

A Study On Impact Of Leadership Styles On Employee's Work Stress And Wellbeing

Dr.Reshma Shrivastava

Amity Business School

Amity University Chhattisgarh

Abstract

The dynamic and rapidly changing organizational environment has created severe challenges for leaders of organisations and businesses. For the growth and success of organisations in today's environment, it has become quintessential to bring changes to their business processes. The job demands on employees have hit its peak and they are having excessive pressure for performance. Therefore, the role of leaders in creating and managing a good working environment comes into play. The failure to address this creates stress and reduces productivity having a long-term impact on organisational performance. This study aims at determining the impact of leadership styles on employee's work stress and wellbeing. The overall goal of the research is to identify and determine different dimensions of leadership style that has a profound effect on employee's work stress and wellbeing. The study highlights a compelling justification for improvements in transformational and transactional leadership to reduce employee stress and enhance employee wellbeing which will in turn impact positively on employee performance as well as organizational growth and success. To support the objectives of this study, a structured questionnaire was prepared and distributed among 150 employees which consisted set of statements showcasing the dimensions of both transactional and transformational leadership style. Chi square goodness of fit test was applied to analyse the data and interpret the significance of the gathered responses. This study suggests that employees benefit from leadership environments where rational leadership styles are present and the leaders have strong values, communicate clearly and inspirationally while attracting employees to follow their vision, where employees are motivated to be creative, and where they feel their leader individually supports them or at a minimum knows them. The findings of the study will provide a broader view at the useful recommendations for the management and the supervisors or managers to practice efficient and effective leadership styles to minimize stress and promote the wellbeing of employees.

Keywords: Leadership style, transformational leadership, transactional leadership, work stress, employee wellbeing

Date of Submission: 02-03-2022

Date of Acceptance: 16-03-2022

I. Introduction to the topic

Leadership Style Leadership style is an adequately consistent pattern of behaviour that characterizes a leader. According to Burns (1978), leadership is a stream of developing interrelationships wherein the leaders continuously encourage and evoke motivational responses from their employees or followers and modify their behaviour as they meet responsiveness or resistance in an incessant process of flow and counter flow. DuBryn (2010) also defined leadership as the ability to inspire confidence and provide support among the employees in achieving organizational goals and further also explains the roles carried out by leaders further contributing to an understanding of the leadership function. Transformational Leadership In transformational leadership style, the leaders encourage, inspire and motivate their employees to innovate and create change that will help grow and shape the future success and growth path of the company. Such type of leaders are always energetic, enthusiastic, and passionate. They are not only concerned and involved in the process but are also determined in helping each and every member or employee of the group to succeed as well. Dimensions of transformational leadership: 1. Idealised influence: The leaders have strong consistent values and always act in accordance with those values. 2. Inspirational motivation: Leaders communicate clearly with their employees, they are often inspirational and convey a vision of the path, convincing others to follow and share in this vision. 3. Intellectual stimulation: They encourage their followers to think creatively and solving problems by using their full capacity. 4. Individual consideration: Leaders support their employees individually and help them to develop their potential. 9 Transactional Leadership In transactional leadership style, the leader believes in motivating employees through a system of rewards and punishment. If a subordinate does what is desired, he/she will be rewarded, and if he/she does not go as per the expectations of the leader, a punishment will follow. Here, the transaction or exchange between a leader and a follower takes place to achieve routine performance goals and

objectives. Dimensions of transactional leadership 1. Contingent reward: The leader makes transactions in a constructive and motivating way by rewarding good performance and making explicit expectations. 2. Management by exception active: The leader always takes corrective actions regarding leader / follower exchanges e.g., punishing poor performance active leaders monitor behaviour and takes corrective actions quickly. 3. Management by exception passive: These leaders wait until the problems manifest before taking any action. The impact of leadership styles on employee's work stress and wellbeing Wellbeing of the employees is cardinal to organizational performance and it has gained the attention of many of the researchers across the globe. Organizational outcomes may be influenced by various other factors, but the relationship between the employees and their superiors stood to play a significant role. The relationship between leadership styles, employee stress and their wellbeing indicate that leadership styles play a very significant role in promoting employee wellbeing which in turn promotes efficient and effective organizational outcomes (Samad et al., 2015). The general wellbeing and satisfaction of employees of any organization is crucial for its growth and development. However, many organizations are not much concerned about the impact of employee engagement on their overall performance as the rightful engagement of employees leads to increased productivity (Saks, 2006). Even though literature revealed that leadership styles may impact an employee's job performance and wellbeing, there is inadequate research on the degree to which leadership can reduce employees' stress (Erkutlu & Chafra, 2006). 10 Leadership as defined by DuBrin(2010) is the ability to inspire and support the employees to achieve organizational goals and further explains that examining the roles carried out by leaders contributes to an understanding of the leadership function. Factors like leadership, employee engagement, the work environment of organisation and job satisfaction are quintessential for the survival of organizations (Omolayo & Ajila, 2012) because the success of an organisation is heavily dependent on the behaviour of employees towards duties assigned to them and the abilities of supervisors to engage their subordinates. Therefore, ineffective leadership might become a great obstacle in organizational development and leads to the failure of organizations (Omolayo & Ajila, 2012). A dissatisfied employee who portrays destructive behaviours such as stress, absenteeism, job disengagement, and intention to leave the organization may develop negative work attitudes. Leaders can minimise these factors by managing and supporting their employees which highlights the importance of leadership styles in organizations. Many researches have highlighted various leadership styles. Some of these styles include bureaucratic, laissez-faire, charismatic, democratic, transactional and transformational. However, Bass (1985) proposed that effective leaders must have both transformational and transactional leadership styles in order to inspire their employees to achieve organizational goals and objectives. Transformational and transactional leadership are the two most important leadership dimensions (Adnan & Mubarak, 2010); with transactional leadership and transformational leadership having been categorised as two main leadership styles. Both the Transformational and transactional leadership styles are perceived leadership styles that have the potential impact on employees' stress level and wellbeing because organizational commitment to the wellbeing of employees through transformational and transactional leaders leads to increased employee performance (Paracha et al., 2012). 11 1.2 Need, objectives and importance of study Need for the study Managers or leaders being in direct contact with employees have a profound effect on employee satisfaction and wellbeing. An organization's leadership style can be one of the major causes for its growth or failure. It can be determined with the help of growing body of evidence that workplaces have begun to transform their approach for addressing manager/subordinate relations. Leadership studies continue to be essential to address employee-related issues. The study highlights the effect of transformational and transactional leadership styles on employees' stress and wellbeing and offers the organizations with different ways for enhancing such leadership styles to promote employee wellbeing while reducing their job stress. The findings of the study will provide a broader view at the useful recommendations for the management and the supervisors or managers to practice efficient and effective leadership styles to minimize stress and promote the wellbeing of employees. The study has finally contributed to the body of knowledge in the field which is useful to future researchers, learners, students, organizations, and nations. Objectives of the study 1. To determine the relationship between transformational relationship and employee's work stress and well being 2. To determine the relationship between transactional relationship and employee's work stress and well being 3. To identify the amount of work stress, job satisfaction and wellbeing of an employee Importance of the study In the traditional workplace, employees stress levels and their well-being has always appeared to be problematic (Rozell, et al., 2011). Stress has been proved to be correlated with increased sick days, decreased performance and morale, and increased employee turnover (Shafritz, et al., 2015). Wellbeing and stress of employees is likely to vary depending on the working environment (Loepp, 2015; Nydegger, 2011). An unpleasant workplace environment can cause stress among employees, which may negatively impact the organization and the success of the business (Adeoye & Torubelli, 2011). Leadership is among one of the most studied constructs within the field of organisational studies but still remains complicated to 12 understand (Zopiatis & Constanti, 2010). Leaders are the essential drivers of organisation's growth and development and hence leadership styles are of interest to researchers. Leader behaviour impacts the performance of the organisation as they motivate, engage and satisfy the needs of their employees (Bolden et al., 2003). Therefore, organizations must be concerned with the environment that

