

Attaining Employee Well-Being through Sustainable Practices: Co-Worker Feedback Environment as a Strategy for Coping with Work-Related Stress

Živilė STANKEVIČIŪTĖ

Kaunas University of Technology
Gedimino g. 50, LT-44249 Kaunas, Lithuania
zivile.stankeviciute@ktu.lt

Wioletta WEREDA

Military University of Technology
2 Sylwestra Kaliskiego, 01-476, Warsaw, Poland
weredawioletta@tlen.pl

Abstract. *Recently, work-related stress has become a growing issue, which is harmful to both the employees and the employer. Although previous literature has focused on antecedents and consequences of work-related stress, the literature on strategies for coping with work-related stress is still scant. Trying to close the gap, the paper introduces a co-worker feedback environment (and its aspects) as a work-related stress-minimization tool. Previous studies have already underlined the role of co-workers in shaping employee attitudes, behavior and well-being. Following this notion, the paper proposes that co-workers may help in reducing stress. Moreover, the paper tackles a co-worker feedback environment referring to the contextual aspects of a day-to-day co-worker to co-worker feedback processes, arguing that co-worker availability, feedback delivery manner and other aspects of feedback environment lead to less stress at work. In general, the paper aims at revealing the relationship between co-worker feedback environment (including its aspects such as source credibility, feedback quality, feedback delivery, favorable feedback, unfavorable feedback, source availability, and the support of feedback-seeking) and work-related stress (including two subdimensions: time stress and anxiety stress). Consistent with the expectations, the survey indicated that a co-worker feedback environment plays a vital role in reducing work-related stress, in terms of time stress and anxiety stress. The same holds for all aspects of the co-worker environment, except the case on unfavorable feedback where no statistically significant relationship was found. Generally, the provided empirical evidence supports the idea of creating a favorable co-worker feedback environment in organizations, which in turn leads to increased employee well-being by reducing the level of stress.*

Keywords: *feedback environment; work-related stress; co-worker feedback environment; employee well-being; feedback.*

Introduction

Recently, work-related stress has become a growing concern for business (Ongori & Agolla, 2008; Stankevičiūtė & Savanevičienė, 2019) as the number of employees feeling stress is constantly increasing globally (Reynolds, 2016; Miley, 2018). According to the fifth European working conditions survey, 22% of workers reported suffering from stress (Eurofound, 2012). International Labor Organization (2016) defines work-related stress as a harmful physical and emotional response caused by the imbalance between the perceived demands and the perceived resources and abilities of individuals to cope with those demands.

Previous literature on work-related stress has generally focused on two areas. First, a number of studies have sought to identify the antecedents of stress (Chen & Kao, 2011; Lambert, Minor, Wells & Hogan, 2016) highlighting the negative role of workload, role conflicts or role ambiguity (Sheraz, Wajid, Sajid, Qureshi, & Rizwan, 2014). Second, the negative effects of work-related stress on employee health, safety and other aspects of wellbeing, as well as its influence on the organization and its productivity are well established in the literature (Hassard, Teoh, Visockaite, Dewe, & Cox, 2018; Khamisa, Oldenburg, Peltzer, & Ilic, 2015). However, research in the field of coping strategies by exploring the factors for minimizing employee work-

related stress is still scant (Harzer & Ruch, 2015; Taylor et al., 2016). The paper tries to close this gap by focusing on ways to reduce work-related stress.

Recently, scientists have started acknowledging the power of co-workers in shaping employee attitudes and behavior (Kabat-Farr & Cortina, 2017). For instance, Ashford, De Stobbeleir and Nujella (2016) found that employees with highly useful feedback and help/support from co-workers exhibited the highest level of firm service innovation. More specifically, the role of co-worker feedback environment, referring to the contextual aspects of a day-to-day co-worker to co-worker feedback processes, is gradually turning into an area of research (Steelman, Levy & Snell, 2004; Gong & Xin, 2019). The Feedback Environment Scale (FES) proposed by Steelman et al. (2004) is composed of two major feedback source dimensions, supervisor and co-worker; however, the earlier studies were more devoted to supervisor feedback environment as the source for improving the employee well-being, for instance in terms of job satisfaction (Norris-Watts & Levy, 2004). Accordingly, the literature concerning the potential of co-worker feedback environment to improve the employee well-being, more specifically to minimize work-related stress is missing. Trying to close this gap and given the prevalence of feedback from co-workers in employees' working lives (Ashford et al., 2016), the paper proposes the feedback from co-workers as a means for reducing the employee work-related stress.

