of female labours is. If the average scores of all work motivation equal to 3.88 is compared to the average scores of all work commitment equal to 3.92, it can be concluded that the higher the work motivation is, the higher the female labours. This is in line with the theory stating that the higher the work motivation is, the higher the work commitment is, and vice versa. Steers and Rhodes (1978) in Burton et al., (2002) describe a model of absenteeism stating that the presence of labours is the main thing leading to the ability and motivation. Theoretically, these two variables interact each other, the sense of ability brings motivation, both of them are related. The presence of motivation affects one's satisfaction to his or her work situation and stress variations (economic conditions, organizational commitment, and others).

There is a positive effect between work motivation and performance. It means that the higher the work motivation perceived by female labours is, the higher the performance of female workers. The performance in this study is measured by three things: the quantity of work, quality of work and timeliness of work. Quality of work is perceived very high by respondents, while the quantity and timeliness of work are perceived high by respondents. On the other hand, work motivation is indicated by three things: the existence, relatedness, and growth. These three indicators are at a positive level that is the level at which respondents feel the high work motivation. If the average scores of all work motivation equal to 3.88 is compared to average scores of all performance equal to 4.06, it indicates that the high motivation will lead to high performance of female labours of fishing industry in Southeast Sulawesi.

The work productivity of female labours is perceived high by respondents, but it is obtained answers of which the work productivity tends to be low, this is due to: 1). Quantity of the results. It is obtained answers that female labours do not fully complete the work as targeted by the management and they only work according to target set and do not have initiatives to complete the work, the average score is 3.81. 2). Quality of the results. It is obtained answers from respondents that the work is not frequently based on sufficient knowledge to complete, therefore a lot of works are not completed on time based on the quality standards and the specified procedures. The average score is 4.23. 3). The average score of timeliness is 4.13. This happens because the company's attention to the welfare of female labours is still lacking. If the averages of all work motivation equal to 3.88 is compared to the average scores of all
Work Productivity equal to 4.06, it is obtained that the high work motivation of female labours encourage the work productivity of female labours to be high. This is in line with the theory stating that the higher the work motivation of someone is, the higher the Work Productivity is, and vice versa. Dweck et al., (2005) in Stevenson et al., (2008) state that it is a fact that the difference between Work Productivity, Motivation in individuals and same innate or different learning abilities is as the theoretical basis of self implicit, perception at competence and it adopts achievement goal orientation.

6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The results of the study shows that the level of work stress determines female labours productivity. To increase and sustain the productivity of female labours, it needs to consider the balance of the roles of women as housewives and workers. There is a significant and negative effect between work stress and work motivation. It means that the lower the work stress is, the higher the work motivation of female labours is. There is a significant and negative effect between work stress and work commitments. It means that the lower the work stress is, the higher the work commitment of female labours is. There is a significant and positive effect between work motivation and work commitments. It means that the higher the work motivation is, the higher the work commitment is. There is a significant and positive effect between work motivation and productivity of female workers. It means that the higher the work motivation is, the higher the productivity of female labours is. On the other hand, there is no a significant effect between work commitments and productivity of female labours.
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