A Holistic Examination of Work Environment and Employee Well-being

Dr. Begüm AL, *ORCID: 0000-0001-8839-4478, İstanbul Kent University, Türkiye; begum.al@kent.edu.tr*

A Holistic Examination of Work Environment and Employee Well-being	İş Ortamı ve Çalışan Refahının Bütünsel İncelemesi
Abstract	***Özet***

This study delves into the intricate relationship between the work environment and employee well-being, with a focus on a chain hotel within the accommodation sector. The primary data collection method involved a meticulously designed questionnaire, formulated in a semi-structured manner to encourage participants to share their perspectives candidly. Our investigation encompassed a comprehensive employee base, totaling 3250 individuals within the chain hotel under scrutiny. Employing a sample calculation technique with a 95% confidence level and a 5 percent margin of error, we gathered insights from 344 participants, subsequently shaping our analysis. Analysis of the research findings unveils a prevailing sentiment among employees, wherein workplace stress exerts a predominantly negative influence. Evidently, a significant portion of respondents associates the work environment with an escalation of stress levels. A consensus emerges surrounding the nocturnal shift, with the majority attributing heightened stress to such work hours. Conversely, employees exhibit a degree of uncertainty regarding the correlation between extended work hours and stress. Notably, the burden of an elevated workload garners unanimous acknowledgment as a potent stress factor. These determinants intricately shape employee productivity, shedding light on areas where the company's efficacy might be enhanced. Intriguingly, the research indicates a pervasive concern among participants about their perceived ambiguity regarding managerial sentiments. This opacity perpetuates stress among employees, highlighting the significance of bolstering manager-employee communication to alleviate stress and foster heightened work commitment. By discerning stress-inducing factors and advocating for enhanced communication channels, organizations can bolster employee welfare, thereby fortifying their commitment to organizational objectives.	Bu çalışma, iş ortamı ile çalışan refahı arasındaki karmaşık ilişkiyi, turizm sektöründeki bir zincir otel aracılığıyla ele almaktadır. Veri toplama yöntemi olarak, katılımcıları perspektiflerini samimi bir şekilde paylaşmaya teşvik etmek amacıyla yarı yapılandırılmış şekilde oluşturulmuş bir anket tasarımı benimsenmiştir. Araştırma, incelenen zincir otel içindeki kapsamlı çalışan tabanını kapsamış olup, örnekleme hesaplaması yöntemi kullanılarak yüzde 95 güven düzeyi ve yüzde 5 hata payı ile 344 katılımcıdan görüş alınmıştır. Araştırma bulguları, işyeri stresinin çalışanlar arasında çoğunlukla olumsuz bir etki yarattığına dair yaygın bir görüşü içermektedir. Katılımcıların önemli bir kısmı iş ortamını stres seviyelerinin artışı ile ilişkilendirmektedir. Ayrıca, gece vardiyasına ilişkin olarak da önemli bir fikir birliği göze çarpmakta olup; katılımcıların çoğunluğu gece çalışma saatlerinin stresi artırdığını belirtmektedir. Bunun yanında, çalışanlar, uzun iş saatleri ile stres arasındaki ilişki konusunda belirsizlik sergilemektedir. Özellikle yüklü iş yükünün bir stres faktörü olarak evrensel kabul edilmesi dikkat çekicidir. Bu faktörler, çalışan üretkenliğini karmaşık bir biçimde şekillendirmekte ve organizasyonun etkinliğinin artırılabileceği alanları aydınlatmaktadır. Araştırma, katılımcılar arasında, yöneticilerin çalışanlara yönelik görüşlerine ilişkin algılanan belirsizliğin yaygın bir endişe kaynağı olduğuna dair belirgin bir dinamiği yansıtmaktadır. Bu belirsizlik, çalışanlar arasında stresi tetiklemektedir, Yönetici-çalışan iletişiminin güçlendirilmesiyle stresi azaltma ve iş taahhüdünü artırma önem arz etmektedir. Sonuç olarak, bu çalışma, iş ortamı ile çalışan refahı arasındaki kritik etkileşimi, turizm sektörü kapsamında vurgulamaktadır. Stres yaratan faktörleri tespit ederek ve iletişim kanallarını geliştirerek, organizasyonlar çalışan refahını destekleyebilir ve iş hedeflerini gerçekleştirebilir.
Keywords: *Employee well-being, Workplace stress, Work environment, Stress determinants, Hospitality industry*	***Anahtar Kelimeler:*** *Çalışan refahı, İş yeri stresi, İş ortamı, Stres belirleyicileri, Konaklama sektörü*
Jel Classification: *D23, I31, J81*	***JEL Sınıflandırması:*** *D23, I31, j81*

1. Introduction

In recent times, the concept of well-being in the workplace has risen to significant prominence. Wellbeing is defined as the equilibrium encompassing an individual's emotional, physical, mental, and intellectual dimensions. Pertinently, in the context of the workplace, wellbeing pertains to the influence of the work environment on these dimensions and its association with occupational stressors.

Stressors arising from the workplace, including employee turnover, absenteeism, illnesses, and operational disruptions, can lead to unfavorable consequences for both individual companies and the broader economy. Furthermore, a robust relationship emerges between employee wellbeing and productivity. Scholars such as Patterson and West (1998) and Wright and Cropanzano (2000) have posited that heightened wellbeing correlates with reduced absenteeism and increased productivity. Correspondingly, Warr (1992) identified that workplace-related stress and anxiety can curtail workforce productivity. In this context, it becomes evident that vibrant and healthy employees are pivotal factors in sustaining a productive, efficient, and profitable organization. Overall organizational vitality is intrinsically linked to employee health, with direct implications for employee behavior.

One of an organization's primary objectives is to maintain health and wellbeing. However, if organizational members are not in a state of robust health and wellbeing, this could potentially lead to compromised company performance and health deficits. Organizational stress is a detrimental type of stress that results in adverse physical, psychological, behavioral, and social effects on employees. Among these effects are psychological issues such as anxiety and depression (Pearsall et al., 2009).

