



# Relationship among noise exposure, sensitivity, and noise annoyance with job satisfaction and job stress in a textile industry

Noise & Vibration Worldwide  
2019, Vol. 50(6) 195–201  
© The Author(s) 2019  
Article reuse guidelines:  
sagepub.com/journals-permissions  
DOI: 10.1177/0957456519853812  
journals.sagepub.com/home/nvw  


Milad Abbasi<sup>1,2</sup> , Saeid Yazdanirad<sup>3,4</sup>, Peymaneh Habibi<sup>4</sup>, Saeid Arabi<sup>5</sup>, Rohollah Fallah Madvari<sup>6</sup> , Ahmad Mehri<sup>7</sup>, Mohsen Poursadeghiyan<sup>8</sup>, Mohammad Hossein Ebrahimi<sup>9</sup> and Maryam Ghaljahi<sup>10</sup>

## Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship among noise exposure, sensitivity, and noise annoyance with job satisfaction and job stress among the workers of a textile industry. In this study, Weinstein's Noise Sensitivity Scale, Noise Annoyance Questionnaire (recommended based on ISO 15666-2003), Health and Safety Executive (HSE) Job Stress Questionnaire, and Job Satisfaction Scale were used to determine the degree of noise sensitivity, noise annoyance, occupational stress, and job satisfaction, respectively. The results showed that there was a significant difference in the mean of job satisfaction, job stress, noise sensitivity, and noise annoyance between case and control groups. The results of multivariate analysis of covariance showed that noise exposure, noise sensitivity, and noise annoyance can justify 0.09, 0.19, and 0.06 of the variance of job stress, respectively. These variables also could justify 0.09, 0.12, and 0.05 of the variance of job satisfaction, respectively. Noise sensitivity had the greatest effect on increasing the occupational stress and job satisfaction.

## Keywords

Noise exposure, noise annoyance, noise sensitivity, job stress, job satisfaction

## Introduction

Noise is an unwanted sound which introduces health and safety risks to workers occupied in various workplaces. There is consistent evidence that exposure to noise produces a wide range of physiological and psychological long-term effects<sup>1</sup> on the human being such as hearing loss,<sup>2</sup> cardiovascular diseases,<sup>3,4</sup> decrease in job satisfaction and psychological well-being,<sup>5,6</sup> and difficulties in communication,<sup>7–10</sup> annoyance, and sleep disorder.<sup>11</sup> There is evidence that noise exposure may increase employees' error rates and occupational accident, and reduce productivity.<sup>12</sup> The noise effects are mediated by individual feature such as sensitivity and psychological variable like noise annoyance.<sup>13–15</sup> Noise sensitivity is the main factor that severely predicts noise annoyance, and it can mediate the effects of noise on psychological aspects of health.<sup>16</sup> Noise sensitive people are more vulnerable against noise because they consider sound as a more dangerous factor compared with others, and they have more intense emotional responses to sound and, consequently, greater difficulty habituating.<sup>17</sup> Annoyance, as an outcome of noise exposure, has a strong

<sup>1</sup>Research Center for Environmental Determinants of Health (RCEDH), Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences, Kermanshah, Iran

<sup>2</sup>Students' Scientific Research Center, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

<sup>3</sup>School of Health, Shahrekord University of Medical Sciences, Shahrekord, Iran

<sup>4</sup>Department of Occupational Health Engineering, School of Public Health, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

<sup>5</sup>Department of Audiology, School of Rehabilitation, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

<sup>6</sup>Student Research Committee, School of Public Health and Safety, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

<sup>7</sup>Department of Occupational Health Engineering, School of Public Health, Iranshahr University of Medical Sciences, Iranshahr, Iran

<sup>8</sup>Health in Emergency and Disaster Research Center, University of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Sciences, Tehran, Iran

<sup>9</sup>Environmental and Occupational Health Research Center, Shahroud University of Medical Sciences, Shahroud, Iran

<sup>10</sup>Department of Occupational Health Engineering, School of Public Health, Zabol University of Medical Sciences, Zabol, Iran

### Corresponding author:

Maryam Ghaljahi, Department of Occupational Health Engineering, School of Public Health, Zabol University of Medical Sciences, Zabol, 454687964 Iran.

