

**Organizational factors that affect employee well being:**

**A Study in Cyprus**

**Panagiotis Machaliotis**

**Department of Business and Public Administration, University of Cyprus**

**MSc Human Resource Management**

**December 2021**

## Περιεχόμενα

<b>Abstract</b> .....	5
Introduction .....	6
Literature Review.....	9
Social context of POS .....	12
Antecedents of POS .....	13
Outcomes of POS.....	16
Occupational Stress.....	17
Reasons for stress.....	19
Outcomes of stress .....	21
Affective well being .....	23
Relationship between variables .....	27
POS and Occupational Stress .....	27
POS and Affective well-being .....	29
POS and employee physical well-being.....	30
POS and emotion .....	33
Participants .....	35
Measurements .....	35
Job Related Affective Well-being Scale.....	36
Perceived Organizational Support (POS).....	36
Occupation Stress Index (OSI) .....	37
Hypothesis Testing.....	38
First Hypothesis .....	39
Second Hypothesis .....	39
Third Hypothesis.....	39

Regression Results .....	40
Analysis of results.....	41
Implications .....	46
Limitations.....	48
Bibliography .....	49

Panagiotis Machaliotis



University  
of Cyprus  
Faculty of Economics and Management  
Department of Business and Public Administration

### Declaration of Authorship

I hereby certify that the thesis I am submitting is entirely my own original work except where otherwise indicated. I am aware of the University's regulations concerning plagiarism, including those regulations concerning disciplinary actions that may result from plagiarism. Any use of the works of any other author, in any form, is properly acknowledged at their point of use.

Student's signature:

Name (in capitals):

PANAGIOTIS MACHALIOTIS

Date of submission:

04/10/2022

Panagiotis Machaliotis

**Abstract**

The purpose of this paper is to examine the impact of occupational stress and perceived organizational support (POS) in the affective well being of employees in the context of Cyprus. It is important to understand how employees conceive their support from their company and its impact on the workplace well being. According to Organizational Support Theory (OST), whether an organization is treated favorably or unfavorably affects the levels of organizational support displayed by its employees. POS may reduce negative physiological and psychological reactions to job stress because employees receive material and emotional assistance from the company when dealing with high job demands. Also, providing employees with fairness in terms of procedures, organizational rewards, and job conditions increases their feelings of being valued and cared for by the organization and their overall well being.

A total of 106 employees from organizations in both the private and public sector in Cyprus, participated in the study. Eighty women and twenty six men responded to questionnaires through Google forms. Three validated instruments a) the Job Related Affective Well Being Scale, b) the Perceived Organizational Support, and c) the occupational stress index were used to measure the factors and the data analysis was done with SPSS v.27. According to the results both POS and occupational stress along with the time that someone is employed are strong predictors of the affective well being of employees. The strongest correlation was the years of employment and employee well being ( $r=0.191$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) and the years of employment and perceived organizational support ( $r= -.223$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). Overall, these findings contribute to the affective well being, occupational stress and POS literature and emphasize the importance of years of employment in all these factors.

**Keywords:** affective well being, perceived organizational support, occupational stress

## Introduction

Today's organizations must navigate a dynamic environment characterized by technological advancements, competition, and globalization (Greenhaus & Callahan, 2013). Amidst restructuring, downsizing, mergers, and layoffs, many employees have begun to question and perhaps redefine their relationships with their organizations (Greenhaus & Callahan, 2013). Not only has the business environment changed, but so too has the day-to-day work of many employees: jobs are shifting from producing goods to providing customized services, work is more interdependent, and social connections are more important (Grant, Fried, Parker, & Frese, 2010). As a result, many jobs now thrust greater cognitive, emotional, and interpersonal demands on employees. Employees therefore must anticipate potential organizational transitions while also adjusting to the changing demands and expectations of their work. With change replacing stability as the norm in business, employees feel greater pressure to remain marketable, as well as assume greater responsibility for their own success (Grant et al., 2010). For these reasons, it is important to consider and understand how employees perceive and react to potential changes in their workplaces.

Through these days' rapid changes there is greater than ever pressure on the organizations and employees to cope with these changes. To remain competitive and successful, organizations have to adjust themselves swiftly to a dynamic environment and also permit their employees to thrive in the workplace (Abid et al., 2019). Thriving personnel are considered as a source of competitive advantage and contribute a very important role in organizational success, as they perform better, they are proactive, self-learners, career-oriented, and disburse higher attention toward organizational goals (Kleine et al., 2019). A hard working and well established employee can feel a sense of satisfaction and achievement from his workplace.

But sometimes the demanding nature of work itself and also the work environment can put a great deal of pressure on him/her. That great deal of burden can cause many harmful psychological and physical consequences called work stress. These negative consequences affect not only the worker but also the organization. Sufficient empirical data shows that unsettled organizational stress results in decreased job satisfaction, reduced work performance, and psychological suffering (Morris & Long, 2002). Furthermore, it can cause poor health, affect mental and physical well-being negatively, absenteeism from workplace, turnover rate and intention to leave the job (Siu, 2002).

The focus for this study is the effect of occupational stress and perceived organizational support on affective well-being in an organization. This research is intended to further the knowledge related to employees' affective well being, understand factors related to occupational stress and organizational support and understanding the relationship of them on emotions in the workplace.



## Literature Review

In this report, it is important to understand how employees conceive their support from their company and organizational support theory can be used to understand this concept.

The potential utility of examining the employee–organization connection from the employees' perspective, the clarity of the POS concept, and the strong links of POS with emotional organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and other attitudinal outcomes have all piqued interest in OST. POS is linked to the major hypothesized antecedents of POS (fairness, human resource [HR] practices, and supervisor support), attitudinal consequences (e.g., affective organizational commitment, job satisfaction), and job performance, according to Rhoades and Eisenberger's (2002) meta-analytic review. Riggle, Edmonson, and Hansen (2009) conducted a more recent meta-analysis with more research to confirm the attitudinal result findings.

According to OST, POS is heavily reliant on employees' perceptions of the organization's motivations behind their positive or unfavorable treatment. As a result, POS triggers a social exchange process in which employees feel bound to assist the organization in achieving its aims and objectives, with the expectation that more efforts on behalf of the organization will result in bigger benefits. POS also meets socioemotional requirements, leading in higher organizational identification and commitment, a stronger desire to help the organization flourish, and improved psychological well-being.

OST explains that perceived organizational support (POS) enhances employees' affective organizational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997). According to organizational support theory (OST), employees acquire a general view of how much the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa,

1986; Shore & Shore, 1995). Organizational support theory draws from social exchange theory in explaining that fruitful employee-organization relationships evolve over time as long as organizations and employees trade valued goods or services and conform to implied rules of exchange (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). According to Social Exchange Theory, social behavior is defined as the exchange of physical or intangible activities that are more or less rewarding or costly for the participants (Homans, 1961). Interdependence exists between exchange relationships. The norm of reciprocity guides the behavior of one partner in relation to the behavior of the other (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). The basic notion of OST is perceived organizational support (POS). It encapsulates employees' opinion that they have established a high-quality social exchange connection with their employer, one in which the latter recognizes their contributions and is concerned about their well-being (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Eisenberger et al., 2004; Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986).

POS can foster a positive social exchange relationship between an employee and an employer. When organizations offer rewards or positive treatment to workers, they can enhance POS and thus evoke the norm of reciprocity, or the social custom that when we receive positive treatment from someone else, we should reciprocate by treating that person well (Gouldner, 1960). Thus, employees who feel valued and supported by their organization often feel obliged to return the favor by demonstrating high levels of commitment to the organization. In addition to promoting social exchanges, POS also helps fulfill employee socioemotional needs (e.g., needs for approval, affiliation, esteem, and emotional support). When employees feel supported, they identify with the organization in which their organizational membership contributes towards having meaning and feeling belongingness in relation to their personal identities (Meyer et al.,

2006). The perceptions of identification evolving from POS subsequently give rise to positive attitudes, most notably affective commitment to the organization (Meyer et al., 2006).

Employee interpretations in the workplace have an impact on POS as a form of perception. Eisenberger et al. (2004) argue that the creation of POS involves a process of interpretation. Employees' creation of POS is influenced by cognitive characteristics of the employee-employer relationship. POS is commonly thought of as a two-way relationship between the employee and the company. Employee views of organizational support are influenced by social framing and the interactions and relationships that employees create in the workplace (Eisenberger et al., 2004; Zagencyk, Scott, Gibney, Murrell, & Thatcher, 2010).

Employees, who experience favorable treatment, feel appreciated and respected by their employer and are more likely to exhibit high POS, according to OST (Eisenberger et al., 2004). Employees who perceive high organisational support express positive attitudes and behaviours towards their organisation. They also try to reciprocate the favourable treatment they have received (Allen & Shanock, 2013; Mignonac & Richebé, 2013).

Employees are motivated not only by their personal treatment, but also by whether or not they are treated better or worse than others, particularly coworkers. They have a better understanding of their relative position within the organization through a social comparison processes. Those who view their leader to be more supportive than their coworkers, for example, have greater levels of job satisfaction, job performance, and organizational citizenship behavior, according to leader-member-exchange research (Hu & Liden, 2013). Furthermore, they have a more positive image of the organization and have a more positive perception of whether the organization fulfills its commitments to them (Henderson, Wayne, Shore, Bommer, & Tetrick, 2008).