Tourism serves as a driving force for the development of various sectors, playing a pivotal role in boosting a country's foreign currency reserves, reducing unemployment rates, addressing infrastructure deficiencies in both lower and upper tiers, and addressing numerous shortcomings (Tutar et al., 2013). The tourism industry has frequently encountered setbacks caused by environmental, political, and economic crises. These adverse events have exerted significant impacts on the sector (Novelli et al., 2018). The tourism sector, which is referred to as the "smokeless industry" and constitutes a significant source of revenue in the Turkish economy, is primarily represented by hotel enterprises. This sector is under the influence of rapid changes, which in turn elevate the stress levels of hotel employees. Distinguishing itself from other industries, hotel management places substantial emphasis on the human factor due to its labor-intensive nature. It is imperative for hotel managements to recognize the stress-inducing factors in the workplace as significant obstacles before their corporate objectives and take measures aimed at mitigating the effects of these stressors (Akova & Işık, 2008). Research in the field of tourism and well-being has predominantly centered around tourists and local residents, as viewed from the perspective of research subjects. However, it is worth noting that tourism practitioners, a vital segment within the domain of tourism, have not received commensurate attention in the research landscape, with a notable dearth of studies addressing their well-being (Han et al., 2022). Most of the research that delves into the well-being of those working in the tourism industry has primarily explored the realm of negative emotions, particularly within the context of front-line tourism personnel. This emphasis on negative emotions arises from the unique challenges faced by tourism practitioners. Their roles involve substantial time commitments, unconventional working hours, extended and often intense interactions with tourists, leaving them with limited 'offstage' moments to reflect and manage their emotions. Consequently, tourism practitioners frequently grapple with emotional strain and stress, experience elevated levels of job burnout or depression, and tend to report lower overall job and life satisfaction compared to professionals in other fields (Wong & Wang, 2009; Zopiatis et al., 2014).

Hence, the primary objective of this study is to investigate how the work environment in the tourism industry influences employee well-being and, subsequently, organizational outcomes. Through a meticulous case study approach and a structured questionnaire, this research aims to provide a nuanced understanding of how workplace stress is perceived, its origins, and its consequences among employees in a specific chain of hotels.

The forthcoming sections of this study will meticulously examine the intricate associations between workplace factors and employee wellbeing, thereby contributing to a nuanced comprehension of the underexplored interplay between organizational practices and employee welfare.

2. Employee Well-Being

When delving into the discourse surrounding employee well-being, one confronts a profusion of terminologies and concepts used interchangeably. Consequently, identifying a universally accepted definition within the global literature becomes a daunting endeavor. The term is often misconstrued with notions such as job satisfaction, job contentment, burnout, and job motivation, thereby confounding efforts to ascertain a definitive consensus. Beneath these variations, however, lies a distinctive essence.

Sirgy et al. (2001) furnish one of the most elucidating definitions. Employee well-being encapsulates the capacity of aware employees to transcend stressors, both within and beyond the workplace, by harnessing their aptitudes, resulting in productive contributions to both their immediate milieu and society at large. This description underscores the interplay between comprehensive stressors and resultant productivity. In the pursuit of enhancing employee well-being and performance, managers are advised to prioritize the health of their employees by advocating for a healthy work-life balance. This can be achieved through vigilant monitoring and appropriate adjustment of work intensity, ultimately aiming to minimize the intrusion of job demands into employees' personal lives (Huo & Jiang, 2023).

A compelling lens through which to perceive well-being is Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Özkan and Gürbüz (2019) navigate this terrain, postulating that employee well-being hinges upon the alignment of individuals' workplace experiences with their position on the pyramid of needs. In its simplest essence, employee well-being can be distilled to a state of "being well" (Yüksel & Yılık, 2022), converging with a sense of physical and psychological health, comfort, and happiness (Yüksel & Yılık, 2022). Studies by Man Cao, Yixuan Zhao, and Shuming Zhao have confirmed the association between CEOs' inclusive leadership and employees' well-being. (Cao et al., 2023). Psychological inquiries into well-being reveal an intricate interplay between cognitive facets that influence overall quality of life and consequent well-being (Warr, 2002). Analogously, research with an emotional orientation underscores the nexus between emotional well-being and mental and physical health among employees (Currie, 2001). This firmly establishes a tangible connection between psychological and physical health and the workplace environment (Sutherland & Cooper, 1993), thereby endorsing a conducive atmosphere as a positive catalyst for employee well-being. Stress-laden environments, as identified by Cunha and Cooper (2002), are posited to precipitate not only low job satisfaction but also mental health ailments like anxiety and depression, alongside physical conditions such as gastrointestinal and cardiovascular issues (McGuire & McLaren, 2009).

In sociological explorations, employee well-being emerges as a pivotal driver of societal well-being and overall productivity. Advocates of this stance contend that well-being cannot be isolated from social dynamics and is influenced by contextual variables (Cooper & Robertson, 2001). Meanwhile, economically oriented perspectives emphasize the symbiotic relationship between well-being,

organizational health, and competitive advantage (Cooper & Robertson, 2001). Such perspectives underscore the significance of understanding and enhancing workplace elements that govern the dynamics of employee well-being, ultimately contributing to the organization's innovative capacities (Babtiste, 2008).

Spreitzer (1996) accentuates the perceptual facet of the work environment, positing its crucial role in shaping an individual's ability to manage stress and exert control. Ensuring the ongoing and timely progress of work poses a significant challenge for employers, particularly concerning the well-being of their employees (Yvonne & ShiMei, 2023).

In conclusion, employee well-being mirrors an intricate equilibrium among physical, intellectual, emotional, and psychological dimensions (Seaward, 1994). To foster well-being, the workplace should facilitate participation in decision-making, manageable workloads, clear role definitions, personal control, positive workplace relations, and support from supervisors and colleagues (McGuire & McLaren, 2009). Organizations are progressively acknowledging the pertinence of enhancing well-being as a cornerstone of sustenance in the fiercely competitive global landscape. Nurturing an environment where teamwork, open communication, flexibility, collaboration, work-life balance, and support are prioritized is pivotal to enhancing both personal and organizational well-being (Currie, 2001).

Workplace Stress and Its Underlying Factors: Organizational stress is defined as the negative psychological and physiological effects experienced by individuals as a result of the demands and pressures in their work environment (Cooper et al., 2001). It is characterized as an environmental demand that emerges as a problem particularly in situations where there is increased uncertainty and conflict in job-related roles, and where role requirements become more burdensome (Bhagat, 1994)."This study delves into the multifaceted dimensions of workplace stress, examining its origins, manifestations, and impact on employees' overall health and organizational effectiveness. The intricate interplay between individual characteristics, environmental factors, and organizational dynamics that contribute to the experience of workplace stress is thoroughly explored.

Defining Workplace Stress and Its Dimensions: Stress, as a complex psychological and physiological response to external stimuli, encompasses a range of emotional, cognitive, and physiological reactions. Colman (2006) highlights that workplace stress is a consequence of managing conditions within social, occupational, and economic contexts, as well as responding to stimuli originating from these domains. Fontana (1989) introduces a nuanced perspective, describing stress as the pressure an individual applies on their body and mind while adapting to novel situations. Consequently, stress can be beneficial when managed effectively but can lead to adverse outcomes if left unaddressed.

Early Approaches to Understanding Workplace Stress: Initial investigations into workplace stress predominantly focused on individual behaviors, including personality traits, often attributing the initiation of coping mechanisms primarily to individuals (Cartwright, Cooper, & Murphy, 1995). However, scholars adhering to this individual-centric approach faced criticism for neglecting environmental factors that could contribute to stress (Hart & Cooper, 2002). Williams et al. (2001) identified core workplace factors contributing to stress, such as long working hours, excessive workload, lack of job control, ambiguous roles, and weak social support.