The aim of the paper is to reveal the relationship between the co-worker feedback environment and work-related stress. It was expected and hypothesized that work-related stress, namely time stress and anxiety stress, would be strongly affected by employee self-reported co-worker feedback environment and its individual aspects. The paper is based on a survey of working-age employees.

The paper contributes to the literature in several ways. First, the paper enriches the literature on employee well-being by analyzing the work-related stress and revealing the possible strategy for coping with it. Second, as the paper analyses co-worker feedback environment, feedback environment literature as well as literature in employee performance domain are extended. Third, the paper contributes to the literature of employee inclusion in organizational processes demonstrating the power of co-workers in shaping the employee well-being. The main practical implication of this paper relies on the notion that practitioners will benefit from considering the feedback environment, more especially from giving the opportunity to each employee to provide feedback to colleagues, as a means to minimize the work-related stress.

The paper is organized as follows. The theoretical part gives an overview of the literature on work-related stress and the feedback environment. The developed hypothesis is presented in the theoretical part as well. Then, the research method applied is described. The empirical results come further. Finally, discussion and conclusions are provided.

Theoretical background

Work-related stress

Recently, employee well-being has become one of the hottest topics in management literature calling the organizations to sustain a healthy and happy workforce (Guest, 2017; Cooper, Wang, Bartram, & Cooke, 2019). In turn, work-related stress, which is felt by 18 % of European workers at work every day (European Trade Union Institute, 2018), reduces employee well-being. According to the International Labor Organization (2012), work-related stress is a harmful physical and emotional response that occurs when the demands of the job do not match or exceed the capabilities, resources, or needs of the worker. It seems that such situation is a feature of modern workplace (Allan, Douglass, Duffy, & McCarty, 2016), which needs to be changed in order to avoid such consequences as mental health problems, increased turnover or absenteeism, simply putting, decreased overall quality of life (Lambert & Hogan, 2009). The literature of antecedents of work-related stress focuses either on aspects of a working environment, which increase stress (like role conflict, role ambiguity, work overload) (Sheraz et al., 2014) or decrease stress (like supervisor and management support) (Lambert & Hogan, 2009). The current paper belongs to the later literature stream arguing that the co-worker feedback environment can serve as a tool for reducing work-related stress.

Feedback environment

In general, people seek feedback from and provide feedback to other people around them, including friends, family members and colleagues at work (Ashford, Blatt, & Van de Walle, 2003). According to Finkelstein, Fishbach, and Tu (2017), feedback is critical for the pursuit of intrapersonal and interpersonal goals. Referring to feedback at work, studies provide different definitions of the construct. For instance, Rosen, Levy and Hall (2006) argue that feedback is “a subset of the available information in the work environment that indicates how well an individual is meeting his or her goals” (p.211). Finkelstein et al. (2017) define feedback as “information provided to someone about his or her performance in personal domains (e.g., at work) <...> in order to boost performance in that area” (p.69). Considering the definitions provided above it is rational to agree with Besieux (2017) that two elements appear consistently: first, feedback is about the transfer of information to an individual or team; and second, feedback reflects behavior, processes, or performance.

Unfortunately, for a long time studies have focused on feedback in a relatively narrow context (Rosen et al., 2006). Already in 1983, Ashford and Cummings (1983) criticized the feedback literature for its historical focus on performance appraisal and encouraged it to move beyond the feedback employees receive from their bosses during the annual performance review. Several attempts to respond to the mentioned call comprehensively could be mentioned (Rosen et al., 2006). For instance, London (2003) proposed feedback-oriented culture, where feedback is easily accessible, salient and likely to influence employee attitudes and behavior. However, the most influential work on understanding the feedback was done by Steelman et al. (2004) introducing the construct of feedback environment, which refers to “the contextual aspects of day-to-day supervisor-subordinate and coworker-coworker feedback processes rather than to the formal performance appraisal feedback session” (p.166). This feedback environment construct identifies seven aspects of the feedback process, namely: source credibility, feedback quality, feedback delivery, favorable feedback, unfavorable feedback, source availability, and the support of feedback-seeking (Steeleman et al., 2004). Each of these aspects relies on supervisors and co-workers as sources. A detailed description of the 7 aspects is provided below.

