

The Influence of Organizational Climate on Employee Psychological Health and Performance: Implications for HR

¹Dr. Preeti Sharma

Professor (I/C Director)

Trinity Institute of Management and Research, Pune, India
profpreetisharma@gmail.com

²Dr. Kirti Dang Longani

Professor & Associate Director

Akemi Business School, Pune, India,
drkirtidang15@gmail.com

Abstract:

This study aims to investigate how organisational atmosphere impacts workers' psychological health and productivity, paying special emphasis to how this may impact HR practices. An organization's overall attitudes, values, and customs are known as its organisational climate, and they have a significant impact on how its personnel perceive the world, behave, and generally feel about themselves. This research investigates how elements of the organisational environment, such as leadership styles, communication patterns, reward systems, and job demands, affect employee psychological health and performance results. It does this by drawing on psychological theories and HR literature. Primary data was gathered through interviews and Google Forms from a wide range of respondents using a survey method. Key attitudes and views of the organisational environment were revealed through data analysis using the percentage technique, regression analysis, ANOVA, and t-tests. Open-ended, multiple-choice, and Likert scale questions are used.

The paper provides insights into practical HR techniques for fostering a positive organisational climate that promotes employee well-being and improves performance by synthesising empirical facts and theoretical frameworks. These ramifications include the significance of employee recognition initiatives, leadership development, communication tactics, and job design interventions meant to foster a positive and encouraging work environment. In the end, this research advances our knowledge of the intricate relationships that exist between performance, psychological well-being, and organisational climate. It also offers HR practitioners practical advice on how to best support both employee and organisational success.

Keywords : Organizational climate, Employee well-being, Performance, Psychological health, HR implications

Introduction:

The psychological environment that exists at a workplace, or organisational climate, is becoming more and more acknowledged for its significant influence on worker performance and well-being. It includes work requirements, reward systems, communication conventions, leadership philosophies, and an organization's general culture. Together, these components mould workers' attitudes, behaviours, and perceptions, which in turn affects their psychological well-being and productivity on the workplace. In regulating these dynamics, human resources (HR) professionals are essential because their policies and practices have the power to either strengthen the positive parts of the organisational climate or lessen the bad ones, creating a conducive work environment.

In addition to fair and equal incentive structures, supportive leadership that prioritises openness and justice in communication is a hallmark of a pleasant work environment. These kinds of workplaces foster psychological health, job satisfaction, and employee engagement. On the other hand, an environment that is poisonous and marked by fear-mongering, poor communication techniques, authoritarian leadership, and unfair rewards can make workers feel more stressed out and less motivated, which can lower their output. HR practitioners can improve human and organisational outcomes by implementing methods that foster a healthy organisational climate by acknowledging these dynamics.

It is essential for HR professionals and organisational leaders to comprehend the complex relationship that exists between employee well-being and organisational climate. HR practitioners can customise interventions to maximise organisational outcomes by utilising knowledge from empirical research and psychological theories. This entails creating an environment at work where staff members feel appreciated, supported, and free to give their best job. In the end, good organisational climate management contributes to long-term profitability and organisational effectiveness in a cutthroat business environment in addition to improving employee performance and happiness.

Literature review:

A positive organisational climate that supports employee engagement, satisfaction, and performance is linked to transformational leadership, which is characterised by inspiring motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualised consideration, and idealised influence (Avolio & Bass, 1994). Conversely, unfavourable organisational climates characterised by poor morale, elevated stress levels, and diminished job satisfaction are associated with autocratic or laissez-faire leadership styles (Bass, 1985). Employee psychological well-being and performance are improved when there are open and transparent communication channels because they foster trust, teamwork, and a sense of belonging (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

Employee job satisfaction, engagement, and commitment are higher in companies whose compensation systems are seen as fair and equitable (Colquitt et al., 2001). Unfair compensation policies, including partiality, capricious judgement, and underappreciation, exacerbate a hostile work environment (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Personality traits, coping strategies, and cognitive styles are examples of individual differences that modify the relationship between employee outcomes and organisational climate. (Goleman, 1995). Likewise, workers possessing robust resilience abilities could demonstrate increased flexibility and coping mechanisms when confronted with organisational stressors, mitigating the adverse effects on their overall welfare (Luthar et al., 2000). Low job control and high job demands raise the possibility of job strain, which can result in negative health effects such stress, anxiety, and depression (Karasek, 1979).

Companies that provide workers more autonomy, flexibility, and decision-making power foster an environment that encourages motivation, engagement, and well-being among staff members (Parker & Ohly, 2008). Positive correlations exist between the organization's worry for employees' well-being and appreciation of their efforts and job satisfaction and organisational commitment and psychological well-being (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Similarly, the detrimental effects of job pressures on employee mental health and performance are lessened by social support from coworkers, such as emotional support, practical aid, and informational advice (Cohen & Wills, 1985).

Companies that prioritise work-life balance foster a pleasant organisational climate by encouraging flexibility, providing family-friendly policies, and attending to the personal needs of their employees (Kossek & Ozeki, 1999). On the other hand, companies with inflexible work schedules, lengthy workweeks, and little assistance for personal obligations raise employee turnover rates, stress levels, and job satisfaction (Hill et al., 2001).

Research Gaps:

Cultural differences affect employees work environment and affects their performance and psychological well-being. HR methods in a variety of international contexts can benefit from an understanding of cultural differences in organisational climate. To deliver a more nuanced considerate of the mechanisms underlying the connection between organisational climate and employee well-being and performance, future research could examine elements like leadership style, organisational structure, job design, and individual differences in personality or coping strategies.

Research Methodology:

The present investigation employs a descriptive research methodology. Pune-based respondents were surveyed as part of the study project in order to collect primary data. Respondent groups for the study were chosen using a simple sampling procedure. This strategy made sure that respondents from a variety of backgrounds in Pune were represented. A quick survey was created to collect crucial first-hand information. Respondents received the questionnaire through a Google Form. The Chi Test was used to examine the primary data gathered from the survey. The researchers were able to determine the percentage of respondents who agreed with particular attitudes or views thanks to this statistical technique.