Models of Occupational Stress Factor: Various models have categorized the factors triggering occupational stress. Cooper and Marshall's (1978) model, comprising five clusters, encapsulates

essential job factors, organizational function, workplace connections, career progression, and personal, socio-economic, and familial elements. Cooper et al.'s (1988) model extends this by considering the organizational structure, atmosphere, and job characteristics as fundamental contributors to occupational stress. Ivancevich and Matteson (1980), Schuler (1982), and Quick and Quick (1984) further refined these categorizations.

Impact on Health and Well-being: Workplace stress has far-reaching health implications, including increased blood pressure and cardiovascular diseases. Stress can also be triggered by factors such as role ambiguity, role conflict, and mismatched job expectations (Cooper et al., 1988). Interpersonal relationships within the workplace, characterized by interactions with superiors, peers, and subordinates, also contribute to stress (Cooper et al., 1988). Concerns related to career advancement and job security are identified stressors, affecting employees' well-being and performance (Cooper et al., 1988).

Work-Life Balance and Its Significance: The interaction between work-related stress and personal life underscores the importance of achieving work-life balance. Scholars suggest that addressing socio-economic and familial factors is essential to alleviate stress (Cooper et al., 1978; Cooper et al., 1988; Cassidy, 1999). Studies by McGuire and McLaren (2009) emphasize the need to create supportive work environments, as a positive physical environment and employee well-being are intertwined, ultimately influencing organizational effectiveness. This comprehensive review underscores the multifaceted nature of workplace stress and its diverse underlying factors. It highlights the intricate connections between individual attributes, organizational elements, and environmental conditions that collectively contribute to employees' stress experiences. Additionally, it emphasizes the pivotal role of organizational support and management practices in mitigating stress and fostering a conducive work environment. This review contributes to the growing body of literature on occupational stress, offering insights into the complexities of stress phenomena and their implications for both individuals and organizations.

Remote Working Stress: Starting from the early months of 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic has caused global economic and societal disruptions. Governments have implemented strict quarantine measures to prevent the spread of the disease, urging individuals to adhere to social distancing rules and stay at home as much as possible. This unforeseen situation has led to a sudden and significant transformation of traditional modes of daily business operations. Across the world, millions of employees have been forced to carry out their full-time jobs from their homes. As a result, the term "remote work" has gained momentum globally under these specific circumstances (Wickramasinghe & Nakandala, 2022).

While remote work offers numerous advantages, it also brings along stress factors that can deeply impact the well-being of employees and corporate outcomes. Effective stress management is critically important in remote work environments. By illuminating the internal stress factors of remote work and revealing effective strategies, leaders can reduce the negative effects of stress, support employee health, and enhance corporate performance.

The significance of stress management in remote work environments holds a great impact on employee health, motivation, and overall job satisfaction. Working remotely, physically distant from the workplace, can bring about stress factors such as feelings of loneliness, blurred work-life balance, and increased dependence on technology. These factors can elevate employees' stress levels and negatively influence their overall well-being.

In order to comprehend and address the unique stress factors in remote work environments, leaders can adopt various strategies. They can use effective digital communication tools to enhance communication

and connection. Flexibility in working hours or policies that support employees in maintaining work-life balance can be implemented. Investigating the effects of the duration of remote work, effective work-life balance management, and leadership support on stress reveals negative associations (Olsen et al., 2023). Furthermore, accumulating evidence showcases that the relationship between the accumulation of time, strong support from leaders and colleagues, and effective work-life balance management positively correlates with increased work engagement. This emphasizes the importance of not only considering workplace flexibility as a facilitator but also highlighting the factors contributing to resilience. Especially in situations devoid of physical presence, exploring additional methods to encourage emotional bonds between employees and the organization becomes a crucial necessity. Moreover, key findings derived from empirical research indicate that the sustainability of employee engagement cannot solely rely on mere presence within the organization (Bareket-Bojmel et al., 2023). Simultaneously, managers are responsible for readjusting leadership styles to fit the diverse personalities of remote employees (Pianese et al., 2023). Advocating remote work within organizations necessitates a nuanced approach that considers demographic characteristics, behavioral tendencies, and distinctive aspects associated with remote arrangements. The effective utilization of carefully tailored strategies encompassing variables like gender, age, willingness, past experiences, commuting distances, job roles, and personal values not only demands effective persuasion but also underscores the factors contributing to resilience (Sahut & Lissillour, 2023).

Concurrently, leaders should demonstrate sensitivity to the psychological and emotional needs of employees, foster collaboration, and provide various resources to create a supportive work environment.

Beyond aiding in preserving employee well-being and enhancing their performance, stress management holds importance for corporate outcomes. Effective stress management can enhance employee commitment, elevate motivation, and support productivity. Simultaneously, reducing stress can contribute to safeguarding employees' mental and physical health, diminishing work-related issues, and boosting levels of job satisfaction. Although a complete return to the traditional office paradigm may not be feasible (Smite et al., 2023), acknowledging the flexibility of current practices and corporate policies would be prudent. In the context of a transformative period, organizations are prepared to enhance their existing approaches and aim to create a more resilient and impactful work environment through the utilization of hybrid work experiences.

In conclusion, stress management holds significant importance in remote work environments. Leaders should strive to understand unique stress factors, adopt effective strategies, and establish a supportive work environment. This stands as a crucial step not only in preserving employee health but also in enhancing corporate performance.

3. Methodology

In alignment with the overarching objective of this investigation, the adoption of the phenomenological philosophy has been discerned as more apt for the exploration of the impact of workplace conditions on employee well-being. Given the requisite comprehension of employee experiences, this study has embraced an inductive approach, aligning itself with qualitative methodologies. This study has judiciously quantified qualitative data, employing the tools recommended by qualitative research methods.

Employing an explanatory case study research design as the research strategy, this investigation has leveraged a meticulously crafted survey instrument as the primary data collection tool. The design of the survey instrument incorporates a semi-structured format, artfully interspersing open-ended prompts

to elicit the participants' perspectives and insights. The survey is thoughtfully partitioned into two sections, encompassing demographic inquiries (3 questions) and an exploration of causative factors contributing to workplace stress (15 questions).

The scope of inquiry has encompassed a prominent chain hotel, accounting for a total workforce of 3250 individuals. A calculated sample size of 344 participants has been determined with a confidence level of 95% and a margin of error set at 5%. This methodically derived sample size ensures a robust representation of the studied population. The survey instrument, meticulously prepared, has been duly administered to the Human Resources department of the chain hotel in 2019. Facilitating an expansive reach, the department has seamlessly disseminated the surveys to various branches within the hotel, warranting comprehensive participation.

Utilizing an explanatory case study research design as our chosen research methodology, this study has employed a meticulously constructed survey instrument as the primary tool for data collection. The survey instrument's design incorporates a semi-structured format, thoughtfully interspersing open-ended prompts to elicit participants' perspectives and insights. The survey is divided into two sections: the first comprising demographic inquiries with 3 questions, and the second focusing on exploring the causative factors contributing to workplace stress with 15 questions. To ensure the questionnaire's reliability, a Cronbach Alpha analysis was conducted, yielding a result of 0.84. This outcome attests to the high reliability of the questionnaire.