### **Social context of POS**

POS can foster a positive social exchange relationship between an employee and employer. When organizations offer rewards or positive treatment to workers, they can enhance POS and thus evoke the norm of reciprocity, or the social custom that when someone receive positive treatment from someone else, he/she should reciprocate by treating that person well (Gouldner, 1960). Thus, employees who feel valued and supported by their organization often feel obliged to return the favor by demonstrating high levels of commitment to the organization. In addition to promoting social exchanges, POS also helps fulfill employee socioemotional needs (e.g., needs for approval, affiliation, esteem, and emotional support). When employees feel supported, they form identification with the organization in which their organizational membership contributes meaning and belongingness to their personal identities (Meyer et al., 2006). The perceptions of identification evolving from POS subsequently give rise to positive attitudes, most notably affective commitment to the organization (Meyer et al., 2006).

According to Organizational Support Theory (OST), whether an organization is treated favorably or unfavorably does not inevitably affect the levels of POS displayed by its employees (Eisenberger et al., 2004). The POS connection should not be viewed solely as a dyadic employee-employer relationship. Because POS is perceptual, it is influenced by employees' interpretation processes. Other employees' contributions to the development of POS should be considered, and more empirical data are required (Vardaman et al., 2016; Zagenczyk et al., 2010). Employees who are focused on other people may see their treatment as being more or less favorable than that of others. Believing that other employees are treated worse than they are

would make them feel better about their own treatment, regardless of whether it is favorable in absolute terms or not. Social reframing, or shifting employees' attention to those who are less fortunate, might influence how they see their own treatment at work, preventing POS loss (Eisenberger et al., 2004).

Recent studies have confirmed the impact of social dynamics on employees' perceptions of their employer's treatment. The classic social exchange concept linked with individual POS is extended by collective perspectives, demonstrating that social impact influences how employees react attitudinally and behaviorally inside organizational contexts (Chen, Kirkman, Kim, Farh, & Tangirala, 2010; Li, Chiaburu, & Kirkman, 2017).

Vardaman, Allen, Otondo, Hancock, Shore, and Rogers (2016) used social comparisons in their POS expanding OST research. They argue that social comparisons are an important element of OST, and that POS has failed to account for employees' self-enhancement inclinations, which meet their socio-emotional requirements. They develop a measure of relative POS by comparing individual POS to the group average, but they do not truly examine employees' comparative judgements and perceptions of organizational support. Employees may see their own treatment as more favorable if they believe that other employees experience unfavorable treatment, according to OST, and social comparison processes play a crucial part in the establishment of POS (Eisenberger et al., 2004). The choice of a standard of comparison by employees can have a considerable impact on the establishment of POS.

### **Antecedents of POS**

POS is thought to satisfy socioemotional demands (approval, esteem, affiliation, and emotional support), resulting in organizational identity. Affective organizational commitment,

according to OST, stems from both self-improvement and social interchange. In terms of self-improvement, POS-induced organizational identification can lead to affective organizational commitment through the development of shared values and the promotion of stronger relational bonds between employees and organizational representatives (Meyer, Becker, & Van Dick, 2006).

Employees also balance affective commitment with the organization's favorable attitude toward them. In addition to social exchange, meeting socioemotional needs should result in increased identification with and affective commitment to the organization. This positive attitude toward work and the business should lead to a more enjoyable work environment, improving employees' enthusiasm in their jobs (Kurtessis et al., 2017).

In the study of Kurtessis and colleagues (2017) it is found that OST is effective in bringing together the growing empirical literature on POS. OST was able to accurately estimate the relative strengths of a large number of bivariate correlations involving POS. In addition, OST's fundamental processes of felt obligation, organizational identity, affective commitment, and performance-reward expectancies were backed up by evidence. The findings indicate that POS is a significant link between various types of favorable treatment by the organization and employees' positive attitudes toward the organization, psychological well-being, and organizational performance (Kurtessis et al., 2017).

Findings reveal a variety of ways that show that companies care about employees' well-being and appreciate their contributions. Supportive aspects of leadership, fairness, HR practices, and working conditions were all related to POS. This suggests that many recurring elements of employees' relationship with the organization influence the employees' perception of the organization's favorable or unfavorable disposition toward them. (Kurtessis et al., 2017).

Fair procedures, according to Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, and Rupp (2001), allow employees to better predict the actions that will lead to rewards and punishments, implying that the organization is concerned about employees' welfare in total rather than individual well being implied by organizational politics. As a result, it was found that fairness contributed significantly to POS. Furthermore, procedural justice had a stronger association with POS than other types of fairness, which is consistent with the belief that employees perceive procedural justice to be more under the control of the organization than other forms of fairness. In contrast to fairness, organizational politics showed a strong negative relationship with POS.

Supervisor support was more strongly connected to POS than coworker support, which is consistent with OST's belief that higher-level employees are more intimately identified with the organization than lower-level employees. When fairness was taken into account, however, the moderate association between supervisor support and POS was significantly diminished. It is found that various types of inspirational and supportive leadership contributed significantly to POS, which is consistent with OST. In contrast, POS was shown to be less connected with beginning structure and transactional leadership (Kurtessis et al., 2017).

Recent data also imply that supervisors' levels of identification with the business vary, and that good leadership by such identified supervisors is highly associated to POS (Eisenberger et al., 2014).

Working conditions were also significant drivers of POS, however the strength of these connections varied, as predicted by OST. Working conditions that would be considered resources, such as autonomy, rewards, and other elements of job enrichment, were stronger predictors of POS than demands related to the character of the job, such as role overload, conflict, and ambiguity, according to Demerouti and colleagues' (2001) job demands–resources

model. This suggests that, while demands influence POS decisions, resources have a stronger impact, with employees placing a higher value on what the job offers them rather than the stressful aspects of the job. It's possible that employees ascribe job resources to the organization's discretion, but they're less likely to blame the organization for the demands placed on them, owing to the nature of their jobs and industries. Eisenberger et al. (1997) revealed that "stress and pressures" was placed last of 18 job conditions in terms of organizational control, whereas job enrichment factors were considered as the most under organizational control, across a variety of organizations. Thus, POS is influenced by the organization's control and motive behind favorable or unfavorable treatment, not just the impact of treatment.

### **Outcomes of POS**

POS, according to OST, encourages employees to value a social exchange relationship with the company over a financial one (Shore et al., 2006). Employees with high POS levels of trust in the business also believe that risks can be taken on the company's behalf without fear of being exploited (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer, 1998).

High-POS employees reported greater felt obligation (and similarly defined normative commitment) directed toward organizational goals and objectives, higher affective commitment, and a greater expectation that high performance will be rewarded, all of which are consistent with the social exchange processes proposed by OST. POS is positively related to organizational identification, and organizational identification partially mediated the association between POS and affective commitment, according to the self-enhancement processes outlined by OST.

POS is favorably related to job satisfaction, job self-efficacy, organization-based self-esteem, and work–family balance, and negatively related to job stress, burnout, and work–family conflict, demonstrating the importance of self-enhancement processes. Workers may be happier



in their jobs if they have a continuous pattern of supportive interactions with leaders and attractive working conditions, which leads to POS and a perception of the organization as dispositionally helpful. Their positive outlook on the future may help diminish threat assessments, which are important in stress processes (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

POS is linked to organizationally beneficial behavioral outcomes, such as improved in-role performance and less withdrawal behaviors. Employees with a high POS score are more likely to serve the business outside of their employment because they want to rather than because they feel obligated to (Meyer & Allen, 1997). When performance feedback from supervisors, coworkers, and/or customers is available, this specific feedback may be the key determinant of job self-efficacy, making POS less important.

### **Occupational Stress**

Another factor to be analyzed in this study is occupational or work-related stress (WRS), which is one of the most common work-related health concerns in Europe and around the world (Brookes et al., 2013). Work-related stress is defined as stress that is caused or aggravated by one's job and is a negative reaction that people have when working expectations and duties are greater than they can easily manage or are beyond their capabilities (Leka & Kortum, 2008). It can affect workers in a variety of ways and come from a variety of places. Occupational stress has long been a source of concern for executives, employees, and other stakeholders in businesses. Stress is a severe problem in many workplaces, according to occupational stress researchers (Cooper and Cartwright, 1994; Ornelas & Kleiner 2003).

Occupational stress has a considerable cost in many firms. According to the International Labor Organization (ILO), inefficiencies caused by occupational stress can cost a country up to

10% of its GDP. Occupational stress is ubiquitous, and it's getting more expensive (Katherine, George, Mary and Linda, 2008). In contrast, according to a research by Randolfi (1997), nearly 70% of workers reported that stress caused health difficulties, which resulted in decreased productivity. Stress symptoms affect an estimated 90% of medical patients. For example, in the United States, businesses spend \$69 billion on stress-related costs each year (Manning & Jackson, 1996). According to the American Institute of Stress, it is the main factor in up to 80% of all work-related injuries and 40% of turnover in the workplace, while the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions reported that 30% of the European working population is affected by work-related stress (Richardson & Rothstein, 2008).

There are different approaches regarding the definition of occupational stress. Most scholars agree that the sense of a gap between environmental demands (stressors) and individual capacities to meet these expectations is defined as occupational stress (Vermunt & Steensma, 2005; Ornelas & Kleiner, 2003). For example, Botha and Pienaar (2006) claim that perceived job loss and security, sitting for extended periods of time or heavy lifting, a lack of safety, the difficulty of repetitive tasks, and a lack of autonomy in the workplace are all factors of occupational stress.

Stress, according to Topper (2007), is a person's psychological and physiological response to perceived demand and difficulty. For example, according to Nelson and Quick (1994), stress is one of the most artistically ambiguous words, having as many interpretations as there are people who use it, and even specialists disagree on how to define it. While Rees and Redfern (2000) claim that there is no commonly accepted definition of stress, Ornelas and Kleiner (2003) suggest that stress is a by-product of modern living caused by our attempts to balance the demands of work and family life.