Email: Occmgh@gmail.com

negative relationship with psychological health and well-being.<sup>18</sup> Job stress is defined as “the harmful physical and emotional responses that occur when the requirements of the job do not match the capabilities, resources, or needs of the worker.”<sup>19</sup> Many occupational factors may cause work-related stress, but among these factors, exposure to high and low levels of noise has a particular importance.<sup>20</sup> Job stress is related to number of numerous health problems such as cancer, cardiovascular diseases, depression, anxiety, and decreased job satisfaction.<sup>21</sup> Job satisfaction is strongly influenced by noise exposure.<sup>22</sup> Based on the above-mentioned data, it is expected that noise can affect work-related stress and job satisfaction by mediating noise sensitivity and annoyance. Reduced work-related stress and job satisfaction decrease work performance and productivity. Regarding the importance of occupational stress and job satisfaction, identifying factors which negatively affect these indexes is an optimal action to reduce or eliminate effective factors. Therefore, in this study, the relationship among noise exposure, sensitivity, and noise annoyance with job satisfaction and job stress was studied.

## Methods

This case-control study was conducted to investigate the effect of noise exposure, sensitivity, and noise annoyance with job satisfaction and occupational stress on 77 (42.1%) textile workers as the control group and 106 (57.9%) as the case group. The criteria for determining the control and case groups were less noise exposure level and more permissible exposure limit for noise exposure (85 dB A-weighted for 8 hours), respectively. In this study, Weinstein's Noise Sensitivity Scale (WNSS), Noise Annoyance Questionnaire (recommended based on ISO 15666-2003), HSE Job Stress Questionnaire, and Job Satisfaction Scale were used to determine the degree of noise sensitivity, noise annoyance, occupational stress, and job satisfaction, respectively. These tools were distributed among workers, and volunteer participants returned the completed questionnaire. In this pilot study, people with a history of anti-depressant drug use, working condition, workers' health status, and non-working life were excluded.

### WNSS

This scale is used to determine the sensitivity of noise, which is one of the attitudinal factors in causing the disturbance caused by noise. It is a valid and reliable tool for measuring individual noise sensitivity.<sup>23,24</sup> The scale comprised 21 items presented on a six-point scale, ranging from (most often) “agree strongly” (0) to “disagree strongly” (5). The maximum total score is 105 and the higher score indicates a higher sensitivity to the noise. Based on the overall score, the subjects are divided into three groups: without sensitivity (scores less than 25

percentiles), moderate sensitivity (scores between 25 and 75 percentiles), and high sensitivity (scores more than 75 percentiles).

### Noise Annoyance Scale (recommended based on ISO 15666-2003)

This scale was distributed among participants to measuring perceived annoyance caused by workplace noise.<sup>25</sup> For this purpose, people were asked to mark their perceived annoyance induced from the noise of the workplace during the last 12 months on a 11-point scale, ranging from 0 (*no annoyance*) to 10 (*extremely annoyed*).

### Health & Safety Executive (HSE) management standards indicator tool

HSE Job Stress Questionnaire is a good tool and indicator for identifying job stressors.<sup>26</sup> The questionnaire consists of 35 questions of seven sub-scales: Demand, Control, Changes, Officials' Support, Colleagues' Support, Relationship, and Role. The scoring of this tool is based on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*always*), and its score ranges from 35 to 175. A higher score indicates a higher job stress. Validity and reliability of the Persian version of this questionnaire have been confirmed by Azadmarzabadi and Gholami (Cronbach's alpha coefficient=0.78).<sup>27</sup>

### Job Satisfaction Scale

To determine job satisfaction, a 11-point scale was used. To this purpose, individuals were asked to mark their subjective response to their job satisfaction from 0 to 10. Higher score indicates higher job satisfaction.<sup>28</sup> In this scale, numbers 0, 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10 were without satisfaction, low satisfaction, moderate satisfaction, high satisfaction, and extreme satisfaction, respectively.<sup>29</sup>

### Noise measurement procedure

To determine the noise exposure level at workplaces, the procedure mentioned in ISO 9612 was followed.<sup>25</sup> First, all work stations were determined for each person. Then, in all locations, the equivalent sound level in A-weighting network was measured for 15 min as a representative of the exposure level at that location (given that at any location, the oscillation was less than 5 dB, 15 minute-measurement was sufficient). Furthermore, according to the time of presence at each station, as well as the equivalent sound level at that station, 8-h equivalent continuous A-weighted sound pressure level (LAeq,8h) was calculated according to the formula in standard ISO 9612. In this study, noise exposure was measured using a calibrated sound-level meter of the TES-1358.