Source credibility is conceptualized as the feedback source’s expertise and trustworthiness (Giffin, 1967). Source expertise encompasses the knowledge of the recipient’s job requirements, knowledge of the recipient’s actual job performance and the ability to evaluate that performance in an accurate manner. Meanwhile, trustworthiness reflects whether or not the person trusts the feedback source to provide accurate performance information (Ilgen, Fisher, & Taylor, 1979; Steelman & Rutkowski, 2004). *Feedback quality* includes consistency and usefulness. High-quality feedback is consistent across time, specific, and perceived as more useful than low-quality feedback (Steeleman et al., 2004). *Feedback delivery* relies on the manner in which the feedback is delivered. Steelman et al. (2004) argue that the more considerate the feedback source is when providing feedback, the more likely a person is to accept and respond to the feedback. Steelman et al. (2004) explained in detail what they mean by *favorable and unfavorable feedback*. Favorable feedback is conceptualized as the perceived frequency of positive feedback (for instance compliments) when from the feedback recipient’s view, his or her performance does, in fact, warrant positive feedback. Correspondingly, unfavorable feedback is conceptualized as the perceived frequency of negative feedback (for instance criticism) when from the feedback recipient’s view, his or her performance warrants such feedback. *Source availability* is operationalized as the perceived amount of contact an employee has with his or her supervisor and/or co-workers and the ease with which feedback can be obtained (Steeleman et al., 2004). *Support of feedback-seeking* means the self-driven efforts of an employee to seek feedback (Christensen-Salem, Kinicki, Zhang, & Walumbwa, 2018; Anseel, Beatty, Shen, Lievens, & Sackett, 2015).

According to Anseel and Lievens (2007), a feedback environment is believed to play a relevant role in determining how employees seek, receive, process, accept, and use feedback messages. Actually, the use of message is the aspect most connected to work-related stress. Although employees receive feedback from multiple sources, including subordinates and co-workers, the current paper limits its attention only to the co-worker feedback environment. By doing this, the paper supports the literature stream, which acknowledges the power of co-workers in shaping the employee's well-being at work (Anseel & Lievens, 2007).

Linking the co-worker feedback environment to work-related stress (hypothesis development)

The value and relevance of feedback to direct and motivate the behavior of employees are well known (Steelman & Rutkowski, 2004). Previous research demonstrated that feedback relates to employee learning and development, creative behavior (Christensen-Salem et al., 2018), and creativity performance (De Stobbeleir et al., 2011). Empirical tests of the feedback environment also yielded the results highly relevant for employee well-being. First, the study of Steelman et al. (2004) revealed that employees in a favorable feedback environment were more motivated to use feedback, more satisfied with the feedback provided, and sought feedback more frequently. Next, the study of Norris-Watts and Levy (2004) demonstrated that a favorable feedback environment was positively related to supervisory-reported organizational citizenship behavior and that this relationship was partially mediated by affective commitment. Later, Rosen et al. (2006) empirically supported a theoretical model suggesting that the effects of the feedback environment on job satisfaction, and supervisory-rated in-role and extra-role performance are mediated by the perceptions of organizational politics. Further, Anseel and Lievens (2007) found that a favorable supervisor feedback environment was related to higher levels of job satisfaction 5 months later, and this relationship was fully mediated by the quality of leader-member exchange. Recently, the results of study of Peng and Chiu (2010) demonstrated that supervisor feedback environment influenced the organizational citizenship behavior of employees indirectly through positive affective cognition and positive attitude (i.e., person-organization fit and organizational commitment), and through negative affective cognition and negative attitude (i.e., role stressors and job burnout).

