

The Invisible Burden: The Individual Oppressed Between Institutional Roles

Assoc.Prof. Yesim Sirakaya

St. Clements University UK Head of Labor Economics and Industrial Relations Department Orcid ID: 0009-0004-2558-8194

ABSTRACT : There is a reality in which individuals working in the modern business world play multiple and implicit roles that are not limited to task definitions. These roles go beyond the official job description; emotional labor, invisible labor force, intermediate finding, psychological buffer task. This phenomenon, called “invisible burden, causes the individual to experience psychological problems such as burnout, role conflict and decrease in organizational commitment. In this article, the individual and institutional effects of the invisible burden from the perspective of industrial psychology were analyzed. In line with the current studies in the literature, the individual's dynamics of crushing under multiple roles, the relationship between psychological capital and administrative awareness levels are discussed. In addition, the disproportionate impact of this burden on female employees and the inadequacy of organizational support mechanisms have been mentioned. The findings of the study show that the psychological security environment and open role definitions are decisive in reducing this invisible burden. Institutions should turn to a more inclusive role management understanding that observes not only physical but also emotional and social labor burdens.

KEYWORDS: Invisible burden, multiple roles, industrial psychology, emotional labor, role conflict, psychological burnout, organizational support.

1. INTRODUCTION

While traditional job roles were shaped by more job description, hierarchy and separation of tasks in the post -industrial revolution period, these boundaries have become increasingly blurred in postmodern organizational structures. Today, individuals who work in corporate structures are not only with the technical workload; At the same time, emotional labor, social interactions and invisible responsibilities have to cope. These invisible responsibilities are implicitly loaded on the shoulders of the individual with organizational expectations, but often cannot be measured and managed because it is not officially defined (Hochschild, 1983; Grandey, 2000). While the individual cope with these roles that are not explicitly defined at work but are continuous; Psychological burnout, role conflict and a sense of belonging in the sense of slimming faces many negativity (Kahn et al., 1964). This becomes more pronounced especially in sectors that require emotional labor and among female employees (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002). Examining the psychological effects of the unseen burden in the context of industrial psychology within the institutional structures is critical for both working prosperity and organizational sustainability. The main purpose of this study is to define the invisible burdens where individuals working in institutional environments are exposed to, to reveal the causes and to evaluate the psychological effects of these loads from the perspective of industrial psychology. In particular, it is aimed to reveal the cognitive and emotional effects of multiple role expectations on the individual. Today, due to job descriptions, technological transformation, digitalization, horizontal organization models and flexible working forms, it has become increasingly permeable and dynamic. This change increases the likelihood of invisible roles of employees, which can cause individual burnout, and performance decrease and commitment problems at the institutional level (Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter, 2001). The importance of the study stems from the fact that these invisible burdens offer solutions to the recognition of organizational policies and solutions for the development of corporate support mechanisms. In addition, it is aimed to make an original contribution to the literature of corporate psychology with the analysis of implicit roles such as “emotional tampons”, “intermediate finding” and “social equalism ilan which has not been dealt with in the literature. In the 21st century, business models, which turned after digitalization, globalization and sponge, brought significant changes in institutional structures. Beyond the traditional task definitions, the roles expected from employees have become increasingly flexible, multidimensional and invisible (Ashforth, Kreiner & Fugate, 2000). An employee no longer only performs technical duties; It also takes on the role of a "silent leader" that regulates internal relations, tries to internalize and spread institutional values and sometimes function as human resources. In this context, the dynamics of institutional change complexated the role perceptions of individuals and reveal multiple roles with uncertain limits. According to the role theory, when the individual has to meet the expectations of different roles at the same time, he experiences “role conflict” and “role tension” (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Especially in hybrid and remote working models, the blur of the work-family boundaries has deepened this situation. In terms of industrial psychology, these new role demands erode the psychological capital of the individual and weaken

The Invisible Burden: The Individual Oppressed Between Institutional Roles

positive features such as self-efficacy, durability and hope (Luthans et al., 2007). For this reason, it is necessary to make visible roles visible and support systems should be restructured in institutional structures.

2. CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

Modern business life is not only technical tasks of individuals; It has also become a multi-layered structure waiting to take on emotional, social and cognitive responsibilities. This leads to roles that are not officially identified by individuals but are expected to contribute to the functioning of the institution. In industrial psychology, various theoretical approaches have been developed to make sense of the effect of such extra responsibilities on the individual. In particular, role theory is functional in explaining the way of emergence and psychological consequences of invisible loads. The role theory is a fundamental theoretical framework that explains the process of fulfilling the behaviors and responsibilities expected by the individual's social environment (Kahn et al., 1964). Within the organization, each individual plays certain roles according to his position; However, in today's flexible business models, the limits of these roles have become increasingly uncertain and enlarged. This results in the simultaneous execution of individuals' role of more than one role and raises the phenomenon of "excessive role loading" (Role Overload). Excessive role loading refers to the fact that the energy and cognitive resources are not sufficient to fulfill the tasks expected from them when the individual has. In particular, implicit tasks such as "emotional buffer", "being a bid of communication" and "extra responsibility", which organizations expect without expressing the individual, push the psychological capacity of the individual (Coverman, 1989). This loading situation has serious consequences in employees such as burnout (burnout), stress, low job satisfaction and loss of motivation (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). In industrial psychology literature, overloading is examined under two basic categories: quantitative loading and qualitative loading (Beehr et al., 1976). Quantitative loading is the situation in which the amount of work requested from the employee exceeds the limits of time, energy or capacity. For example, a large number of tasks or overtime expectations to be completed in a short time are included in this scope. Qualitative loading, on the other hand, is related to consumer tasks in a complex, uncertain or emotionally, which pushes the individual's competencies or psychological limits. In particular, roles such as emotional labor, intermediate finding or crisis solving, which are invisible burden, are in this context (Karasek, 1979). Qualitative loading is often not noticed; Because the employee internalizes these tasks as a part of the work. However, such loads increase the burnout of the individual and weaken psychological strength. In addition, the frequent loading of female employees with such implicit roles shows that gender roles are reproduced at the institutional level (Coser, 1974; Hochschild, 1983). The uncertainty of role is that the expectations, task limits and success criteria for the role of the employee are not defined and clearly defined (Rizzo, House & Lirtzman, 1970). This forms the basis of invisible loads; Because the individual cannot know which tasks belong to him and which of them to be held responsible. This uncertainty leads to difficulty in making decisions, a decrease in control and anxiety. The role conflict is the situation in which the individual faces contradictory expectations, resulting from multiple roles at the same time. For example, when an employee is expected to establish authority as a team leader and a mediator that offers emotional support, these roles clash. This conflict reduces the functionality of the individual and creates inefficiency at both individual and organizational level (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Role uncertainty and conflict is more common, especially in structures where invisible loads increase. Because the individual feels a continuous "compliance pressure" under non-defined tasks and implicit expectations. This leads to a decrease in psychological security and decrease in job satisfaction (Edmondson, 1999).

3. PSYCHOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS

The invisible burden, which is exposed to individuals working in institutional structures, threatens not only the job satisfaction but also the mental and physical health of the individual directly. In the face of uncertain, multiple and implicit role expectations, the individual is alone with exhaustion, internal conflict and physical symptoms. This load goes beyond classical business stress models and creates a multidimensional psychological wear at emotional, cognitive and psychosomatic levels. In the following subtitles, these effects were analyzed by industrial psychology perspective. Emotional exhaustion, as described in Maslach's Burnout Model (Maslach & Jackson, 1981), occurs by consuming emotional resources as a result of the constant stress experienced by the individual. Roles such as emotional effort, intermediate finding and empathic support, which form the basis of invisible burden, consume the emotional energy of the employees. This is more prominent in sectors of "emotional labor intensive", especially in health, education and customer service (Hochschild, 1983). In this process, the individual feels "empty" not only physically but also; It becomes indifferent to his work, becomes intolerant of his environment and his devotion to the institution weakens. In addition, the rise of cortisol levels, anger explosions, inward closure and social withdrawal behaviors are observed as chronic stress response (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). The individual who has to cope with constantly invisible responsibilities approaches the limits of his cognitive capacity. Decision fatigue, continuous role transitions, contradictory expectations and uncertain task limits weakens the individual's attention, planning and problem solving skills (Baumeister et al., 1998). This negatively affects both individual productivity and internal functionality. The invisible burden functions as a cognitive consumer. While the individual wants to focus on his duty, he tries to solve mentally emotional conflicts, to balance the workload of others or to calm the environment. Such cognitive clutter causes a decrease in business quality and an increase in error rates (Meijman & Mulder, 1998). In addition, this wear hurts one's self-efficacy belief. The feeling of "I cannot catch up" can lead to a tendency to decrease organizational commitment and leave the