Other scholars have remarked that the definition of stress is vague and can be highly misleading. Because of the widespread, nontechnical, and popular use of the word stress, according to Beehr (1998), job stress is an area of research that has the potential to be riddled with ambiguity. To add to the ambiguity surrounding the term stress, it appears that most researchers divide stress into two categories: good stress and harmful stress. Good stress is defined as positive stress that drives employees to perform, whereas harmful stress is defined as stress that has negative repercussions (Bland, 1999). Selye (1987) divided stress into two types: eustress and distress, with eustress being pleasant and distress being harmful. Most researchers have chosen to interpret the term stress in reference to their work or study in order to avoid this ambiguity. For example, stress is characterized by Hausman (2001) as the uncertainty and even anxiety associated with the introduction of new technologies and systems between enterprises. Varca (1999) described stress as a reaction to one's surroundings. A stressful environment, she defined, is a gap between environmental demands and personal resources to meet those demands.

### **Reasons for stress**

Various reasons stand for stress in the workplace, but many studies believe that job overload is the most common cause (Buchanan and Kaczenski, 2019). Increasing the workload in an organization without considering the availability of workers to complete the tasks might result in occupational stress. As a result, the growth in workload in any business should match the availability of labor. Furthermore, Buchanan and Huczynski (2019) identified some common sources of stress in the workplace as an insufficient physical working environment, improper job design, poor management style, poor relationships, an uncertain future, and divided loyalties.

Further to the above, unsympathetic corporate culture, poor communication between managers and employees, lack of involvement in decision-making, bullying and harassment, constant or rapid change, insufficient resources, conflicting priorities, and a lack of challenges, according to Tehrani (2002), generate stress. All employees should have access to the organization's communication channels, and they should be able to participate in the decision-making process in order to reduce stress. Employees will become stressed as a result of management's lack of involvement. According to Bland (1999), occupational stresses include too much work, insufficient time to complete tasks, a stressful environment, relational problems with partners, bosses, or coworkers, and financial insecurity. Stress is exacerbated by conflicts between home and work, as well as the influence on personal relationships (Fairbrother & Warn, 2003).

Role ambiguity, conflicting performance expectations, the political atmosphere of the business, and poor relationships with coworkers are all sources of stress (Manshor, et al., 2003). Job content, such as workload; working environments, such as physically demanding labor; and social connections at work, such as mobbing expenses, are all elements that contribute to stress (Otto and Schmidt, 2007). Individual and family variables, socioeconomic and financial status, as well as mental and physical health considerations, all have a significant role in occupational stress (Manshor et al., 2003).

Workplace stress is also induced by a lack of resources and equipment; work patterns (such as working late shifts or overtime) and the organizational atmosphere are both factors that contribute to employee stress. Moreover, changes in technology, downsizing, rapid restructuring, and unexpected changes in work schedules, competition for promotional chances, lack of participation in decision-making, and lack of employee empowerment, according to Harvey and

Brown (2006), are all key stressors in the workplace. Conflicts with coworkers, insufficient time to complete responsibilities, and workplace violence are some of the others. Acts of violence in the workplace, perpetrated by both employees and customers, contribute significantly to employee stress.

The US National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) developed a model that depicts the relationship between occupational stress and health. Physical environment, role conflict, role ambiguity, interpersonal conflict, job future ambiguity, job control, employment opportunities, quantitative work load, variance in work load, responsibility for people, underutilization of abilities, cognitive demands, and shift work are all listed as causes of stress in this model. Inadequate advice and support from superiors, lack of consultation and communication, lack of encouragement from superiors, feelings of isolation, prejudice and favoritism, and inadequate or low quality training/management development, according to Kirkcaldy, Trimpoo, and Williams (2002). Keeping up with new technologies, ideas, technology, or innovations in companies, attending meetings, a lack of social support from coworkers, and simply being visible or available are all factors that contribute to stress. All of these stresses are linked to the management of factors to control occupational stress and provide a better workplace well being for employees.

### **Outcomes of stress**

Stress is commonly acknowledged to have both positive and harmful effects on people. An acceptable level of stress can help an individual's performance improve, however excessive stress can lead to lower performance (Stevenson & Harper, 2006). In both industrialized and

developing countries that have seen rapid industrialization, occupational stress has raised the risk of work-related disorders and accidents (Manshor et al., 2003).

When employees begin to experience symptoms of work stress, they may become dissatisfied and leave. This turnover has a negative impact on the company since it raises recruitment and selection costs (Ongori, 2007). Furthermore, professional stress has an impact on an individual's physical and psychological well-being. This can result in heart disease, hypertension, peptic ulcers, sickness, drunkenness, depression, suicidal thoughts, anxiety, and other mental illnesses (Botha & Pienaar, 2006). As a result, management must design suitable stress management strategies in the workplace. Symptoms of stress can be categorized in five categories: first emotional (anxiety, nervousness, worries, depression, anger, irritability, guilt, moodiness, and loss of enjoyment) and physical symptoms (loneliness, loss of humor, lack of confidence, isolation, and job dissatisfaction). Second, bodily symptoms includes restlessness, tenseness, elevated blood pressure, back and neck muscle strain, fatigue, dry mouth, headaches, sleeplessness, dizziness, appetite loss or gain, and ringing in the ears. Third, there are behavioral issues such as impatience, impulsivity, hyperactivity, short temper, aggression, alcoholism, drug misuse, avoiding uncomfortable circumstances, sex drive loss, and overworking. Fourth, mental issues as frequent memory lapses, continual negative thinking, harsh self-criticism, inability to make decisions, difficulties completing tasks, skewed concepts, rigid attitudes, and difficulty concentrating. Finally, health related issues include high blood pressure, increased susceptibility to colds and flu, headaches, irritable bowel symptoms, ulcers, stomach diseases, heart attacks, angina, strokes, asthma, and skin rashes may arise (Cohen & Single, 2001).

Occupational stress is associated with high employee discontent, job mobility, burnout, poor work performance, and ineffective interpersonal relationships at work (Manshor, Rodrigue,

and Chong, 2003). Homicide is the second leading cause of fatal occupational injury for working males, while it is the leading cause of mortality for working women, according to the American Institute of Stress (AIS). In their study on occupational stress and student learning experience, Stevenson and Harper (2006) found that the impacts of stress on academic staff include teaching below par, absenteeism from work, disagreement with students, and looking for work elsewhere.

Stressors factors have a direct negative impact on the learning experience of students. Furthermore, the negative impacts were definitely large, despite the fact that stress has some positive effects, such as enforcing deadlines and improving performance. Low motivation and morale, poor performance, high turnover, sick leave, accidents, bad job satisfaction, low quality products and services, poor internal communication, and conflicts are all factors that lead to occupational stress (Schabracq & Cooper 2000).

Reduced efficiency, lower capacity to function, dampened initiative and reduced enthusiasm in working, increased rigidity of thought, lack of concern for the company and coworkers, and a loss of responsibility are all negative effects of occupational stress. Overall, occupational stress can affect negatively employees well being and especially their well being in the workplace, which is the last factor that is going to be studied.

### **Affective well being**

In today's working environment, firms must be attentive to employee requirements in order to attract and retain people. At the same time, businesses are beginning to recognize the value of providing a positive work environment for their employees, particularly supportive working circumstances that encourage employees' well being (Mearns et al., 2010). This emphasis on support can be seen in increased concern for employee safety and physical health, as well as a greater emphasis on providing psychologically healthy environments.

Employees who are healthier are more productive because they miss fewer days due to illness, have fewer health claims, and have better general concentration and attitude (Warr, 1994). Organizational issues affecting employee health are important to research because it can provide practical advice on how to improve employee health and consequently organizational effectiveness. Employment conditions are one of the socioeconomic determinants of health, according to the World Health Organization (Employment Conditions Knowledge Network (EMCONET), 2007). Employee interactions with one another and supervisors, as well as the associated emotional states and supportive work environment, have the ability to influence health, in addition to the numerous human resource policies and initiatives aimed to encourage wellness.

The majority of the literature on subjective well-being considers it to be essentially an affective state (Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999). Several expanded conceptualizations of well-being have been developed in the last 15 years, embracing not only affect, but also behavior and motivation (Ryff, 1989). This begs the question of how subjective well-being should be understood: does it primarily refer to an emotive judgment about events in people's lives (Diener et al., 1999), or should it be viewed as a broader phenomenon that includes non-affective features as well?

Subjective well-being is increasingly being recognized by social scientists as a barometer of societal progress and living standards (Fitoussi & Stiglitz, 2012). Individuals' global ratings of satisfaction have traditionally been used to measure well-being. For example, national surveys such as the United States General Social Surveys ask respondents to rate their overall job satisfaction by answering the question "How pleased would you say you are with your employment?". Despite their simplicity, global well-being measurements frequently tap into



people's overall opinions about a certain activity rather than reflecting their actual experience in the field; this restriction has led to the development of a new component of subject well-being called affective well-being (Krueger et al. 2013). Affective well-being refers to people's perceptions of recent specific episodes in their lives and captures how people experience their lives moment to moment as reflected in the positive and negative feelings that accompany their daily activities (Kahneman & Krueger 2006). Affective experience, in a nutshell, gives quantitative data on respondents' time usage as well as the intensity of stress, enjoyment, and other affective emotions experienced during their varied uses of time (Lim, 2016). In comparison to global well-being measures, time-based well-being relates people's claimed well-being to actual events in their life, giving a more accurate picture of what they're going through at any given time (Krueger et al., 2013). Affective well-being, a distinct core dimension of subjective well-being, is important not only in and of itself, but also because it causally predicts a variety of positive outcomes, such as the quality of social and work life (e.g., increased prosocial behavior, better economic prospects), health, and longevity (Krueger et al., 2013). Examining how people experience time and how that varies across social groups sheds light on the well-being implications of various daily activities as well as the social processes that contribute to health-related quality-of-life disparities (Kahneman et al., 2004).