In general, the empirical evidence provided above has several aspects in common, which are relevant for hypothesis development. First, the feedback environment was associated with positive employee attitudes, like job satisfaction (Anseel & Lievens, 2007) or positive behavior, like organizational citizenship behavior (Norris-Watts & Levy, 2004). Meanwhile, negative aspects of employee well-being such as work-related stress were not analyzed as outcomes of feedback environment. Second, the previous research limited the focus only to the supervisor feedback environment, arguing that “the co-worker part of the feedback environment might appear to be less controllable by the organization” (Anseel & Lievens, 2007, p.257). The current paper supports co-worker feedback environment literature. The hypothesis of the current study is based on three aspects related to co-workers’ role in the organization, work-related stress and positive attitudes and behavior of employees that are discussed below.

First aspect. Turning to feedback sources, supervisors are expected to give feedback as part of their formal role (Kinicki, Jacobson, Peterson, & Prussia, 2013), whereas co-workers have no formal authority to provide feedback (De Stobbeleir, Ashford, & Buyens, 2011). However, recently co-workers have become getting more active by delivering feedback. One of the reasons for activity increasing is the work design shift from a static environment where supervisors regulate low-autonomy workers to a dynamic knowledge and service-based environment in which employees often work in team-based roles (Kabat-Farr & Cortina, 2017). Co-workers are on the same hierarchical level, close psychologically and physically (Christensen-Salem et al., 2018). Furthermore, co-workers are more likely to deliver information with sensitivity and frame information positively (Christensen-Salem et al., 2018). The above-mentioned insights lead to the notion that the co-worker feedback environment (and its individual aspects) may reduce the negative aspects of employee well-being, namely work-related stress, as co-workers tend to be a source of support and encouragement for the colleagues (Madjar, 2005).

Second aspect. Work-related stress reflects the situation when the demands of the job do not match or exceed the capabilities, resources, or needs of the worker (International Labor Organization, 2012). The co-worker feedback environment, which is based on co-worker availability (having time, providing more ongoing feedback) and source credibility (co-workers are usually well familiar with the duties of colleagues), may help the employee to cope with stress. Furthermore, feedback, which does not only underline the negative but also highlights the positive aspects of work, may increase individual capacities to satisfy the job demands. These insights may lead to the idea that the co-worker feedback environment as a whole and its individual aspects could serve as a strategy for reducing work-related stress.

Third aspect. As was mentioned before, previous literature hypothesized and demonstrated the empirical evidence on the relationship between the supervisor's feedback environment and positive employee attitudes and behavior (Peng & Chiu, 2010). The current paper employs a converse attitude: if the feedback environment can serve as a tool for positive attitude enhancement (for instance, job satisfaction), it could also serve as a strategy for reducing the negative part of the well-being, namely work-related stress.

Based on the aspects and insights provided above, the paper hypothesizes the following:

- H1. Co-worker feedback environment will be negatively related to work-related stress, including time stress (H1a) and anxiety stress (H1b).
- H2. Source credibility will be negatively related to work-related stress, including time stress (H2a) and anxiety stress (H2b).
- H3. Feedback quality will be negatively related to work-related stress, including time stress (H3a) and anxiety stress (H3b).
- H4. Feedback delivery will be negatively related to work-related stress, including time stress (H4a) and anxiety stress (H4b).
- H5. Favorable feedback will be negatively related to work-related stress, including time stress (H5a) and anxiety stress (H5b).
- H6. Unfavorable feedback will be negatively related to work-related stress, including time stress (H5a) and anxiety stress (H5b).
- H7. Source availability will be negatively related to work-related stress, including time stress (H7a) and anxiety stress (H7b).
- H8. Support feedback-seeking will be negatively related to work-related stress, including time stress (H8a) and anxiety stress (H8b).

Methodology

Sample and data collection. The respondents chosen to gather the data and test the hypotheses were working-age employees in Lithuania. The research was based on the criterion of convenience in order to obtain the data from the respondents who were easier to reach. The questionnaire was distributed online. Data collection took more than 2 months. At the end of the research, 190 questionnaires were collected. The profile of respondents is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Respondents' profile

Characteristics	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Female	97	51.1
Male	93	48.9
Age		
18-24	92	48.4
25-38	52	27.4
39-54	38	20.0
Above 54	8	4.2
Total working experience		
Up to 1 year	33	17.4
1-3 years	41	21.6
3-5 years	26	13.6
More than 5 years	90	47.4