The Invisible Burden: The Individual Oppressed Between Institutional Roles

job by breaking the self-confidence of the individual over time (Bandura, 1997). One of the long-term effects of invisible load is anxiety disorders, insomnia and psychosomatic complaints experienced by employees. The individual experiences a constant alert in the organizational environment with the anxiety of "I wonder if I contributed sufficiently" and unrest caused by not being evaluated. This can prepare the ground for the formation of generalized anxiety disorder (GAD) and social anxiety symptoms (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Sleep disorders are characterized by the continuation of mental cycles, especially during the night. The individual has difficulty in transition to sleep by considering the uncertainties he will encounter the next day, the burden of implicit roles expected to undertake and possible conflicts (Morin et al., 2003). This leads to an increasingly depletion of both mental and physical energy. In addition, psychosomatic symptoms occur as a result of chronic stress. Physical symptoms such as headache, stomach disorders, muscle pain and cardiovascular symptoms are actually a physical reflection of the invisible load (Slye, 1976). Unfortunately, these symptoms are usually diagnosed misconduct and the main cause is of psychological origin.

4. INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS and ADMINISTRATIVE FACTORS

The level of coping of the individual with invisible role burdens is not only dependent on his personal durability or psychological capital; At the same time, the structural features, managerial approaches and cultural codes of the institution in which it works play a decisive role in the formation of this burden. The perspective of institutions and employees as "infinite resources" causes these individuals to be exhausted, to feel worthless and to break away from the organization. In this context, the following institutional factors constitute the institutional floor of the invisible load. The fact that the task descriptions are not clear in corporate structures causes critical questions such as what job the individual is expected to do and at what point the responsibility is taken from him. This uncertainty leads to the employee to assume invisible roles with his own initiative; Because filling the gaps is seen as a "belief loyalty" or "duty ethics" (Rizzo, House & Lirtzman, 1970). The transfer of some of the works in their duties to the sub-positions in the hierarchy can be defined as managerial load transfer. This leads to the burden of both their own definitions of task and the emotional and logistics of the employees, especially at low levels. This transfer may lose its belonging with the feeling that this extra load is not noticed because it usually occurs implicitly. Such applications also damage the principle of labor department and performance justice (Beehr & Newman, 1978). The leadership style adopted by managers is one of the main factors that directly affect employees' load perception. Supporting and transformational leadership styles strengthen the psychological resources of employees; The forms of leadership forms that create indifferent or role uncertainty prepare the ground for an increase in the invisible burden (Bass & Avolio, 1994). For example, while the transformationist leadership employee is a protective factor in terms of strengthening, integration with vision and providing emotional support; Transactional leadership can only make the employee's extra effort invisible by focusing on task-based success (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). The fact that the leader cannot realize invisible roles or sees these roles as "natural responsibility" reinforces the feeling of injustice and non-value in employees. This is the managerial trigger of burnout syndrome. Each organization builds a culture with its unique norms and values system. Some organizational cultures offer the employee to "constantly busy" as an indicator of loyalty. Staying empty, asking for help or questioning the distribution of work can be perceived as passiveness or inadequacy in these cultures (Hofstese, 1991). Such norms cause the invisible load to be internalized at the individual level. The obligation to "be continuously accessible" is more evident with digitalization; In particular, the spatial limits of the work have been completely erased through e-mail, messaging applications and online meetings. This leads to violations of work-life balance and mental burnout (Mazmanian, Olikowski & Yates, 2013). In addition, in some organizations, more "silent" and more "compatible" employees are imposed on the lack of task sharing or inadequate support systems. Such practices feed the dynamics that cause psychological damage such as emotional labor exploitation and unequal role distribution within the organization (Grandey, 2000).