surrounds their employees and its impact on their well-being and stress levels. Hence this study on leadership, measuring work stress and employee wellbeing may add to the existing leadership theory and may help leaders to manage their subordinates more effectively to deliver the desired results.

II. Leadership Styles

According to many researchers and theorists, there is no single style of leadership that is appropriate in each and every circumstance (Bass & Avolio, 1990). However, the leadership styles can be varied across a diverse spectrum of possibilities, from authoritarian dictatorial styles to an anything-goes laissez-faire style (Rajagopalan, 2009). A leader must effectively hold a certain degree of control over the situation at hand, the dynamics of the team, and the actions of the team's subordinates. As a result, an effective manager shall also possess some control over the outcomes of the business through the assertion of influence that falls somewhere within this wide range of leadership styles. However, it is necessary to understand concepts that pertain to motivation within the workplace before assessing the varying leadership styles. Such type of motivation provides reasons for employee's response towards their leaders in one manner over another. Since the early 20th century, leadership is being redefined with various leadership theories having been propounded dependent on different hypothetical viewpoints and grouped consequently (Avolio et al., 2009). Hempshell (2014) concluded that "it is becoming more evident that leaders in the twenty-first century are required to navigate an increasingly complicated environment, like volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous. Effective and efficient leadership is generally acknowledged as significant in defining key strategic business goals and objectives, policy development, and organisational practices. Different theoretical methods have been used to determine the various leadership styles but the most renowned framework is transactional and transformational framework (Hambley et al., 2007). Transformational and transactional leadership styles are perceived leadership styles that have the potential effect on employees' stress level and wellbeing because organizational commitment to the wellbeing of employees through transformational and transactional leaders leads to employee performance (Paracha et al., 2012) As Berman and West (2008) described the characteristics of a successful leader and the requirements to achieve a level of effective management of their subordinates. Historically, the literature has identified a innumerable distinct leadership styles of unknown number and has frequently evidenced disagreement regarding taxonomy, overlap, hierarchy and critical distinctions. However, there is some wide agreement regarding the existence of four styles which although not exhaustive (Anderson & 14 Sun, 2015) have the widest evidence base with regards to impact on employee outcomes. Recently leaders have been entitled in creating an environment that allows their knowledge workers to be engaged and perform at high levels, therefore, contributing to the growth and success of the organisation (Wildermuth & Pauken, 2008; Attridge, 2009). Leaders, who promote supportive relationships, motivate their subordinates, facilitate more positive and less negative emotions among subordinates, and create more evaluations of stressful activities among subordinates are most likely to be more effective than the more traditional leaders who tend toward task-directive techniques (Lyons & Schneider, 2009). A leadership that consists of task and relational behaviours is considered as the styles approach to leadership (Madlock, 2008) and has a direct relationship with employee satisfaction. This further implicates that leadership styles are behaviours that leaders employ to influence the behaviours of subordinates and hence the right leadership behaviour is quintessential for the success of the organisation.