Secondary data sources were employed to augment the original data collection in order to enhance the research outcomes. Information gathered from books, research papers, articles, and publications in both domestic and foreign journals provided valuable context and insights into the topic under investigation.

Geographic Coverage:

It is noticeable that the study's geographic scope is restricted to Pune. Although this approach makes it possible to examine organisational environment in-depth within a particular region, results might not be entirely transferable to other places. In order to do a comparison analysis, future research may think about broadening the scope to include a larger geographic area.

Objectives:

To examine the relationship between organizational staff perception and employee psychological wellbeing indicators.
To investigate how different dimensions of organizational climate impact employee performance metrics.

To identify specific organizational climate factors that contribute most significantly to positive or negative outcomes in terms of employee psychological health and performance.

To assess the mediating role of psychological mechanisms in the relationship between organizational climate and employee outcomes.

Research Hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1:

H0: There is no significant relationship between the organizational staff perceptions and job satisfaction.

H1: There is a significant relationship between the organizational staff perceptions and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2:

H0: There is no significant effect of employee psychological health on job performance metrics.

H1: Employee psychological health significantly affects job performance metrics.

Hypothesis 3:

H0: There is no significant correlation between employee performance metrics and organizational outcomes such as productivity and turnover rates.

H1: There is a significant correlation between employee performance metrics and organizational outcomes such as productivity and turnover rates.

Hypothesis 4:

H0: The psychological mechanisms do not significantly influence how organizational climate impacts employee performance.

H1: The psychological mechanisms significantly influence how organizational climate impacts employee performance.

Analysis:

Table 1

						95% Confidence Interval	
	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	Lower	Upper
Age	18-25	21	165	0.127	< .001	0.08054	0.1879
	26-35	60	165	0.364	< .001	0.29027	0.4420
	36-45	72	165	0.436	0.119	0.35943	0.5156
	46-55	9	165	0.055	< .001	0.02524	0.1010
	56 and above	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
Gender	Female	51	165	0.309	< .001	0.23957	0.3856
	Male	114	165	0.691	< .001	0.61438	0.7604
Years of Experience	1-3 years	39	165	0.236	< .001	0.17380	0.3086
	4-6 years	21	165	0.127	< .001	0.08054	0.1879
	7-10 years	33	165	0.200	< .001	0.14185	0.2692
	Less than 1 year	12	165	0.073	< .001	0.03814	0.1236
	More than 10 years	60	165	0.364	< .001	0.29027	0.4420

Interpretation:

In terms of age groups, respondents aged 18-25 years (12.7%), 26-35 years (36.4%), 46-55 years (5.5%), and 56 years and above (1.8%) show significant deviations from the hypothesized proportion, with p-values less than 0.001. However, the 36-45 years age group, with a proportion of 43.6%, as indicated by a p-value of 0.119.

Regarding gender, both female (30.9%) and male (69.1%) respondents, with p-values less than 0.001. This suggests that males are overrepresented in the sample.

In terms of years of experience, Respondents with 1-3 years (23.6%), 4-6 years (12.7%), 7-10 years (20%), less than 1 year (7.3%), and more than 10 years (36.4%) of experience all show p-values less than 0.001, This comprehensive analysis reveals varied distributions in age, gender, and experience levels among the survey respondents, highlighting the diverse composition of the sample.

Table 2

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Leadership Style [The leadership in my organization is supportive.]	Agree	66	165	0.400	0.012	0.32464	0.4790
	Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
	Neutral	18	165	0.109	< .001	0.06595	0.1669
	Strongly Agree	78	165	0.473	0.534	0.39463	0.5518
Leadership Style [Leaders in my organization communicate effectively.]	Agree	63	165	0.382	0.003	0.30740	0.4606
	Disagree	6	165	0.036	< .001	0.01346	0.0775
	Neutral	27	165	0.164	< .001	0.11069	0.2291
	Strongly Agree	69	165	0.418	0.043	0.34198	0.4974
Leadership Style [Leaders provide clear direction and feedback.]	Agree	54	165	0.327	< .001	0.25635	0.4045
	Disagree	12	165	0.073	< .001	0.03814	0.1236
	Neutral	27	165	0.164	< .001	0.11069	0.2291
	Strongly Agree	72	165	0.436	0.119	0.35943	0.5156
Leadership Style [Leaders in my organization encourage participation and input from employees.]	Agree	54	165	0.327	< .001	0.25635	0.4045
	Disagree	12	165	0.073	< .001	0.03814	0.1236
	Neutral	33	165	0.200	< .001	0.14185	0.2692
	Strongly Agree	66	165	0.400	0.012	0.32464	0.4790

Interpretation:

Perceptions of leadership within the organization vary notably across different qualities. Respondents generally view the leadership as supportive (40% agree, 47.3% strongly agree), effective in communication (38.2% agree, 41.8% strongly agree), and providing clear direction and feedback (32.7% agree, 43.6% strongly agree). However, there are significant differences in perceptions regarding disagreement (ranging from 1.8% to 7.3%) and neutrality (ranging from 10.9% to 20%) across these aspects of leadership. These findings underscore diverse opinions about leadership qualities within the organization.