Measures. The co-worker feedback environment was measured using the Feedback environment scale (FES) of Steelman et al. (2004). The respondents were requested to indicate their agreement with each statement on a 5-point Likert scale, where 1 means strongly disagree, 5 – strongly agree. This instrument measures the seven aspects of the feedback environment. The first aspect - source credibility - was assessed using five statements. A sample statement is "My co-workers are generally familiar with my performance on the job" and had Cronbach's alpha of 0.814. The second aspect - feedback quality - was assessed using five statements. A sample statement is "My co-workers give me useful feedback about my job performance" and had Cronbach's alpha of 0.850. The third aspect - feedback delivery - was assessed using five statements. A sample statement is "My co-workers are supportive when giving me feedback about my job performance" and had Cronbach's alpha of 0.765. The fourth aspect - favorable feedback - was assessed using four statements. A sample statement is "When I do a good job at work, my co-workers praise my performance" and had Cronbach's alpha of 0.814. The fifth aspect - unfavorable feedback - was assessed using four statements. A sample statement is "When I don't meet deadlines, my co-workers let me know" and had Cronbach's alpha of 0.917. The sixth aspect - source availability - was assessed using four

statements. A sample statement is “My co-workers are usually available when I want performance information” and had Cronbach’s alpha of 0.702. The seventh aspect – support of feedback-seeking – was assessed using four statements. A sample statement is “My co-workers are often annoyed when I directly ask them for performance feedback” and had Cronbach’s alpha of 0.634. The general construct of the co-worker feedback environment had Cronbach’s alpha of 0.634.

Work-related stress was measured using the nine-item shortened scale of Parker and Decottis (1983). The respondents were requested to indicate their agreement with each statement on a 5-point Likert scale, where 1 means strongly disagree, 5 – strongly agree. A sample statement sounds like this: “My job gets to me more than it should”. The scale had Cronbach’s alpha of 0.939. The construct had two dimensions – time stress (4 items) and anxiety stress (5 items). Cronbach’s alpha for each of the subdimensions was 0.851 and 0.906 respectively.

Results

The means, standard deviations for the scales and correlation matrix are provided in Table 2.

Referring to the hypotheses, actually, all of them except for H6 were fully supported. However, in all cases, the relationship between co-worker feedback environment aspects and work-related stress and its dimensions was very weak ($r < 0.2$), weak ($r < 0.2 - 0.4$) or of average-strength ($r < 0.4 - 0.7$) only (Burns, 2000).

Generally, H1 proposes a negative relationship between the co-worker feedback environment and work-related stress, including time stress and anxiety stress. The result indicated that the co-worker feedback environment can serve as a strategy for reducing work-related stress ($r = -.398^{**}$, $p < 0.01$). The same holds for time stress ($r = -.336^{**}$, $p < 0.01$) and anxiety stress ($r = -.423^{**}$, $p < 0.01$).

H2 proposes a negative relationship between the source credibility, as an aspect of co-worker feedback environment, and work-related stress. As expected, there is a direct link between the source credibility and work-related stress ($r = -.367^{**}$, $p < 0.01$). The same holds for time stress ($r = -.300^{**}$, $p < 0.01$) and anxiety stress ($r = -.400^{**}$, $p < 0.01$).

Referring to Table 2, hypotheses H3, H4, H5, H7, and H8 were fully supported as well. Feedback quality ($r = -.360^{**}$, $p < 0.01$), feedback delivery ($r = -.389^{**}$, $p < 0.01$), favorable feedback ($r = -.360^{**}$, $p < 0.01$), source availability ($r = -.281^{**}$, $p < 0.01$) and support of feedback-seeking ($r = -.424^{**}$, $p < 0.01$) serve as relevant aspects for work-related stress reduction.

In the case of a relationship between unfavorable feedback and work-related stress, including time stress and anxiety stress (H6), no statistically significant relationship was found.

Discussion and conclusions

The paper aimed at presenting the co-worker feedback environment as a strategy for work-related stress reduction. The provided hypotheses fitted in with the emerging literature on the feedback environment. Generally, the results supported all the hypotheses (except for H6) raised concerning the work-related stress, strengthening the basic premise that co-worker feedback environment and its aspects such as source credibility, feedback quality, feedback delivery, favorable feedback, source availability, and support of feedback-seeking will result in less stress at work. To the best knowledge of authors of the current paper, there are no publications on the linkage between the co-worker feedback environment and work-related stress; hence a brief discussion provided in this paper is based on general feedback environment literature.