5. WORK-LIFE IMBALANCE and IDENTITY EROSION

The impact of invisible institutional loads on the individual is not only at work; It deeply shakes the individual's private life, social roles, and even self-perception. In particular, the tasks whose borders become uncertain, constant occupation culture and multiple role pressures, faint the separation of work-life, lead to the individual to forget who he is. In this process, the individual turns into a "organizational extension" that is in a constant duty beyond being an employee. In this section, three main dimensions of this transformation are discussed:

Factors such as digitalization, flexible working forms, hybrid office models and institutional commitment expectations have eliminated the temporal and spatial limits of the work. This causes the work to infiltrate every moment of the life of the individual, not only in the office or working hours (Derks & Bakker, 2014). Employees now respond to the e-mail while on holiday, attending weekend meetings, or work on business files late at night. This organizational border melting transforms the concept of work-life balance into an empty ideal; The mental resting time of individuals is eliminated and personal living spaces are occupied by business (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011). Invisible loads often accumulate in these uncertain areas: "invisible tasks", such as being consulted, supporting, solving crisis, responding to messages instantly, consume the mental capacity of the individual. In the literature of industrial psychology, "role fatigue" is a state of burnout due to the individual or simultaneous roles (Goode, 1960). Multiple roles (employee, team leader, emotional support provider, mentor, etc.) undertaken in institutional structures may contradict the parenting,

The Invisible Burden: The Individual Oppressed Between Institutional Roles

accompanying or social roles within the family of the individual. In particular, female employees are stuck between two high expectations such as “motherhood” and “corporate success”; The employee, whose individual resources are limited, loses the integrity of identity while continuously transition between these roles (Hays, 1996). Male employees may also go beyond their traditional “livelihood” identities and experience a similar burnout when they face the expectation of emotional support. This multiple role tension reduces the individual's life satisfaction, causes conflicts in private life and interrupts the efficiency of the individual at work. At the same time, feeling “unsuccessful in non-business roles also seriously damages the self-confidence and general welfare of the individual (Frone, 2000). Institutional invisible loads also weaken the individual's sense of belonging to the organization. The employee, whose burden is not noticed, supported and appreciated, feels lonely, worthless and alienated over time. This results in the disintegration of organizational belonging (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Decreased belonging affects not only work performance, but also the individual's capacity and motivation to connect the individual. Over time, the individual becomes insensitive to the organization, shows less volunteering, emotionally closed, and begins to move away from interpersonal interactions in the workplace. This situation both silences the social identity of the individual within the organization and reduces organizational citizenship behaviors (Organ, 1997). In the last stage, this alienation can turn into non-functional work behaviors such as quiet quitting, passive resistance and emotional break. The individual who is crushed by the organization that is not visible by the organization usually uses moving away from the organization as a defense strategy (Kahn, 1990).

6. SOLUTION SEARCHES and INTERVENTION MODELS

The invisible burden is a versatile problem that erodes not only the business life of the individual, but also the identity, belonging and general mental health. Therefore, the solution process cannot be reduced only to individual resistance or stress management techniques; Requires deeper and holistic intervention models. In this section, both micro-level individual-specific strategies and macro-level structural policy suggestions are included. The management of the role burden is primarily possible by restructuring task definitions and simplifying business processes. It is critical to clarify the distribution of tasks of institutions, make implicit responsibilities visible and offer open role limits to employees (Katz & Kahn, 1978). The task simplification is narrowing the roles undertaken by the employees to comply with the basic business goals; It involves the systematic elimination of unnecessary intermediate tasks or emotional workloads. In particular, the support of employees in the leading position can be a precautionary measure of the transfer of over-invisible loads. In addition, the regular redefinition of roles through role clarification workshops, task analysis practices and internal communication tools makes it easier for the individual to understand his role expectations and strengthen the perception of justice within the organization (Rizzo et al., 1970). Corporate support systems serve as a critical buffer to increase employee's capacity to cope with the invisible load. Psychological Counseling Services make it possible to increase stress-cope skills, to provide emotional support and to be directed by early intervention of individuals with risk of burnout (Quick et al., 1997). Psychological support centers to be established within the institutions should provide professional counseling fields based on privacy, where employees can apply voluntarily. In addition, emotional load sharing, role conflict solution and structured supervision sessions towards the need for value can support the functions of this center. Mentoring and Coaching Systems are very functional in terms of recognizing and coping with invisible responsibilities, especially for new employees and intermediate managers (Luthans & Youssef, 2007). Such support systems not only increase psychological resistance, but also strengthen organizational commitment. Sustainable solutions in coping with invisible load should not be limited to individual or managerial strategies; Structural transformation should also be aimed at the level of corporate policies and business culture. Some of the proposed policy steps in this context are as follows:

Invisible load awareness trainings: It should be ensured that this phenomenon should be recognized and internalized through trainings for both administrators and employees throughout the institution.

Workload Balancing Algorithms: Data-based load sharing systems can be developed by digitally monitoring performance and tasks distribution, including emotional and social labor.

Revision of Performance Evaluation Systems: Multidimensional performance criteria based not only on numerical outputs but also behavioral indicators such as emotional labor, cooperation and supporting should be established (Organ, 1997).

Arrangements that observe the balance of work-life: The welfare of the welfare of structural reforms such as limitation of accessibility clocks, compulsory digital detox clocks and alternating workload balancing models should be centralized.

In summary, the invisible burden is not only by individual effort; Strategic leadership can be reduced by organizational sensitivity and cultural transformation. In this context, it is inevitable that industrial psychology will serve as a guide to both diagnostic and intervention developing guides.

7. CONCLUSION

This study has discussed the psychological, cognitive and social effects of multiple role expectations that have become increasingly invisible in institutional structures on employees. Evaluations in the light of role theory, burnout literature and organizational behavior approaches have revealed that the invisible burden has not only had an exhaustion at the individual level, but also in areas such as organizational productivity, belonging, perception of justice and cultural sustainability. The research shows that employees

The Invisible Burden: The Individual Oppressed Between Institutional Roles

experience a serious identity and psychological difficulties in the environments where task descriptions are uncertain, administrative burden transfer becomes widespread and emotional labor expectations increase. In this context, under the following three basic headings, the contributions of the study and the expansions for the future are presented:

This article is not only with the workload framework of the invisible burden concept to industrial psychology literature; It offers a holistic model that evaluates with socio-psychological components such as role conflict, identity abrasion and disintegration of belonging. In addition, the unseen burden, emotional buffer, organizational support, silent leadership, secret crisis management, such as previously analyzed conceptualized roles in the literature have been analyzed systematically. The study proposes the role theory as a conceptual subcategory of "invisible role efforts". This offers both organizational behavior and business psychology literature. Human resources professionals should periodically review their task descriptions and define invisible responsibilities and transparent the burden perception of the employees. Managers should be trained, especially in terms of emotional burden transfer, responsibility sharing in crisis management and sensitivity to support needs; It should be raised about the psychological effects of leadership styles on employees. Corporate managers should review task sharing systems for more equal and fair distribution of invisible loads; Systematic overload should be prevented for "compatible" or "silent" employees. Employee support units should establish a system that follows emotional prosperity not only in the event of crisis, but continuously and proactively. Support models such as supervision, psychohegrialism and group therapy should be expanded. The invisible load phenomenon released in this study is not only industrial psychology; It also offers research opportunities in many disciplines such as sociology, labor economy, women's studies, psychiatry, occupational health and digital media studies:

In terms of sociology of the organization, it can be investigated how invisible roles are shaped and reproduced by internal power relations.

From the perspective of gender studies, the disproportionate impact of invisible burdens on female employees can be examined in more depth.

In the disciplines of psychiatry and clinical psychology, neuropsychological bonds can be studied between invisible load and anxiety, depression, burnout and psychosomatic symptoms.