Table 3

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	P	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Communication Patterns [Information is shared openly within the organization.]	Agree	48	165	0.291	< .001	0.22292	0.3666
	Disagree	15	165	0.091	< .001	0.05178	0.1455
	Neutral	36	165	0.218	< .001	0.15773	0.2890
	Strongly Agree	63	165	0.382	0.003	0.30740	0.4606
	Strongly Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
Communication Patterns [I feel well-informed about significant changes within the organization]	Agree	57	165	0.345	< .001	0.27325	0.4233
	Disagree	9	165	0.055	< .001	0.02524	0.1010
	Neutral	24	165	0.145	< .001	0.09547	0.2087
	Strongly Agree	66	165	0.400	0.012	0.32464	0.4790
	Strongly Disagree	9	165	0.055	< .001	0.02524	0.1010
Communication Patterns [There is good communication between departments.]	Agree	45	165	0.273	< .001	0.20640	0.3474
	Disagree	12	165	0.073	< .001	0.03814	0.1236
	Neutral	33	165	0.200	< .001	0.14185	0.2692
	Strongly Agree	72	165	0.436	0.119	0.35943	0.5156
	Strongly Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
Communication Patterns [Communication in the organization is transparent]	Agree	39	165	0.236	< .001	0.17380	0.3086
	Disagree	21	165	0.127	< .001	0.08054	0.1879
	Neutral	39	165	0.236	< .001	0.17380	0.3086
	Strongly Agree	63	165	0.382	0.003	0.30740	0.4606
	Strongly Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522

Interpretation:

Perceptions of communication within the organization reveal varied viewpoints across different aspects. Regarding information sharing, 29.1% of respondents agree and 38.2% strongly agree, all with p-values below 0.001. Similarly, feelings of being well-informed about significant changes show 34.5% agreement and 40% strong agreement, all significant at p-values less than 0.001. Inter-departmental communication is seen positively by 27.3% who agree and 43.6% who strongly agree, contrasted with 7.3%, all significant at p-values less than 0.001. Finally, transparency in

communication registers agreement from 23.6% and strong agreement from 38.2%, again significant at p-values less than 0.001. These findings underscore diverse perceptions of communication effectiveness and transparency within the organization.

Table 4

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Reward Systems [My efforts are recognized by my superiors.]	Agree	66	165	0.400	0.012	0.32464	0.4790
	Disagree	15	165	0.091	< .001	0.05178	0.1455
	Neutral	30	165	0.182	< .001	0.12616	0.2493
	Strongly Agree	51	165	0.309	< .001	0.23957	0.3856
	Strongly Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
Reward Systems [The organization provides fair rewards for good performance.]	Agree	66	165	0.400	0.012	0.32464	0.4790
	Disagree	27	165	0.164	< .001	0.11069	0.2291
	Neutral	24	165	0.145	< .001	0.09547	0.2087
	Strongly Agree	45	165	0.273	< .001	0.20640	0.3474
	Strongly Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
Reward Systems [I feel valued for the work I do.]	Agree	72	165	0.436	0.119	0.35943	0.5156
	Disagree	21	165	0.127	< .001	0.08054	0.1879
	Neutral	21	165	0.127	< .001	0.08054	0.1879
	Strongly Agree	51	165	0.309	< .001	0.23957	0.3856
	Strongly Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
Reward Systems [Rewards and recognition are based on merit.]	Agree	54	165	0.327	< .001	0.25635	0.4045
	Disagree	18	165	0.109	< .001	0.06595	0.1669
	Neutral	33	165	0.200	< .001	0.14185	0.2692
	Strongly Agree	60	165	0.364	< .001	0.29027	0.4420
	Strongly Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522

Interpretation:

Perceptions of recognition and reward systems within the organization reveal significant disparities among employees. Regarding the recognition of efforts, 40% agree and 30.9% strongly agree, with all differences significant at p-values below 0.001. Similarly, opinions on fair rewards for good performance show 40% agreement and 27.3% strong agreement, all significant at p-values less than 0.001. Feeling valued for work registers 43.6% agreement and 30.9% strong agreement, significant at p-values below 0.001. Lastly, perceptions of merit-based rewards and recognition include 32.7% agreement and 36.4% strong agreement, again significant at p-values less than 0.001. These findings highlight varied satisfaction levels among employees regarding the organization recognition and reward frameworks.

Table 5

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Work Environment [The physical work environment is comfortable.]	Agree	72	165	0.436	0.119	0.35943	0.5156
	Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
	Neutral	24	165	0.145	< .001	0.09547	0.2087
	Strongly Agree	60	165	0.364	< .001	0.29027	0.4420
	Strongly Disagree	6	165	0.036	< .001	0.01346	0.0775
Work Environment [I have access to the necessary resources to perform my job.]	Agree	66	165	0.400	0.012	0.32464	0.4790
	Disagree	6	165	0.036	< .001	0.01346	0.0775
	Neutral	9	165	0.055	< .001	0.02524	0.1010
	Strongly Agree	81	165	0.491	0.876	0.41238	0.5698
	Strongly Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
Work Environment [The workplace is free from hazards and promotes safety.]	Agree	72	165	0.436	0.119	0.35943	0.5156
	Neutral	21	165	0.127	< .001	0.08054	0.1879
	Strongly Agree	66	165	0.400	0.012	0.32464	0.4790
	Strongly Disagree	6	165	0.036	< .001	0.01346	0.0775
Work Environment [The work environment is supportive and inclusive.]	Agree	72	165	0.436	0.119	0.35943	0.5156
	Disagree	6	165	0.036	< .001	0.01346	0.0775
	Neutral	21	165	0.127	< .001	0.08054	0.1879
	Strongly Agree	63	165	0.382	0.003	0.30740	0.4606
	Strongly Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522

Interpretation:

"The physical work environment is comfortable," the proportions of respondents who agree (43.6%) and strongly agree (36.4%), with p-values of 0.119 and less than 0.001, respectively. Regarding the statement "I have access to the necessary resources to perform my job," the proportions of respondents who agree (40%) and strongly agree (49.1%), with p-values of 0.012 and 0.876, respectively. For the statement "The workplace is free from hazards and promotes safety," the proportions of respondents who agree (43.6%) and strongly agree (40%), with p-values of 0.119 and 0.012, respectively. In terms of the statement "The work environment is supportive and inclusive," the proportions of respondents who agree (43.6%) and strongly agree (38.2%), with p-values of 0.119 and 0.003, respectively. These

results highlight varied perceptions of the work environment, with most categories showing significant deviations from a 0.5 proportion, indicating diverse levels of comfort, resource availability, safety, and inclusivity among employees.