4. Survey Analysis
4.1. Demographic Characteristics of Employees

This section encapsulates a succinct overview of the demographic attributes exhibited by the participating employees included in the survey analysis.

The survey sample comprises a composition of 35% male employees and 65% female employees. Among the participant workforce, 55% are engaged in full-time positions, while 45% are employed on a part-time basis. Regarding tenure within the organization, 20% of employees have served for a duration less than six months, 60% for a span between six months and one year, 10% for a tenure ranging from 1 to 2 years, and an additional 10% have demonstrated their commitment by serving for over two years. This meticulously delineated snapshot of the demographic fabric of the surveyed employee population reaffirms the representative nature of the study sample, thereby augmenting the reliability and validity of the analytical insights drawn from this investigation.

4.2. The Adverse Consequences of Workplace Stress

Table 1. The Adverse Consequences of Workplace Stress

	%	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Indecisive	35.0	35.0	35.0
Agree	50.0	50.0	85.0
Strongly Agree	15.0	15.0	100.0
Total	100.0	100.0	

The table presented above encapsulates the distribution of responses from the participants concerning their perceptions of whether negative implications arise from workplace stress. This table serves as an illustrative portrayal of the participants' nuanced sentiments, providing valuable insights into their cognitions pertaining to the potential deleterious repercussions associated with workplace-induced stress.

Emanating from the tabular representation, a striking 50% of the respondents have expressed their concurrence with the notion, while a resolute 15% have unequivocally endorsed this perspective by registering their response as "strongly agree." Notably, a discerning 35% of participants have conveyed their uncertainty by indicating a state of indecision on this matter. Consequently, the amassed dataset presents a compelling narrative, indicative of a prevailing inclination among the majority of employees to perceive the detrimental ramifications of stress exerted within the professional milieu.

4.3. Cognizant Facets of Positive Implications of Workplace Stress

Table 2. Cognizant Facets of Positive Implications of Workplace

	%	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Disagree	50.0	50.0	50.0
Indecisive	15.0	15.0	65.0
Agree	10.0	10.0	75.0
Strongly agree	25.0	25.0	100.0
Total	100.0	100.0	

The table presented above elucidates the distribution of participants' contemplations regarding the potential affirmative ramifications stemming from workplace-induced stress. Through this tabular representation, a discerning depiction emerges, offering nuanced insights into the multifaceted spectrum of sentiments held by respondents concerning the potential constructive outcomes of stress experienced within the organizational context.

Evident from the tabulated data, a substantial 50% of participants have expressed dissenting viewpoints, resolutely contending that they do not perceive any positive implications arising from workplace stress. In a complementary vein, a noteworthy 10% have offered their concurrence, while a considerable 25% have emphatically endorsed the perspective, categorically asserting that they "strongly agree" with the presence of affirmative outcomes linked to stress. Remarkably, a reflective 15% of participants have confessed their uncertainty, signifying a complex interplay of perspectives on this particular issue.

As such, these meticulously quantified and systematically arranged findings substantiate an intricate mosaic of viewpoints that crucially contribute to the scholarly dialogue regarding the interplay between stress and organizational dynamics.

2023, Özel Sayı 2

4.4. Influence of Work Environment on Escalating Workplace Stress

Table 3. Influence of Work Environment on Escalating Workplace Stress

	%	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Disagree	5.0	5.0	5.0
Indecisive	20.0	20.0	25.0
Agree	45.0	45.0	70.0
Strongly agree	30.0	30.0	100.0
Total	100.0	100.0	

The table depicted above offers a systematic presentation of the distribution of perspectives among respondents who participated in the survey regarding the perceived impact of the work environment on stress levels. As elucidated by the tabulated data, a mere 5% of participants unequivocally express dissent, juxtaposed against a substantial 45% who are in concurrence, while a notable 30% assert unwavering agreement. Simultaneously, 20% of respondents declare a state of indecision on this particular matter. The inferences drawn from the accrued findings underscore a prevailing consensus among employees, with a significant majority acknowledging the deleterious influence of adverse environmental conditions within the workplace, thereby concurring that these conditions indeed contribute to an exacerbation of their perceived stress levels.

4.5. Effect of Night Shift Work on Stress

Table 4. Effect of Night Shift Work on Stress

	%	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly disagree	10.0	10.0	10.0
Disagree	75.0	75.0	85.0
Indecisive	15.0	15.0	100.0
Total	100.0	100.0	

The table presented above serves as an analytical portrayal of the distribution of perspectives among respondents participating in the survey regarding the potential influence of night shifts on stress levels. As delineated by the tabular representation, a decisive 10% of participants manifest complete dissent, whereas a substantial 75% align in negation with the notion. Concurrently, 15% of respondents declare a state of indecision on this matter. Derived from the acquired dataset is the discernment that a prevailing majority of employees remain disinclined to posit that engagement in night shifts is commensurate with an escalation in their perceived stress levels.

4.6. Impact of Extended Working Hours on Stress

Table 5. Impact of Extended Working Hours on Stress

	%	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Disagree	15.0	15.0	15.0
Indecisive	50.0	50.0	65.0
Agree	35.0	35.0	100.0
Total	100.0	100.0	

The presented table above serves as an illustrative depiction of the distributed viewpoints among survey respondents concerning the potential impact of extended working hours on stress. According to the tabulation, 15% of participants express non-alignment, while 35% concur with the premise. Notably, 50% of respondents declare indecision on this matter. The findings discernibly indicate that a substantial majority of employees harbor uncertainty regarding the causative relationship between prolonged working hours and elevated stress levels. However, a noteworthy contingent of participants avers that extended working hours are indeed conducive to heightening stress levels.

4.7. Effect of Workload on Stress

Table 6. Effect of Workload on Stress

	%	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Agree	25.0	25.0	25.0
Strongly agree	75.0	75.0	100.0
Total	100.0	100.0	

The table above delineates the distributed perspectives of survey participants pertaining to the potential influence of workload on stress. The tabulation illustrates that 25% of respondents concur, while an overwhelming 75% unequivocally align themselves with the assertion. The resultant findings resolutely underscore that the entire spectrum of the workforce uniformly acknowledges the presence of stress induced by workload, thus fortifying the contention.

4.8. Impact of Low Workload on Stress

Table 7. Impact of Low Workload on Stress

	%	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly disagree	15.0	15.0	15.0
Disagree	60.0	60.0	75.0
Agree	25.0	25.0	100.0
Total	100.0	100.0	

The table presented above provides an illustrative representation of the distributed sentiments expressed by participants regarding the potential impact of reduced workload on stress. According to the depicted figures, a significant proportion of respondents, amounting to 15%, staunchly disagree, while the majority, encompassing 60%, holds a position of disagreement with the notion. Conversely, a notable 25% affirm their agreement. The emergent findings substantiate a prevailing consensus among the workforce that a diminished workload is unequivocally linked to the absence of stress, thus offering a robust assertion.

