

Janiukštis, Andrius; Kovaite, Kristina; Butvilas, Tomas; Šumakaris, Paulius

Article

Impact of organisational climate on employee well-being and healthy relationships at work: A case of social service centres

Administrative Sciences

Provided in Cooperation with:

MDPI – Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute, Basel

Suggested Citation: Janiukštis, Andrius; Kovaite, Kristina; Butvilas, Tomas; Šumakaris, Paulius (2024) : Impact of organisational climate on employee well-being and healthy relationships at work: A case of social service centres, Administrative Sciences, ISSN 2076-3387, MDPI, Basel, Vol. 14, Iss. 10, pp. 1-19,
<https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci14100237>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/321051>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Article

Impact of Organisational Climate on Employee Well-Being and Healthy Relationships at Work: A Case of Social Service Centres

Andrius Janiukštis, Kristina Kovaitė * , Tomas Butvilas and Paulius Šumakaris 

Faculty of Creative Industries, Vilnius Gediminas Technical University, Traku Str. 1, LT-01132 Vilnius, Lithuania; andrius.janiukstis@vilniustech.lt (A.J.); tomas.butvilas@vilniustech.lt (T.B.); paulius.sumakaris@vilniustech.lt (P.Š.)

* Correspondence: kristina.kovaitė@vilniustech.lt

Abstract: Multiple studies highlight the crucial role of management of a positive organisational climate, which in turn contributes to employee well-being and healthy workplace relationships and mitigates the occurrence of negative behaviour, including harassment at the workplace. Furthermore, contemporary scholars emphasise the importance of open and transparent communication channels in reducing workplace tensions and improving employee mental health. However, the interrelationship between organisational climate, open communication, employee well-being, and negative behaviours in the workplace is a complex phenomenon. Despite the relevance and interest in organisational climate on employee well-being, limited efforts have been devoted to the area of relationships and causality, and straightforward answers about the objective links between these phenomena and their general nature remain complex. Therefore, this study aims to strengthen the understanding of the impact of the organisational climate on employee well-being and negative behaviours in the workplace. This is the first study that applied causality to the investigated problem to identify statistical relationships between the variables. This study was conducted in Lithuanian social service centres and schools, focussing on professionals with a high psychological risk at work due to their nature. This study offers valuable contributions and provides a comprehensive and profound insight into the management field, focussing on the impact of the organisational climate. The values of harassment in the workplace are explained by the values of organisational climate and employee well-being. This study demonstrates that improving the organisational climate contributes to employee well-being and healthy relationships and reduces the prevalence of negative behaviours in the workplace. This study introduces the academic and practical implications and suggests the pathways for further research.

Keywords: organisational climate; employee well-being; negative behaviour and harassment at the workplace; discourse; communication as connecting means



Citation: Janiukštis, Andrius, Kristina Kovaitė, Tomas Butvilas, and Paulius Šumakaris. 2024. Impact of Organisational Climate on Employee Well-Being and Healthy Relationships at Work: A Case of Social Service Centres. *Administrative Sciences* 14: 237. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci14100237>

Received: 18 July 2024

Revised: 16 September 2024

Accepted: 25 September 2024

Published: 28 September 2024



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The complexity of organisational operations escalates due to rapid changes in the environment. Factors such as globalisation, resource depletion, advanced technologies, financial scandals, bankruptcies, catastrophes, and external pressures from various social groups compel organisations to address the increasing complexity of business operations to achieve resilience, longevity, and sustainability. Therefore, organisational climate's impact on employee well-being and workplace relationships is crucial as it directly influences individual productivity and overall organisational performance. For organisational success, it is crucial to consider the external environmental factors that impact the organisation and the internal factors, such as the importance of maintaining a positive internal climate and, most importantly, employee well-being and healthy relationships at work. A positive organisational climate fosters employee satisfaction, reduces workplace conflicts, and enhances collaboration, ultimately creating a healthier and more efficient work environment.

Understanding these dynamics is key to improving employee retention, reducing stress, and promoting a culture of well-being and respect within organisations.

Organisational climate impacts employee behaviour, performance, and the overall performance of the organisation. Organisational climate, as a collection of individual characteristics of the organisation, is also related to the attitudes, values, and perceptions of the employees of the organisation. The importance of a positive organisational climate is that it increases employee job satisfaction and positively influences how employees feel in the work environment, their performance, and their interactions with each other (Rimbayana et al. 2022; Afe et al. 2018; Osmani et al. 2022).