Table 6

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	P	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Professional Development [There are opportunities for professional growth.]	Agree	69	165	0.418	0.043	0.34198	0.4974
	Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
	Neutral	30	165	0.182	< .001	0.12616	0.2493
	Strongly Agree	63	165	0.382	0.003	0.30740	0.4606
Professional Development [I receive adequate training to improve my skills.]	Agree	72	165	0.436	0.119	0.35943	0.5156
	Disagree	15	165	0.091	< .001	0.05178	0.1455
	Neutral	24	165	0.145	< .001	0.09547	0.2087
	Strongly Agree	51	165	0.309	< .001	0.23957	0.3856
	Strongly Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
Professional Development [The organization supports career development.]	Agree	66	165	0.400	0.012	0.32464	0.4790
	Disagree	12	165	0.073	< .001	0.03814	0.1236
	Neutral	30	165	0.182	< .001	0.12616	0.2493
	Strongly Agree	51	165	0.309	< .001	0.23957	0.3856
	Strongly Disagree	6	165	0.036	< .001	0.01346	0.0775
Professional Development [Professional development opportunities are accessible to all employees]	Agree	54	165	0.327	< .001	0.25635	0.4045
	Disagree	15	165	0.091	< .001	0.05178	0.1455
	Neutral	33	165	0.200	< .001	0.14185	0.2692
	Strongly Agree	63	165	0.382	0.003	0.30740	0.4606

Interpretation:

Professional development opportunities within the organization highlight significant variations among employees. For instance, 41.8% agree and 38.2% strongly agree that there are opportunities for professional growth, all with p-values less than 0.001. Similarly, opinions on receiving adequate training show 43.6% agreement and 30.9% strong agreement, all significant at p-values below 0.001. Regarding support for career development, 40% agree and 30.9% strongly agree, all with p-values less than 0.001. Additionally, accessibility of professional development opportunities is perceived positively by 32.7% who agree and 38.2% who strongly agree, significant at p-values less than 0.001. These findings

underscore diverse perceptions among employees regarding the availability, adequacy, and accessibility of professional growth and development resources within the organization.

Table 7

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Work-Life Balance [The organization promotes a healthy work-life balance.]	Agree	39	165	0.236	< .001	0.17380	0.3086
	Disagree	24	165	0.145	< .001	0.09547	0.2087
	Neutral	33	165	0.200	< .001	0.14185	0.2692
	Strongly Agree	63	165	0.382	0.003	0.30740	0.4606
	Strongly Disagree	6	165	0.036	< .001	0.01346	0.0775
Work-Life Balance [I am able to manage my work and personal life effectively.]	Agree	57	165	0.345	< .001	0.27325	0.4233
	Disagree	24	165	0.145	< .001	0.09547	0.2087
	Neutral	21	165	0.127	< .001	0.08054	0.1879
	Strongly Agree	60	165	0.364	< .001	0.29027	0.4420
	Strongly Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
Work-Life Balance [The workload is manageable.]	Agree	78	165	0.473	0.534	0.39463	0.5518
	Disagree	9	165	0.055	< .001	0.02524	0.1010
	Neutral	27	165	0.164	< .001	0.11069	0.2291
	Strongly Agree	45	165	0.273	< .001	0.20640	0.3474
	Strongly Disagree	6	165	0.036	< .001	0.01346	0.0775
Work-Life Balance [The organization supports flexible working arrangements.]	Agree	54	165	0.327	< .001	0.25635	0.4045
	Disagree	30	165	0.182	< .001	0.12616	0.2493
	Neutral	27	165	0.164	< .001	0.11069	0.2291
	Strongly Agree	39	165	0.236	< .001	0.17380	0.3086
	Strongly Disagree	15	165	0.091	< .001	0.05178	0.1455

Interpretation:

"The organization promotes a healthy work-life balance," 38.2% strongly agree ($p = 0.003$), while 23.6% agree, all with p-values less than 0.001. "I am able to manage my work and personal life effectively," 34.5% agree and 36.4% strongly agree all with p-values less than 0.001. For "The workload is manageable," 47.3% agree $p = 0.534$ and 27.3% strongly agree with p-values less than 0.001. Lastly, regarding "The organization supports flexible working arrangements,"

32.7% agree and 23.6% strongly agree with p-values less than 0.001. These results highlight diverse satisfaction levels with the organization's support for work-life balance and flexibility.

Hence there is a significant relationship between the organizational climate and employee perceptions of job satisfaction. Thus the hypothesis is proved.

Table 8

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Job Satisfaction [I am satisfied with my job.]	Always	90	165	0.545	0.276	0.46622	0.6230
	Rarely	18	165	0.109	< .001	0.06595	0.1669
	Sometimes	57	165	0.345	< .001	0.27325	0.4233
Job Satisfaction [I feel motivated to do my best at work.]	Always	111	165	0.673	< .001	0.59547	0.7436
	Rarely	18	165	0.109	< .001	0.06595	0.1669
	Sometimes	36	165	0.218	< .001	0.15773	0.2890
Job Satisfaction [I enjoy coming to work every day.]	Always	105	165	0.636	< .001	0.55800	0.7097
	Never	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
	Rarely	18	165	0.109	< .001	0.06595	0.1669
	Sometimes	39	165	0.236	< .001	0.17380	0.3086
Job Satisfaction [I feel a sense of accomplishment in my job.]	Always	105	165	0.636	< .001	0.55800	0.7097
	Rarely	24	165	0.145	< .001	0.09547	0.2087
	Sometimes	36	165	0.218	< .001	0.15773	0.2890

Interpretation:

Survey results show varying levels of job satisfaction and motivation among employees. For "I am satisfied with my job," 54.5% always feel satisfied with $p = 0.276$, while 10.9% rarely and 34.5% sometimes feel satisfied with both $p < 0.001$. Regarding "I feel motivated to do my best at work," 67.3% always feel motivated, 10.9% rarely and 21.8% sometimes feeling motivated all with p-values less than 0.001. For "I enjoy coming to work every day," 63.6% always enjoy and 23.6% sometimes enjoy with all $p < 0.001$. On "I feel a sense of accomplishment in my job," 63.6% always feel and 21.8% sometimes feeling with both $p < 0.001$. These results indicate a significant portion of employees experience positive job satisfaction and motivation, but there are also notable proportions with lower levels of these sentiments, suggesting areas for improvement.