This topic appears to be particularly important in the context of occupational well-being. Some significant outcome variables in work and occupational psychology tap into components of affective well-being (e.g. job satisfaction, commitment, and depression), whereas others measure aspects of these larger well-being conceptualizations (e.g. motivation, competence and efficacy). A positive view of different aspects of one's employment, including affective, motivational, behavioral, cognitive, and psychosomatic components, is understood as occupational well-being.

The two broad conceptualizations of psychological well-being outlined earlier influenced the selection of these categories (i.e. those of Ryff, 1989, and Warr, 1994).

To better understand well-being we can use two well known models. The first one is the well-being model proposed by Ryff: Ryff and her colleagues have constructed a broad, context-free model of happiness during the last decade (Ryff, 1989; Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Ryff suggested a six-dimensional model of well-being based on Erikson's (1994) and Maslow's (1959) multidimensional frameworks of positive psychological functioning. (1) Self-acceptance: a positive assessment of oneself and one's past life; (2) Environmental mastery: the ability to effectively manage one's life and the environment; (3) Autonomy: a sense of self-determination and the ability to reject social pressures to think and act in specific ways; (4) Positive interpersonal relationships, such as genuine concern for others' well-being; (5) Personal growth: a sense of personal growth and development, as well as an openness to new experiences; and (6) Life purpose: the belief that one's life is meaningful and purposeful, and that one has something to live for. Confirmatory factor analysis validated the distinctions between these notions, suggesting that a latent second-order factor might account for their relationships (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Although distinct dimensions of well-being can be separated empirically and theoretically, they appear to tap the same underlying phenomenon at a higher level of abstraction.

The second is Warr's model of mental health: Unlike Ryff and her colleagues, Warr (1994) focused on well-being in a particular context (i.e. at work). The advantage of thinking of well-being as a job-specific rather than a context-free phenomenon is that relationships with job-related antecedents are stronger for job-related well-being, potentially allowing for a better understanding of how specific work characteristics affect employees' well-being. Warr (1994)

distinguished four primary dimensions (anxiety, comfort (labelled earlier as contentment) depression, and enthusiasm).

Affective well-being is made up of numerous different broad classes of affective experience, such as anxiety–comfort, depression–pleasure, boredom–enthusiasm, tiredness–vigor, and anger–placidity, according to research on the structure of emotions and mood (Daniels, 2000). Although a number of underlying dimensions may account for the correlations between these affects, empirical data suggests that the pleasure–displeasure axis accounts for the majority of the covariance between indicators of affective well-being in the workplace (Daniels, 2000). Many current measures for evaluating occupational well-being (e.g., job satisfaction, organizational commitment, work strain, and weariness) focus primarily on the affective dimension.

### **Relationship between variables**

#### **POS and Occupational Stress**

POS refers to employees' general aspect that the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger et al. 1986). According to a meta-analysis by Rhodes and Eisenberger (2002), employees' POS may be reduced as a result of role stress. According to George et al. (1993), POS may reduce negative physiological and psychological reactions to job stress because employees receive material and emotional assistance from the company when dealing with high job demands. POS was also found to be negatively connected to burnout in empirical investigations (e.g., Cropanzano et al. 1997).

According to Rhodes and Eisenberger (2002), four mechanisms proposed by organizational support theory underlie the indirect relationships of three categories of treatments

received by employees from the organization POS-outcomes. Attributional processes, a sense of commitment to help the organization, satisfaction of socioemotional needs, and performance-reward expectancies are the four mechanisms.

It is proposed that attributional processes and the satisfaction of socioemotional demands can help to understand how job stress promotes job burnout via POS: Employees first believe that many stressors (such as job overload, role ambiguity, and role conflict) can be regulated by the organization, and then they blame a stressful work environment to a lack of support from the company. As a result, occupational stress lowers POS. Second, low POS may contribute to staff burnout by failing to meet employees' socioemotional requirements. Some research has found that POS mediates the relationship between stress and anger and depressive symptoms (Richardson et al. 2008) as well as turnover intention (Kim and Barak, 2015), providing preliminary evidence for the hypothesis that POS mediates the relationship between job stress and burnout.

According to Cohen and Wills (1985), support has four functions to protect individuals from deleterious effects of job stress. First, support serves to boost people's self-esteem; that is, support can boost people's self-esteem and acceptance by signaling that they are respected and loved regardless of their flaws. Second, assistance provides individuals with sufficient information to help define, interpret, and cope with stressful occurrences. Third, support provides social companionship, which meets the urge to be accompanied and affiliated while also distracting people from their stress. Finally, support plays an important role in providing material resources and services to assist people cope with stress.

Because it is highly related to three of the five roles, namely preserving and enhancing self-esteem, delivering knowledge, and providing material resources, organizational support can

buffer the effect of job stress on burnout (George et al. 1993). First, when people are unable to cope with stress successfully, they may relate their inability to a lack of abilities or personality flaws, putting their self-esteem at risk. Such dangers may cause them to underestimate their own ability to cope with stress, exacerbating their burnout symptoms. Individuals' perceptions of being respected and cared for by their companies, on the other hand, may reduce esteem-threatening self-recriminations and increase general self-esteem, boosting their sense of stress-coping capacities. Second, those with a high POS feel that their employers will give them all of the information they need about the stressors and how to deal with them effectively. Because they reduce their inclination to exaggerate stressors and increase their impression of available resources to cope with stress, such beliefs may buffer the influence of job stress on their burnout. Finally, individuals who believe their organizations are supportive believe that they will offer them with resources to cope with stress, such as time off from work and sufficient job autonomy, hence reducing the stress's impact on burnout. To summarize, POS may buffer the effect of occupational stress on burnout by affecting individuals' stress appraisal and sense of available stress-coping tools (Cohen & Wills, 1985).

### **POS and Affective well-being**

According to the organizational support theory framework (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002), providing employees with fairness in terms of procedures, supervisor support, organizational rewards, and/or positive job conditions increases their feelings of being valued and cared for by the organization (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Positive job-related emotion should lead to fewer symptoms of ill physical health if employees feel valued and cared for by their employers (a high level of POS).

When it comes to employee reactions to their workplaces, POS is a crucial component to explore. Recent data reveals that low POS is linked to the specific emotion of anger (O'Neill et al., 2009) and that high POS is linked to generic happy mood (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002). Employees, on the whole, believe that their organization has a positive or negative attitude toward them, according to research (Eisenberger et al., 1986). POS stands for the perception that the organization in which they work recognizes their contributions and is concerned about their well-being (Eisenberger et al., 1986). POS has been linked to a number of critical outcomes in organizational research, including affective commitment, job involvement and performance (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Family-to-work conflict is more strongly connected to poor job performance among workers reporting low versus high levels of POS, suggesting that POS may buffer the negative impacts of family-to-work conflict (Witt and Carlson, 2006).

POS has been found to interact with colleague support to predict safety voice in terms of its impact on employee physical health (Tucker et al., 2008). In order to forecast performance, POS interacts with the amount of chronic pain - when POS is high, it minimizes the harmful effects of chronic pain on performance (Byrne and Hochwarter, 2006).

### **POS and employee physical well-being**

Employee well-being is defined as the absence of illness as well as the presence of good states, and it might comprise affective, cognitive, psychological, and physical components.

Physical health is hardly mentioned in the POS literature; psychological conditions have been studied more carefully (e.g. Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002). In terms of health, social support has a long history of research. Organizational support, unlike social support, is an overall sense that an employee has about the organization that he or she works for - not about any one specific

individual (Cropanzano et al., 1997). As a result, despite the distinctions between these two notions, we can learn about the links between POS and health from the literature on social support. More social support has been connected to lower rates of sickness and mortality (Uchino, 2009). Social interactions are a predictor of human health even after controlling for stressful events, depression, and health-related habits such as smoking, exercise, and diet (Heaphy and Dutton, 2008). Much fewer studies have looked into the specific link between POS and physical health than there have been studies that have looked into the overall link between social support and physical health (Richardson et al., 2008).

Studies on the direct impacts of POS on physical health have found that they are beneficial. POS has been proven to have a direct effect on a variety of health issues such as weariness, burnout (Cropanzano et al., 1997), and headaches (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002). Other research has looked into the mediating and moderating effects. A favorable link between POS and physical health was reinforced in a research of military personnel, which found that a supportive work environment had a beneficial influence on job satisfaction, which in turn had a positive effect on employee physical health (Dupre & Day, 2007). POS was conceived as one component of the concept of a helpful work environment. The POS- physical health association appears to be mediated by job satisfaction. There was no association between POS and physical health in another study that looked into the moderating impact of POS in respect to the stressor-strain relationship, where strain was defined as physical health (Richardson et al., 2008). The authors of this study, which used a sample from a retail organization, speculate that these findings are due to the fact that POS is linked to "cognitive processing" and hence has a stronger relationship with cognitively based strain such as depression (Richardson et al., 2008, p. 804). It's possible that the relationship between POS and physical health varies depending on the

context. Overall, researches have shown that there is a credible link between POS and physical health, with higher POS being associated with better physical health.