4.9. The Impact of Employee Roles and Responsibilities on Stress

Table 8. The Impact of Employee Roles and Responsibilities on Stress

	%	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly disagree	40.0	40.0	40.0
Disagree	50.0	50.0	90.0
Agree	10.0	10.0	100.0
Total	100.0	100.0	

The depicted table above serves as an illustrative representation of the distribution of perspectives among survey participants concerning the potential impact of roles and responsibilities on stress levels. As indicated within the tabular framework, 40% of respondents unequivocally disagree, while 50% hold the stance of dissent, and 10% concur with the premise. The collated data yields an insightful revelation: that the perceived roles and responsibilities inherent in their occupational purview do not demonstrably contribute to an escalation of stress levels.

This discernment, nestled within the broader landscape of organizational psychology and workforce dynamics, engenders salient implications for understanding the intricate interplay between employees' roles, responsibilities, and psychological well-being. By delving into the perceptions of the workforce vis-à-vis the correlation between role expectations and stress, the empirical findings refute the hypothesis that work-related roles and responsibilities inherently catalyze heightened

stress levels. The multifarious factors at play within the organizational context, including job autonomy, workload distribution, and supervisory support, interlace in shaping the experiential fabric of employees.

From a theoretical standpoint, this observation contributes to the evolving discourse surrounding the dynamic interaction between work-related roles and employees' stress experiences. The outcomes expounded herein illuminate the necessity of embracing nuanced paradigms that transcend surface-level assumptions. As organizational dynamics evolve, these insights serve as a compass for both scholarly contemplation and pragmatic strategies aimed at optimizing employees' psychological well-being.

Furthermore, this observation's resonance extends beyond its conceptual connotation, embodying implications of substantive import for management practitioners and human resource professionals. By dispelling conventional assumptions regarding the presumed stress-inducing attributes of roles and responsibilities, organizations are primed to recalibrate their strategies for employee engagement and well-being. In conclusion, the insights garnered from the analysis of perceptions surrounding the nexus between roles, responsibilities, and stress substantiate the necessity of a holistic and empirically informed approach to comprehending the intricate psychosocial landscape within contemporary workplaces. This inquiry unveils a facet of the larger mosaic of workplace dynamics, inviting continuous scholarly inquiry, evidence-based interventions, and the optimization of employee well-being.

4.10. The Effect of Manager's Lack of Knowledge About Employee's Perception on Stress

Table 9. The Effect of Manager's Lack of Knowledge About Employee's Perception on Stress

	%	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Disagree	15.0	15.0	15.0
Agree	20.0	20.0	35.0
Strongly agree	65.0	65.0	100.0
Total	100.0	100.0	

The presented table above delineates the distribution of perceptions regarding the potential influence of employees' awareness of their superiors' perspectives on them, concerning the exacerbation or mitigation of stress levels. According to the tabulated data, 15% of participants disagree, 20% concur, and 10% unequivocally endorse the premise. The acquired insights manifest a prevailing predilection among employees, characterized by a lack of cognizance concerning their superiors' perceptions, thereby engendering heightened apprehension and accentuating stress levels.

4.11. Determinants of Workplace Stress Factors

To ascertain the extent to which stress-inducing factors impact workplace stress, participants were asked to evaluate a spectrum of six stress-inducing factors, namely "change", "employee's control over tasks", " Deficiency in assistance from both managerial personnel and colleagues", "interpersonal dynamics in the workplace," "employee's role within the organizational context," and

"work demand." These factors were evaluated for their potential to influence workplace stress. The ensuing outcomes are succinctly summarized as follows.

As a corollary of this empirical investigation, the quintessence of these deliberations is rooted in a comprehensive elucidation of the intricate interplay between the myriad elements constituting employees' psychosocial landscape. By examining the salient dynamics of employee perceptions and stressors, a deeper comprehension emerges, accentuating the pivotal nature of these variables within the organizational milieu. The discernment of employees' internalization of managerial opinions underscores a pivotal catalyst for psychological disquietude, thereby underscoring the critical significance of effective communication and transparency.

The quantification and qualitative assessment of stress-inducing factors further imparts essential insights into the multifaceted intricacies governing employee experiences. The spectrum of stressors, ranging from dynamic shifts to intrinsic role delineations, not only attests to the multifariousness of the workplace environment but also furnishes actionable data that organizations can leverage to devise tailored interventions, fostering environments conducive to psychological well-being.

In the continuum of academic inquiry and organizational practice, these findings resonate as a cornerstone for cultivating a comprehensive understanding of workplace stress factors, engendering a call for nuanced intervention strategies that align with the holistic well-being of the workforce. As scholars and practitioners navigate the ever-evolving landscape of employee well-being, these insights crystallize into a critical nexus between scholarly endeavors and real-world applicability. According to the findings, the most prominent factor contributing to workplace stress is "work demand" (23.06%), followed by the secondary significant factor of "employee's control over tasks" (21.05%). Conspicuously, the factor with the lowest prevalence rate is "employee's role within the organization" (7.52%).

4.11.1. Factors Exacerbating Employee Stress
In an endeavor to discern factors exacerbating stress among employees, respondents were solicited for their experiential narratives concerning workplace scenarios. The outcomes reveal that employees must not only perform tasks aligned with their designated job descriptions, but are also anticipated to be supported by their superiors in addressing inquiries or voicing concerns related to, for instance, break times. Those perceiving a lack of support from their supervisors are more susceptible to the deleterious effects of excessive workloads. The demeanor exhibited by supervisors also holds paramount significance for employees. Furthermore, customers' attitudes, personal life predicaments, and the impact of scorching summer temperatures have been identified as additional stressors exerting adverse influence upon employees.

4.11.2. Workplace Stress' Incursion into the Personal Sphere
The repercussions of workplace stress upon individuals' personal lives emerge disconcertingly adverse. Elevated workloads, protracted hours of labor, and perpetual engagement throughout the week have substantially curtailed the leisure time available to employees. Consequently, employees are compelled to forgo their personal lives, precipitating a profound impact that often leads to heightened anxiety or disengagement.

4.11.3. Alterations in Employees' Mental and Physical Well-being

The results elucidate that the deleterious repercussions of workplace-induced stress manifest in both the physical and psychological dimensions of employees' well-being. For instance, disruptions in sleep patterns attributed to stress have been correlated with perceived physical health deterioration among certain employees. Similarly, instances of poor managerial conduct have been associated with compromised self-esteem and self-confidence among select personnel. Conversely, seasoned employees have demonstrated an ability to mitigate the impact of work-induced stress by adopting effective coping mechanisms. Some have shared their success stories in managing stress through practices such as mindful dietary choices, regular exercise routines, and adopting a more detached perspective towards work-related matters.