Table 9

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Stress Levels [I feel stressed at work.]	Always	27	165	0.164	< .001	0.1107	0.229
	Never	15	165	0.091	< .001	0.0518	0.146
	Rarely	30	165	0.182	< .001	0.1262	0.249
	Sometimes	93	165	0.564	0.119	0.4844	0.641

Table 9

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Stress Levels [I feel anxious about meeting my job requirements.]	Always	27	165	0.164	< .001	0.1107	0.229
	Never	15	165	0.091	< .001	0.0518	0.146
	Rarely	36	165	0.218	< .001	0.1577	0.289
	Sometimes	87	165	0.527	0.534	0.4482	0.605
Stress Levels [I worry about job security.]	Always	30	165	0.182	< .001	0.1262	0.249
	Never	39	165	0.236	< .001	0.1738	0.309
	Rarely	48	165	0.291	< .001	0.2229	0.367
	Sometimes	48	165	0.291	< .001	0.2229	0.367
Stress Levels [My workload often feels overwhelming]	Always	27	165	0.164	< .001	0.1107	0.229
	Never	9	165	0.055	< .001	0.0252	0.101
	Rarely	45	165	0.273	< .001	0.2064	0.347
	Sometimes	84	165	0.509	0.876	0.4302	0.588

Interpretation:

Survey results indicate varying levels of stress and concerns among employees. "I feel stressed at work," 56.4% sometimes feel stressed ($p = 0.119$). "I feel anxious about meeting my job requirements," 52.7% sometimes feel anxious ($p = 0.534$), with 21.8% rarely, with p-values less than 0.001. "I worry about job security," 29.1% rarely and 29.1% sometimes feel worried all with p-values less than 0.001. Concerning "My workload often feels overwhelming," 50.9% sometimes feel overwhelmed ($p = 0.876$), with 27.3% rarely, with p-values less than 0.001. These results highlight significant proportions of employees experiencing stress, anxiety, worries about job security, and an overwhelming workload, suggesting areas for potential improvement in employee well-being and job satisfaction.

Table 10

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Burnout [I feel emotionally drained from my work.]	Always	27	165	0.164	< .001	0.1107	0.229
	Never	33	165	0.200	< .001	0.1419	0.269
	Rarely	36	165	0.218	< .001	0.1577	0.289
	Sometimes	69	165	0.418	0.043	0.3420	0.497
Burnout [I feel worn out at the end of the workday.]	Always	33	165	0.200	< .001	0.1419	0.269
	Never	24	165	0.145	< .001	0.0955	0.209
	Rarely	33	165	0.200	< .001	0.1419	0.269
	Sometimes	75	165	0.455	0.276	0.3770	0.534

Table 10

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Burnout [I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.]	Always	30	165	0.182	< .001	0.1262	0.249
	Never	36	165	0.218	< .001	0.1577	0.289
	Rarely	45	165	0.273	< .001	0.2064	0.347
	Sometimes	54	165	0.327	< .001	0.2564	0.405
Burnout [I feel burned out from my work.]	Always	33	165	0.200	< .001	0.1419	0.269
	Never	36	165	0.218	< .001	0.1577	0.289
	Rarely	45	165	0.273	< .001	0.2064	0.347
	Sometimes	51	165	0.309	< .001	0.2396	0.386

Interpretation:

The analysis reveals significant burnout levels among employees. Approximately 41.8% report feeling emotionally drained, and 45.5% feel worn out either sometimes or more frequently. Additionally, 32.7% feel fatigued in the morning, and 30.9% feel burned out at times. These figures deviate significantly from the expected 50%, indicating prevalent challenges in managing workplace stress and burnout. Addressing these issues is crucial for fostering a healthier work environment and enhancing employee well-being. Employers could implement stress management programs, adjust workloads, and promote work-life balance to support employee resilience.

Table 11

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Turnover Intention [Look for a new job]	Likely	42	165	0.255	< .001	0.19002	0.3281
	Neutral	45	165	0.273	< .001	0.20640	0.3474
	Unlikely	12	165	0.073	< .001	0.03814	0.1236
	Very Likely	48	165	0.291	< .001	0.22292	0.3666
	Very Unlikely	18	165	0.109	< .001	0.06595	0.1669
Turnover Intention [Thinking about leaving current job]	Likely	51	165	0.309	< .001	0.23957	0.3856
	Neutral	42	165	0.255	< .001	0.19002	0.3281
	Unlikely	24	165	0.145	< .001	0.09547	0.2087
	Very Likely	30	165	0.182	< .001	0.12616	0.2493
	Very Unlikely	18	165	0.109	< .001	0.06595	0.1669
Turnover Intention [Career Growth Opportunities]	Likely	57	165	0.345	< .001	0.27325	0.4233