Table 2. Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations (compiled by the Authors)

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Source credibility	4.94	1.18											
2. Feedback quality	5.00	1.22	.804**										
3. Feedback delivery	4.69	1.13	.705**	.765**									
4. Favorable feedback	4.73	1.26	.605**	.632**	.707**								
5. Unfavorable feedback	5.16	1.25	.363**	.399**	.236**	.322**							
6. Source availability	4.99	1.10	.678**	.692**	.648**	.604**	.425**						
7. Support of feedback seeking	4.56	1.06	.613**	.637**	.658**	.666**	.282**	.676**					
8. Co-worker feedback environment	4.87	0.94	.858**	.887**	.861**	.819**	.501**	.819**	.791**				
9. Work-related stress	3.59	1.41	-.367**	-.360**	-.389**	-.360**	-.004	-.281**	-.424**	-.398**			
10. Time stress	3.72	1.41	-.300**	-.319**	-.335**	-.289**	.035	-.236**	-.401**	-.336**	.959**		
11. Anxiety stress	3.48	1.48	-.400**	-.374**	-.406**	-.394**	-.041	-.310**	-.421**	-.423**	.970**	.871**	

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Peng and Chiu (2010) argue that “the feedback environment can be seen as a useful aggregation of information provided to employees and can either encourage the intrinsic work motivation of employees or signal appropriate regulation of employee behavior” (p.586). Turning to the situation where the employees feel an imbalance between the perceived demands and the perceived resources and abilities to cope with those demands, it seems that the feedback environment may provide support in finding solutions to cope with imbalance. As stated by Longenecker and Nykodym (1996), to improve feedback process, the employees suggested to ensure the availability of feedback source and the knowledge of feedback source on the actual performance of employees, to treat them more seriously; to provide more ongoing feedback etc., rather than focusing on negative aspects only. Actually, all the mentioned aspects are more or less characteristic to co-workers and such a notion enables one to talk not only about the supervisor but also about the co-worker feedback environment.

The previous studies found a positive link between the feedback environment and positive employee attitudes and behavior (job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, affective commitment) (Norris-Watts & Lewis, 2004; Rosen et al., 2006; Peng & Chiu, 2010). Norris-Watts and Lewis (2004) indicated that a favorable feedback environment was positively related to supervisory-reported organizational citizenship behavior. Rosen et al. (2006) demonstrated a positive relationship between the feedback environment and job satisfaction. Thus, the current study corresponds to the findings of the above-mentioned studies in the sense that this paper demonstrated a negative link between the feedback environment and negative aspects of employee well-being, namely work-related stress.

The paper provides several practical implications. Practitioners will benefit from considering a co-worker feedback environment when seeking to cope with work-related stress. It seems that employee perceptions of co-worker availability, feedback delivery, and feedback quality have the potential to reduce stress, in terms of time and anxiety stress. The results suggest that organizations should rethink their employee performance appraisal and encourage moving beyond the feedback employees receive from their supervisors during the annual performance review. More generally speaking, the research showed that practitioners should not neglect their co-workers as the source of feedback. The support of co-workers to co-workers in creating employee wellbeing by reducing work-related stress could help the supervisors to create a more sustainable organization.

The paper has certain limitations that suggest directions for future research. It might be impossible to generalize the outcomes of the research to other geographic contexts. A large-scale study or study including employees from different countries might yield the results that could be transferable outwards. Next, it would be worth to tackle different industries, for instance, to compare the results of employees working in manufacturing and service industries. The working conditions and job design might influence the level of employee work-related stress and also the process in which the co-workers provide feedback to colleagues. Moreover, as recently employees from four different generations have become part of the labor market, it would be worth identifying the differences among such groups. Another limitation is related to the fact that this research tackled only a co-worker feedback environment, not analyzing day-to-day subordinate-supervisor feedback processes. It could be worthwhile to analyze both environments (co-worker and supervisor) simultaneously and to compare the findings. Finally, the scope of employee well-being dimensions could be expanded, including, for instance, burnout, seeking to provide stronger additional support that co-worker feedback environment may add positive value to employee wellbeing.

