

Workplace Pressure in Turbulent Times: Psychological Implications for Employee Mental Health and Organisational Performance

Moses T. Imbur, PhD¹; Akeem A. Kenku, PhD²

¹Department of Psychology, University of Uyo, Nigeria

²Department of Psychology, Nasarawa State University, Nigeria

mosimbur@yahoo.com²

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17317773>

Citation: Imbur, M. T., & Kenku, A. A. (2025). Restless Workers In Restless Times: Psychological Implications for Employee Mental Health and Organisational Performance. *Transnational Journal of Arts, Humanities and Sciences*, 1(3).

Abstract

The contemporary workplace is increasingly defined by relentless demands and high-pressure environments, creating conditions in which employees often feel overwhelmed and restless. This paper provides a conceptual analysis of the psychological dimensions of workplace pressure, with particular attention to its implications for employee mental health and organisational performance. Drawing on established psychological theories and empirical literature, it synthesises evidence on the major sources of workplace stress, including excessive workload, role ambiguity, toxic organisational cultures, and the erosion of work-life balance. The review highlights how these pressures contribute to chronic stress, anxiety, burnout, and reduced job satisfaction, while also examining coping mechanisms that range from adaptive strategies such as mindfulness and organisational interventions to maladaptive responses that intensify mental health challenges. In addition, it identifies deficiencies in existing organisational support systems and underscores the importance of cultivating a supportive workplace culture. By integrating theoretical insights with comparative evidence from Nigeria and Europe, the paper offers actionable recommendations to guide employers, policymakers, and mental health professionals in addressing the workplace mental health crisis, ultimately promoting both employee well-being and organisational sustainability.

Keywords: Workplace Pressure, Employee Mental Health, Organisational Performance, Burnout and Stress, Comparative Analysis (Nigeria and Europe), Workplace Culture

Background

Introduction

The modern professional landscape is shaped by rapid technological advancements, economic volatility, and evolving work paradigms, all of which have intensified the demands placed on employees worldwide. Workplace pressure has emerged as a pervasive and unavoidable reality across industries and regions. Employees are increasingly expected to meet heightened performance standards, adapt to constant organizational changes, and balance complex professional and personal demands. These pressures often come at the expense of employees' mental health and well-being, underscoring workplace stress as a critical issue in contemporary organizational life (Eurofound, 2021; OECD, 2021).

Although workplace pressure is a global phenomenon, its manifestations and consequences vary across socio-economic, cultural, and institutional contexts. In Nigeria, high unemployment, unstable economic conditions, and organizational inefficiencies exacerbate workplace stress. Employees often face job insecurity, inadequate remuneration, and long working hours with minimal benefits. Cultural stigma surrounding mental health further discourages open discussion, while the absence of structured support systems, such as Employee Assistance Programs (EAPs), limits access to psychological care, contributing to high turnover rates, reduced productivity, and broader economic strain (Okeke et al., 2022; Adewunmi, 2023).

By contrast, in Europe, stronger labor protections and institutional support frameworks have not eliminated workplace stress. The shift toward knowledge-intensive and technology-driven industries has heightened cognitive and emotional demands, while the COVID-19 pandemic has introduced new stressors such as remote work challenges, digital fatigue, and blurred work–life boundaries. Despite the availability of mental health resources, survey data indicate that over 40% of European workers experience chronic workplace stress, illustrating the persistence of this issue even in well-regulated environments (EWCS, 2020; Eurofound, 2021).

Workplace pressure, often driven by high job demands, unrealistic expectations, tight deadlines, and excessive workloads, has profound implications for both individual mental health and organizational outcomes. While moderate levels of pressure can motivate performance, sustained and unmanaged pressure is associated with serious psychological conditions, including anxiety, depression, insomnia, and burnout (Chu et al., 2018; Kim et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2019). These conditions compromise employees' emotional well-being, impair cognitive functioning, and reduce job satisfaction. Over time, unresolved workplace stress contributes to physical health risks such as

cardiovascular disease and weakened immune systems (Lee et al., 2020; Sood et al., 2021).

From an organizational perspective, workplace pressure undermines job satisfaction, employee retention, and productivity. Research demonstrates a clear association between excessive work demands and increased turnover intentions, diminished morale, and disengagement (Wang & Zhao, 2019; Zhang et al., 2019). Employees facing prolonged stress often withdraw, either through absenteeism or presenteeism, both of which impose significant economic costs on organizations. Furthermore, unsupportive workplace cultures perpetuate stress by failing to prioritize employee well-being, thereby reinforcing a cycle of burnout and reduced performance.