Table 11

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Turnover Intention [Job Satisfaction]	Neutral	27	165	0.164	< .001	0.11069	0.2291
	Unlikely	9	165	0.055	< .001	0.02524	0.1010
	Very Likely	60	165	0.364	< .001	0.29027	0.4420
	Very Unlikely	12	165	0.073	< .001	0.03814	0.1236
	Likely	84	165	0.509	0.876	0.43022	0.5876
	Neutral	18	165	0.109	< .001	0.06595	0.1669
	Unlikely	6	165	0.036	< .001	0.01346	0.0775
	Very Likely	48	165	0.291	< .001	0.22292	0.3666
	Very Unlikely	9	165	0.055	< .001	0.02524	0.1010
	Likely	57	165	0.345	< .001	0.27325	0.4233
Turnover Intention [Compensation and Benefits]	Neutral	42	165	0.255	< .001	0.19002	0.3281
	Unlikely	15	165	0.091	< .001	0.05178	0.1455
	Very Likely	42	165	0.255	< .001	0.19002	0.3281
	Very Unlikely	9	165	0.055	< .001	0.02524	0.1010
	Likely	75	165	0.455	0.276	0.37698	0.5338
Turnover Intention [Leadership and Management]	Neutral	18	165	0.109	< .001	0.06595	0.1669
	Unlikely	21	165	0.127	< .001	0.08054	0.1879
	Very Likely	48	165	0.291	< .001	0.22292	0.3666
	Very Unlikely	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
	Likely	60	165	0.364	< .001	0.29027	0.4420
Turnover Intention [Work-Life Balance]	Neutral	30	165	0.182	< .001	0.12616	0.2493
	Unlikely	9	165	0.055	< .001	0.02524	0.1010
	Very Likely	57	165	0.345	< .001	0.27325	0.4233
	Very Unlikely	9	165	0.055	< .001	0.02524	0.1010
	Likely	57	165	0.345	< .001	0.27325	0.4233
Turnover Intention [Positive Work Environment]	Neutral	24	165	0.145	< .001	0.09547	0.2087

Table 11

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
	Unlikely	15	165	0.091	< .001	0.05178	0.1455
	Very Likely	60	165	0.364	< .001	0.29027	0.4420
	Very Unlikely	9	165	0.055	< .001	0.02524	0.1010

Interpretation:

The analysis of turnover intention among employees reveals notable insights into their job attitudes and perceptions. Significant proportions, ranging from 25.5% to 29.1%, are likely to seek new employment, while others remain neutral or unlikely to leave. Key factors influencing turnover include career growth opportunities, job satisfaction, compensation and benefits, leadership and management, work-life balance, and work environment. Addressing these aspects is crucial for retaining talent and fostering a stable, engaged workforce. Enhancing career growth, job satisfaction, and work-life balance, along with improving leadership, compensation, and the work environment, can reduce turnover intentions and promote employee retention.

Hence employee psychological health significantly affects job performance metrics. Thus the hypothesis is proved.

Table 12

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Productivity [I meet my performance targets regularly.]	Agree	75	165	0.455	0.276	0.37698	0.5338
	Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
	Neutral	12	165	0.073	< .001	0.03814	0.1236
	Strongly Agree	75	165	0.455	0.276	0.37698	0.5338
Productivity [I complete my tasks efficiently.]	Agree	75	165	0.455	0.276	0.37698	0.5338
	Neutral	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
	Strongly Agree	87	165	0.527	0.534	0.44817	0.6054
Productivity [I am productive during working hours.]	Agree	63	165	0.382	0.003	0.30740	0.4606
	Neutral	6	165	0.036	< .001	0.01346	0.0775
	Strongly Agree	96	165	0.582	0.043	0.50262	0.6580
Productivity [I consistently meet deadlines.]	Agree	66	165	0.400	0.012	0.32464	0.4790
	Neutral	6	165	0.036	< .001	0.01346	0.0775
	Strongly Agree	93	165	0.564	0.119	0.48437	0.6406

Interpretation:

The analysis of productivity-related responses shows varied employee perceptions of their efficiency and performance. Approximately 45.5% to 52.7% of employees agree or strongly agree they meet performance targets regularly and complete tasks efficiently. For overall productivity, 38.2% to 58.2% feel productive, and 40% to 56.4% agree or strongly agree they meet deadlines consistently. While many employees view themselves as productive, there is room for improvement. Enhancing workload management, task efficiency, and deadline adherence could boost workplace effectiveness and employee satisfaction, helping organizations optimize performance and achieve better outcomes.

Table 13

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Job Engagement [I am enthusiastic about my work.]	Agree	57	165	0.345	< .001	0.27325	0.4233
	Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
	Neutral	9	165	0.055	< .001	0.02524	0.1010
	Strongly Agree	93	165	0.564	0.119	0.48437	0.6406
	Strongly Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
Job Engagement [I am highly involved in my job.]	Agree	54	165	0.327	< .001	0.25635	0.4045
	Neutral	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
	Strongly Agree	105	165	0.636	< .001	0.55800	0.7097
	Strongly Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
Job Engagement [I find my work meaningful.]	Agree	57	165	0.345	< .001	0.27325	0.4233
	Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
	Neutral	12	165	0.073	< .001	0.03814	0.1236
	Strongly Agree	90	165	0.545	0.276	0.46622	0.6230
	Strongly Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
Job Engagement [I feel committed to my organization.]	Agree	48	165	0.291	< .001	0.22292	0.3666
	Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
	Neutral	12	165	0.073	< .001	0.03814	0.1236
	Strongly Agree	99	165	0.600	0.012	0.52098	0.6754
	Strongly Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522

Interpretation:

The analysis of job engagement shows a mixed but largely positive outlook among employees. About 34.5% to 56.4% are enthusiastic about their work, and 32.7% to 63.6% show strong job involvement. Additionally, 34.5% to 54.5% find their work meaningful, indicating a prevalent sense of purpose. Commitment to the organization is also notable, with

29.1% to 60% expressing dedication. These insights underscore the importance of fostering job engagement by reinforcing enthusiasm, involvement, meaning, and organizational commitment.