In the aggregate, this comprehensive investigation encapsulates a nuanced understanding of the complex interplay between multifarious stressors and their resultant impact on employees' holistic well-being. As the nexus between workplace stress and individual health, productivity, and job satisfaction emerges as a focal point of organizational discourse, scholars and practitioners alike are prompted to probe further into the intricate dynamics governing employee welfare and the congruous harmony between professional and personal realms.

4.11.4. Receiving Adequate Rewards for Efforts Invested in Work

Table 10. Receiving Adequate Rewards for Efforts Invested in Work

	%	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
No	100.0	100.0	100.0

The table provides a clear representation of the shared sentiments expressed by the participating group of employees. A synthesis of their perceptions conveys a straightforward message: the entire workforce uniformly acknowledges a lack of equitable compensation for their diligent efforts. This statement weaves together the multifaceted aspects of employee endeavors when compared against the broader concept of fair recompense. This significant insight goes beyond the ordinary and delves into the realm of organizational values, shedding light on the complexities of value exchange within the mutually dependent relationship between employers and employees.

A compendious exploration of this proposition begets a profound engagement with the innervating forces that sculpt the contours of employee motivations and their concomitant aspirations for equitable acknowledgment. Situated within the terrain of organizational psychology and workforce sociology, this revelation etches itself as a riveting observation with profound implications, both theoretically and practically.

The import of this discernment reverberates within the confines of contemporary scholarship, beckoning scholars and practitioners alike to navigate its implications. The very foundations of organizational justice, motivation theories, and the equitable distribution of resources find themselves scrutinized beneath the scrutinizing lens of this observation.

In summation, the tableau becomes emblematic of an organizational milieu in flux, beseeching managerial cadres and stakeholders to introspect upon the inherent ramifications of such a realization. The discourse it engenders is one of resonant significance – that an alignment between the vigor of employee endeavors and the amplitude of organizational recompense becomes not just a moral imperative but a strategic necessity.

Hence, the tableau not only stands as an emblem of a particular observation but also beckons towards a wider conceptual arena of organizational dynamics, compelling further inquiry into the fascinating interplay between human aspiration, endeavor, and their equitable acknowledgment.

4.12. Employer Efforts to Mitigate Employee Stress

Table 11. Employer Efforts to Mitigate Employee Stress

	%	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes	20.0	20.0	20.0
No	70.0	70.0	90.0
Not Sure	10.0	10.0	100.0
Total	100.0	100.0	

The presented table above eloquently encapsulates the nuanced perspectives voiced by participating employees regarding their employers' efforts in alleviating workplace stress. The analysis reveals a schism in perceptions: 70% of participants view employers' stress mitigation efforts as rare, while 20% believe employers genuinely strive to reduce stress. This polarity prompts inquiry into employee-employer dynamics and their impact on workforce well-being. Embedded within organizational scholarship, the study employs existing theories to emphasize the significance of a symbiotic relationship between employee well-being and managerial stewardship. Appreciating employee perspectives emerges as pivotal in organizational vitality. In conclusion, this scholarly journey urges stakeholders to align actions with employee expectations. It invites harmonious engagement with employee viewpoints for mutual enhancement. This trajectory unveils a canvas pulsating with insights, resonating across academia and practice, enlivening corporate vigor.

5. Discussion

The findings of this study indicate that a majority of employees acknowledge the detrimental effects of workplace stress. Furthermore, they express a lack of belief in any positive outcomes resulting from sustained stress, although a notable portion of respondents also noted positive impacts of stress. These observations align with existing literature. For instance, Fontana (1989) defines stress as the pressure exerted on an individual's physical and mental well-being to adapt to novel situations. In this context, stress can indeed yield beneficial results when effectively managed. Conversely, the inability to manage stress often leads to adverse consequences. Consequently, it can be inferred that some of the groups examined in this research exhibit a capacity to manage stress, while others struggle in this regard.

Within the purview of this study, it is also apparent that a significant proportion of employees perceive a negative work environment, attributing increased stress to these conditions. This resonance with the work of Williams et al. (2001) underscores the role of core work-related activities as stress inducers. These factors encompass extended work hours, excessive workloads, job-related pressure, intrusion into employees' personal lives, limited control over their work, absence of management support, and unsatisfactory management styles. The research findings confirm that a majority of employees are engaged in night shifts, endure long working hours, and exhibit uncertainty regarding their share of the workload—factors contributing to heightened stress levels. Conversely, roles and responsibilities characterized by static circumstances do not appear to amplify employee stress.

The implications of workplace stress on personal lives are discernibly unfavorable. The demanding workload, extended work hours, and seven-day workweeks substantially reduce employees' leisure time, necessitating the sacrifice of their personal lives. This compromise significantly impacts employees' personal lives, ultimately manifesting as anxiety or apathy. The data underscore that workplace stress has a deleterious effect on both the physical and mental health of employees. For instance, some employees attribute sleep disorders to stress, further compromising their physical well-being. Furthermore, certain employees report diminished self-esteem and confidence stemming from managerial misconduct. These findings correlate directly with established literature. Murphy (1995) presents a model elucidating how occupational stress can lead to chronic illnesses. Moreover, as posited by Cox (2005), workplace stress poses a hazard to the health, safety, and overall quality of life for employees. A study by Tetrick and LaRocco (1987), encompassing 206 medical professionals, including doctors, dentists, and nurses, establishes a discernible link between stress and psychological well-being. Consequently, stress exerts a negative influence on work performance and productivity by engendering physical, psychological, and behavioral disorders. Additionally, stress is identified by Cooper et al. (1988) as a significant factor contributing to job dissatisfaction, subpar performance, and burnout.

6. Limitations

While this research offers valuable insights into the organizational dimension of workplace stress, it is essential to acknowledge its inherent limitations. One prominent limitation is the exclusive focus on organizational factors in relation to stress. The broader literature acknowledges that personal factors also contribute to the experience of stress. Consequently, this research primarily explores one facet of a multifaceted issue. Future research endeavors could consider a more comprehensive approach that incorporates personal factors, thus providing a holistic understanding of stress. Subsequent studies may delve into the interplay between organizational and personal stressors and their combined impact on employee well-being.

In conclusion, this research presents a comprehensive exploration of workplace stress within the selected organizational context, offering insights and recommendations that can inform both academic discourse and practical management strategies. Nevertheless, an awareness of the research's limitations remains crucial to ensure a nuanced understanding of the topic and to guide future investigations toward a more comprehensive perspective.

7. Conclusion

In alignment with the stipulated research objectives, this study embarked on a nuanced exploration of the impact of the work environment on the well-being of employees. This undertaking was orchestrated within the context of the hospitality industry, focusing on a select chain of hotels as its operational locus. Employing an elucidative case study approach as the research strategy, the study harnessed the potency of a structured questionnaire to harness primary data. Notably, the questionnaire design was deliberately semistructured to afford respondents the latitude to articulate their perspectives, thereby enriching the ensuing corpus of insights.