Furthermore, employee well-being is another equally important phenomenon related to organisational performance. Employee well-being is commonly defined as an employee's positive physical, emotional, and psychological state, which is satisfying and results from a supportive working atmosphere in which the employee can realise his or her personal and professional potential. Positive employee well-being is most often associated with higher job performance, job satisfaction, productivity and task efficiency, lower absenteeism, and other factors (Ponting 2019; Salleh et al. 2020; Kahtani and Sulphrey 2022). In addition, studies by Bowen and Blackmon (2020), Mueller (2023), and Lee (2018) emphasise the importance of open and transparent communication channels in improving both the organisational climate and the well-being of employees as well as healthy relationships.

However, adverse effects, such as financial consequences, psychological or emotional problems, burnout syndrome, reduced productivity, or job satisfaction (Vévodová et al. 2020; Pacheco et al. 2021), have a negative impact on organisational climate, employee well-being, and healthy relationships at work, which is manifested by deliberate behaviour by those inside or outside the organisation that is intended to harm the organisation's employees physically, psychologically, or emotionally.

Therefore, the interrelationship between organisational climate, open communication, employee well-being, and negative behaviours in the workplace is a complex phenomenon. The current body of knowledge has focused mainly on the significance of organisational climate on individual factors related to employee well-being and the prevalence of negative behaviours in the workplace. Airaksinen et al. (2023) set out to develop a risk prediction algorithm to identify work units with increased risk of violence in the workplace and to assess the extent to which unit characteristics can help predict threats of harassment. Wech et al. (2020) explored how workplace bullying affects employees, the organisation, and its services. Zhou et al. (2020) investigated the impact of harassment on employees' innovative behaviour and employee well-being as a mediator between harassment and innovative behaviour. Bhusal et al. (2023) investigated the role of workplace policies, environments, and practices in the incidence of workplace harassment. Bitencourt et al. (2021) assessed the prevalence of harassment against health professionals and analysed variables associated with harassment against health professionals. Undoubtedly, these studies provide valuable insights into the field, but not without limitations, such as using single items instead of complete scales, being limited to one institution or specific niche or sample size, and the interpretation of the causal relationship between the variables is limited.

Therefore, despite the relevance and interest in organisational climate for employee well-being, limited efforts have been devoted to the area of relationships and causality in the scientific literature, and the general nature remains complex. There is a notable research gap regarding a comprehensive understanding of the role of organisational climate impact on employee well-being and the occurrence of negative behaviours in the workplace and, most importantly, the objective links between these phenomena. Therefore, in this study we set forth to strengthen the understanding of the impact of the organisational climate on employee well-being and negative behaviours in the workplace and propose constructs of organisational microclimate and employee well-being to predict negative behaviours. In this article, we address the following research question: What role does the organisational

climate play in enhancing employee well-being and preventing the occurrence of negative behaviours, including harassment, in the workplace?

The research aims to explore the foundations for a better understanding of the impact of the organisational climate on employee well-being and the prevalence of negative behaviours, including harassment, in the workplace. The following hypotheses were formulated:

H1: *The climate of an organisation has a positive impact on employee well-being.*

H2: *The climate of an organisation has a negative impact on harassment in the workplace.*

H3: *Employee well-being has a negative impact on harassment in the workplace.*

H4: *The values of harassment in the workplace are explained by the values of organisational climate.*

H5: *The values of harassment in the workplace are explained by the values of employee well-being.*

This article is structured as follows: Section 2 presents the theoretical background. Section 3 presents the case study, materials, and methods. Results are presented in Section 4, followed by a discussion (Section 5). Finally, Section 6 presents conclusions, limitations, and future research.

2. Communication as a Catalyst of Building an Organisational Climate

Researchers have conceptualised communication as part of the organisational climate and the climate itself from several perspectives. The research presented by Jones and Smith (2019) emphasises the pivotal role of vertical communication in shaping organisational climate. The quality of communication flow between different hierarchical levels can significantly impact the overall atmosphere within an organisation, influencing factors such as trust, collaboration, and employee engagement. Studies by Bowen and Blackmon (2020) highlight the link between vertical communication and employee well-being. Open and transparent communication channels within the vertical structure can foster a supportive work environment, improving employee job satisfaction, mental health, and overall well-being. Lee (2018) explores the relationship between the climate of communication and negative behaviour in the workplace, underscoring the importance of effective vertical communication in preventing conflicts that could escalate into violent incidents. Clear communication channels and conflict resolution mechanisms are crucial in mitigating negative behaviours in the workplace.