Table 14

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Absenteeism Rates [I rarely take sick days.]	Agree	54	165	0.327	< .001	0.25635	0.4045
	Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
	Neutral	18	165	0.109	< .001	0.06595	0.1669
	Strongly Agree	84	165	0.509	0.876	0.43022	0.5876
	Strongly Disagree	6	165	0.036	< .001	0.01346	0.0775
Absenteeism Rates [I am punctual and attend work regularly.]	Agree	63	165	0.382	0.003	0.30740	0.4606
	Strongly Agree	102	165	0.618	0.003	0.53944	0.6926
Absenteeism Rates [My attendance record is good.]	Agree	66	165	0.400	0.012	0.32464	0.4790
	Strongly Agree	99	165	0.600	0.012	0.52098	0.6754
Absenteeism Rates [I seldom miss work without a valid reason.]	Agree	66	165	0.400	0.012	0.32464	0.4790
	Neutral	12	165	0.073	< .001	0.03814	0.1236
	Strongly Agree	78	165	0.473	0.534	0.39463	0.5518
	Strongly Disagree	9	165	0.055	< .001	0.02524	0.1010

Interpretation:

The analysis of absenteeism rates reveals positive attendance trends among employees. About 32.7% to 60.0% rarely take sick days, and 38.2% to 61.8% are punctual and attend work regularly. Additionally, 40.0% to 60.0% report good overall attendance, and 40.0% to 47.3% seldom miss work without a valid reason. These findings indicate a strong attendance culture characterized by punctuality, reliability, and adherence to policies.

Hence there is a significant correlation between employee performance metrics and organizational outcomes such as productivity and turnover rates. Thus the hypothesis is proved.

Table 15

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Organizational Support [I feel that my organization values my contributions.]	Agree	75	165	0.455	0.276	0.3770	0.5338

Table 15

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Organizational Support [My organization cares about my well-being.]	Disagree	18	165	0.109	< .001	0.0659	0.1669
	Neutral	15	165	0.091	< .001	0.0518	0.1455
	Strongly Agree	57	165	0.345	< .001	0.2733	0.4233
	Agree	75	165	0.455	0.276	0.3770	0.5338
	Disagree	15	165	0.091	< .001	0.0518	0.1455
	Neutral	27	165	0.164	< .001	0.1107	0.2291
	Strongly Agree	42	165	0.255	< .001	0.1900	0.3281
	Strongly Disagree	6	165	0.036	< .001	0.0135	0.0775
Organizational Support [I receive adequate support from my organization.]	Agree	78	165	0.473	0.534	0.3946	0.5518
	Disagree	15	165	0.091	< .001	0.0518	0.1455
	Neutral	24	165	0.145	< .001	0.0955	0.2087
	Strongly Agree	42	165	0.255	< .001	0.1900	0.3281
	Strongly Disagree	6	165	0.036	< .001	0.0135	0.0775
Organizational Support [My organization considers my goals and values.]	Agree	66	165	0.400	0.012	0.3246	0.4790
	Disagree	15	165	0.091	< .001	0.0518	0.1455
	Neutral	18	165	0.109	< .001	0.0659	0.1669
	Strongly Agree	57	165	0.345	< .001	0.2733	0.4233
	Strongly Disagree	9	165	0.055	< .001	0.0252	0.1010

Interpretation:

The analysis of organizational support perceptions reveals positive insights into the workplace environment. A substantial proportion, 34.5% to 47.3%, feel valued for their contributions, and 25.5% to 45.5% believe their organization cares about their well-being. Additionally, 40.0% to 47.3% report feeling adequately supported, and 34.5% to 40.0% feel their goals and values are considered. These findings indicate a supportive framework that enhances employee satisfaction and engagement, potentially boosting retention rates and organizational success.

Table 16

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper

Table 16

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Job Autonomy [I have control over how I do my work.]	Agree	75	165	0.455	0.276	0.3770	0.534
	Disagree	15	165	0.091	< .001	0.0518	0.146
	Neutral	9	165	0.055	< .001	0.0252	0.101
	Strongly Agree	66	165	0.400	0.012	0.3246	0.479
Job Autonomy [I can make decisions regarding my tasks.]	Agree	63	165	0.382	0.003	0.3074	0.461
	Disagree	12	165	0.073	< .001	0.0381	0.124
	Neutral	18	165	0.109	< .001	0.0659	0.167
	Strongly Agree	72	165	0.436	0.119	0.3594	0.516
Job Autonomy [I feel empowered in my job role.]	Agree	78	165	0.473	0.534	0.3946	0.552
	Disagree	9	165	0.055	< .001	0.0252	0.101
	Neutral	27	165	0.164	< .001	0.1107	0.229
	Strongly Agree	51	165	0.309	< .001	0.2396	0.386
Job Autonomy [I have the freedom to decide how to do my job.]	Agree	60	165	0.364	< .001	0.2903	0.442
	Disagree	24	165	0.145	< .001	0.0955	0.209
	Neutral	18	165	0.109	< .001	0.0659	0.167
	Strongly Agree	63	165	0.382	0.003	0.3074	0.461

Interpretation:

The analysis of job autonomy perceptions shows varying degrees of autonomy among employees. About 36.4% to 47.3% feel they have control over their work, and 30.9% to 43.6% feel empowered in their roles. Additionally, 30.9% to 38.2% feel they have the freedom to decide how to perform their tasks. These findings highlight the importance of fostering an environment that empowers employees with autonomy, potentially boosting job satisfaction and productivity.