The implications of workplace pressure are particularly acute in Nigeria, where systemic economic challenges intersect with cultural stigmas to exacerbate stress and hinder access to mental health resources (Adewunmi, 2023; Ojo & Akinwale, 2021). In Europe, while structural supports are stronger, employees face emerging pressures related to digital overload, remote work, and multicultural workplace complexities (Eurofound, 2021). This contrast highlights the need for a comparative, context-sensitive understanding of workplace stress.

Objectives

The primary objective of this study is to provide a conceptual analysis of workplace pressure, synthesising psychological and organisational perspectives to examine its implications for employee mental health and organisational performance.

The specific objectives are to:

- i. Synthesise existing theories and empirical evidence to identify the primary sources of workplace pressure and their psychological effects on employees.
- ii. Analyse the organisational consequences of workplace pressure, with particular attention to workplace culture, productivity, and employee retention.
- iii. Examine coping strategies and interventions discussed in the literature, distinguishing between adaptive and maladaptive responses, and propose evidence-based recommendations for practice and policy.
- iv. Compare the manifestations and management of workplace pressure in Nigeria and Europe, highlighting both shared challenges and context-specific dynamics.

Literature Review

Theoretical Perspectives on Workplace Pressure

Several psychological and organizational theories provide a foundation for understanding the dynamics of workplace stress and restlessness. Selye's Stress Theory (1936) introduces the General Adaptation Syndrome, explaining the progression from alarm to exhaustion, which aligns with the development of burnout in employees exposed to persistent stressors. Karasek's Demand–Control Model (1979) highlights the

interaction between job demands and autonomy, positing that high-strain jobs (high demand, low control) are most detrimental to mental health. Siegrist's Effort–Reward Imbalance Model (1996) emphasizes the role of fairness, arguing that stress emerges when employees perceive disproportionate effort relative to rewards. Finally, Caplan's Person–Environment Fit Theory (1987) suggests that misalignment between individual needs and workplace resources exacerbates dissatisfaction and disengagement. Together, these models underscore the interplay between structural conditions, employee autonomy, and perceptions of fairness in shaping workplace stress (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Caplan, 1987).

Psychological Implications of Workplace Pressure

The literature consistently links workplace pressure with adverse psychological outcomes, including anxiety, depression, insomnia, and burnout. Empirical studies demonstrate that high job demands predict elevated rates of anxiety and depression (Chu et al., 2018; Kim et al., 2019), while sustained stress contributes to sleep disturbances and fatigue (Chen et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2020). Burnout, characterized by emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, is a widely documented consequence of prolonged exposure to workplace stressors (Chen et al., 2018; Sood et al., 2021). These findings affirm the cumulative toll of unrelenting pressure on psychological health.

Organizational Consequences of Workplace Stress

From an organizational standpoint, unmanaged workplace pressure erodes productivity, job satisfaction, and employee retention. Studies show that high pressure is a significant predictor of turnover intentions and disengagement (Wang & Zhao, 2019; Zhang et al., 2019). Moreover, presenteeism and absenteeism arising from stress-related conditions impose considerable economic costs on organizations (Eurofound, 2021; OECD, 2021). Toxic workplace cultures and inadequate recognition systems further exacerbate employee dissatisfaction (Siegrist, 1996). Conversely, supportive environments with clear expectations and resources are shown to buffer the negative effects of pressure and enhance resilience (Ojo & Akinwale, 2021).

Regional Perspectives: Nigeria and Europe

Workplace pressure manifests differently across socio-economic and cultural contexts. In Nigeria, high unemployment, inadequate remuneration, and weak institutional support systems intensify stress, while cultural stigma inhibits open dialogue about mental health (Okeke et al., 2022; Adewunmi, 2023). The absence of formal employee assistance programs compounds these challenges, leading to decreased productivity and high turnover. In Europe, although labor protections are more advanced, employees face new stressors linked to digitalisation, remote work, and multicultural work dynamics. Reports from the European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS, 2020) indicate that over 40% of European workers experience chronic workplace stress

despite greater access to support systems. This contrast highlights the importance of context-sensitive interventions that address structural weaknesses in Nigeria and emerging psychosocial risks in Europe.