2.2 Transformational leadership

According to DuBrin(2010), Transformational leadership is defined as the leadership style that brings positive changes in an organization. A transformational leader is focused on making accomplishments through a good relationship with group members. It relates to emotions, values, ethics, long term goals and objectives, the needs and motives of the members as well as the needs of the leader (Northouse, 2004). Transformational leadership portrays charismatic and visionary leadership and it incorporates an outstanding level of influence that stimulates the members to perform credibly beyond expectations. According tp (Puni et al., 2018) the underlying principle behind transformational leadership is that the employees will follow leaders who shows them a vision into future, inspire and motivate them. It was determined that a transformational leader should be the "one who raises the followers' level of consciousness about the value and importance of desired outcomes and the methods of reaching those outcomes". Changes such as raising people's awareness of the importance of certain rewards and getting people to look beyond their self-interests for the sake of the team and the organization Involves establishing oneself as a role model by inspiring employees to follow them, gaining trust and employee confidence. These leaders are charismatic and attract aspect and trust from colleagues, they inspire, motivate and are seen as collaborative and fair. They model useful organisational behaviours; they wish employees to adopt. They respect staff and challenge employees to follow them 15 (Bass, 1990; 1998; Eagly et al., 2003). As Judge and Piccolo (2004) state "Transformational leaders offer a purpose that transcends short term goals and focuses on higher order intrinsic needs". Research suggests that transformational leaders employ a creative and visionary style of leadership. They tend to act as a coach and mentor, while providing personal attention and psychological support for the development of individual employees, inspire them to make individual decisions, and reach the satisfaction

levels at their work Bass (1985) revised the original transformational leadership construct by Burns and subsequently, the four components of transformational leadership emerged. These components consist of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. These four components or factors are also described as the transformational behaviours and they are briefly explained as follows. • Idealized Influence: This component is also known as charisma and is the emotional component of leadership (Antonakis, 2012). Such leaders commonly have very high standards of morality and ethics while providing members with a vision in the future and a sense of mission and normally serve as a role model to their members. According to Northouse (2007), two factors are used to measure the idealized influence namely; an attributional factor (which deals with the ascriptions of leaders made by followers premised on their perception of their leaders) and a behavioural factor (which consists of the observations made by followers about leader's behaviour). • Inspirational Motivation: These leaders tend to communicate high expectations to their members, and motivate them to commit to the organisation's shared vision. They also promote team spirit, using pep talk and encouraging words. • Intellectual Stimulation: Such leaders stimulate members to think with creativity and outside the box, challenge the status quo, and to identify new ways in solving organisational problems. In other words, they inspire members to be pragmatic and creative. • Individualized Consideration: These leaders create a supporting environment to listen to the individual needs of the members. They also act as coaches and advisers to help followers grow in their work or carrier. 16 The highlights of the results from prior researches on transformational leadership determined that it is positively correlated to job satisfaction (Nielsen, Yarker, Randall, & Munir, 2009; Wolfram & Mohr, 2009) and less stress (Bono & Meredith, 2007; Munir, Nielsen, & Carneiro, 2010). It is also positively correlated with effective well-being of employees. 2.3 Transactional leadership Transactional leadership includes the exchanges in which both the superior and the subordinate influences one another reciprocally so that each of them derives something of value (Yukl, 1981). Furthermore, Transactional leadership describes it as a relationship between the leader and their subordinates which is based on the social learning and social exchange theories. Focuses on transaction and exchange of resources in order to accomplish necessary work, rewards are contingent on measurable performance and taking corrective action when tasks are being undertaken poorly e.g., punishments (Bass, 1990). Transactional leadership consists of three components or factors, thus contingent reward, management-by-exception is active and management-by-exception passive. According to the previous researches conducted on this regard it can be determined that that there is a relationship between transactional leadership styles and higher levels of stress in comparison to transformational leadership (Lyons & Schneider, 2009). Further studies found that transactional leadership was related to high employee wellbeing (Morrison, Chappel, & Ellis, 1997) but lower than transformational leadership.

Antonakis, et al. (2003) further categorized the transactional leadership into three dimensions:

- Contingent rewards: Such leaders makes use of rewards to motivate employees to achieve standard goals and objectives (Nicholson, 2007). Bass (1985) emphasized that, a transactional leader must inspire a reasonable level of involvement, loyalty, commitment and performance from followers in managing contingent rewards.
- Management-by-exception (active): It is the situation wherein the leader ensures that their followers adhere to pre-set standards. Management by exception (active) refers to such leaders who actively monitor and appraise the work of followers and make sure that predefined standards are adhered. 17 (Antonakis, et al. 2003). It consists of transactional leaders who continuously monitor subordinate's performance and only take actions when performance falls below the established standards.
- Management by exception (passive): Such leaders intervene only when problems occur. It consists of transactional leaders who intervene only when subordinates performance problems get serious. As posited by Lyons and Schneider (2009), transactional leadership is made up of elements of power and influence, they also determined that the transactional leadership style is more applicable in management and hence transactional leadership in its extreme practice may be similar to autocratic leadership style having the power to making decisions concentrated essentially and solely with the leader.

Employee Stress

A healthy and sound job is the one that offers employees with appropriate resources and support they require for effective execution of work. Employee's work stress can have very crucial consequences. Distressing work conditions significantly influences and is detrimental to the health of employees as well as their work performance. The job stress can be managed with the help of right work environment and support from their supervisors. According to Selye (2006) in an event wherein employees are given work that is more than what they can manage or that exceeds their capability levels, they are likely to be stressed. If an employee cannot meet or is unable to meet the demands of a job or work. According to Newton (2009), stress is an aversive sensation like tension, anxiety, frustration and depression. Imtiaz and Ahmad (2009) explained stress as a mental strain which is in link with both the internal as well as the external conditions that adversely affects an individual's ability to perform the tasks. Naqvi et al. (2013) described stress as a state of physical and mental disorder which ensues in pressure situations when available resources are unable to match the needs of an