In the context of digitalization, it can be analyzed how the unseen load from home working models interacts with remote access, online demands and digital fatigue. In short, the invisible burden is a complex problematic that threatens both individual health and corporate sustainability. Recognizing, identifying and managing this burden is a compulsory step for a more human and psychologically safe working life.

REFERENCES

- 1) Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1), 20-39. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1989.4278999>
- 2) Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(3), 472-491. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2000.3363315>
- 3) Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W.H. Freeman.
- 4) Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Sage Publications.
- 5) Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Muraven, M., & Tice, D. M. (1998). Ego depletion: Is the active self a limited resource? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(5), 1252-1265. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.5.1252>
- 6) Beehr, T. A., & Newman, J. E. (1978). Job stress, employee health, and organizational effectiveness: A facet analysis, model, and literature review. *Personnel Psychology*, 31(4), 665-699. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1978.tb02118.x>
- 7) Beehr, T. A., Walsh, J. T., & Taber, T. D. (1976). Relationships of stress to individually and organizationally valued states: Higher order needs as a moderator. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61(1), 41-47. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.61.1.41>
- 8) Brotheridge, C. M., & Grandey, A. A. (2002). Emotional labor and burnout: Comparing two perspectives of "people work". *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 60(1), 17-39. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1815>
- 9) Coverman, S. (1989). Role overload, role conflict, and stress: Addressing consequences of multiple role demands. *Social Forces*, 67(4), 965-982. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2579350>
- 10) Coser, L. A. (1974). Greedy institutions: Patterns of undivided commitment. Free Press.
- 11) Derks, D., & Bakker, A. B. (2014). Smartphone use, work-home interference, and burnout: A diary study on the role of recovery. *Applied Psychology*, 63(3), 411-440. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2012.00530.x>
- 12) Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350-383. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999>
- 13) Frone, M. R. (2000). Work-family conflict and employee psychiatric disorders: The national comorbidity survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(6), 888-895. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.6.888>

The Invisible Burden: The Individual Oppressed Between Institutional Roles

- 14) Goode, W. J. (1960). A theory of role strain. *American Sociological Review*, 25(4), 483-496. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2092933>
- 15) Grandey, A. A. (2000). Emotion regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(1), 95-110. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.5.1.95>
- 16) Greenhaus, J. H., & Allen, T. D. (2011). Work-family balance: A review and extension of the literature. In J. C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 165-183). American Psychological Association.
- 17) Hays, S. (1996). *The cultural contradictions of motherhood*. Yale University Press.
- 18) Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. University of California Press.
- 19) Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. McGraw-Hill.
- 20) Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755-768. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755>
- 21) Kahn, R. L. (1990). Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity. In J. E. R. O'Reilly & K. Roberts (Eds.), *Stress and human performance* (pp. 33-48). Wiley.
- 22) Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. Wiley.
- 23) Karasek, R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24(2), 285-308. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392498>
- 24) Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). Wiley.
- 25) Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer Publishing Company.
- 26) Luthans, F., & Youssef, C. M. (2007). Emerging positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Management*, 33(3), 321-349. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307300814>
- 27) Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 2(2), 99-113. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030020205>
- 28) Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397>
- 29) Mazmanian, M., Orlikowski, W. J., & Yates, J. (2013). The autonomy paradox: The implications of mobile email devices for knowledge professionals. *Organization Science*, 24(5), 1337-1357. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1120.0806>
- 30) Meijman, T. F., & Mulder, G. (1998). Psychological aspects of workload. In P. J. D. Drenth & H. Thierry (Eds.), *Handbook of work and organizational psychology: Work psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 5-33). Psychology Press.
- 31) Morin, C. M., Rodrigue, S., & Ivers, H. (2003). Role of stress, arousal, and coping skills in primary insomnia. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 65(2), 259-267. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.PSY.0000030391.09558.A3>
- 32) Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 85-97. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_2
- 33) Quick, J. C., Quick, J. D., Nelson, D. L., & Hurrell Jr., J. J. (1997). *Preventive stress management in organizations*. American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10238-000>
- 34) Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15(2), 150-163. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2391486>
- 35) Selye, H. (1976). *The stress of life* (Rev. ed.). McGraw-Hill.