Coping Mechanisms and Interventions

The literature identifies both adaptive and maladaptive coping strategies. Adaptive responses include mindfulness, stress management training, and work–life balance initiatives, which have demonstrated effectiveness in reducing stress symptoms (Kabat-Zinn, 1990; Ashkanasy & Daus, 2005). Organizational interventions, such as flexible work arrangements and supportive leadership practices, are also associated with improved employee well-being (Galanti et al., 2017). Conversely, maladaptive strategies, such as withdrawal, presenteeism, and avoidance behaviors, exacerbate stress and diminish performance (Adebayo & Osibanjo, 2014). Scholars increasingly emphasize resilience and emotional intelligence as protective factors that enable employees to adapt to high-pressure environments and maintain engagement (Shin et al., 2012; Goleman, 1995).

Conceptual Orientation

This study adopts a conceptual approach, drawing on established psychological theories and empirical literature to examine the implications of workplace pressure for employee mental health and organisational performance. Rather than presenting original empirical data, the paper synthesises and integrates insights from diverse strands of research to develop a theoretically grounded analysis of workplace stress as a global phenomenon.

The conceptual orientation is anchored in four theoretical frameworks: Selye's Stress Theory (1936), Karasek's Demand–Control Model (1979), Siegrist's Effort–Reward Imbalance Model (1996), and Caplan's Person–Environment Fit Theory (1987). Together, these models illuminate the mechanisms through which workplace pressure shapes psychological outcomes and organisational dynamics. The study also employs the Transactional Model of Stress and Coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) to highlight the role of individual coping strategies in mediating stress experiences.

To develop its analysis, the study relies on a literature synthesis methodology, reviewing peer-reviewed journal articles, survey reports, and institutional publications. Sources include global data (e.g., OECD, 2021; Eurofound, 2021), regional surveys (e.g., European Working Conditions Survey, 2020), and context-specific studies on Nigeria (e.g., Adewunmi, 2023; Okeke et al., 2022). By integrating these diverse strands of evidence, the paper provides a comparative account of workplace pressure in Nigeria and Europe, identifying both commonalities and region-specific challenges. The conceptual contribution of this paper lies in its integrative analysis of psychological and organisational dimensions of workplace stress across different socio-cultural contexts. Unlike empirical studies limited to single industries or regions, this approach highlights

how structural, cultural, and individual-level factors interact to shape the manifestations of workplace pressure. The article also advances practical implications by translating theoretical insights into actionable recommendations for policymakers, employers, and mental health professionals.

Discussion

Restating the Purpose

This conceptual study set out to synthesise psychological and organisational perspectives on workplace pressure, with a comparative focus on Nigeria and Europe. Rather than reporting new empirical data, it integrates existing theories and secondary evidence to highlight the multifaceted implications of workplace stress for employee mental health and organisational performance. By doing so, the study positions workplace pressure not only as an individual psychological concern but also as a structural and cultural issue with far-reaching economic and social consequences.

Theoretical Integration

The conceptual foundations of workplace pressure are best understood through an integration of established psychological and organisational theories. Selye's Stress Theory (1936) provides the earliest framework, describing stress as a biological response that progresses through alarm, resistance, and eventual exhaustion. This model remains influential in explaining how chronic workplace demands can escalate into burnout. Building on this, Karasek's Demand–Control Model (1979) emphasises the interaction between job demands and decision latitude, predicting that high-demand, low-control roles are most detrimental to employee well-being. The model has been supported by multiple empirical studies, particularly in healthcare and service industries where autonomy is limited (Van der Doef & Maes, 1999; Häusser et al., 2010).

A complementary perspective is offered by Siegrist's Effort–Reward Imbalance Model (1996), which highlights the role of perceived fairness in shaping stress responses. When employees perceive their efforts as disproportionate to the rewards they receive, the psychological strain is intensified, often resulting in reduced job satisfaction and increased turnover intentions (Siegrist, 1996; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Finally, Caplan's Person–Environment Fit Theory (1987) situates workplace stress within the broader mismatch between employee needs and organisational resources. This framework has been widely applied to explain disengagement and job dissatisfaction, particularly in contexts of role ambiguity and inadequate support systems (French et al., 1982; Edwards et al., 1998).