employee. Michac (1997) examined that “stress is induced by various factors such as inability to get things done, poor unclear job descriptions, time management, quality and complexity of tasks, feelings of inadequacy and insecurity, bad personal 18 relationships, lack of communication”. Mwanza (2017) examined that the major occupational stress drivers include social and work interactions with superiors or leaders and colleagues, style of management style of leaders, work demands, and other external economic conditions. Rebecca (2010) mentions that the key to achieving organizational goals is support from leaders and managers. Superiors must understand employees needs in order to support them and manage them effectively so that the employees can give out their best towards the achievement of organizational goals. Stress stood out to be a major cost to organizations. Lambert and Ito (2004) posited that stress is a key factor to corporate inefficiency, reduced quality and quantity output, high labour turnover, absenteeism and increased health care cost for employees. Work stress according to Elovainio et al. (2002) is damaging to the efficiency and productivity of employees and can cause other work-related problems. Therefore, it is essential for the superiors or supervisors to find ways of addressing and solving the problems of work stress which in turn can positively impact and improve the performance. It can be said that effective leadership, management and proper guidance are factors that are likely to reduce employee stress and improves their effectiveness on the job. It follows, therefore, that leadership style has the potential to either increase or reduce employee stress and promote employee wellbeing. Employee wellbeing According to the International Labour Organization, wellbeing at work can be defined as all aspects of work life, from the quality and safety of the physical environment, to how workers feel about their work, the climate at work and work organization. Wellbeing of employees as described by Van Dierendonck et al. (2004) is how people feel about themselves and the conditions or environment in which they live and work. The concept of wellbeing revolves around emotional, intellectual, social and spiritual well beingness (McCarthy et al., 2011; Brunetto et al., 2012; Samad et al., 2015). Poor engagement of workforce also stood to be a reason that can deteriorate employee wellbeing and productivity which in turn can negatively affect organisational outcomes (Shuck & Reio,2013). Just like employee stress, Shirom (1989) posited that reduction in employee wellbeing results in 19 frequent and severe accidents at work, with increased apathy, reduced commitment and task performance, increased absenteeism and undesirable turnover. It was determined by Naqvi et al. (2013) that when the stress levels are high, employee wellbeing reduces. Parker & Decotiis (1983) defines work stress as an “undesirable or uncomfortable feeling that an individual experiences who is required to deviate from normal or self-desired functioning in the work place as the result of constraints, opportunities or requirements relating to essential work-related outcomes.” They state in their study that job stress is linked to a decrease in organisational effectiveness and individual performance and researchers concur with this view (Abualrub & Al-Zaru, 2008). Transformational versus Transactional Leadership Modern leadership comprising of transactional and transformational styles is defined in the works of Burns (1978). In simple words, transactional leadership’s characteristics and styles are marked by transactions between leaders and followers that best meet the needs and objectives of both the organization as well as the individual. Conversely, transformational leadership characterizes leaders who transform or change their followers and the organization with an intent to motivate rather than manipulate (Bass & Avolio, 2004; Burns, 1978). It can be said that transactional leadership is less flexible or proactive as compared to transformational leadership. It is essential to understand that leaders are not solely characterized as transactional or transformational. They are rather, a blend of both approaches (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Transactional leadership is usually utilized in blue-collar settings where independent thinking, creativity and acting have limited value. On the contrary, transformational leadership is typically more often utilized in white-collar (i.e., service, healthcare, and professional) settings where motivation and social interactions have more emphasis.

Sampling Technique For this study convenience sampling technique has been used. Convenience sampling which may also called as availability sampling is a specific type of nonprobability sampling method that relies on data collection from the population that is conveniently available to participate in the study. Method of data collection The survey method was applied to gather the relevant data for this study. A survey may be fielded online or through the distribution of questionnaires. This study adopted a distribution of questionnaires through online medium. A structured questionnaire was designed. The questionnaire consisted of set of statements that was further divided into four sections namely, transformational leadership 22 dimensions, transactional leadership dimensions, employee work stress and lastly employee wellbeing. The survey was conducted for employees of the different organizations who were willing and available to participate in the study to complete them. Sample size: The sample size of the study was 150 respondents

4.2 Analysis and interpretation

TABLE 1: DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

Gender	Number of respondents	Age	Number respondents
Male	88	18-20 years	23
Female	62	21-30 years	48
		31-40 years	44
		41-50 years	31
		50 years and above	4
Total	150		150

Gender Number of respondents Age Number of respondents Male 88 18-20 years 23 Female 62 21-30 years 48 31-40 years 44 41-50 years 31 50 years and above 4 Total 150

1. I feel good to work with my supervisor
 H0: There is no significant difference to determine that the respondents feel good to work with their supervisor
 H1: There is a significant difference to determine that the respondents feel good to work with their supervisor
 Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) X2= (O-E)2 /E
 Strongly agree 31 30 0.03 Agree 59 30 28.03 Neutral 32 30 0.13 Disagree 21 30 2.70 Strongly Disagree 7 30 17.63 Total N=150 $\sum x^2= 48.52$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 48.52 Decision: H0 is rejected Interpretation: From the above table it can be inferred that there is a significant difference on a positive side as maximum respondents feel good to work along with their supervisor. Among the 150 respondents, 20.7% of the them strongly agreed, 39.3% agreed while 21.3% of them were neutral when asked if they feel good to work along with their supervisor or leaders. Whereas, 14% of the respondents disagreed and 4.7% of them strongly disagreed. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted.

2. My supervisor talks about most important values and beliefs
 H0: There is no significant difference to determine that the respondents feel that their supervisor talks about most important values and beliefs
 H1: There is a significant difference to determine that the respondents feel supervisor talks about most important values and beliefs
 Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) X2= (O-E)2 /E
 Strongly agree 30 30 0.00 Agree 68 30 48.13 Neutral 29 30 0.03 Disagree 13 30 9.63 Strongly Disagree 10 30 13.33 Total N=150 $\sum x^2= 71.12$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 71.12 Decision: H0 is rejected Interpretation: According to the above table it can be inferred that there is a significant difference on a positive side as maximum respondents feel that their supervisor talks about most important values and beliefs. Among the 150 respondents, 20 % of the them strongly agreed, 45.3% agreed while 19.3% of them were neutral when asked if they feel that their supervisor talk about most important values and beliefs. Whereas, 8.7% of the respondents disagreed and 6.7% of them strongly disagreed. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted.