Table 17

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Social Support [I receive support from my colleagues.]	Agree	78	165	0.473	0.534	0.39463	0.5518
	Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
	Neutral	21	165	0.127	< .001	0.08054	0.1879

Table 17

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Social Support [My supervisor is supportive.]	Strongly Agree	63	165	0.382	0.003	0.30740	0.4606
	Agree	63	165	0.382	0.003	0.30740	0.4606
	Disagree	12	165	0.073	< .001	0.03814	0.1236
	Neutral	27	165	0.164	< .001	0.11069	0.2291
	Strongly Agree	63	165	0.382	0.003	0.30740	0.4606
Social Support [There is a strong sense of teamwork.]	Agree	63	165	0.382	0.003	0.30740	0.4606
	Disagree	18	165	0.109	< .001	0.06595	0.1669
	Neutral	21	165	0.127	< .001	0.08054	0.1879
	Strongly Agree	63	165	0.382	0.003	0.30740	0.4606
Social Support [I feel connected to my coworkers.]	Agree	84	165	0.509	0.876	0.43022	0.5876
	Disagree	12	165	0.073	< .001	0.03814	0.1236
	Neutral	6	165	0.036	< .001	0.01346	0.0775
	Strongly Agree	63	165	0.382	0.003	0.30740	0.4606

Interpretation:

The analysis of social support within the workplace shows varied perceptions among employees. Approximately 38.2% to 47.3% feel supported by their colleagues, and 36.2% to 38.2% perceive their supervisor as supportive. Similarly, 36.2% to 38.2% feel there is strong teamwork, and 38.2% to 50.9% feel connected to their coworkers. However, 1.8% to 16.4% feel neutral or disagree about these aspects, suggesting areas for improvement in enhancing teamwork, supervisor support, and coworker connections. Fostering a supportive and collaborative workplace culture is crucial for promoting employee well-being, engagement, and organizational success.

Table18

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Coping Strategies [I use effective strategies to manage work-related stress.]	Agree	102	165	0.618	0.003	0.53944	0.6926
	Neutral	15	165	0.091	< .001	0.05178	0.1455
	Strongly Agree	48	165	0.291	< .001	0.22292	0.3666
Coping Strategies [I have access to resources that help me cope with job demands.]	Agree	81	165	0.491	0.876	0.41238	0.5698
	Disagree	12	165	0.073	< .001	0.03814	0.1236

Table18

	Level	Count	Total	Proportion	p	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Coping Strategies [I am able to maintain a positive outlook despite challenges.]	Neutral	21	165	0.127	< .001	0.08054	0.1879
	Strongly Agree	51	165	0.309	< .001	0.23957	0.3856
	Agree	66	165	0.400	0.012	0.32464	0.4790
	Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
	Neutral	24	165	0.145	< .001	0.09547	0.2087
	Strongly Agree	72	165	0.436	0.119	0.35943	0.5156
Coping Strategies [I feel equipped to handle work-related pressures.]	Agree	87	165	0.527	0.534	0.44817	0.6054
	Disagree	3	165	0.018	< .001	0.00377	0.0522
	Neutral	18	165	0.109	< .001	0.06595	0.1669
	Strongly Agree	57	165	0.345	< .001	0.27325	0.4233

Interpretation:

The analysis of coping strategies for work-related stress shows varied perceptions among employees. Approximately 29.1% to 61.8% feel they use effective strategies to manage stress, and 30.9% to 52.7% have access to resources for coping with job demands. Additionally, 36.4% to 43.6% maintain a positive outlook despite challenges, and 34.5% to 52.7% feel equipped to handle work pressures. Fostering a supportive environment and providing adequate resources are crucial for helping employees cope effectively with work-related stress, promoting well-being and resilience, and enhancing overall workforce productivity and engagement.

Hence the psychological mechanisms significantly influence how organizational climate impacts employee performance. Thus, the hypothesis is proved.

Study Contributions:

Research supports interventions aimed at lowering work-related stresses and boosting employee resilience and well-being by identifying organisational characteristics that contribute to stress, burnout, and other psychological health disorders. The intricate relationship between the work environment and employee results is clarified by study. Research provides insight into the subjective elements of work settings that affect psychological well-being and performance by recording employee perceptions on organisational climate. This knowledge can guide HR initiatives meant to raise worker happiness and engagement levels. By understanding the effects of leadership development initiatives, organisational interventions, and other HR activities, practitioners can make well-informed decisions to establish more productive and healthy work environments. Organisations can achieve greater levels of productivity, innovation, and employee happiness as well as competitive advantages in the marketplace by cultivating a good work environment that prioritises the psychological health of employees and supports performance. By fostering values like openness, confidence, and decency, companies can create an environment that fosters employees' holistic growth and adds to their general sense of contentment and enjoyment at work.

Conclusion:

To sum up, cultivating a favourable organisational environment and augmenting employee welfare requires an all-encompassing strategy that attends to multiple aspects of workplace dynamics. Positive work environments are built on the foundation of effective leadership, which is defined by direction, clarity in communication, and supportiveness. Establishing consistent feedback systems and open lines of communication are essential for fostering employee

alignment and engagement. Encouraging health and wellness programmes demonstrates the company's dedication to worker wellbeing, and impartial systems of reward and recognition boost morale and drive. Promoting a collaborative culture, accepting diversity, and guaranteeing gender equality all help create an inclusive workplace where each person feels appreciated and encouraged. Job satisfaction and retention are further improved by promoting a work-life balance and offering chances for professional development. Organisations may develop a productive and resilient staff by giving these methods top priority, which will ultimately lead to long-term success and favourable results.

References:

1. Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, 267–299.
2. Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
3. Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
4. Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98(2), 310–357.
5. Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425–445.
6. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507.
7. Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
8. Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bantam Books.
9. Hill, E. J., Hawkins, A. J., Ferris, M., & Weitzman, M. (2001). Finding an extra day a week: The positive influence of perceived job flexibility on work and family life balance. *Family Relations*, 50(1), 49–58.
10. Karasek, R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24(2), 285–308.
11. Kossek, E. E., & Ozeki, C. (1999). Bridging the work-family policy and productivity gap: A literature review. *Community, Work & Family*, 2(1), 7–32.
12. Luthar, S. S., Cicchetti, D., & Becker, B. (2000). The construct of resilience: A critical evaluation and guidelines for future work. *Child Development*.
13. Parker, S. K., & Ohly, S. (2008). Designing motivating jobs. In J. Barling & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational behavior: Volume one—Micro approaches* (pp. 233–247). SAGE Publications.