Organizational issues can be linked to physical health on a broad basis (EMCONET, 2007). An overview of linkages between organizational characteristics and physiology reveals that pleasant social interactions can have significant benefits on human physiological systems, according to a positive psychology perspective (Heaphy and Dutton, 2008). The findings imply that people's subjective sense of their ties with others has immediate, permanent, and consequential repercussions on their bodies, according to the authors (Arnold and Dupré, 2012).

A review of studies that linked physiological measures to “quality of social relationships and connections” found that the more positive connections people had, the better their health, as measured by protective cardiology effects (lower HR and BP), stronger immune systems, and healthier hormone patterns while under stress (Heaphy and Dutton, 2008). Insofar as positive links can be found in POS, this lends indirect support to the theory that POS and physical health are linked.

POS has also been linked to psychological health, supporting the claim that it has an impact on employee physical well-being. Employees were shielded against the detrimental consequences of politics, according to one study (Byrne et al., 2005). Furthermore, it has been discovered that supportive managers and regulations linked to family-work balance boost employees' feelings of work and personal control, which reduces sadness (Arnold and Dupré, 2012). Other types of supportive leadership, such as transformational leadership (Bass and Riggio, 2010), have been linked to psychological well-being via effects on job meaning, role clarity, and development possibilities (Arnold et al., 2007). To the extent that supervisors and



leaders may represent the organization to employees, our assumptions about POS are informed by findings about leadership and its impact on employee well-being.

### **POS and emotion**

People feel happy when they are valued. As a result, we believe that a greater POS will lead to more pleasant sentiment. Affective state without a specified objective or object is defined as a positive mood (George, 1989). According to research, POS affects how valued and worthwhile employees feel, and when people feel valued, they are more likely to have a good mood (Eisenberger et al., 2001; Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002). We're looking for emotion that can be linked to the work that an employee does. Trait affectivity, on the other hand, tends to be a more stable emotional make-up of an individual. Work-related state feeling (both positive and negative) is likely associated to POS. The discovery that POS is related to job satisfaction – another form of positive work-related affect (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002) that has been distinguished from positive and negative job-related emotion – adds to our case that emotion associated to a work aim should be influenced by POS (Van Katwyk et al., 2000).

People dislike feeling undervalued, thus we anticipate that low POS will act as a stressor and cause unpleasant sentiment. Negative social interactions (conflict, rejection, criticism, and intrusiveness) have also been connected to negative affect experience (Newsom et al., 2005). Although lower POS does not always indicate a bad relationship between the individual and the organization (it could be a neutral relationship), it is plausible that low POS increases negative sentiment. Despite the fact that there are not specific linkages between POS and negative emotion, it is critical to explore these two distinct emotional systems for a variety of reasons. To begin with, there are few studies that look at both "positive and negative emotion together as

predictors of mortality" (Brummett et al., 2005, p. 215). The relationship to physical health and analysis of both factors in the same study is an essential goal. Second, negative and pleasant emotions are not always mutually exclusive. Positive and negative "psychological experiences of relationships are characterized by diverse evoking contexts, methods, and outcomes," and so do not necessarily engage the same processes in terms of health connections (Heaphy and Dutton, 2008). As a result, negative emotion may have a greater relationship than positive feeling.

After examining all these factors, the analysis of the research will be presented by displaying research methodology, statistical analysis and finding of the research.

## **Methodology**

The purpose of this research is to determine the relationship of occupational stress, perceived organizational support and affective well-being on employees working in Cyprus. The study proposes three hypotheses to guide this examination of relationships. To evaluate these questions the following null and contingent hypotheses are proposed.

### **Participants**

To select our survey questionnaires we chose the probability sampling selection which is based on random selection and permits the researcher to eliminate bias in selection. Questionnaires were distributed via email using Google forms to employees working in different sectors in Cyprus context during September and October of 2021. A total of 106 employees from organizations in both the private and public sector in Cyprus, participated in the study. Of the 106 employees participated in the study 75% (N=80) were females, 25% (N=26) were males.

Twenty four (22.6%) participants had been with their employer for less than 6 months, 20 (18.9%) had been with their organization up until 1 year, 44 (41.5%) had been with their organization between 1-5 years, 12 (11.3%) had been employed between 5-10 years, and 6 (5.7%) had been with their organization for more than 10 years.

Then the measurement of our study was done by using three known and validated instruments: a) the Job Related Affective Well Being Scale, b) the Perceived Organizational Support, and c) the occupational stress index. Finally, for the analysis of our results SPSS Statistics v.27 was used.

### **Measurements**

### **Job Related Affective Well-being Scale**

In the present research, Job Related Affective Well Being Scale (JAWS, Van Katwyk et al., 2000) was used for measuring job related affective well-being of employees working in Cyprus. JAWS comprises of 20 items with a 5-point Likert scale (1 = "never" and 5 = "extremely often"; score ranges from 5-100). The present study has scored JAWS on single dimension of job related affective well-being where items 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16, and 17 were reverse scored. Higher scores on the scale indicate higher levels of job related affective well-being and vice versa. The main advantages of the JAWS are that (a) it provides a pure measure of affect, as opposed to the more complex attitudinal nature of job satisfaction; (b) it measures job-specific affective response, as opposed to the general affective tendencies measured by prior instruments of job satisfaction; and (c) it refers to the full range of possible affective states associated with the job, in contrast to prior instruments, which focuses on high-arousal states (Van Katwyk et al. 2000). In the present study, the Cronbach's alpha of 0.816 indicated the validity of this scale.

### **Perceived Organizational Support (POS)**

Perceived organization was measured with the short, 16-item version of the original 36-item version of Eisenberger et al.'s (1986) survey of Perceived Organizational Support (POS). The SPOS was designed to assess the degree to which individuals believe that their organization cares about their well-being. This short version comprises of the 16 items with the highest factor loadings on the 36-item SPOS that its developers adopted as the short version. The items were originally rated on a 5-point scale with a response format ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

The scale contains both positively and negatively worded items. Sample items include: "The organization really cares about my well-being", and "The organization cares about my

opinions.” Cronbach’s  $\alpha$  coefficient of .718 was obtained in the present study for the 16-item version of the SPOS. Higher scores on the POS reflect greater perception of organizational support.

### **Occupation Stress Index (OSI)**

Occupational Stress Index (OSI) is a widely acceptable scale for measuring job stress. Srivastava and Singh were the first to create an English version of the OSI (1984). The scale is designed to assess how much stress people are experiencing as a result of various workplace components and conditions. The scale can be used to assess individuals at all levels working in industries or other non-production groups. The original scale has 46 items, 28 of which are 'true-keyed' and 18 of which are 'false-keyed,' and each is scored on a five-point scale. The elements are related to practically every aspect of working life that causes stress in some form. This scale comprises 12 sub-scales: Role overload (6 items), Role ambiguity (4 items), Role conflict (5 items), Unreasonable group and Political pressure (4 items), Responsibility for persons(3 items), Underparticipation (4 items), Powerlessness (3 items), Poor peer relations (4 items), Intrinsic impoverishment (4 items), Low status (3 items), Strenuous working conditions (4 items), and Unprofitability(2 items). In our research we delivered a 34 item scale as three subscales (a. Unreasonable Group and Political Pressure, b. Intrinsic Impoverishment and c. Strenuous Working Condition) were excluded. The items were rated on a 5-point scale with a response format ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The cronbach alpha of the scale in this study is 0.807 as shown in Table 1.

---

Table 1: Reliability for Instruments for the research

---

Components

This Study Cronbach alpha

---

---

Affective Well Being	0.816
Perceived Organizational Support	0.718
Occupational Stress Index	0.807

### **Hypothesis Testing**

The purpose of this research is to determine the relationship of occupational stress, perceived organizational support and affective well-being within an organization. The study proposes three hypotheses to guide this examination of relationships. Taken together, these questions consider the relationship of occupational stress within an organization, perceived organizational support within the same organization and job-related affective well-being within

this organization. To evaluate this question we proposed the following null and contingent hypotheses.

### First Hypothesis

H0. There is no relationship between POS and affective well being.

H1. There is a positive relationship between POS and affective well being.

### Second Hypothesis

H0. There is no relationship between POS and occupational stress.

H1. There is a positive relationship between POS and occupational stress.

### Third Hypothesis

H0. There is no relationship between occupational stress and affective well being.

H1. There is a positive relationship between occupational stress and affective well being.

Table 1 presents the correlational analysis results of the components associated with these hypotheses.

Table.1: Correlation Analysis of all variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Gender	.	.					

2. Age			-	-			
	106	.130					
3. Organizational Sector			-	-			
	106	.051	.164				
4. Years of employment			-	.			
	106	.121	.501*	.015			
5. Occupational Stress			.	-			
	106	.064	.021	.039	.130		
6. Affective well being			-	.			
	106	.184	.056	.008	.191*	.138	
7. Organizational support			-	.			
	106	.261*	.019	.135	.223*	.013	.177

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

Results of the bivariate correlational analysis suggest a negative correlation between gender and organizational support ( $r = -.261$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ). Two more statistical significant results were the positive correlation between years of employment and well being ( $r = 0.191$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) and the negative correlation between years of employment and organizational support ( $r = -.223$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Finally, none of the three null hypotheses could be rejected.

### Regression Results

Then the target was to examine the factors that better predict employee well being in an organization. A regression analysis was conducted with the results indicate that there was a



collective significant effect between occupational stress, organizational support, yeas of employment and well being ( $F(3,102) = 4.164, p < 0.05, R^2 = .109$ ).

By examining closer the results, the variable of years of employment is a significant predictor of well being of employees ( $t=2.312, p < 0.05$ ).