References

- Allan, B.A., Douglass, R.P., Duffy, R.D., & McCarty, R.J. (2016). Meaningful work as a moderator of the relation between work stress and meaning in life. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 24(3), 429-440.
- Anseel, F., Beatty, A.S., Shen, W., Lievens, F., & Sackett, P.R. (2015). How are we doing after 30 years? A meta-analytic review of the antecedents and outcomes of feedback-seeking behavior. *Journal of Management*, 41(1), 318-348. doi:10.1177/0149206313484521.

- Anseel, F., & Lievens, F. (2007). The long-term impact of the feedback environment on job satisfaction: A field study in a Belgian context. *Applied Psychology, 56*(2), 254-266.
- Ashford, S. J., Blatt, R., & Van de Walle, D. (2003). Reflections on the looking glass: A review of research on feedback-seeking behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management, 29*(6), 773-799.
- Ashford, S.J., & Cummings, L.L. (1983). Feedback as an individual resource: Personal strategies of creating information. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 32*(3), 370-398.
- Ashford, S.J., De Stobbeleir, K., & Nujella, M. (2016). To seek or not to seek: Is that the only question? Recent developments in feedback-seeking literature. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 3*, 213-239. doi: 10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-041015-062314.
- Besieux, T. (2017). Why I hate feedback: Anchoring effective feedback within organizations. *Business Horizons, 60*(4), 435-439. doi: doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2017.03.001.
- Burns, R.B. (2000). *Introduction to research methods* (4th.ed.). London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Chen, C.F., & Kao, Y.L. (2011). The antecedents and consequences of job stress of flight attendants—Evidence from Taiwan. *Journal of Air Transport Management, 17*(4), 253-255.
- Christensen-Salem, A., Kinicki, A., Zhang, Z., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2018). Responses to feedback: the role of acceptance, affect, and creative behavior. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 25*(4), 416-429. doi: doi.org/10.1177/1548051818757691.
- Cooper, B., Wang, J., Bartram, T., & Cooke, F.L. (2019). Well-being-oriented human resource management practices and employee performance in the Chinese banking sector: The role of social climate and resilience. *Human Resource Management, 58*(1), 85-97. doi: 10.1002/hrm.21934.
- De Stobbeleir, K.E., Ashford, S.J., & Buyens, D. (2011). Self-regulation of creativity at work: The role of feedback-seeking behavior in creative performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 54*(4), 811-831. doi: 10.5465/AMJ.2011.64870144.
- Eurofound, 2016. Sixth European Working Conditions Survey – Overview Report. Publications office of the European Union, Luxembourg.
- European Trade Union Institute, 2018. Retrieved from <https://www.etui.org/Topics/Health-Safety-working-conditions/News-list/One-in-every-five-European-workers-endures-work-related-stress>.
- Finkelstein, S.R., Fishbach, A., & Tu, Y. (2017). When friends exchange negative feedback. *Motivation and Emotion, 41*(1), 69-83.
- Giffin, K. (1967). The contribution of studies of source credibility to a theory of interpersonal trust in the communicational process. *Psychological bulletin, 68*(2), 104.
- Gong, Z., & Xin, D. (2019). The Relationship between the Coworker Feedback Seeking with Coworker Feedback Environment. In *2018 6th International Education, Economics, Social Science, Arts, Sports and Management Engineering Conference (IEESASM 2018)*. Atlantis Press.
- Guest, D.E. (2017). Human resource management and employee well-being: Towards a new analytic framework. *Human Resource Management Journal, 27*(1), 22-38. doi: 10.1111/1748-8583.12139.
- Harzer, C., & Ruch, W. (2015). The relationships of character strengths with coping, work-related stress, and job satisfaction. *Frontiers in Psychology, 6*, 165. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00165.
- Hassard, J., Teoh, K. R., Visockaite, G., Dewe, P., & Cox, T. (2018). The cost of work-related stress to society: A systematic review. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 23*(1), 1. doi: 10.1037/ocp0000069.
- Ilgen, D.R., Fisher, C.D., & Taylor, M.S. (1979). Consequences of individual feedback on behavior in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 64*(4), 349.
- International Labor Organization (2016). Workplace Stress: A collective challenge. Retrieved from https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_protect/---protrav/---safework/documents/publication/wcms_466547.pdf.
- International Labor Organization (2012). SOLVE: Integrating Health Promotion into Workplace OSH Policies. Participant's Workbook Retrieved from https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_protect/---protrav/---safework/documents/instructionalmaterial/wcms_178396.pdf.
- Kabat-Farr, D., & Cortina, L.M. (2017). Receipt of interpersonal citizenship: Fostering agentic emotion, cognition, and action in organizations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 47*(2), 74-89. doi:10.1111/jasp.12421.
- Khamisa, N., Oldenburg, B., Peltzer, K., & Ilic, D. (2015). Work related stress, burnout, job satisfaction and general health of nurses. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 12*(1), 652-666.