Additionally, recent academic research, including works by Patterson and Mueller, underscores the importance of effective internal communication. The organisational climate refers to the prevailing atmosphere, values, and norms within an organisation. It directly impacts employee experiences and behaviours. Patterson and Mueller's study on internal communication during organisational change emphasises that timely and transparent communication fosters a positive climate. When employees receive clear information about changes, their uncertainty decreases, leading to greater trust in leadership and a more supportive work environment (Patterson and Mueller 2020). Effective communication positively influences employee well-being. The stakeholder approach of Welch and Jackson to internal communication highlights the role of communication as a job resource. When employees have access to relevant information, feel heard, and experience open dialogue, their job satisfaction improves. On the contrary, poor communication can lead to burnout, stress, and decreased well-being (Welch and Jackson 2007).

Therefore, strategic communication practices are crucial to shaping the organisational environment and directly impact employee well-being. As practitioners, we must recognise the power of communication and prioritise strategies that improve both the workplace environment and the lives of our employees.

On the other hand, climate refers to the organisation itself and the characteristics that define it, such as the organisation's policies, procedures, expectations for practices spe-

cific to that organisation, organisation culture, and values (D'Amato 2023; Kessler 2019; Osmani et al. 2022). In this case, it is observed that the organisational climate will be distinctive for each organisation, allowing for the perception of the organisation itself, both for the people inside and outside the organisation. On the other hand, individual perceptions of employees and their interactions are essential to describe the climate. In this context, climate refers to employees' perceptions of how the organisation, its processes, policies, culture, and practices work. This perception of the work environment is influenced by people's values, attitudes, norms, and characteristic behaviours or feelings in the work environment (Diab et al. 2021; Ozsoy 2022; Luthufi et al. 2020; Molleda and Ferguson 2019; Afe et al. 2018). Alongside this, different strands of organisational climates are also observed, such as supportive climate (the prevailing support in the organisation), security climate (the prevailing security practices), inclusive climate (the balance between formal and informal policies), and national climate (the acceptance of people of different nationalities) (Kakhki et al. 2020; Li et al. 2022; Jackson et al. 2021; Wardono et al. 2022; Roberge et al. 2021; Köllen et al. 2019). Organisational characteristics and individual employee perceptions are also essential to measure the climate of an organisation (Vos and Page 2020). Researchers are observed to be looking for a balance between the factors that characterise the organisation and the subjective assessment of individuals. For example, Barría-González et al. (2021) identify five dimensions of climate: organisational trust, job strain, social support, rewards, and job satisfaction. The authors complement Tadesse (2019) and Michalak (2019) by highlighting the dimensions of organisational clarity, employee rewards, organisational standards, flexibility, responsibility, and team participation. In turn, Mueller and Surachaikulwattana (2020) provide an even more comprehensive construct by dividing the organisational climate into four dimensions (human relations, internal processes, open systems, and rational goals) and breaking them down into seventeen subscales.

2.1. Communication for the Employee Well-Being

Communication acts as the lifeblood of any organisation. It is the cornerstone of a positive and productive environment, which fosters collaboration, builds trust, and ultimately impacts employee well-being. This chapter delves into the critical role communication plays in shaping a healthy work environment and discusses how effective communication strategies can lead to a thriving workforce. Open communication, characterised by transparency, honesty, and a two-way flow of information, is a crucial ingredient for a positive organisational climate. Patterson (2021) emphasise the importance of psychological safety, a work environment where employees feel comfortable sharing ideas, concerns, and mistakes without fear of retribution. Open communication fosters this safety, allowing employees to voice their opinions, ask questions, and participate in decision-making. This fosters a sense of trust and belonging, leading to increased employee engagement and motivation (Mueller 2023).

Without effective communication, misunderstandings and misinformation can flourish. This can lead to frustration, inefficiency, and, ultimately, conflict. A study by Morrow et al. (2022) highlights the negative impact of poor communication on team collaboration. When information flow is hampered, teams struggle to coordinate efforts, leading to missed deadlines and decreased productivity. On the contrary, effective communication fosters trust, a crucial element for a healthy work environment. Employees feel valued and invested in the success of the organisation when informed about the goals, changes, and challenges of the company. This builds trust in leadership and fosters a sense of camaraderie amongst colleagues.

In addition, the impact of communication extends beyond just work performance. Effective communication strategies can significantly improve the well-being of employees. When employees feel comfortable expressing concerns and seeking support, they experience a reduction in stress and anxiety. Open communication about work-life balance and mental health initiatives also conveys that the organisation prioritises employee well-being

(Cameron and Fredrickson 2018). This promotes a healthy work environment and can lead to increased employee retention and satisfaction.