Table 3: Regression Analysis of variables predicting affective well being of employees

Variable	B	t	Sig	R	R <sup>2</sup>	F
<b>Model</b>				.33	.10	.00
(Constant)	10.913	8.704	<.001			
Organizational Support	-.270	-1.224	.224			
Years of employment	.298	2.312	.023			
Organizational Support	.294	1.122	.265			

### Analysis of results

In this research the purpose was to understand the different factors that can influence the well being of employees in the workplace. More specifically, a focus was given to employees

working in Cyprus where research is limited and not many data are available. Even though, after the analysis of the results none of the three null hypotheses was rejected, yet some significant outcomes were found. Firstly, an important variable according to the results seems to be the years of an employee working in an organization. The research showed that the more years someone has been in a company the better is his/her affective well-being. These results can be generalized in the broad context of employees working either part or full time and employees working with permanent contracts, contrary with those that need to work with temporary ones.

According to the research, the consequences of temporary versus permanent contracts on health are contradictory. According to certain studies in Europe, such as those conducted in Finland, Spain, Germany, and Sweden (Virtanen, & Hammarstrom, 2011), workers on fixed-term contracts have poorer physical health than those on permanent contracts. Fixed-term contracts have been proven in other research to have no or even favorable effects on health (Sverke, Gallagher, & Hellgreen, 2000). Ehlert and Schaffner (2011) used the European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC), a panel dataset covering 27 European nations from 2004 to 2008. Employees with permanent contracts do not appear to have better health than those with temporary contracts in most nations; nonetheless, repeated temporary contracts have a major detrimental impact on their workplace well-being. Fixed-term employment is traditionally thought to have a negative impact on psychological well-being. Fixed-term contracts are stressful because they imply employment uncertainty (Bohle, Quinlan, & Mayhew, 2001), and workers are unable to plan and regulate their life due to the temporary nature of their occupations. Several investigations back up this traditional belief (Quesnel-Vallee, DeHaney, & Ciampi, 2010). Fixed-term contracts, on the other hand, are unlikely to have the same impact on all workers. Individual characteristics such as ambiguity tolerance and self-

monitoring play an important role in affecting stress reactions and the selection process for permanent employment (Bauer & Truxillo, 2000). As a result, it's not unexpected to find research in the literature that contradicts the traditional belief that fixed-term work has a detrimental influence on psychological well-being (Cottini & Lucifora, 2010). In general, new data suggests that workers on fixed-term contracts are not a homogenous group when compared to those on permanent contracts in terms of health and well-being. The relationship between fixed-term contracts and psychological well-being has been shown to be mediated by factors such as the level of employability and prospect of finding another job, level of work control and choice (such as self-scheduling) and dislike of uncertainty, which may in turn be mediated by the individual's preference for risk (Joyce, Pabayo, Critchley, & Bambra, 2010). Using 12 waves of the British Household Panel Survey, Robone, Jones, and Rice (2011) evaluate the impact of contractual terms on employee health and psychological well-being. Their findings show that having a fixed-term contract has a negative impact on one's health and psychological well-being as compared to having a permanent one.

Moreover, the research of Gakovic and Tetrick (2003), indicate that part-time employees, contrary to expectations, reported greater levels of POS than full-time employees. This might be due to disparities in other aspects of social exchange. This reinforces the idea that these part-time employees see their connection with the company as primarily focused on monetary rewards in the near term (Shore & Tetrick, 1994). If this is the case, the POS findings are much more unexpected. It's possible that part-time employees are valued by employers because of the flexibility that contingent workers bring. It's also possible that part-time employees feel more appreciated by their employers since part-time work gives them the freedom to pursue their educational ambitions.

Full-time employees indicated higher levels of commitment–sacrifice to their employers, as well as stronger relational and transactional commitments. Full-time employees may have greater degrees of continuous commitment–sacrifice because they have accumulated investments in their businesses over time while also losing chances with other employers (Becker, 1960). The findings also revealed that full-time employees have stayed with their companies for longer than part-time employees. Tenure was assumed to explain for greater levels of sacrifice reported by full-time employees since tenure is an indicator of investments made in the company (Sheldon, 1971; Alutto, Hrebiniak, & Alonso, 1973). After adjusting for organizational tenure, the disparity between part-time and full-time employees persisted. As a result, disparities in organizational tenure do not appear to be the cause of full-time employees' greater levels of continuous commitment–sacrifice. Part-time employees' greater levels of POS may be explained by the higher levels of sacrifice indicated by full-time employees. Full-time employees may have higher standards of what constitutes organizational support and hence report lower levels of POS because increased commitment over time may engender feelings of greater corporate duty (Shore & Shore, 1995). According to some study, part-time employees may have more positive opinions toward their employers due to reduced initial employment expectations (Eberhardt & Shani, 1984; Wakefield et al., 1987). Individuals employed full-time may report lower levels of POS because they are more likely to attention to information that is important to their goals, but focus more on negative information than positive information (De Bruin & Van Lange, 2000; Shaw & Steers, 2001). Full-time employees, contrarily, had higher levels of felt commitments to their employers, supporting the social exchange perspective of employment relationships, in which full-time labor is linked to larger organizational investment (Shore et al., 1999).

Research has continually demonstrated the benefits of having a motivated workforce for organizations. POS was found to be favorably associated to a wide range of positive work attitudes and behaviors (e.g. job performance) and negatively connected to negative work attitudes and behaviors (e.g. turnover intentions; Eisenberger & Stinglhamber, 2011). According to OST, POS develops a sense of obligation among employees to return the firm's valuation and caring by establishing attitudes and actions that are advantageous to the organization, based on the social exchange theory and the reciprocity norm. A high POS, in addition to its organizational benefits, has been shown to be beneficial to employees in terms of subjective well-being both at work and outside of work. As a result, POS has been linked to better levels of job satisfaction, positive affect toward the organization, and lower levels of psychological strain at work (Caesens & Stinglhamber, 2014). OST claims that POS increases employees' subjective well-being by meeting their socioemotional needs. Employees would benefit from POS since it would boost their self-esteem and subjective well-being (Kurtessis et al., 2015).

Interestingly, several experts suggested that POS could help people become more engaged at work (e.g. Caesens & Stinglhamber, 2014). According to Eisenberger and Stinglhamber (2011), POS may have a positive impact on employee work engagement by increasing employees' intrinsic interest in their jobs. Because of four primary reasons, POS would encourage employees' inherent interest in their jobs (Eisenberger & Stinglhamber, 2011). For starters, POS instills in employees the impression that their company would assist them with monetary or emotional needs when they arise. Second, POS could send the message to employees that outstanding performance would be rewarded. Third, POS meets the socio-emotional needs of employees (e.g. need for self-esteem). Fourth, through encouraging self-efficacy, POS may increase employees' intrinsic interest in their jobs. Caesens and Stinglhamber

(2014) demonstrated that, by serving as a job resource as defined by the JD-R model, POS had a beneficial impact on employees' work engagement and consequent well-being indicators by increasing employees' self-efficacy.

Employees require organizational support to stay motivated and morally sensitive in the face of workplace system complexity (Fairchild, 2010). Organizational support, for example, may buffer employees from the negative consequences of stress by boosting their self-esteem and indicating that the organization cares about their well-being, according to George et al (1993). Organizational assistance, such as employee advancement and recognition, ongoing education, and skill training, are critical factors in motivating employees to successfully expand their roles (Lee & Low, 2010). Furthermore, it is argued that employees attach humanlike traits to the organization and explain their interactions with it in terms of what they invest and what they receive; their justification influences their total performance (Eisenberger et al., 1986). It was observed that social exchange theory of POS has been utilized to explain beneficial influences on behaviors such as in-role performance and extra-role performance ((Eisenberger et al., 2001). Furthermore, high levels of POS may be negatively associated with role stress, according to social exchange theory, because organizations that care about their employees' well-being are more likely to eliminate unnecessary work complications and distractions for their employees, such as conflicting job requirements (Jawahar et al., 2007).

In conclusion, it appears that organizational support is an important factor to consider in the workplace. The organizational support system could serve as a catalyst for improving overall job performance, as well as reducing job stress and other negative consequences.

### **Implications**

Our findings have important implications. To our knowledge this is one of the first studies that explore significant factors of the workplace context in Cyprus. First, in terms of theoretical considerations, we conceive office employees' well-being in this study by considering their emotional well-being. Employees are critical to the organization's success. As a result, it is critical that businesses pay attention to their employees' feelings, attitudes, and behaviors, and demonstrate to them that they are a valuable asset to the company. Employee well-being can lead to increased work engagement, which can lead to improved performance and less stress. According to Lipp (2005) organizations that do not care about the health and well-being of their people tend to have a demotivated, angry, underperforming work force that can cause a lot of damage to the organization. This is consistent with our findings. As a result, managers should implement tactics aimed at boosting organizational support, so that employees feel supported emotionally and professionally.

Different factors that play a key role in the relationship between affective well-being and occupational stress, organizational support, and years spent working for an organization are also taken into account. Employees on long-term contracts have greater health than those on short-term contracts. Fewer years can be linked to work uncertainty, greater stress, and ultimately poor employee well-being.

Our research backs up the value of years of employment and all the good elements that influence a person's well-being. Employees who had been with their firms for fewer years, on the other hand, reported higher levels of organizational support, contrary to predictions. This could be because they feel more valued as a result of their accomplishments and the flexibility that their employer affords them in many circumstances. Employees who have worked for a company

for a longer period of time may perceive a bigger organizational commitment and have higher expectations for what constitutes organizational support, resulting in lower levels of POS.