Together, these models underscore that workplace stress is not solely a product of workload intensity but arises from the dynamic interplay between demands, control, fairness, and person–environment alignment. Integrating these perspectives highlights that structural conditions, cultural contexts, and individual perceptions collectively

shape the manifestations of workplace pressure (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Ganster & Rosen, 2013).

Psychological Implications of Workplace Pressure

The literature consistently demonstrates that workplace pressure has profound psychological consequences, manifesting in conditions such as anxiety, depression, insomnia, and burnout. High job demands and persistent performance pressure are strongly associated with heightened levels of anxiety and depressive symptoms. For instance, Chu et al. (2018) found that healthcare workers exposed to excessive workloads reported significantly greater psychological distress, while Kim et al. (2019) documented a similar association among service-sector employees, where customer-facing demands intensified emotional exhaustion. These findings align with the Transactional Model of Stress and Coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), which posits that stress results from an imbalance between perceived demands and available coping resources.

Insomnia is another well-documented outcome of sustained workplace stress. Studies reveal that prolonged exposure to job pressure disrupts sleep quality, leading to difficulty initiating or maintaining sleep (Chen et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2020). Sleep deprivation, in turn, exacerbates cognitive impairments, reduces emotional regulation, and increases irritability, further compounding the cycle of workplace stress. Over time, these disruptions diminish both personal well-being and professional effectiveness.

Perhaps the most extensively studied psychological outcome of chronic workplace pressure is **burnout**. Defined by emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation, and reduced personal accomplishment (Maslach & Jackson, 1981), burnout is a direct result of prolonged exposure to overwhelming demands without adequate recovery. Empirical studies consistently confirm that burnout is predictive of decreased motivation, higher turnover intentions, and elevated risk of physical health conditions such as cardiovascular disease (Chen et al., 2018; Sood et al., 2021).

Overall, the literature highlights that the psychological implications of workplace stress extend beyond temporary discomfort to entrenched, chronic conditions that impair employees' capacity to function effectively. The cumulative evidence underscores the necessity of organisational interventions that address not only workload management but also psychological resilience and support systems.

Organisational Implications of Workplace Pressure

Beyond its effects on individual well-being, workplace pressure has far-reaching organisational consequences, particularly in the areas of productivity, employee retention, and workplace culture. Excessive job demands are consistently associated with reduced job satisfaction, a key predictor of turnover intentions. Wang and Zhao (2019) demonstrated that employees experiencing chronic work pressure reported significantly lower satisfaction levels, which in turn heightened their likelihood of

leaving the organisation. High turnover not only leads to the loss of experienced talent but also imposes substantial costs associated with recruitment, training, and reduced team cohesion.

Workplace stress also undermines productivity and performance. Employees working under constant pressure often exhibit diminished concentration, impaired decision-making, and reduced creativity. As Zhang et al. (2019) argue, psychological strain directly compromises efficiency, leading to missed deadlines, lower-quality outputs, and weakened collaboration. Furthermore, stress-related absenteeism and presenteeism (employees being physically present but unable to perform effectively) impose hidden costs on organisations, with global estimates suggesting billions of dollars in annual productivity losses (OECD, 2021; Eurofound, 2021).

A further organisational concern is the deterioration of workplace culture. Environments characterised by toxic competition, unclear expectations, or insufficient managerial support can exacerbate stress and foster disengagement. Siegrist's (1996) Effort–Reward Imbalance Model illustrates how perceived unfairness in recognition and compensation deepens employee dissatisfaction, creating a cycle of frustration and withdrawal. Conversely, evidence indicates that supportive organisational cultures, marked by open communication, flexible work arrangements, and recognition of employee contributions, can mitigate the negative impact of pressure and enhance resilience (Ojo & Akinwale, 2021).

Taken together, these findings underscore that workplace pressure is not merely an individual challenge but an organisational liability. Left unmanaged, it erodes job satisfaction, increases turnover, and undermines productivity. More positively, organisations that proactively address workplace stress by fostering supportive cultures and implementing evidence-based interventions can enhance both employee well-being and long-term performance.

Comparative Insights: Nigeria and Europe

Although workplace pressure is a global phenomenon, its manifestations and consequences are shaped by socio-economic, cultural, and institutional contexts. A comparative analysis of Nigeria and Europe illustrates both shared challenges and distinct regional dynamics.