In addition, it is worth focussing on the general concept of well-being to conceptualise employee well-being, as it provides a framework for employee well-being and the factors that define it. Well-being refers to the internal or external human environment (Kahtani and Sulphrey 2022), adding that it is primarily characterised by objective phenomena, such as food, income, housing, and what ensures objective well-being and the satisfaction of human needs. Also, subjective factors are those such as a person's feelings, thoughts, abilities, evaluation of one's own life, satisfaction, and sense of fulfilment (Brunetto et al. 2021; Elsamani et al. 2023; Salleh et al. 2020; Sora et al. 2021; Stankevičienė et al. 2021). Employee well-being is conceptualised in a very similar way, arguing that it is characterised by the individual's internal environment (employee's feelings, satisfaction), the external environment (alignment of the employee's and the organisation's goals, the importance of the environmental factors for the individual), and the interaction of these environments with the way in which the individual functions in the organisation (thinking, experience, ability to realise capabilities) (Appelbaum et al. 2007; Khan et al. 2020; Quifors et al. 2021; Corrêa et al. 2019; Kahtani and Sulphrey 2022; Taj et al. 2020). To measure employee well-being, researchers focus primarily on psychological aspects such as the need for autonomy, individual competence, social relationships, positive emotions, engagement, and a sense of meaning. Although this approach views employee well-being as a psychological phenomenon, it is also characterised by other states, such as those that are physical (physical capacity, the impact of environmental factors, illness, diet, lifestyle) and social (the relationship between managers and employees, colleagues) (Kahtani and Sulphrey 2022; Ahmad et al. 2022; Nathan 2022; Sorribes et al. 2021; Quifors et al. 2021; Suwarnajote and Mekhum 2020; Tantarut et al. 2021). In addition to the abundance of dimensions of employee well-being, researchers' work also shows the identification of some concepts with each other; for example, (Beck-Krala 2022) identifies the psychological and emotional dimensions by relating them to general mental state. Moreover, this list of employee well-being is complemented by affective, cognitive, occupational, spiritual, and intellectual dimensions (Platts et al. 2022; Gorgenyi-Hegyes et al. 2021).

2.2. Prevention of Negative Behaviours in the Workplace as the Presumption of Employee Well-Being

Negative workplace behaviours can significantly affect organisations and employees. These behaviours violate organisational norms and policies (Appelbaum et al. 2007) and are often voluntary actions against colleagues or the company (Dumazert and Plane 2012). Factors contributing to negative behaviour include perceived organisational politics, abusive supervision, and overqualification (Abdullah and AL-Abrrow 2022). These behaviours can lead to decreased cooperation, reduced work meaning, and opportunistic conflicts (Dumazert and Plane 2012). On the contrary, positive workplace behaviours, such as task performance and organisational citizenship, are influenced by perceived organisational justice, support, and identity (Abdullah and AL-Abrrow 2022). Organisations should strengthen positive variables while reducing negative ones to address negative behaviours and promote positive ones (Abdullah and AL-Abrrow 2022). Negative behaviours in the workplace are not easy to define. Although some scholars use generic definitions and relate them to violence, they are also associated with descriptions such as 'intimidation', 'harassment', 'bullying', 'psychological issues', 'hostility', 'sabotage', or stalking (Akanni et al. 2020; Civilotti et al. 2021; Schablon et al. 2022; Stahl-Gugger and Hämmig 2022; Zhou et al. 2020; Ghareeb et al. 2021). Furthermore, the perspective of the perpetrator is also observed, distinguishing between horizontal negative behaviours, where aggressive behaviour comes from a colleague, client, or family member inside or outside the organisation, and vertical dimension is observed, where the perpetrator is a manager in a more senior position (Pacheco et al. 2021; Hsu et al. 2022; Barros et al. 2022; Mitchell and Ambrose 2007; Somani et al. 2021; Caillier 2020). The nature of the phenomenon of the

negative behaviour itself is also essential, suggesting that it can be verbal (non-physical harm), physical (physical harm), active (direct harm), passive (deliberate failure to act, lack of cooperation), direct (e.g., actively shouting at the victim, or threatening the victim), and indirect (e.g., gossiping about the victim without the victim's knowledge), as in the case of Barros et al. (2022) and Caillier (2020). In addition, scholars have also explored the concept of mobbing, which is characterised by repeated aggressive behaviour and can be noticed vertically or horizontally. In this case, aggressive behaviour is linked to getting rid of the victim and the imbalance of power, as Maran et al. (2022) and Vveinhardt and Sroka (2020) argue. Furthermore, it can be noted that mobbing is not a static phenomenon but changes over time and can involve different degrees of complexity. When investigating mobbing, Vveinhardt and Sroka (2020) and Dopelt et al. (2022) categorise mobbing into five dimensions: negative behaviour through social relationships (e.g., isolation), communication (e.g., constant criticism), reputation (e.g., rumour-mongering), occupational or quality of life (e.g., denying work), and health (e.g., working in harmful conditions).