### **Limitations**

Although this research has contributed to the existing body of knowledge, yet it might carry various limitations that need to be addressed in future by other scholars. For example, the sample size for this study was insufficient to generalize the findings. Furthermore, this final sample contains a large number of women, raising concerns about the generalizability of our findings. Furthermore, this study used a quantitative method, which has its own set of limitations. Repeated studies under conditions other than those of this project should be done to validate the conclusions of this research. Consistency among different types of organizations, as well as organizations that span diverse industries and represent different organizational forms, are issues that must be addressed.

Our data may have also been subject to the common method variance (CMV) problem because our variables were measured utilizing a single source (i.e. questionnaires). Following Podsakoff et al.'s (2003) recommendations, we took great care to assure the anonymity of the responses to participants and encouraged them to respond as honestly as possible. Additional studies should be conducted to validate the ethical climate components' effect on affective well-being as well as show the presence of negative pleasure feelings and moods within an organization. While this study clearly established some significant relationships between the study variables, additional research is required to obtain a greater understanding of what constitutes these relationships. Finally, the fact that our data were collected over a specific period without using multiple measurement types restricts the generalization of the findings.



### Bibliography

- Abid, G., Contreras, F., Ahmed, S., & Qazi, T. (2019). Contextual Factors and Organizational Commitment: Examining the Mediating Role of Thriving at Work. *Sustainability, 11*(17), 4686. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11174686>
- Allen, D.G., & Shanock, L. (2013). Perceived organizational support and embeddedness as key mechanisms connecting socialization tactics to commitment and turnover among new employees. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34*(3), 350–369. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1805>
- Arnold, K. A., & Dupré, K. E. (2012). Perceived organizational support, employee health and emotions. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management.*
- Arnold, K. A., Turner, N., Barling, J., Kelloway, E. K., & McKee, M. C. (2007). Transformational leadership and psychological well-being: the mediating role of meaningful work. *Journal of occupational health psychology, 12*(3), 193.
- Aselage, J., & Eisenberger, R. (2003). Perceived organizational support and psychological contracts: A theoretical integration. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*(5), 491–509. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.211>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Bland, J. M. (1999). A New Approach to Management of Stress. *Journal of Industrial and Commercial Training, 31*(2), 44-48.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2010). The transformational model of leadership. *Leading organizations: Perspectives for a new era, 2*, 76-86.
- Beehr, T. (2014). *Psychological stress in the workplace (psychology revivals)*. Routledge.
- Beehr, T. A., & Newman, J. E. (1998). Research on occupational stress: An unfinished enterprise. *Personnel Psychology, 51*(4), 835-844.
- Botha, C., & Pienaar, J. (2006). South African correctional official occupational stress: The role of psychological strengths. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 34*(1), 73-84.
- Briner, R. (1999). The Neglect and Importance of Emotion at Work. *European Journal Of Work And Organizational Psychology, 8*(3), 323-346. <https://doi.org/10.1080/135943299398212>

- Brookes, K., Limbert, C., Deacy, C., O'reilly, A., Scott, S., & Thirlaway, K. (2013). Systematic review: work-related stress and the HSE management standards. *Occupational Medicine*, 63(7), 463-472.
- Brummett, B. H., Boyle, S. H., Siegler, I. C., Williams, R. B., Mark, D. B., & Barefoot, J. C. (2005). Ratings of positive and depressive emotion as predictors of mortality in coronary patients. *International journal of cardiology*, 100(2), 213-216.
- Buchanan, D. A., & Huczynski, A. A. (2019). *Organizational behaviour*. Pearson UK.
- Burnard, P. (1991). *Coping with stress in the health professions: a practical guide*. London: Chapman & Hall.
- Byrne, Z. S., Kacmar, C., Stoner, J., & Hochwarter, W. A. (2005). The relationship between perceptions of politics and depressed mood at work: unique moderators across three levels. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10(4), 330.
- Byrne, Z. S., & Hochwarter, W. A. (2006). I get by with a little help from my friends: The interaction of chronic pain and organizational support on performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(3), 215.
- Cascio, W. F. (2003). Changes in workers, work, and organizations. *Handbook of psychology*, 12, 401-422.
- Caesens, G., & Stinglhamber, F. (2014). The relationship between perceived organizational support and work engagement: The role of self-efficacy and its outcomes. *European Review of Applied Psychology*, 64(5), 259-267.
- Chen, G., Kirkman, B.L., Kim, K., Farh, C.I.C., & Tangirala, S. (2010). When does cross-cultural motivation enhance expatriate effectiveness? A multilevel investigation of the moderating roles of subsidiary support and cultural distance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(5), 1110 –1130. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2010.54533217>
- Cohen, J. R., & Single, L. E. (2001). An examination of the perceived impact of flexible work arrangements on professional opportunities in public accounting. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 32(4), 317-328.
- Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological bulletin*, 98(2), 310.
- Cooper, C. L., & Cartwright, S. (1994). Healthy mind; healthy organization—A proactive approach to occupational stress. *Human relations*, 47(4), 455-471.

- Cropanzano, R., Byrne, Z. S., Bobocel, D., & Rupp, D. E. (2001). Moral virtues, fairness heuristics, social entities, and other denizens of organizational justice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 164-209.
- Cropanzano, R., Howes, J. C., Grandey, A. A., & Toth, P. (1997). The relationship of organizational politics and support to work behaviors, attitudes, and stress. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 18(2), 159-180.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M.S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874–900. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602>
- Daniels, K. (2000). Measures of five aspects of affective well-being at work. *Human Relations*, 53(2), 275-294.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. 2001. The job demands–resources model of burn-out. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 499-512.
- Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological bulletin*, 125(2), 276.
- Dupré, K. E., & Day, A. L. (2007). The effects of supportive management and job quality on the turnover intentions and health of military personnel. *Human Resource Management: Published in Cooperation with the School of Business Administration, The University of Michigan and in Alliance with the Society of Human Resources Management*, 46(2), 185-201.
- Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P.D., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 42–51. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.42>
- Eisenberger, R., Cummings, J., Armeli, S., & Lynch, P. 1997. Perceived organizational support, discretionary treatment, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 812-820.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>
- Eisenberger, R., Jones, J.R., Aselage, J., & Sucharski, I.L. (2004). Perceived Organizational Support. In J.A.M. Coyle-Shapiro, L.M. Shore, M.S. Taylor, & L.E. Tetrick (Eds.), *The employment relationship: Examining psychological and contextual perspectives* (pp. 206–225). New York: Oxford University Press.

- Eisenberger, R., Shoss, M. K., Karagonlar, G., Gonzalez-Morales, M. G., Wickham, R., & Buffardi, L. C. (2014). The supervisor POS–LMX–subordinate POS chain: Moderation by reciprocity wariness and supervisor’s organizational embodiment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 35*, 635-656.
- Eisenberger, R., & Stinglhamber, F. (2011). *Perceived organizational support: Fostering enthusiastic and productive employees*. American Psychological Association.
- Employment Conditions Knowledge Network (EMCONET) (2007). “Employment conditions and health inequities: final report to the WHO commission on social determinants of health (CSDH)”, available at: [www.who.int/social\\_determinants/resources/articles/emconet\\_who\\_report.pdf](http://www.who.int/social_determinants/resources/articles/emconet_who_report.pdf) (accessed August 29, 2021).
- Erikson, E. H. (1994). *Identity and the life cycle*. WW Norton & Company.
- Fairbrother, K., & Warn, J. (2003). Workplace dimensions, stress and job satisfaction. *Journal of managerial psychology, 18*(1), 1-12.
- Fairchild, R. M. (2010). Practical ethical theory for nurses responding to complexity in care. *Nursing ethics, 17*(3), 353-362.
- Fredrickson, B. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist, 56*(3), 218-226.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.56.3.218>
- Fitoussi, J. P., & Stiglitz, J. E. (2012). On the measurement of social progress and wellbeing: some further thoughts. *The Global Macro Economy and Finance, 13-24*.
- Galanakis, M., Galanopoulou, F., & Stalikas, A. (2011). Do positive emotions help us cope with occupational stress?. *Europe’s Journal Of Psychology, 7*(2).  
<https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v7i2.127>
- Gakovic, A., & Tetrick, L. E. (2003). Perceived organizational support and work status: a comparison of the employment relationships of part-time and full-time employees attending university classes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior, 24*(5), 649-666.
- George, J. M. (1989). Mood and absence. *Journal of applied psychology, 74*(2), 317.
- George, J. M., Reed, T. F., Ballard, K. A., Colin, J., & Fielding, J. (1993). Contact with AIDS patients as a source of work-related distress: Effects of organizational and social support. *Academy of Management Journal, 36*(1), 157-171.

- Gouldner, A. (1960). The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25(2), 161. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2092623>
- Grant, A. M., Fried, Y., Parker, S. K., & Frese, M. (2010). Putting job design in context: Introduction to the special issue.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Callanan, G. A. (2013). Career dynamics.
- Harvey, D. and Brown, D. R. (2006). *An Experimental Approach to Organisation Development* (7th Ed.). pp. 254-257, Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
- Hausman, A. (2001). Variations in relationship strength and its impact on performance and satisfaction in business relationships. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*.
- Heaphy, E. D., & Dutton, J. E. (2008). Positive social interactions and the human body at work: Linking organizations and physiology. *Academy of management review*, 33(1), 137-162.
- Henderson, D.J., Wayne, S.J., Shore, L.M., Bommer, W.H., & Tetrick, L.E. (2008). Leader-member exchange, differentiation, and psychological contract fulfillment: A multilevel examination. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(6), 1208–1219. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012678>
- Hekman, D. R., Bigley, G. A., Steensma, H. K., & Hereford, J. F. (2009). Combined effects of organizational and professional identification on the reciprocity dynamic for professional employees. *Academy of management journal*, 52(3), 506-526.
- Homans, G.C. (1961). *Social behavior and its elementary forms*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Hu, J., & Liden, R.C. (2013). Relative leader-member exchange within team contexts: How and when social comparison impacts individual effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology*, 66(1), 127–172. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12008>
- Jawahar, I. M., Stone, T. H., & Kisamore, J. L. (2007). Role conflict and burnout: The direct and moderating effects of political skill and perceived organizational support on burnout dimensions. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 14(2), 142.
- Johnson, S. J. (2001). Occupational stress among social workers and administration workers within a social services department (Doctoral dissertation).
- Kahneman, D., & Krueger, A. B. (2006). Developments in the measurement of subjective well-being. *Journal of Economic perspectives*, 20(1), 3-24.