3. My supervisor talks optimistically about goals to be achieved
 H0: There is no significant difference to determine that the respondents feel that their supervisor talks optimistically about goals to be achieved
 H1: There is a significant difference to determine that the respondents feel supervisor talks optimistically about goals to be achieved
 Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) X2= (O-E)2 /E
 Strongly agree 30 30 0.00 Agree 72 30 58.80 Neutral 27 30 0.30 Disagree 13 30 9.63 Strongly Disagree 8 30 16.13 Total N=150 $\sum x^2= 84.86$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 84.86 Decision: H0 is rejected Interpretation: According to the above table it can be inferred that there is a significant difference on a positive side as maximum respondents feel that their supervisor talks optimistically about the goals that are to be achieved. Among the 150 respondents, 20 % of the them strongly agreed, 48% agreed while 18% of them were neutral when asked if they feel that their supervisor talks optimistically about the goals that are to be achieved. Whereas, 8.7% of the respondents disagreed and 5.3% of them strongly disagreed. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted.

4. My supervisor encourages me to get the most out of my skills and capabilities
 H0: There is no significant difference to determine that the supervisors encourage the respondents to get the most out of their skills and capabilities
 H1: There is a significant difference to determine that the supervisors encourage the respondents to get the most out of their skills and capabilities
 Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) X2= (O-E)2 /E
 Strongly agree 36 30 1.20 Agree 61 30 32.03 Neutral 22 30 2.13 Disagree 16 30 6.53 Strongly Disagree 15 30 7.50 Total N=150 $\sum x^2= 49.39$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 49.39 Decision: H0 is rejected Interpretation: According to the above table it can be inferred that there is a significant difference on a positive side as maximum of the respondents believe that the supervisors encourage them to get the most out of their skills and capabilities. Among the 150 respondents, 24 % of the them strongly agreed, 61% agreed while 14.7% of them were neutral when asked if they believe that their supervisors encourage them to get the most out of their skills and capabilities. Whereas, 10.7% of the respondents disagreed and 10% of them strongly disagreed. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is

accepted. 28 5. My supervisor enables me to think about old problems in a new way H0: There is no significant difference to determine that the supervisors enable their employees to think about old problems in a new way H1: There is a significant difference to determine that the supervisors enable their employees to think about old problems in a new way Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) $X^2 = (O-E)^2 / E$ Strongly agree 25 30 0.83 Agree 66 30 43.20 Neutral 30 30 0 Disagree 21 30 2.70 Strongly Disagree 8 30 16.13 Total N=150 $\sum x^2 = 62.86$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 62.86 Decision: H0 is rejected Interpretation: From the above table it can be inferred that there is a significant difference on a positive side as maximum of the respondents believe that the supervisors enable them to think about old problems in a new way. Among the 150 respondents, 16.7 % of the them strongly agreed, 44% agreed while 20% of them were neutral when asked if they believe that the supervisors enable them to think about old problems in a new way. Whereas, 14% of the respondents disagreed and 5.3% of them strongly disagreed. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted. 29 6. I get help from my supervisor to rethink ideas I have never questioned before H0: There is no significant difference to determine that the respondents get help from their supervisors to rethink ideas that they have never questioned before H1: There is a significant difference to determine that the respondents get help from their supervisors to rethink ideas that they have never questioned before Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) $X^2 = (O-E)^2 / E$ Strongly agree 32 30 0.13 Agree 63 30 36.30 Neutral 30 30 0 Disagree 14 30 8.53 Strongly Disagree 11 30 12.03 Total N=150 $\sum x^2 = 56.99$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 56.99 Decision: H0 is rejected Interpretation: According to the above table it can be inferred that there is a significant difference on a positive side as maximum of the respondents believe that they get help from their supervisors to rethink ideas that they have never questioned before. Among the 150 respondents, 21.3 % of the them strongly agreed, 42% agreed while 20% of them were neutral when asked if they believe that they get help from their supervisors to rethink ideas that they have never questioned before. Whereas, 9.3% of the respondents disagreed and 7.3% of them strongly disagreed. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted. 30 7. I get timely feedback from my supervisor H0: There is no significant difference to determine that the respondents get timely feedback from their supervisor H1: There is a significant difference to determine that the respondents get timely feedback from their supervisor Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) $X^2 = (O-E)^2 / E$ Strongly agree 21 30 2.70 Agree 67 30 45.63 Neutral 27 30 0.30 Disagree 26 30 0.53 Strongly Disagree 9 30 14.07 Total N=150 $\sum x^2 = 63.23$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 63.23 Decision: H0 is rejected Interpretation: According to the above table it can be inferred that there is a significant difference on a positive side as maximum of the respondents believe that they get timely feedback from their supervisor. Among the 150 respondents, 14 % of the them strongly agreed, 44.7% agreed while 18% of them were neutral when asked if they get timely feedback from their supervisor. Whereas, 17.3% of the respondents disagreed and 6% of them strongly disagreed. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted. 31 8. My supervisor pays attention to the working conditions H0: There is no significant difference to determine that the supervisors pay attention to the working conditions H1: There is a significant difference to determine that the supervisors pay attention to the working conditions Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) $X^2 = (O-E)^2 / E$ Strongly agree 24 30 1.20 Agree 62 30 34.13 Neutral 41 30 4.03 Disagree 15 30 7.50 Strongly Disagree 8 30 16.13 Total N=150 $\sum x^2 = 62.99$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 62.99 Decision: H0 is rejected Interpretation: According to the above table it can be inferred that there is a significant difference on a positive side as maximum of the respondents believe that the supervisors pay attention to their working conditions. Among the 150 respondents, 16 % of the them strongly agreed, 41.3% agreed while 27.3% of them were neutral when asked if the supervisors pay attention to their working conditions. Whereas, 10% of the respondents disagreed and 5.3% of them strongly disagreed. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted. 32 9. My supervisor makes clear what one can expect to receive when the goals are achieved H0: There is no significant difference to determine that the supervisors make clear what one can expect to receive when the goals are achieved H1: There is a significant difference to determine that the supervisors make clear what one can expect to receive when the goals are achieved Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) $X^2 = (O-E)^2 / E$ Strongly agree 32 30 0.13 Agree 65 30 40.83 Neutral 27 30 0.30 Disagree 17 30 5.63 Strongly Disagree 9 30 14.70 Total N=150 $\sum x^2 = 61.59$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 61.59 Decision: H0 is rejected Interpretation: According to the above table it can be inferred that there is a significant difference on a positive side as maximum of the respondents believe that supervisors make clear what one can expect to receive when the goals are achieved. Among the 150 respondents, 21.3 % of the them strongly agreed, 43.3% agreed while 18% of them were neutral when asked if the supervisors make clear what one can expect to receive when the goals are achieved. Whereas, 11.3% of the respondents disagreed and 6% of them strongly disagreed. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted. 33 10. My supervisor provides me rewards/incentives for the goals I achieve H0: There is no significant difference to determine that the supervisor provides the employees with rewards/incentives for the goals that they achieve H1: There is a significant difference to determine that the