Maidaniuc-Chirilă (2020) argues that individuals working in an organisation may perceive a hostile environment as threatening, based on their inherent traits and perceived control over environmental factors, and consequently experience unpleasant feelings such as anger or anxiety, eventually leading to tension or aggressive human behaviour. This implies that the emergence of negative behaviour in the workplace is linked to the organisational climate. Hsu et al. (2022) and Barros et al. (2022) argue that the occurrence of negative behaviour in the workplace can be linked to too much direct contact with customers, workload problems, limits in time, high demands, noise, lack of attention, problematic relationships between employees, and policy or procedural problems, which are all characteristics of the organisation that are linked to the climate.

3. Results

3.1. Interconnection of Phenomena

Pearson correlation analysis was performed on these variables to understand whether the organisational climate has a positive impact on employee well-being (H1). The analysis reveals that the correlation coefficient is $r = 0.512$ with a statistical significance of $p < 0.01$ (Table 1).

Table 1. Correlations between organisational climate and employee well-being scales.

	Correlations	Employee Well-Being
	Pearson's correlation	0.512 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
Climate	N	85

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

The data show a positive, moderately strong, statistically significant correlation between organisational climate and employee well-being variables. This means that employee well-being will improve as the organisation's climate improves. The findings suggest that the organisational environment has a positive impact on employee well-being, and H1 is confirmed by correlation analysis. The scales on organisational climate and employee well-being (Table 2) show that there is a positive, moderately strong relationship between all the subscales of organisational climate (autonomy, integration, inclusion, support, competence development) and the employee well-being subscale, ranging from $r = 0.420$ (autonomy) to $r = 0.630$ (competence development). The weakest statistically significant relationships were found between the subscales of integration and well-being in life, competence development, and psychological well-being. Similarly, no statistically significant relationship was found between autonomy and well-being in life, autonomy and psychological well-being, inclusion and psychological well-being.

Table 2. Correlations between the subscales of organisational climate and employee well-being.

Correlations		Well-Being in Life	Labour	Well-Being in Life
Autonomy	Pearson's correlation	0.146	0.420 **	0.192
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.182	0.000	0.078
	N	85	85	85
Integration	Pearson's correlation	0.283 **	0.491 **	0.301 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.009	0.000	0.005
	N	85	85	85
Engagement	Pearson's correlation	0.323 **	0.550 **	0.213
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.003	0.000	0.050
	N	85	85	85
Support	Pearson's correlation	0.345 **	0.652 **	0.338 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.001	0.000	0.002
	N	85	85	85
Developing Competence	Pearson's correlation	0.349 **	0.630 **	0.298 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.001	0.000	0.006
	N	85	85	85

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

Pearson's correlation analysis was performed on the following variables to understand whether the organisational environment negatively impacts negative workplace behaviours (H2). The analysis reveals that the correlation coefficient is $r = -0.789$ with a statistical significance of $p < 0.01$ (Table 3).

Table 3. Correlations between scales on organisational climate and workplace harassment.

Correlations		Harassment in the Workplace
Climate	Pearson's correlation	-0.789 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0
	N	85

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

The data show a hostile, substantial, and statistically significant correlation between the variables of organisational climate and harassment in the workplace. This means that as the organisational climate improves, harassment in the workplace decreases. Summarising the data, it is concluded that the organisational climate has a negative impact on harassment in the workplace, and H2 is confirmed by correlation analysis. The organisational climate scale revealed a strong and statistically significant correlation between workplace harassment and the subscales of participation ($r = -0.741$) and support ($r = -0.728$). Similarly, harassment in the workplace has a moderate and significant correlation with all other subscales of organisational climate (Table 4).

Pearson's correlation analysis was carried out on these variables to understand whether employee well-being has a negative impact on harassment in the workplace (H3). The analysis reveals that the correlation coefficient is $r = -0.458$ with a statistical significance of $p < 0.01$ (Table 5).

The data show a negative, moderate, and statistically significant correlation between the variables of employee well-being and harassment in the workplace. This means that as employee well-being improves, harassment in the workplace decreases. The findings suggest that employee well-being has a negative impact on harassment in the workplace,

and H3 is confirmed by correlation analysis. The well-being of life scale (Table 6) shows that harassment in the workplace is moderately and significantly correlated with the well-being at work subscale ($r = -0.531$).