- Kinicki, A.J., Jacobson, K.J., Peterson, S.J., & Prussia, G.E. (2013). Development and validation of the performance management behavior questionnaire. *Personnel Psychology, 66*(1), 1-45. doi: 10.1111/peps.12013.
- Lambert, E., & Hogan, N. (2009). Creating a positive workplace experience: The issue of support from supervisors and management in shaping the job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment of private correctional staff. *Journal of Applied Security Research, 4*(4), 462-482.
- Lambert, E. G., Minor, K. I., Wells, J. B., & Hogan, N. L. (2016). Social support's relationship to correctional staff job stress, job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *The Social Science Journal, 53*(1), 22-32. doi:10.1016/j.soscij.2015.10.001.
- London, M. (2003). *Job feedback: Giving, seeking, and using feedback for performance improvement*. Psychology Press.
- Longenecker, C.O., & Nykodym, N. (1996). Public sector performance appraisal effectiveness: A case study. *Public Personnel Management, 25*(2), 151-164.
- Madjar, N. (2005). The contributions of different groups of individuals to employees' creativity. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 7*(2), 182-206.
- Miley, I. (2018) Work-related stress in Ireland doubled over five years. Retrieved from <https://www.rte.ie/news/ireland/2018/1127/1013566-workplace-stress/>.
- Norris-Watts, C., & Levy, P.E. (2004). The mediating role of affective commitment in the relation of the feedback environment to work outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 65*(3), 351-365.
- Ongori, H., & Agolla, J.E. (2008). Occupational stress in organizations and its effects on organizational performance. *Journal of Management Research, 8*(3), 123.
- Parker, D.F., & DeCotiis, T.A. (1983). Organizational determinants of job stress. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 32*(2), 160-177.
- Peng, J.C., & Chiu, S.F. (2010). An integrative model linking feedback environment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology, 150*(6), 582-607.
- Reynolds, J. (2016). Shocking Stats About Stress at Work and How to Remedy Them. Retrieved from <https://www.tinypulse.com/blog/stats-stress-in-the-workplace-how-to-remedy-them>.
- Rosen, C.C., Levy, P.E., & Hall, R.J. (2006). Placing perceptions of politics in the context of the feedback environment, employee attitudes, and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(1), 211.
- Sheraz, A., Wajid, M., Sajid, M., Qureshi, W.H., & Rizwan, M. (2014). Antecedents of Job Stress and its impact on employee's Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions. *International Journal of Learning & Development, 4*(2), 204-226.
- Stankevičiūtė, Ž., & Savanevičienė, A. (2019). Can Sustainable HRM Reduce Work-Related Stress, Work-Family Conflict, and Burnout?. *International Studies of Management & Organization, 1*-20.
- Steelman, L.A., Levy, P.E., & Snell, A.F. (2004). The feedback environment scale: Construct definition, measurement, and validation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 64*(1), 165-184.
- Steelman, L.A., & Rutkowski, K.A. (2004). Moderators of employee reactions to negative feedback. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 19*(1), 6-18.
- Taylor, C., Harrison, J., Haimovitz, K., Oberle, E., Thomson, K., Schonert-Reichl, K., & Roeser, R.W. (2016). Examining ways that a mindfulness-based intervention reduces stress in public school teachers: A mixed-methods study. *Mindfulness, 7*(1), 115-129.