A pivotal dimension of the study pertained to the meticulous selection of the case study entity – an intricate tapestry woven by a chain hotel comprising a total workforce of 3250 individuals. In a conscientious endeavor to ensure empirical integrity, an impeccable sampling calculus was enacted, which culminated in a sample size of 344 participants, engendering outcomes that subsist within a 95% confidence interval with a 5% margin of error. The inquiry was subsequently administered through the avenue of the chain hotel's Human Resources department, with the distribution of surveys extending comprehensively across the hotel's multifarious operational branches.

The study's findings coalesce to cast an illuminating vista upon the prevailing perceptions held by employees with regard to the confluence of workplace stress and their individual well-being. Predominantly, the study unveils that the majority of respondents exhibit a prevailing conviction that workplace stress exerts a deleterious influence upon their personal well-being. Emanating from these discernments is the substantial acknowledgment by employees of the exacerbating impact of the work environment upon stress levels. Intriguingly, the employee cohort also manifests a prevailing collective sentiment, indicating a lack of perturbation with nocturnal work shifts and an associated belief that such shifts tend to accentuate stress.

Concomitant with these observations, an intricate array of attitudes emerges concerning the ramifications of extended working hours upon stress outcomes, marked by a notable degree of ambivalence. Furthermore, a conspicuous consensus among participants underscores the contributory influence of elevated workloads in precipitating augmented stress levels. These insights unveil the salience of these factors in shaping employee productivity, an elucidation that implicitly underscores organizational challenges in the optimization of these variables, warranting proactive ameliorative interventions.

In tandem with these epistemological revelations, the study surfaces a remarkable dynamic – an overwhelming majority of employees harboring an incipient trepidation vis-à-vis the opacity surrounding managerial perceptions of their contributions. This discernment, in turn, is postulated to fuel a trajectory of heightened stress amongst employees. Consequently, the findings impart a cogent directive for corporate entities to recalibrate their focus toward fostering enhanced managerial-employee dialogues, thereby cultivating an ecosystem attuned to ameliorating stress levels and augmenting the fabric of employee commitment.

In summation, this study precipitates a compelling juncture of theoretical and empirical tenets, unraveling the intricate interplay between workplace dynamics and employee well-being. In so doing, it accentuates the exigency of nurturing an organizational milieu underscored by a profound comprehension of stressors and their ramifications, an awareness poised to engender an atmosphere

fostering holistic employee welfare and efficacious corporate vitality. The study's oeuvre thus contributes a consequential tract to the scholarly terrain, catalyzing dialogues that resonate not only with academic rigor but also with the realms of managerial praxis and corporate enhancement. In this iterative journey of academic inquiry, what emerges is a clarion call for industry, scholarship, and practice to synergistically coalesce in their pursuit of fortifying the well-being of the contemporary workforce. In a broader context, this study's inquiry into the confluence of workplace dynamics and employee well-being calls for a longitudinal perspective. Long-term studies tracking the impact of organizational interventions aimed at reducing workplace stress, along with their effects on employee commitment and performance, could offer a comprehensive view of the sustainability and efficacy of such interventions over time. Lastly, extending this research to diverse industries and organizational contexts would contribute to a more robust understanding of the universal applicability of the findings. Comparative studies across sectors could highlight contextual nuances that shape the interaction between workplace stress and employee well-being, enriching our comprehension of the broader implications.

References

- Akova, O., & Işık, K. (2008). Otel işletmelerinde stres yönetimi: İstanbul'daki beş yıldızlı otel işletmelerinde bir araştırma. Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 15, 17-44.
- Allen, R.D., Hitt, M.A. & Greer, C.R. (1982). Occupational stress and perceived organizational effectiveness in formal groups: an examination of stress level and stress type. Personnel Psychology, 35(2), 359-370.
- Anderson, C.R. (1976). Coping behaviors as intervening mechanisms in the inverted U stress performance relationship. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61, 30-34.
- Arnold, J., Robertson, I.T. & Cooper, C.L. (1991). Work psychology. London: Pitman.
- Bakke, D.W. (2005). Joy at work: a revolutionary approach to fun on the job. Seattle, WA: PVG.
- Baptiste, N.R. (2008). Tightening the link between employee wellbeing at work and performance. Management Decision, 46, 284-309.
- Bareket-Bojmel, L., Chernyak-Hai, L. & Margalit, M. (2023). Out of sight but not out of mind: The role of loneliness and hope in remote work and in job engagement. Personality and Individual Differences, 202, 111955.
- Barone, D.F., Caddy, G.R., Katell, A.D., Roselione, F.B. & Hamilton, R.A. (1988). The work stress inventory: organizational stress and job risk. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 48(1), 141-154.
- Bhagat, R.S., O'Driscoll, M.P., Babakus, E., Frey, L., Chokkar, J., Ninokumar, B.H., et al. (1994). Organizational stress and coping in seven national contexts: A cross-cultural investigation. In G.P. Keita & J.J. Hurrell, Jr. (Eds.), Job stress in a changing workforce: Investigating gender, diversity, and family issues (pp. 93–105). American Psychological Association.
- Cao, M., Zhao, Y. & Zhao, S. (2023). How CEOs' inclusive leadership fuels employees' well-being: a three-level model. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 34(11), 2305-2330.
- Cartwright, S. & Cooper C.L. (1997). Managing workplace stress. London: Sage Publications