Table 4. Correlations between the subscales of organisational climate and workplace harassment.

Correlations		Harassment in the Workplace
Autonomy	Pearson's correlation	−0.581 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	85
Integration	Pearson's correlation	−0.629 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	85
Engagement	Pearson's correlation	−0.741 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	85
Support	Pearson's correlation	−0.728 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	85
Developing Competence	Pearson's correlation	−0.567 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	85

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

Table 5. Correlations between employee well-being and workplace harassment scales.

Correlations		Harassment in the Workplace
Employee well-being	Pearson's correlation	−0.458 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0
	N	85

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

Table 6. Correlations between employee well-being and harassment in the workplace scales.

Correlations		Harassment in the Workplace
Well-being in life	Pearson's correlation	−0.388 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	85
Labour well-being	Pearson's correlation	−0.531 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	85
Psychological well-being	Pearson's correlation	−0.320 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.003
	N	85

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

A weak and statistically significant correlation exists between workplace harassment and the well-being subscales ($r = -0.388$) and psychological well-being ($r = -0.320$).

3.2. Impact of Organisational Climate on Harassment in the Workplace

Regression analysis was used to understand whether harassment on the job is directly related to the organisational climate. In this case, the climate values were tested to explain the values of workplace harassment (H4). The model fit was analysed as follows:

$$\text{Harassment in the workplace} = C - b_1 \text{ organisational climate} + e \quad (1)$$

Table 7 shows the coefficient of determination $R^2 = 0.622$, and considering the data, it can be seen that the organisational climate explains 62% of the harassment values in the workplace, so it can be said that the model is sufficiently accurate to describe the data and is appropriate. The ANOVA p -value is demonstrated ($p < 0.05$), so it can be said that the model is appropriate.

Table 7. Coefficient of determination of climate and harassment.

Summary of the Model				
Model	R	R-Square	Adjusted R-Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.789 ^a	0.622	0.617	0.12372

^a Predictors.

Considering the p -value of the student's criterion, the regressor is significant (Table 8). The coefficient of b shows that the organisational climate has a statistically significant negative impact on workplace harassment, with a one-point increase in the climate that leads to a decrease of 1.372 in workplace harassment ($b = -1.372$).

Table 8. Student's criterion for climate and harassment.

Coefficients ^a							
Model	Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	1.120	0.050	22.425	0.000		
	Climate	−1.372	0.117	−0.789	−11.682	0.000	0.622

^a Dependent variable.

Looking at the residual error plots shows that the normality requirements are met. To summarise the data, it is concluded that the organisational climate has a direct negative impact on harassment in the workplace, and H4 is confirmed by regression analysis. Regression equation:

$$\text{Harassment in the workplace} = 1.120 - 1.372 \text{ Organisational climate} \quad (2)$$

To assess which subscales of the organisational climate are most affected by harassment in the workplace, an initial multivariate linear regression model was constructed, with independent variables coded as autonomy (*Aut*), integration (*Int*), involvement (*Itr*), supportiveness (*Pal*), and competence (*Komp*). Regression equation:

$$\text{Harassment in the workplace} = C - b_1 \text{ Aut} - b_2 \text{ Int} - b_3 \text{ Itr} - b_4 \text{ Pal} - b_5 \text{ Komp} + e \quad (3)$$

The regression model was multicollinear, with the regressor $\text{Int} - \text{VIF} > 4$. Also, looking at the p -value of the Student's criterion, it is observed that the regressors *Int*, *Pal*, and *Komp* are statistically insignificant ($p > 0.05$). To address these issues, the *Int*, *Itr*, *Pal*, and *Komp* regressors were removed from the model and replaced by the mean of these regressors, *Mikr_all*. The coefficient of determination of the new model is $R^2 = 0.616$, and

the ANOVA p -value confirms the goodness of fit of the model ($p < 0.05$). Given the p -value of the Student's coefficient, it can be concluded that the two regressors *Aut* and *Mikr_all* are statistically significant and that the influence of the regressor *Mikr_all* on the dependent variable is highest ($b = -0.176$). When looking at the residual error plots, the normality assumptions are satisfied. Regression equation:

$$\text{Harassment in the workplace} = 1.186 - 0.046 \text{ Aut} - 0.176 \text{ Mikr_all} \quad (4)$$

3.3. Impact of Employee Well-Being on Violence in the Workplace

To test the fifth hypothesis (H5), the fit of the linear regression model was tested to see whether the employee well-being values explain the values of harassment in the workplace.

$$\text{Harassment in the workplace} = C - b_1 \text{ Employee well-being} + e \quad (5)$$

Looking at the coefficient of determination (Table 9), we can see that employee well-being explains 20% of the values of harassment in the workplace ($R^2 = 0.209$), suggesting that the model describes the data reasonably accurately and that it is appropriate. Considering the statistical significance of the ANOVA ($p < 0.05$), it can also be said that the model is appropriate.