In Nigeria, workplace stress is intensified by structural and economic vulnerabilities. High unemployment, inadequate remuneration, and organisational inefficiencies leave employees vulnerable to chronic job insecurity and financial strain (Okeke et al., 2022; Adewunmi, 2023). Long working hours with limited benefits are common, while the cultural stigma surrounding mental health discourages open discussion of psychological distress. The absence of structured institutional support, such as Employee Assistance Programs (EAPs), further compounds these challenges, often resulting in burnout, high turnover, and reduced productivity. Scholars note that

this lack of support not only undermines individual well-being but also places a burden on national economic development by reducing labour force stability and efficiency (Ojo & Akinwale, 2021).

In Europe, the dynamics of workplace stress differ, though the problem remains pervasive. Labour protections and organisational policies are generally more advanced, yet employees face new psychosocial stressors associated with the shift toward knowledge-intensive industries and digitalised work environments. The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated remote and hybrid work arrangements, producing new challenges such as blurred work–life boundaries, digital fatigue, and heightened expectations of constant availability (Eurofound, 2021; EWCS, 2020). Despite the availability of mental health resources, surveys reveal that more than 40% of European workers report experiencing chronic workplace stress, reflecting the persistence of the issue even in contexts with stronger institutional safeguards (EWCS, 2020). Workplace harassment and performance pressures also remain significant contributors to stress, particularly in multicultural and high-demand sectors (OECD, 2021).

Taken together, the Nigerian and European cases underscore that workplace pressure is universal but context-dependent. In Nigeria, systemic economic challenges and cultural stigmas exacerbate stress, while in Europe, technological transformation and shifting work paradigms introduce new stressors. This comparative perspective highlights the importance of context-sensitive interventions: in Nigeria, urgent priorities include destigmatising mental health and institutionalising formal support systems, while in Europe, policies must address digital overload, hybrid work challenges, and the psychosocial risks of knowledge-based economies.

Conclusion and Contribution to Scholarship

This study has provided a conceptual analysis of workplace pressure, synthesising psychological and organisational perspectives to explore its implications for employee mental health and organisational performance. Drawing on established theories, such as Stress Theory, the Demand–Control Model, the Effort–Reward Imbalance Model, and the Person–Environment Fit Theory, the paper demonstrates that workplace stress emerges from the complex interaction of demands, control, fairness, and contextual fit. Integrating these frameworks with evidence from existing literature highlights how workplace pressure manifests in psychological conditions such as anxiety, depression, insomnia, and burnout, while also producing organisational outcomes including reduced productivity, diminished job satisfaction, and high turnover.

A comparative analysis of Nigeria and Europe further illustrates the context-dependent nature of workplace pressure. In Nigeria, socio-economic vulnerabilities, weak institutional supports, and cultural stigma amplify stress and inhibit access to mental health resources. In Europe, workplace stress persists despite stronger protections, driven largely by digital fatigue, hybrid work challenges, and the

psychosocial demands of knowledge-based economies. These contrasts emphasise the importance of context-sensitive interventions that respond to both structural and cultural dynamics.

The key contribution of this study lies in its integrative, conceptual approach. By synthesising theories and empirical findings across psychology, organisational studies, and regional contexts, the paper advances a multidimensional understanding of workplace pressure that moves beyond sector- or country-specific analyses. It also translates theoretical insights into actionable recommendations, offering guidance for policymakers, employers, and mental health professionals seeking to mitigate the impact of workplace stress.

Future research should extend this conceptual foundation through empirical studies that investigate how interventions operate across different cultural and organisational contexts. Longitudinal and comparative designs would be particularly valuable in assessing the effectiveness of strategies such as Employee Assistance Programs, flexible work policies, and mindfulness-based training in reducing workplace stress and promoting resilience.

In sum, while workplace pressure is an inevitable feature of modern organisational life, its negative consequences for employees and organisations are not. By recognising the psychological and organisational dimensions of stress, and by implementing evidence-based strategies tailored to specific contexts, employers and policymakers can foster healthier, more resilient, and more productive workforces.

References

- Adewunmi, T. (2023). *Mental health in Nigerian workplaces: Challenges and opportunities*. *Journal of African Occupational Studies*, 15(2), 45-57.
- Ashkanasy, N. M., & Daus, C. S. (2005). Rumors of the death of emotional intelligence in organizational behavior are vastly exaggerated. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(4), 441–452.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W.H. Freeman.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W.H. Freeman.
- Burke, W. W. (2013). *Organization change: Theory and practice*. Sage Publications.
- Druskat, V. U., & Wolff, S. B. (2001). Building the emotional intelligence of groups. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(3), 81-90.
- Druskat, V. U., & Wolff, S. B. (2001). Building the emotional intelligence of groups. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(3), 81-90.

- Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. Random House.
- Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. Random House.
- Eurofound. (2021). *Living and working in Europe 2021*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS). (2020). *6th European Working Conditions Survey overview report*. Eurofound.
- Galanti, T., Drake, C., & Garbarino, S. (2017). Toward a culture of rest: Workplace practices and policies that support work-life balance. *Journal of Business Ethics, 142*(1), 169–181.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bantam Books.
- Hiatt, J. M. (2006). *ADKAR: A model for change in business, government, and our community*. Prosci Research.
- Kabat-Zinn, J. (1990). *Full catastrophe living: Using the wisdom of your body and mind to face stress, pain, and illness*. Delacorte.
- Kabat-Zinn, J. (1990). *Full catastrophe living: Using the wisdom of your body and mind to face stress, pain, and illness*. Delacorte.
- Kotter, J. P., & Schlesinger, L. A. (2008). Choosing strategies for change. *Harvard Business Review, 86*(7/8), 130–139.
- Luthar, S. S., Cicchetti, D., & Becker, B. (2000). The construct of resilience: A critical evaluation and guidelines for future work. *Child Development, 71*(3), 543–562.
- Luthar, S. S., Cicchetti, D., & Becker, B. (2000). The construct of resilience: A critical evaluation and guidelines for future work. *Child Development, 71*(3), 543–562.
- Masten, A. S. (2014). *Ordinary magic: Resilience in development*. Guilford Press.
- Masten, A. S. (2014). *Ordinary magic: Resilience in development*. Guilford Press.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2004). Emotional intelligence: Theory, findings, and implications. *Psychological Inquiry, 15*(3), 197–215.

- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2004). Emotional intelligence: Theory, findings, and implications. *Psychological Inquiry, 15*(3), 197–215.
- OECD. (2021). *Mental health and work: New perspectives*. OECD Publishing.
- Ojo, A., & Akinwale, A. (2021). *The impact of workplace stress on productivity in Nigerian SMEs*. *Journal of Business and Social Inquiry, 10*(1), 78-91.
- Okeke, O., Adeyemi, L., & Udo, E. (2022). *Workplace stress and employee performance in Nigeria: A review of empirical studies*. *African Journal of Management Research, 17*(3), 25-38.
- Petrides, K. V., Pita, R., & Kokkinaki, F. (2007). The location of trait emotional intelligence in personality factor space. *British Journal of Psychology, 98*(2), 273–289.
- Petrides, K. V., Pita, R., & Kokkinaki, F. (2007). The location of trait emotional intelligence in personality factor space. *British Journal of Psychology, 98*(2), 273–289.
- Richards, J., & Plate, R. (2018). The impact of hustle culture on rest and productivity. *Journal of Human Relations, 71*(10), 1352–1368.
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 9*(3), 185–211. Ashkanasy, N. M., & Daus, C. S. (2005). Rumors of the death of emotional intelligence in organizational behavior are vastly exaggerated. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(4), 441–452.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 9*(3), 185–211.
- Salyers, V. A., Sullivan, K. M., Rollins, A. L., & McGuire, J. F. (2017). Burnout, work-life balance, and self-care in the helping professions. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health, 44*(3), 435–447.
- Sausenthaler, S., Skarupke, M., & Holzinger, B. (2014). The importance of sleep and rest for physical and mental health: A public health perspective. *Sleep Medicine Reviews, 18*(1), 51–59.
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership*. Jossey-Bass.

- Shin, L. M., Rauch, S. L., & Pitman, R. K. (2012). Amygdala, medial prefrontal cortex, and hippocampal function in PTSD. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1071(1), 67–79.
- Shin, L. M., Rauch, S. L., & Pitman, R. K. (2012). Amygdala, medial prefrontal cortex, and hippocampal function in PTSD. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1071(1), 67–79.
- Walker, M. P. (2017). *Why we sleep: Unlocking the power of sleep and dreams*. Scribner.
- Wheaton, A. G., Ferro, G. A., & Krueger, P. M. (2016). The relationship between sleep duration and health: A meta-analysis of epidemiologic studies. *Health Psychology*, 35(9), 928–939.