**Table 1.** Descriptive information of the understudy variables.

Descriptive information	N	Minimum	Maximum	M	SD
Age	183	28.00	63.00	39.7596	6.40
Experience		6.00	31.00	14.8087	5.85
Noise annoyance		1.00	10.00	6.7322	2.42
Noise exposure		58.90	100.00	85.8109	11.81
Noise sensitivity		34.00	100.00	70.3770	13.34
Role		5.00	25.00	21.3607	3.10
Relationship		4.00	20.00	15.5301	3.67
Officials' support		5.00	28.00	17.8470	4.39
Colleagues' support		4.00	20.00	14.6776	3.26
Control		6.00	28.00	16.7158	4.45
Demand		13.00	36.00	23.6940	4.90
Changes		3.00	15.00	10.3716	2.98
Total job stress		55.00	160.00	120.2514	16.05
Job satisfaction		1.00	10.00	6.10	1.9

### Statistical analysis

The data were analyzed using SPSS 20. To compare the mean of the studied variables in the case and control groups, independent t-test was applied. Also, to test for the significant differences of the mean of job stress and job satisfaction among classified variables, the paired t-test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used with two and three categories, respectively.

Finally, regarding the results of the above-mentioned tests, the variables which have a significant relationship with dependent variables were entered in a model of multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA). In MANCOVA, statistical differences of independent categorized variables with the various continuous dependent variables are evaluated, while the impacts of the number of variables (covariates) are controlled. In this model, the impact of covariates on the association between the dependent and the independent variables is removed.

### Results

In 2017, this descriptive-analytical study was carried out on 183 workers in a textile industry. In the study, 11.5% (n=21) of the participants were single and 88.5% (n=162) were married. Also, 20.2% (n=37) of participants were hired as administrative staff, 21.9% (n=40) as technical, 25.7% (n=47) as spinning workers, and 32.2% (n=59) as weaving workers. Also, 65% (n=119) had used hearing protection equipment and 35% (n=64) did not use that. Based on the noise exposure results, 42.1% (n=77) of subjects were in the control group and 57.9% (n=106) in the case group. Also, 73.8% (n=135) of the participants were able to see the sources of sound, and 26.2% (n=48) remaining subjects did not observe the sources of sound. Other descriptive information is shown in Table 1.

The results of the independent t-test indicated that there was a significant difference in the mean of job satisfaction, job stress, changes, demand, support, role, noise sensitivity, work experience, and visibility of noise source between case and control groups. However, there was no significant difference among age, relationship, support, control, hearing protective equipment, and marital status between case and control groups. Further details are given in Table 2.

One-way ANOVA was used to determine the difference between the mean of job satisfaction and occupational stress in job groups, noise annoyance, noise sensitivity, age, and work experience (Table 3). The results showed that there was a significant difference between the mean of occupational stress among the noise exposure groups, annoyance, sensitivity, age, type of occupation, and work experience. The mean of occupational stress was higher in the case group, high sensitive people, extremely annoyed people, people with a higher age group, and people with work experience less than 10 years. Other results are evident in Table 3. According to Table 3, there was a significant difference between the average job satisfaction among all classified variables other than marital status. There was more average job satisfaction among age groups more than 45 years, people with work experience more than 20 years, people with annoyance less than 6 years, control group, people without sensitivity to noise, people without hearing protective devices, participants who could not see sources of noise, and technical workers.