Table 9. Coefficient of determination of employee well-being and harassment in the workplace.

Summary of the Model				
Model	R	R-Square	Adjusted R-Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.458 ^a	0.209	0.200	0.17888

^a Predictors: (Constant), Employee_ well-being.

Table 10 shows the p -value of the student's criterion ($p < 0.05$) and the coefficient of b ($b = -0.781$), suggesting that the regressor's employee well-being is statistically significant and has a negative effect on the dependent variable harassment on the workplace, where a one-point increase in employee well-being leads to a decrease in harassment on the workplace of 0.781.

Table 10. Employee well-being and harassment in the workplace Student criteria.

Coefficients ^a								
Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	0.813	0.058		14.103	0.000		
	Employee_ well-being	−0.781	0.167	−0.458	−4.689	0.000	1.000	1.000

^a Dependent variable.

The plots of the standardised residual errors show that the normality requirements are met. Taken together, the findings suggest that employee well-being has a direct negative impact on harassment in the workplace. Hypothesis H5 is supported by regression analysis. Regression equation:

$$\text{Harassment in the workplace} = 0.813 - 0.781 \text{ Employee well-being} \quad (6)$$

To assess which subscales of employee well-being are most affected by harassment in the workplace, an initial multivariate linear regression model was constructed, with the

independent variables coded as follows: well-being in life—*Gyv*; well-being at work—*Darb*; psychological well-being—*Psych*. Regression equation:

$$\text{Harassment in the workplace} = C - b_1 \text{Gyv} - b_2 \text{Darb} - b_3 \text{Psych} + e \quad (7)$$

Although the coefficient of determination of the model is $R^2 = 0.282$ and the statistical significance of the ANOVA confirms the goodness of fit of the model, a problem was encountered when testing the regression model. Looking at the p -value of the student's criterion, it is observed that the regressors *Gyv* and *Psych* are statistically insignificant and are removed from the model to solve this problem. The coefficient of determination of the new model has changed slightly, $R^2 = 0.281$, and the p -value of the ANOVA confirms the goodness of fit of the model ($p < 0.05$). When looking at the residual error plots, it can be seen that the assumptions of normality are met. Looking at the data, it is concluded that the regressor *Darb* is statistically significant and has a negative effect on the dependent variable harassment in the workplace, where a one-point increase in well-being at work results in a 0.142 decrease in harassment in the workplace. Regression equation:

$$\text{Harassment in the workplace} = 0.897 - 0.142 \text{Darb} \quad (8)$$

4. Materials and Methods

4.1. A Case of Social Service Centres

This study was carried out in social service centres and schools in Lithuania. Social services create conditions for a person or a family to develop or strengthen the ability and possibilities to solve social problems, maintain social relations with society, and help overcome social exclusion. Social service centres assist various groups of people: elderly individuals and their families, disabled persons and their families, children who lost parental care, children at social risk and their families, families at social risk, foster families for children, and other individuals and families. Both social service centres and schools provide services that involve constant contact with various groups, such as training, counselling, sociocultural events, organisation of meetings, building or restoring social skills, and coping with crises. Moreover, social services are provided at social service institutions and at home. Therefore, social workers face a higher risk of experiencing stress or psychological and emotional abuse because they work with clients who lack social skills, have mental disorders, alcohol and substance abuse, domestic violence, etc. In addition to these characteristics, schools and social service centres are characterised by a disproportion between administration and staff, with many directly subordinate professionals per administrative staff member. It is likely that due to the specific nature of these institutions, professionals are at high psychological risk at work, and the phenomena of climate, employee well-being, and negative behaviours in the workplace can be tangible and objectively quantified. Therefore, multiple methods were adopted to investigate the case: comparative analysis of the scientific literature, quantitative written survey, and statistical data analysis (MS SPSS 29.0).

4.2. Research Method

Multiple previous studies have already applied a wide range of statistical data analysis methods to investigate the relationship between organisational climate, employee well-being, and negative behaviours in the workplace (Airaksinen et al. 2023; Wech et al. 2020; Zhou et al. 2020; Bhusal et al. 2023; Bitencourt et al. 2021). However, limited efforts have been devoted to the area of relationships and causality and straightforward answers about the objective links between these phenomena. Therefore, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first study that applied causality to the investigated problem to identify statistical relationships between the variables.