supervisor provides the employees with rewards/incentives for the goals that they achieve Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) $X^2 = (O-E)^2 / E$ Strongly agree 33 30 0.30 Agree 51 30 14.7 Neutral 32 30 0.13 Disagree 22 30 2.13 Strongly Disagree 12 30 10.80 Total N=150 $\sum x^2 = 28.06$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 28.06 Decision: H0 is rejected Interpretation: From the above table it can be inferred that there is a significant difference on a positive side as maximum of the respondents believe that their supervisor provides them with rewards/incentives for the goals that they achieve. Among the 150 respondents, 22 % of the them strongly agreed, 34% agreed while 21.3% of them were neutral when asked if the supervisor provides them with rewards/incentives for the goals that they achieve. Whereas, 14.7% of the respondents disagreed and 8% of them strongly disagreed. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted. 34 11. My supervisor keeps track of all mistakes and guides me in meeting the performance standards H0: There is no significant difference to determine that the supervisors keep track of all mistakes and guides the employees in meeting the performance standards H1: There is a significant difference to determine that the supervisors keep track of all mistakes and guides the employees in meeting the performance standards Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) $X^2 = (O-E)^2 / E$ Strongly agree 25 30 0.83 Agree 53 30 17.63 Neutral 40 30 3.33 Disagree 20 30 3.33 Strongly Disagree 12 30 10.80 Total N=150 $\sum x^2 = 35.92$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 35.920 Decision: H0 is rejected Interpretation: According to the above table it can be determined that there is a significant difference on a positive side as maximum of the respondents believe that their supervisor keeps track of all mistakes and guides them in meeting the performance standards. Among the 150 respondents, 16.7 % of the them strongly agreed, 35.3% agreed while 26.7% of them were neutral when asked if the supervisor keeps track of all mistakes and guides them in meeting the performance standards. Whereas, 13.3% of the respondents disagreed and 8% of them strongly disagreed. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted. 35 12. My supervisor focuses on irregularities and deviations from standard performance H0: There is no significant difference to determine that the supervisors focus on irregularities and deviations from standard performance H1: There is a significant difference to determine that the supervisors focus on irregularities and deviations from standard performance Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) $X^2 = (O-E)^2 / E$ Strongly agree 31 30 0.03 Agree 60 30 30 Neutral 33 30 0.30 Disagree 15 30 7.50 Strongly Disagree 11 30 12.03 Total N=150 $\sum x^2 = 49.86$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 49.86 Decision: H0 is rejected Interpretation: According to the above table it can be determined that there is a significant difference on a positive side as maximum of the respondents believe that their supervisors focus on irregularities and deviations from standard performance. Among the 150 respondents, 20.7 % of the them strongly agreed, 40% agreed while 22% of them were neutral when asked if the supervisors focus on irregularities and deviations from standard performance. Whereas, 10% of the respondents disagreed and 7.3% of them strongly disagreed. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted 36 13. My supervisor waits for the things to go wrong before taking any action H0: There is no significant difference to determine that the supervisor waits for the things to go wrong before taking any action H1: There is a significant difference to determine that the supervisor waits for the things to go wrong before taking any action Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) $X^2 = (O-E)^2 / E$ Strongly agree 14 30 8.53 Agree 25 30 0.83 Neutral 29 30 0.03 Disagree 54 30 19.20 Strongly Disagree 28 30 0.13 Total N=150 $\sum x^2 = 28.72$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 28.72 Decision: H0 is rejected Interpretation: According to the above table it can be determined that there is a significant difference on a positive side as maximum of the respondents believe that their supervisor does not wait for the things to go wrong before taking any action. Among the 150 respondents, 9.3 % of the them strongly agreed, 16.7% agreed while 19.3% of them were neutral when asked if their supervisor waits for the things to go wrong before taking any action. Whereas, 36% of the respondents disagreed and 18.7% of them strongly disagreed. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted. 37 14. As long as the things are working, my supervisor doesn't feel the need to change anything H0: There is no significant difference to determine that as long as the things are working, the supervisors don't feel the need to change anything H1: There is a significant difference to determine that as long as the things are working, the supervisors don't feel the need to change anything Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) $X^2 = (O-E)^2 / E$ Strongly agree 16 30 6.53 Agree 24 30 1.20 Neutral 27 30 0.30 Disagree 65 30 40.83 Strongly Disagree 18 30 4.80 Total N=150 $\sum x^2 = 53.66$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 53.66 Decision: H0 is rejected Interpretation: From the above table, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference on a positive side as maximum of the respondents believe that their supervisors don't fail to bring changes whenever required. Among the 150 respondents, 10.7 % of the them strongly agreed, 16% agreed while 18% of them were neutral. Whereas, 43.3% of the respondents disagreed and 12% of them strongly disagreed that as long as the things are working, the supervisors don't feel the need to change anything. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted. 38 15. I have an extremely large amount of work to do H0: There is no significant difference to determine that the respondents have an extremely large amount of work to do H1: There is a significant difference to determine that the respondents have an extremely large amount of work to do

Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) $X^2 = \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$ Strongly agree 27 30 0.30 Agree 18 30 4.80 Neutral 33 30 0.30 Disagree 46 30 8.53 Strongly Disagree 26 30 0.53 Total N=150 $\sum x^2 = 14.46$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 14.46 Decision: H₀ is rejected Interpretation: From the above table, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference on a positive side as maximum of the respondents don't feel that they have an extremely large amount of work to do. Among the 150 respondents, 18% of the them strongly agreed, 12% agreed while 22% of them were neutral. Whereas, 30.7% of the respondents disagreed and 17.3% of them strongly disagreed that they have an extremely large amount of work to do. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted. 39 16. I always feel restless and depressed at work H₀: There is no significant difference to determine that the respondents always feel restless and depressed at work H₁: There is a significant difference to determine that the respondents always feel restless and depressed at work Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) $X^2 = \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$ Strongly agree 19 30 4.03 Agree 19 30 4.03 Neutral 32 30 0.13 Disagree 54 30 19.2 Strongly Disagree 26 30 0.53 Total N=150 $\sum x^2 = 27.92$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 27.92 Decision: H₀ is rejected Interpretation: From the above table, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference on a positive side as maximum of the respondents don't feel restless and depressed at work. Among the 150 respondents, 12.7% of the them strongly agreed, 12.7% agreed while 21.3% of them were neutral. Whereas, 36% of the respondents disagreed and 17.3% of them strongly disagreed that they always feel restless and depressed at work. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted. 40 17. The work atmosphere is stressful in my organization H₀: There is no significant difference to determine that the respondents feel that the atmosphere in their organization is stressful H₁: There is a significant difference to determine that the respondents feel that the atmosphere in their organization is stressful Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) $X^2 = \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$ Strongly agree 10 30 13.33 Agree 23 30 1.63 Neutral 33 30 0.30 Disagree 60 30 30 Strongly Disagree 24 30 1.20 Total N=150 $\sum x^2 = 46.46$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 46.46 Decision: H₀ is rejected Interpretation: According to the above table, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference on a positive side as maximum of the respondents don't feel that the atmosphere in their organization is stressful. Among the 150 respondents, 6.7% of the them strongly agreed, 15.3% agreed while 22% of them were neutral. Whereas, 40% of the respondents disagreed and 16% of them strongly disagreed when asked if the atmosphere in their organization is stressful. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted. 41 18. I can't complete work on time H₀: There is no significant difference to determine that the respondents can't complete their work on time H₁: There is a significant difference to determine that the respondents can't complete their work on time Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) $X^2 = \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$ Strongly agree 15 30 7.50 Agree 25 30 0.83 Neutral 35 30 0.83 Disagree 50 30 13.33 Strongly Disagree 25 30 0.83 Total N=150 $\sum x^2 = 23.32$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 23.32 Decision: H₀ is rejected Interpretation: From the above table, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference on a positive side as maximum of the respondents are able to complete their work on time. Among the 150 respondents, 10% of the them strongly agreed, 16.7% agreed while 23.3% of them were neutral when asked if they are unable to complete their work on time. Whereas, 33.3% of the respondents disagreed and 16.7% of them strongly disagreed. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted. 42 19. I feel extremely exhausted at my work everyday H₀: There is no significant difference to determine that the respondents feel extremely exhausted at work everyday H₁: There is a significant difference to determine that the respondents feel extremely exhausted at work everyday Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) $X^2 = \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$ Strongly agree 15 30 7.50 Agree 20 30 3.33 Neutral 38 30 2.13 Disagree 58 30 26.13 Strongly Disagree 19 30 4.03 Total N=150 $\sum x^2 = 43.12$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 43.12 Decision: H₀ is rejected Interpretation: From the above table, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference on a positive side as maximum of the respondents don't feel extremely exhausted at work every day. Among the 150 respondents, 10% of the them strongly agreed, 13.3% agreed while 25.3% of them were neutral. Whereas, 38.7% of the respondents disagreed and 12.7% of them strongly disagreed when asked if they feel extremely exhausted at work every day. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted. 43 20. I am not able to enjoy my work H₀: There is no significant difference to determine that the respondents are not able to enjoy their work Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) $X^2 = \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$ Strongly agree 12 30 10.80 Agree 24 30 1.20 Neutral 24 30 1.20 Disagree 59 30 28.03 Strongly Disagree 31 30 0.03 Total N=150 $\sum x^2 = 41.26$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 41.26 Decision: H₀ is rejected Interpretation: From the above table, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference on a positive side as maximum of the respondents enjoy their work. Among the 150 respondents, 8% of the them strongly agreed, 16% agreed while 16% of them were neutral. Whereas, 39.3% of the respondents disagreed and 20.7% of them strongly disagreed. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted. 44 21. My job makes me feel relaxed H₀: There is no significant difference to determine that the respondent's job makes them feel relaxed H₁: There is a

significant difference to determine that the respondent's job makes them feel relaxed Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) X²= (O-E)² /E Strongly agree 20 30 3.33 Agree 35 30 0.83 Neutral 39 30 2.70 Disagree 22 30 2.13 Strongly Disagree 34 30 0.53 Total N=150 $\sum x^2= 9.52$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 9.52 Decision: H₀ is rejected Interpretation: From the above table, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference on a positive side as maximum of the respondents feel relaxed at their job. Among the 150 respondents, 13.3% of the them strongly agreed, 23.3% agreed while 26% of them were neutral when asked if their job makes them feel relaxed. Whereas, 14.7% of the respondents disagreed and 22.7% of them strongly disagreed. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted.