The next step was to check the simultaneous effects of independent variables such as noise exposure, noise sensitivity, and noise annoyance on job stress and job satisfaction; while the effect of other variables is justified, MANCOVA was used. In general, this model was able to justify 41% and 45% of variances of job stress and job satisfaction, respectively. According to the eta coefficients obtained from this test, it can be stated that noise exposure, noise sensitivity, and noise annoyance can justify 0.09%,

**Table 2.** Differences of quantitative understudy variables between case and control groups.

Variables	Control, n = 77		Case, n = 106		p value
	M ± SD		M ± SD		
Age	39.3 ± 6.7		40.1 ± 6.2		0.30
Experience	15.2 ± 6.2		14.5 ± 5.6		0.051
Noise annoyance	6.2 ± 2.6		7.1 ± 2.2		0.014 <sup>*b</sup>
Noise sensitivity	67.6 ± 11.6		72.3 ± 14.2		0.01 <sup>*</sup>
Role	20.7 ± 4.9		21.8 ± 3.2		0.001 <sup>**b</sup>
Relationship	15.1 ± 4.1		15.8 ± 3.4		0.35
Officials' support	16.7 ± 4.5		18.6 ± 4.1		0.83
Colleagues' support	13.5 ± 3.7		15.5 ± 2.6		0.004 <sup>**b</sup>
Control	15.4 ± 4.7		17.6 ± 4.5		0.34
Demand	22.9 ± 5.3		24.2 ± 4.5		0.05 <sup>*b</sup>
Changes	9.5 ± 3.2		10.0 ± 2.7		0.05 <sup>*b</sup>
Job stress	113.9 ± 18.8		124.6 ± 12.1		0.001 <sup>**b</sup>
Job satisfaction	6.7 ± 2.3		5.6 ± 1.4		0.001 <sup>**b</sup>
Visibility of the noise source	Yes	n = 37	n = 98		0.001 <sup>**a</sup>
	No	n = 38	n = 10		
Hearing protective devices	Yes	n = 49	n = 70		0.45 <sup>a</sup>
	No	n = 26	n = 38		
Marital status	Married	n = 8	n = 13		0.44 <sup>a</sup>
	Single	n = 67	n = 95		

<sup>a</sup>Chi-square test.

<sup>b</sup>Independent t-test.

\*Significant at the 0.05 level; \*\*significant at the 0.01 level.

0.19%, and 0.06% of changes in the variance of job stress, respectively. Accordingly, it can be admitted that among the above-mentioned variables, the noise sensitivity has the greatest effect on increasing the occupational stress. However, these variables justify changes in job satisfaction variance of 0.09%, 0.12%, and 0.05%, respectively, and the most effect was related to noise sensitivity. According to the coefficients of  $\eta_p^2$  in relation to the combined effect of independent variables on stress and job satisfaction, it is evident that the variables of job stress ( $\eta_p^2 = 0.21$ ) are affected more than job satisfaction ( $\eta_p^2 = 0.20$ ) (Table 4).

## Discussion

Existing evidence in this study showed that occupational noise exposure, noise annoyance, and noise sensitivity can increase job stress and decrease job satisfaction. Among these factors, noise sensitivity has the greatest impact on job stress and job satisfaction (based on  $\eta_p^2$  shown in Table 4). This result is consistent with the study of Nordin et al., which revealed that noise sensitivity is related to perceived stress.<sup>30</sup> Noise sensitivity is a personal feature that increases individual vulnerability against noise and is relatively affected by noise,<sup>31</sup> so it can be said that noise exposure can affect job stress and job satisfaction through noise sensitivity indirectly. Previous studies showed that noise sensitive people have a decreased threshold for psychological stress response;<sup>32, 33</sup> thus, they perceive noise greater and

this can lead to the psychological and physiological health problems such as stress. In the Stansfeld et al. study, noise sensitivity has been related to poorer health-related quality of life and depressive symptoms, which in turn are related to stress and satisfaction.<sup>15, 34</sup> It has been hypothesized that noise sensitivity can be an indicator for vulnerability to sounds; thus, sensitive individuals might be more susceptible to disease, anxiety and depression, neuroticism, and posttraumatic stress disorder while exposed to noise.<sup>35–38</sup> In a structural equation model, Fyhri and Klæboe<sup>39</sup> revealed that association between noise sensitivity and somatic sign was more potent than the association between noise annoyance and symptoms. Based on the above-mentioned results and this study, it can be confirmed that noise sensitivity has an important role for causing stress and dissatisfaction among people exposed to noise.