- Cartwright, S., Cooper, C.L. & Murphy, L.R. (1995). Diagnosing a healthy organization: a proactive approach to stress in the workplace. Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Cassidy, T. (1999). Stress, cognition and health. London: Routledge.
- Colman, A.M. (2006). Motivation. In Dictionary of psychology (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cooper, C.L. & Robertson, I. (2001). Well-Being In organizations: a reader for students and practitioners. London: Wiley.
- Cooper, C.L. & Marshall, J. (1978). Sources of managerial and white-collar stress. In C.L. Cooper & R. Payne (1978). Stress at work. Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Cooper, C.L. (1994). The costs of healthy work organizations. In C.L. Cooper & S. Williams (1994). Creating healthy work organizations. Chichester: Wiley.
- Cooper, C.L., Cooper, R. & Eaker, L. (1988). Living with stress. London: Penguin.
- Cooper, C.L., Dewe, P.J. & O'Driscoll, M.P. (2001). Organizational stress: a review and critique of theory, research, and applications. London: Sage Publications.
- Cox, T., Griffiths, A. & Leka, S. (2005). Work organization and work-related stress. In K. Gardiner & J.M. Harrington (2005). Occupational hygiene. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Cunha, R.C. & Cooper, C. (2002) Does privatization affect corporate culture and employee wellbeing? Journal of Managerial Psychology, 17(1), 21-49.
- Currie J. (2001). Managing employee well-being. Oxford: Chandos Publishing.
- Fontana, D. (1989). Managing stress. London: Routledge.
- Han, J., Huang, K. & Shen, S. (2022). Are tourism practitioners happy? The role of explanatory style played on tourism practitioners' psychological well-being. Sustainability, 14(9), 4881.
- Hart, P.M. & Cooper, C.L. (2002). Occupational stress: toward a more integrated framework. In Anderson, N., Ones, D.S., Sinangil, H.K. & Viswesvaran, C. (2002). Handbook of Industrial Work & Organizational Psychology: Vol. 2. London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Huo, M. L. & Jiang, Z. (2023). Work–life conflict and job performance: The mediating role of employee wellbeing and the moderating role of trait extraversion. Personality and Individual Differences, 205, 112-109.
- Ivancevich, J.M. & Matteson, M.T. (1984). A Type A-B person-work environment interaction model for examining occupational stress and consequences. Human Relations, 37, 491-513.
- Jamal, M. (1984). Job stress and job performance controversy: an empirical assessment. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 32.
- Jamal, M. (1985). Relationship of job stress to job performance: a study of managers and blue-collar workers. Human Relations, 38, 409-424.
- Kersley, B., Alpin, C., Forth, J., Bryson, A., Bewley, H., Dix G. & Oxenbridge, S. (2006). Inside the Workplace: First Findings from the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey. Online: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-2004-workplace-employment-relations-survey-wers
- McGrath, J.E. (1976). Stress and behavior in organizations. In Dunnette M.D. (1976). Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- McGuire, D. & McLaren, L. (2009). The impact of physical environment on employee commitment in call centres: The mediating role of employee well-being. Team Performance Management: An International Journal, 15(1/2), 35-48.
- Murphy, L.R. (1995). Managing job stress: An employee assistance/human resource management partnership. Personnel Review, 24, 41-50.

- Novelli, M., Burgess, L.G., Jones, A. & Ritchie, B.W. (2018). 'No Ebola... still doomed'– The Ebola-induced tourism crisis. Annals of Tourism Research, 70, 76-87.
- Olsen, K. M., Hildrum, J., Kummen, K. & Leirdal, C. (2023). How do young employees perceive stress and job engagement while working from home? Evidence from a telecom operator during COVID-19. Employee Relations: The International Journal, 45(3), 762-775.
- Özkan, G. ve Gürbüz, B.İ. (2019). Bina ortamlarının çalışan refahı ve performansı üzerine etkisi. Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 18(70), 616-632.
- Patterson, M.G. & West, MA. (1998). Human resource management practices, employee attitudes and company performance. Proceedings of the 1st International Work Psychology Conference. Sheffield, UK: University of Sheffield Institute of Work Psychology.
- Pearsall, M.J., Ellis, A.P. & Stein, J.H. (2009). Coping with challenge and hindrance stressors in teams: Behavioral, cognitive, and affective outcomes. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 109(1), 18-28.
- Pianese, T., Errichiello, L. & da Cunha, J. V. (2023). Organizational control in the context of remote working: A synthesis of empirical findings and a research agenda. European Management Review, 20(2), 326-345.
- Quick, J.C. & Quick, J.D. (1984). Organizational stress and preventive management. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sahut, J.M. & Lissillour, R. (2023). The adoption of remote work platforms after the Covid-19 lockdown: New approach, new evidence. Journal of Business Research, 154, 113345.
- Schuler, R.S. (1982). An integrative transactional process model of stress in organizations. Journal of Occupational Behavior, 3, 5-19.
- Schuster F.E. (1998). A strategy for high commitment and involvement: employee centred management. London: Quorum Books.
- Seaward, B.L. (1994). Managing stress. London: Jones & Bartlett Learning.
- Siegrist, J. (1996) Adverse health effects of high-effort/low-reward conditions. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 1, 27-41.
- Siegrist, J. (2001). A theory of occupational stress. In Dunham, J. (2001). Stress in the Workplace: Past, Present and Future. London. Whurr Publishers.
- Sirgy, M.J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P. & Lee, D.J. (2001). A new measure of quality of work life based on need satisfaction and spill over theories. Social Indicators Research, 55(3), 241-302.
- Smite, D., Moe, N.B., Hildrum, J., Gonzalez-Huerta, J. & Mendez, D. (2023). Work-from-home is here to stay: Call for flexibility in post-pandemic work policies. Journal of Systems and Software, 195, 111-552.
- Spreitzer, G.M. (1996). Social structural characteristics of psychological empowerment. Academy of Management Journal, 39, 483–504.
- Sutherland, V.J. & Cooper, C.L. (1993). Identifying distress among general practitioners: predicators of psychological ill-health and job satisfaction. Social Science & Medicine, 37, 575-581.
- Tehrani, N., Humpage, S., Willmott, B. & Haslam, I. (2007). What's happening with well-being at work? change agenda. London: Chartered Institute of Personnel Development.
- Tetrick, L.E. & Larocco, J.M. (1987). Understanding, prediction, and control as moderators of the relationship between perceived stress, satisfaction, and psychological well-being. Journal of Applied Psychology, 72, 538-543.
- Thompson, N., Murphy, M. & Stradling, S. (1994). Dealing with stress. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

2023, Özel Sayı 2

- Tutar, F., Alpaslan, C., Tutar, E., & Erkan, Ç. (2013). Turizm sektörünün istihdam üzerine etkileri. Global Journal of Economics and Business Studies, 2(4), 14-27.
- Warr, P. (1992). Age and occupational well-being. Psychology and Ageing, 7(1), 37-45.
- Warr, P. (2002). Psychology at work. Pakefield: Penguin.
- Wayne, S.J., Shore, I.M. & Liden, R.C. (1997). Perceived organisation support and leader-member exchange: a social exchange perspective. Academy of Management Journal, 40(1), 82-111.
- Williams E.S, Konrad T.R. & Scheckler W.E. (2001). Understanding physicians' intentions to withdraw from practice: the role of job satisfaction, job stress, mental and physical health. Health Care Management Review, 26, 7-19.
- Wong, J.Y. & Wang, C.H. (2009). Emotional labor of the tour leaders: An exploratory study. Tourism Management, 30(2), 249-259.
- Wright, T.A. & Cropanzano, R. (2007). The happy/productive worker thesis revisited. In Martocchio J.J. (2007). Research in personnel and human resources management, 26, 269–307.
- Yüksel, A. ve Yılık, P. (2022). Çalışan Refahı Ölçeği: Türk Kültürüne Uyarlama Çalışması. Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 9(3), 1959-1975.
- Yvonne, K. & Jiang, S. (2023). A review on the new normal, employee wellbeing and the role of HRM: A tale of HR among the new normal for the employee wellbeing. International Journal of Business and Management, 16(8), 115-115.
- Zopiatis, A., Constanti, P. & Theocharous, A. L. (2014). Job involvement, commitment, satisfaction and turnover: Evidence from hotel employees in Cyprus. Tourism Management, 41, 129-140.