45 22. I am inspired and satisfied with my work H₀: There is no significant difference to determine that the respondents are inspired and satisfied with their work H₁: There is a significant difference to determine that the respondents are inspired and satisfied with their work Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) X²= (O-E)² /E Strongly agree 24 30 1.20 Agree 36 30 1.20 Neutral 32 30 0.13 Disagree 29 30 0.03 Strongly Disagree 29 30 0.03 Total N=150 $\sum x^2= 2.59$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 2.59 Decision: H₀ is accepted Interpretation: According to the above table, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference to determine that the respondents are inspired and satisfied with their work. Among the 150 respondents, 16% of the them strongly agreed, 24% agreed while 21.3% of them were neutral when asked if they are inspired and satisfied with their work. Whereas, 19.3% of the respondents disagreed and 19.3% of them strongly disagreed. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

46 23. My job makes me feel lively H₀: There is no significant difference to determine that the respondents feel lively at their job H₁: There is a significant difference to determine that the respondents feel lively at their job Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) X²= (O-E)² /E Strongly agree 27 30 0.30 Agree 31 30 0.03 Neutral 36 30 1.20 Disagree 33 30 0.30 Strongly Disagree 23 30 1.63 Total N=150 $\sum x^2= 3.46$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 3.46 Decision: H₀ is accepted Interpretation: According to the above table, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference to determine that the respondents feel lively at their job. Among the 150 respondents, 18% of the them strongly agreed, 20.07% agreed while 24% of them were neutral when asked if they feel lively at their job. Whereas, 22% of the respondents disagreed and 15.3% of them strongly disagreed. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

47 24. My supervisor encourages me at work H₀: There is no significant difference to determine that the supervisors encourage their employees at work H₁: There is a significant difference to determine that the supervisors encourage their employees at work Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) X²= (O-E)² /E Strongly agree 25 30 0.83 Agree 36 30 1.20 Neutral 33 30 0.30 Disagree 30 30 0 Strongly Disagree 26 30 0.53 Total N=150 $\sum x^2= 2.86$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 2.86 Decision: H₀ is accepted Interpretation: According to the above table, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference to determine that the supervisors encourage their employees at work. Among the 150 respondents, 16.7% of the them strongly agreed, 24% agreed while 22% of them were neutral when asked if they are encouraged at their work by the supervisors. Whereas, 20% of the respondents disagreed and 17.3% of them strongly disagreed. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

48 25. The atmosphere in my workplace is very friendly H₀: There is no significant difference to determine that the respondents feel that the atmosphere in their workplace is very friendly H₁: There is a significant difference to determine that the respondents feel that the atmosphere in their workplace is very friendly Particulars Observed Expected= (150/5) X²= (O-E)² /E Strongly agree 27 30 0.30 Agree 35 30 0.83 Neutral 31 30 0.03 Disagree 31 30 0.03 Strongly Disagree 26 30 0.53 Total N=150 $\sum x^2= 1.72$ Significance level= 0.05 Degree of freedom= 4 Critical value= 9.49 Whereas, Chi-square value = 1.72 Decision: H₀ is accepted Interpretation: According to the above table, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference to determine that the respondents feel that the atmosphere in their workplace is very friendly. Among the 150 respondents, 18% of the them strongly agreed, 23.3% agreed while 20.7% of them were neutral when asked if the atmosphere in their workplace is very friendly. Whereas, 20.7% of the respondents disagreed and 17.3% of them strongly disagreed. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted.

49 TABLE 2: Conclusion of analysis S. no Statement Significance Level Degree of freedom Critical Value Chisquare value Null Hypothesis

1. I feel good to work with my supervisor 0.05 4 9.49 48.52 Rejected
2. My supervisor talks about most important values and beliefs 0.05 4 9.49 84.86 Rejected
3. My supervisor talks optimistically about goals to be achieved 0.05 4 9.49 49.39 Rejected
4. My supervisor encourages me to get the most out of my skills and capabilities 0.05 4 9.49 62.86 Rejected
5. My supervisor enables me to think about old problems in a new way 0.05 4 9.49 56.99 Rejected
6. I get help from my supervisor to rethink ideas I have never questioned before 0.05 4 9.49 63.23 Rejected
7. I get timely feedback from my supervisor 0.05 4 9.49 62.99 Rejected
8. My supervisor pays attention to the working conditions 0.05 4 9.49 61.59 Rejected
9. My supervisor makes clear what one can expect to receive when the goals are achieved 0.05 4 9.49 28.06 Rejected
10. My supervisor provides me rewards/incentives for the goals I achieve 0.05 4 9.49 35.92 Rejected
11. My supervisor keeps track of all mistakes and guides me in meeting the performance standards . 0.05 4 9.49 49.86 Rejected
12. My supervisor focuses on irregularities and deviations from standard performance 0.05 4 9.49 49.86 Rejected
13. My supervisor waits for the things to go

wrong before taking any action 0.05 4 9.49 28.72 Rejected 14. As long as the things are working, my supervisor doesn't feel the need to change anything 0.05 4 9.49 53.66 Rejected 15. I have an extremely large amount of work to do 0.05 4 9.49 14.46 Rejected 16. I always feel restless and depressed at work 0.05 4 9.49 27.92 Rejected 17. The work atmosphere is stressful in my organization 0.05 4 9.49 46.46 Rejected 18. I can't complete work on time 0.05 4 9.49 23.32 Rejected 19. I feel extremely exhausted at my work everyday 0.05 4 9.49 43.12 Rejected 20. I am not able to enjoy my work 0.05 4 9.49 41.24 Rejected 21. My job makes me feel relaxed 0.05 4 9.49 9.52 Rejected 22. I am inspired and satisfied with my work 0.05 4 9.49 2.59 Accepted 23. My job makes me feel lively 0.05 4 9.49 3.46 Accepted 24. My supervisor encourages me at work 0.05 4 9.49 2.86 Accepted 25. The atmosphere in my workplace is very friendly 0.05 4 9.49 1.72 Accepted