The results of this study indicated that noise have a positive significant effect on job stress and an inverse effect on job satisfaction. This result was observed in the previous studies.<sup>9, 20, 40</sup> Evans and Johnson stated that long-lasting exposure to low-level noise may also have adverse effects on workplace satisfaction and job stress.<sup>41</sup> Mursali et al. revealed that prevalence of job stress in high- and low-noise conditions was 55% and 24.5%, respectively. In our study, workers who work in high-noise sections experienced 10 mean scores of job stress compared with workers in quieter sections. It seems that effect of noise on job stress is greater in the Mursali et al. study, which may be

**Table 3.** Comparison of the mean of job stress and job satisfaction by the categorized variables.

	Group	n	Job stress	p value	Job satisfaction	p value
			M ± SD		M ± SD	
Age	>35	55	112.4 ± 15.0	0.001**a	6.9 ± 1.9	0.005**a
	35–45	83	123.1 ± 12.2		5.7 ± 1.6	
	<45	45	124.6 ± 19.9		5.7 ± 2.3	
Experience	>10	60	123 ± 15.3	0.004**a	5.8 ± 2	0.004**a
	10–20	80	121.9 ± 14.5		5.8 ± 1.8	
	<20	43	113.3 ± 17.9		6.9 ± 2	
Noise annoyance	>6	83	113.9 ± 17.1	0.001**a	6.8 ± 2	0.001**a
	6–8	58	123.2 ± 11.9		5.7 ± 1.6	
	<8	42	128.6 ± 13.8		5.1 ± 1.5	
Noise exposure	Control	77	114.3 ± 17.7	0.001**	5.6 ± 1.56	0.001**b
	Case	106	124.5 ± 12.1		0.7 ± 2.3	
Noise sensitivity	>63 or (percentile 25)	49	116.0 ± 17.9	0.001**a	6.7 ± 2.0	0.001**a
	63–79 or (percentiles 25–75)	92	117.5 ± 14.4		6.2 ± 1.9	
	<79 or (percentile 75)	42	131.1 ± 12.1		5.0 ± 1.6	
Visibility of the noise source	Yes	135	125.8 ± 12.1	0.36	4.9 ± 1.4	0.003**b
	No	48	104.5 ± 15.4		7.8 ± 2.1	
Hearing protective devices	Yes	64	132.4 ± 14.1	0.43	4.9 ± 1.5	0.01**b
	No	119	113.7 ± 12.9		6.7 ± 1.8	
Type of job	Official staff	37	117.2 ± 20.3	0.001**a	6.2 ± 2.2	0.001**a
	Technician	40	112.3 ± 17.6		7.0 ± 2.4	
	Spinning staff	47	125.8 ± 12.3		5.4 ± 5.4	
	Weaver staff	59	123.1 ± 11.8		5.8 ± 5.8	
Marital status	Single	21	124.3 ± 14.7	0.84	5.6 ± 1.6	0.29
	Married	162	119.7 ± 16.1		6.0 ± 2	

<sup>a</sup>One-way analysis of variance.

<sup>b</sup>Independent t-test.

\*Significant at the 0.05 level; \*\*significant at the 0.01 level.

**Table 4.** Tests of between-subject effects to assess the effect of independent variables on dependent variables.

Source	Dependent variable	Type III sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p value	$\eta_p^2$
Corrected model	Job satisfaction	283.3 <sup>a</sup>	25	11.3	4.4	0.001*	0.41
	Job stress	21,065.1 <sup>b</sup>	25	842.6	5.1	0.001*	0.45
Intercept	Job satisfaction	3202.4	1	3202.4	1240.7	0.001*	0.89
	Job stress	1,396,128.1	1	1,396,128.1	8517.2	0.001*	0.98
Noise sensitivity	Job satisfaction	56.3	2	28.1	10.9	0.001*	0.12
	Job stress	6186.1	2	3093.1	18.9	0.001*	0.19
Noise exposure	Job satisfaction	39.9	2	19.9	7.7	0.001*	0.09
	Job stress	2597.1	2	1298.5	7.9	0.001*	0.09
Noise annoyance	Job satisfaction	21.0	2	10.9	4.2	0.016*	0.05
	Job stress	1830.8	2	915.4	5.6	0.005*	0.06
Annoyance × sensitivity × noise exposure	Job satisfaction	102.5	19	5.4	2.1	0.007*	0.20
	Job stress	6753.1	19	355.4	2.2	0.005*	0.21
Error	Job satisfaction	405.2	157	2.6			
	Job stress	25,735.3	157	163.9			
Total	Job satisfaction	7385.0	183				
	Job stress	2,693,052.0	183				
Corrected total	Job satisfaction	688.5	182				
	Job stress	46,800.4	182				