- Kahneman, D., Krueger, A. B., Schkade, D. A., Schwarz, N., & Stone, A. A. (2004). A survey method for characterizing daily life experience: The day reconstruction method. *Science*, *306*(5702), 1776-1780.
- Katherine, P. E., George, J. A., Mary, B. and Linda, S. P. (2008). Stress Management in the Work Place. *Journal of Computers in Human Behaviour*, *24*(2), 486-496.
- Kim, A., & Barak, M. E. M. (2015). The mediating roles of leader- member exchange and perceived organizational support in the role stress-turnover intention relationship among child welfare workers: *A longitudinal analysis. Children and Youth Services Review*, *52*, 135–143.
- Kirkcaldy B. D., Timpoo R. M. and Williams S. (2002). Occupational Stress and Healthy Outcomes Among British and German Managers. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *17*(6), 491-505.
- Kleine, A., Rudolph, C., & Zacher, H. (2019). Thriving at work: A meta-analysis. *Journal Of Organizational Behavior*, *40*(9-10), 973-999. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2375>
- Krueger, A. B., Kahneman, D., Schkade, D., Schwarz, N., & Stone, A. A. (2013). National time accounting: The currency of life. In *Measuring the subjective well-being of nations: National accounts of time use and well-being*. Chicago Scholarship Online. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226454573.003.0002>.
- Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., Stewart, K. A., & Adis, C. S. (2017). Perceived organizational support: A meta-analytic evaluation of organizational support theory. *Journal of management*, *43*(6), 1854-1884.
- Laguna, M., Alessandri, G., & Caprara, G. (2016). Personal Goal Realisation in Entrepreneurs: A Multilevel Analysis of the Role of Affect and Positive Orientation. *Applied Psychology*, *65*(3), 587-604. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12061>
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. 1984. *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York: Springer.
- Lee, I. S., & Low, L. P. (2010). Nurses' role in the early defibrillation of cardiac patients: Implications for nursing in Hong Kong. *Contemporary nurse*, *35*(1), 88-94.
- Leka, S., & Kortum, E. (2008). A European framework to address psychosocial hazards. *Journal of occupational health*, *50*(3), 294–6. <https://doi.org/10.1539/joh.M6004>.
- Lexshimi, R., Tahir, S., Santhna, L. P., & Md Nizam, J. (2007). Prevalence of stress and coping mechanism among staff nurses in the intensive care unit. *Med Health*, *2*(2), 146-53.

- Li, N., Chiaburu, D.S., & Kirkman, B.L. (2017). Cross-level influences of empowering leadership on citizenship behavior. *Journal of Management*, 43(4), 1076–1102.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314546193>
- Lim, C. (2016). Religion, time use, and affective well-being. *Sociological Science*, 3, 685-709.
- Lindholm, M. (2006). Working conditions, psychosocial resources and work stress in nurses and physicians in chief managers' positions. *Journal Of Nursing Management*, 14(4), 300-309.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2934.2006.00636.x>
- Manning, M. R., Jackson, C. N., & Fusilier, M. R. (1996). Occupational stress, social support, and the costs of health care. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(3), 738-750.
- Manshor, A. T., Fontaine, R., & Choy, C. S. (2003). Occupational stress among managers: a Malaysian survey. *Journal of managerial psychology*.
- Mark, L. F., Jonathan and Gregory, S. K. (2003), Eustress, Distress and Interpretation in Occupational Stress. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(7), 726-744.
- Maslow, A. H. (1959). New knowledge in human values.
- Mearns, K., Hope, L., Ford, M. T., & Tetrick, L. E. (2010). Investment in workforce health: Exploring the implications for workforce safety climate and commitment. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 42(5), 1445-1454.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, J. P., Becker, T. E., & Van Dick, R. (2006). Social identities and commitments at work: Toward an integrative model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27: 665-683.
- Mielniczuk, E., & Łaguna, M. (2018). The factorial structure of job-related affective well-being: Polish adaptation of the Warr's measure. *International Journal Of Occupational Medicine And Environmental Health*. <https://doi.org/10.13075/ijomeh.1896.01178>
- Mignonac, K., & Richebé, N. (2013). No strings attached?: How attribution of disinterested support affects employee retention. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 23(1), 72–90.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2012.00195.x>
- Morris, J. E., & Long, B. C. (2002). Female clerical workers' occupational stress: The role of person and social resources, negative affectivity, and stress appraisals. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 49(4), 395.



- Nelson, D. L., & Quick, J. C. (2003). *Organisational behavior: foundations, realities and challenges*. Canada: Thomson.
- Newsom, J. T., Rook, K. S., Nishishiba, M., Sorkin, D. H., & Mahan, T. L. (2005). Understanding the relative importance of positive and negative social exchanges: Examining specific domains and appraisals. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *60*(6), 304.
- O'Neill, O. A., Vandenberg, R. J., DeJoy, D. M., & Wilson, M. G. (2009). Exploring relationships among anger, perceived organizational support, and workplace outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *14*(3), 318.
- Ongori, H. (2007). A Review of the Literature on Employee Turnover. *Africa Journal of Business Management*, *1*(3), 49-54.
- Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of applied psychology*, *74*(1), 157.
- Ornelas, S., & Kleiner, B. H. (2003). New developments in managing job related stress. *Equal Opportunities International*.
- Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(879), 10-1037.
- Pratt, L. I., & Barling, J. (1988). Differentiating between daily events, acute and chronic stressors: A framework and its implications. *Occupational stress: Issues and developments in research*, 41-53.
- Randolfi, E. A. (1997). Developing a stress management and relaxation centre for the worksite. *Worksite Health*, *4*(3), 40-4.
- Rees, C. J., & Redfern, D. (2000). Recognising the perceived causes of stress—a training and development perspective. *Industrial and commercial Training*.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived Organizational Support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(4), 698–714. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698>
- Richardson, K. M., & Rothstein, H. R. (2008). Effects of occupational stress management intervention programs: a meta-analysis. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, *13*(1), 69.



- Richardson, H. A., Yang, J., Vandenberg, R. J., DeJoy, D. M., & Wilson, M. G. (2008). Perceived organizational support's role in stressor-strain relationships. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23, 789–810.
- Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, A. B., Burt, R. S., & Camerer, C. 1998. Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 23: 393-404.
- Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Exploration of the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 1069–1081.
- Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 69(4), 719.
- Schabracq, M. J., & Cooper, C. L. (2000). The changing nature of work and stress. *Journal of managerial psychology*.
- Sears, K., & Humiston, G. S. (2015). The role of emotion in workplace incivility. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*.
- Selye, H. (1977). Stress Without Distress. *School Guidance Worker*, 32(5), 5-13.
- Shore, L. M., Tetrick, L. E., Lynch, P., & Barksdale, K. 2006. Social and economic exchange: Construct development and validation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36, 837-867.
- Siu, O. L. (2002). Occupational stressors and well-being among Chinese employees: The role of organisational commitment. *Applied Psychology*, 51(4), 527-544.
- Stevenson, A., & Harper, S. (2006). Workplace stress and the student learning experience. *Quality assurance in education*.
- Topper, E. F. (2007). Stress in the Library. *Journal of New Library*, 108(11/12), 561-564.
- Tucker, S., Chmiel, N., Turner, N., Hershcovis, M. S., & Stride, C. B. (2008). Perceived organizational support for safety and employee safety voice: the mediating role of coworker support for safety. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 13(4), 319.
- Uchino, B. N. (2009). What a lifespan approach might tell us about why distinct measures of social support have differential links to physical health. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 26(1), 53-62.
- Van Katwyk, P. T., Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Using the Job-Related Affective Well-Being Scale (JAWS) to investigate affective responses to work stressors. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 5(2), 219.
- Varca, P. E. (1999). Work stress and customer service delivery. *Journal of Services Marketing*.

Vardaman, J.M., Allen, D.G., Otondo, R.F., Hancock, J.I., Shore, L.M., & Rogers, B.L. (2016). Social comparisons and organizational support: Implications for commitment and retention.

*Human Relations*, 69(7), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726715619687>

Vermunt, R., & Steensma, H. (2005). How can justice be used to manage stress in organizations. *Handbook of organizational justice*, 383-410.

Warr, P. (1987). *Work, unemployment, and mental health*. Oxford University Press.

Warr, P. (1994). A conceptual framework for the study of work and mental health. *Work & Stress*, 8(2), 84-97.

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of management*, 17(3), 601-617.

Witt, L. A., & Carlson, D. S. (2006). The work-family interface and job performance: moderating effects of conscientiousness and perceived organizational support. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 11(4), 343.

Zagenczyk, T.J., Scott, K.D., Gibney, R., Murrell, A.J., & Thatcher, J.B. (2010). Social influence and perceived organizational support: A social networks analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 111, 127–138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2009.11.004>