df: degrees of freedom.

<sup>a</sup>R<sup>2</sup> = 0.411 (Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> = 0.318).

<sup>b</sup>R<sup>2</sup> = 0.450 (Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> = 0.363).

\*Significant at the 0.05 level.

due to differences in understudy population and research design.

The results of Pyoung et al. which obtained from office staff showed that there is no significant relationship between noise exposure and job satisfaction, but in this study, it is obvious that workers with high exposure to the noise had lower job satisfaction compared with workers with low exposure level. This may be due to differences in perceived workload in different conditions because a physical hardwork can affect job satisfaction in textile workers. In the another study by Sundstorm et al.,<sup>42</sup> it was clear that noise exposure had an inverse relationship with job satisfaction. Kim et al.<sup>43</sup> showed that among various factors affecting job satisfaction, workplace noise had third rank. In the Kim et al. study, low-noise level decreased job satisfaction, so it is expected that high level of noise exposure in textile workers can disturb job satisfaction. In the studies by Melamed et al.<sup>44</sup> and Raffaello and Maass,<sup>7</sup> the results indicated that high-level noise exposure can adversely influence job satisfaction in occupational workers. There is no precise mechanism for interaction between noise exposure and job satisfaction. It may be due to psychophysiological effects of noise such as noise annoyance. Overly, workers who work in a noisy workplace with high level of noise exposure are identified as stressed and dissatisfied due to social isolation which resulted from communication problems with their coworkers.

The results of this study indicated that noise annoyance has a positive significant effect on job stress and an inverse effect on job satisfaction. Yoon et al.<sup>45</sup> studied occupational noise annoyance relationship with depressive symptoms and suicidal ideation. They concluded that occupational noise annoyance can adversely impact psychological symptoms and mental health.<sup>45,46</sup> The direction of causality is not determined; however, it is clear that workers who have mental problem can perceive more annoyance compared with healthy workers, as well as noise annoyance can intensify the psychological problem. Fields et al.<sup>47</sup> stated that the noise level and individual perception of sound level are key elements that can impact human health. Noise annoyance is related to personal perception of noise exposure and, according to Fields et al., can affect stress and satisfaction that are part of human mental health.

According to the combined effect of independent variables on stress and job satisfaction, it is clear that job stress is affected more than job satisfaction. This shows that job stress is more vulnerable to noise exposure and its personal perception and subjective effects. There are a number of limitations in this study worth mentioning, and it is suggested that they will be considered in future studies. First, this study is confined to only one sitting; thus, caution should be taken when interpreting and generalizing the findings to other contexts. Second, in addition to the studied variables, job stress and job satisfaction are also affected by other variables such as working conditions,

workers' health status, and non-working life, which are beyond the scope of this study. Third, the interaction between job stress and job satisfaction is ignored.

Results of this study support the idea that occupational noise exposure annoyance and sensitivity can adversely affect job stress and job satisfaction of workers. These factors have a multidimensional interaction with occupational stress and satisfaction of workers.


### Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### ORCID iDs

Milad Abbasi  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0787-1533>

Rohollah Fallah Madvari  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3112-6733>

### References

1. Abbasi M, Monazzam MR, Akbarzadeh A, et al. Impact of wind turbine sound on general health, sleep disturbance and annoyance of workers: a pilot-study in Manjil wind farm, Iran. *J Environ Health Sci* 2015; 13(1): 71.
2. Thepaksorn P, Koizumi A, Harada K, et al. Occupational noise exposure and hearing defects among sawmill workers in the south of Thailand. *Int J Occup Saf Ergo* 2018; 2018: 1–9.
3. Stokholm ZA, Hansen ÅM, Grynderup MB, et al. Recent and long-term occupational noise exposure and salivary cortisol level. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* 2014; 39: 21–32.
4. Kerns E, Masterson EA, Themann CL, et al. Cardiovascular conditions, hearing difficulty, and occupational noise exposure within US industries and occupations. *Am J Ind Med* 2018; 61: 477–491.
5. Schmidt FP, Basner M, Kröger G, et al. Effect of night-time aircraft noise exposure on endothelial function and stress hormone release in healthy adults. *Eur Heart J* 2013; 34(45): 3508–3514.
6. Abbasi M, Monazzam MR, Ebrahimi MH, et al. Assessment of noise effects of wind turbine on the general health of staff at wind farm of Manjil, Iran. *J Low Freq Noise Vib* 2016; 35(1): 91–98.
7. Raffaello M and Maass A. Chronic exposure to noise in industry: the effects on satisfaction, stress symptoms, and company attachment. *Environ Behav* 2002; 34(5): 651–671.
8. Wallenius MA. The interaction of noise stress and personal project stress on subjective health. *J Environ Psychol* 2004; 24(2): 167–177.
9. Leather P, Beale D and Sullivan L. Noise, psychosocial stress and their interaction in the workplace. *J Environ Psychol* 2003; 23(2): 213–222.

10. Fouladi DB, Nassiri P, Monazzam EM, et al. Industrial noise exposure and salivary cortisol in blue collar industrial workers. *Noise Health* 2012; 14(59): 184.
11. Abbasi M, Monazzam MR, Zakerian S, et al. Effect of wind turbine noise on workers' sleep disorder: a case study of Manjil wind farm in northern Iran. *Fluct Noise Lett* 2015; 14(2): 1550020.
12. Seixas NS, Neitzel R, Stover B, et al. 10-year prospective study of noise exposure and hearing damage among construction workers. *Occup Environ Med* 2012; 69: 643–650.
13. Ellermeier W, Eigenstetter M and Zimmer K. Psychoacoustic correlates of individual noise sensitivity. *J Acoust Soc Am* 2001; 109(4): 1464–1473.
14. Babisch W, Ising H and Gallacher J. Health status as a potential effect modifier of the relation between noise annoyance and incidence of ischaemic heart disease. *Occup Environ Med* 2003; 60(10): 739–745.
15. Shepherd D, Welch D, Dirks KN, et al. Exploring the relationship between noise sensitivity, annoyance and health-related quality of life in a sample of adults exposed to environmental noise. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2010; 7(10): 3579–3594.
16. Paunović K, Jakovljević B and Belojević G. Predictors of noise annoyance in noisy and quiet urban streets. *Sci Total Environ* 2009; 407(12): 3707–3711.
17. Stansfeld SA. Noise, noise sensitivity and psychiatric disorder: epidemiological and psychophysiological studies. *Psychol Med Monogr Suppl* 1992; 22: 1–44.
18. Dratva J, Zemp E, Dietrich DF, et al. Impact of road traffic noise annoyance on health-related quality of life: results from a population-based study. *Qual Life Res* 2010; 19(1): 37–46.
19. Smith A. Perceptions of stress at work. *Hum Resour Manag J* 2001; 11(4): 74–86.
20. Mursali A, Basuki E and Dharmono S. Relationship between noise and job stress at a private thread spinning company. *Univ Med* 2016; 28(1): 8–16.
21. Murphy LR. Stress management in work settings: a critical review of the health effects. *Am J Health Promot* 1996; 11(2): 112–135.
22. Lee PJ, Lee BK, Jeon JY, et al. Impact of noise on self-rated job satisfaction and health in open-plan offices: a structural equation modelling approach. *Ergonomics* 2016; 59(2): 222–234.
23. Alimohammadi I, Nassiri P, Azkhash M, et al. Reliability and validity of the Persian translation of the Weinstein Noise Sensitivity Scale. *Psychol Res* 2006; 9(1–2): 74–87.
24. Ekehammar B and Dornic S. Weinstein's Noise Sensitivity Scale: reliability and construct validity. *Percept Mot Skills* 1990; 70(1): 129–130.
25. ISO 9612:2009. Acoustics—Determination of occupational noise exposure—Engineering method.
26. Cousins R, Mackay CJ, Clarke SD, et al. “Management standards” work-related stress in the UK: practical development. *Work Stress* 2004; 18(2): 113–136.
27. Azadmarzabadi EM and Gholami FM. Reliability and validity assessment for the HSE Job Stress Questionnaire, 2011, [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/291448932\\_Reliability\\_and\\_validity\\_assessment\\_for\\_the\\_HSE\\_Job\\_Stress\\_Questionnaire](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/291448932_Reliability_and_validity_assessment_for_the_HSE_Job_Stress_Questionnaire)
28. Locke EA. What is job satisfaction? *Organ Behav Hum Perf* 1969; 4(4): 309–336.
29. Wanous JP, Reichers AE and Hudy MJ. Overall job satisfaction: how good are single-item measures? *J Appl Psychol* 1997; 82(2): 247.
30. Nordin S, Ljungberg JK, Claeson A-S, et al. Stress and odor sensitivity in persons with noise sensitivity. *Noise Health* 2013; 15(64): 173.
31. Kishikawa H, Matsui T, Uchiyama I, et al. Noise sensitivity and subjective health: questionnaire study conducted along trunk roads in Kusatsu, Japan. *Noise Health* 2009; 11(43): 111–117.
32. Wayne KP, Bengtsson J, Rylander R, et al. Low frequency noise enhances cortisol among noise sensitive subjects during work performance. *Life Sci* 2002; 70(7): 745–758.
33. Ljungberg JK and Neely G. Stress, subjective experience and cognitive performance during exposure to noise and vibration. *J Environ Psychol* 2007; 27(1): 44–54.
34. Stansfeld S and Shipley M. Noise sensitivity and future risk of illness and mortality. *Sci Total Environ* 2015; 520: 114–119.
35. Zijlema W, Morley D, Stolk R, et al. Noise and somatic symptoms: a role for personality traits? *Int J Hyg Envir Heal* 2015; 218(6): 543–549.
36. Hill EM, Billington R and Krägeloh C. Noise sensitivity and diminished health: testing moderators and mediators of the relationship. *Noise Health* 2014; 16(68): 47.
37. Baguley DM. Hyperacusis. *J Roy Soc Med* 2003; 96(12): 582–585.
38. Zimmer K and Ellermeier W. Psychometric properties of four measures of noise sensitivity: a comparison. *J Environ Psychol* 1999; 19(3): 295–302.
39. Fyhri A and Klæboe R. Road traffic noise, sensitivity, annoyance and self-reported health: a structural equation model exercise. *Environ Int* 2009; 35(1): 91–97.
40. Mino Y, Shigemi J, Tsuda T, et al. Perceived job stress and mental health in precision machine workers of Japan: a 2 year cohort study. *Occup Environ Med* 1999; 56(1): 41–45.
41. Evans GW and Johnson D. Stress and open-office noise. *J Appl Psychol* 2000; 85(5): 779.
42. Sundstrom E, Town JP, Rice RW, et al. Office noise, satisfaction, and performance. *Environ Behav* 1994; 26(2): 195–222.
43. Kim J and De Dear R. Workspace satisfaction: the privacy-communication trade-off in open-plan offices. *J Environ Psychol* 2013; 36: 18–26.
44. Melamed S, Fried Y and Froom P. The interactive effect of chronic exposure to noise and job complexity on changes in blood pressure and job satisfaction: a longitudinal study of industrial employees. *J Occup Health Psych* 2001; 6(3): 182.
45. Yoon JH. Occupational noise annoyance linked to depressive symptoms and suicidal ideation: a result from nationwide survey of Korea. *PLoS ONE* 2014; 9(8): e105321.
46. Stansfeld S, Haines M, Burr M, et al. A review of environmental noise and mental health. *Noise Health* 2000; 2(8): 1–8.
47. Fields J, De Jong R, Gjestland T, et al. Standardized general-purpose noise reaction questions for community noise surveys: research and a recommendation. *J Sound Vib* 2001; 242(4): 641–679.