The survey was conducted between 24 September and 24 October 2023, and 85 respondents participated in it. As part of this study's organisation, participants were asked to voluntarily complete a questionnaire in direct contact with some of the school teachers and social workers. This study investigated the organisation's climate, the employees'

well-being, and the dimensions of these phenomena. It also looked at negative workplace behaviours and the factors that contribute to them (Table 11).

Table 11. Structure of the questionnaire.

Construct	Indicator	Number of Claims	Author(s), Year
Organisational Climate	Autonomy	5 statements.	Mueller and Surachaikulwattana (2020)
	Integration	5 statements.	
	Engagement	6 statements	
	Support	5 statements.	
	Developing Competence	4 statements.	
Employee Well-being	Well, being in life	6 statements	Karapinar et al. (2019)
	Labour well-being	6 statements	
	Psychological well-being	6 statements	
Harassment at Work	-	20 statements	Einarsen et al. (2009)

Organisational climate. The OCM questionnaire was used to identify the organisational climate and its dimensions, assessing the dimensions of human relations, internal processes, open systems, and rational goals (Mueller and Surachaikulwattana 2020). However, in their research work, the authors use a shortened construct of ‘human relations’ that assesses the dimensions of autonomy, integration, inclusion, support, competence development, and well-being. Since employee well-being is studied as a separate variable in this study, a shortened version of the OCM questionnaire has been chosen to study the organisational climate by removing the dimension of well-being. The questions are scored on a 5-point Likert scale, where 5 means ‘strongly agree’ and 1 means ‘strongly disagree’.

Employee well-being. The EWB questionnaire was used to measure employee well-being, which assesses three dimensions of employee well-being: well-being in life, well-being at work, and psychological well-being (Karapinar et al. 2019). Given the insights of the researchers described in the analysis of theoretical works that psychological and emotional well-being can be seen as a single dimension that measures the overall mental state in this study, the EWB questionnaire was chosen to measure employee well-being. The questions are scored on a 5-point Likert scale, where 5 means ‘strongly agree’ and 1 means ‘strongly disagree’.

Harassment in the workplace. The NAQ-R (Negative Factors Questionnaire-Revised), which assesses work-related harassment and social or physical intimidation, was used to identify harassment in the workplace (Einarsen et al. 2009). The questions focus on negative behaviours and exclude aggression and lawless aspects. To determine how often respondents are exposed to work-related harassment and negative behaviour, the questions are rated on a 5-point Likert scale, where 5 means ‘often’ and 1 means ‘never’.

4.3. Ethics of Research

During this study, the following ethical principles of social research were ensured:

- The principle of goodwill. The survey questionnaire was designed respectfully, and the anonymity of the participants was ensured using an electronic data collection platform, allowing them to complete the questionnaire comfortably and confidentially. Participants were informed that their participation in this study was voluntary and that they could change their minds at any time.
- The principle of respect for personal dignity. The purpose of the survey, the meaning of participation, and the confidentiality and anonymity of the survey were explained to the participants in everyday language.
- The principle of justice. Subjects have been informed that personal information that identifies individuals or organisations where they work will not be recorded in the

survey or questionnaire. Furthermore, the questionnaire data will be stored only on the author's computer and deleted after statistical analysis.

4.4. Data Analysis

The statistical data of this study were processed using the Microsoft Excel software package (Windows), version 16 and the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) software package, version 17. The following statistical methods and steps were used to achieve the objective and objectives of this study:

- Cronbach's alpha was used to assess the validity of the questionnaire scale.
- The Shapiro–Wilk test was used to assess the normal distribution of the data.
- Correlation analysis was used to identify statistical relationships between organisational climate variables, employee well-being, and hostile workplace behaviours. This method was used to test hypotheses H1, H2, and H3.
- Regression analysis was used to investigate the impact of climate and employee well-being on negative workplace behaviours. Hypotheses H4 and H5 were tested.

4.5. Validity of the Questionnaire Scales

To determine the validity of the scales, their internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha, which can range from 0 to 1. The internal consistency assessment (Table 12) shows that the internal consistency coefficients of the scales range from $\alpha = 0.737$ to $\alpha = 0.969$. In light of these data, the internal consistency of the questionnaire scales and subscales is acceptable for further statistical analyses.

Table 12. Internal consistency of the questionnaire.

Scale	Number of Claims	Cronbach Alpha
Organisational Climate	25 statements	0.957
Autonomy	5 statements.	0.851
Integration	5 statements.	0.864
Engagement	6 statements	0.926
Support	5 statements.	0.939
Developing Competence	4 statements.	0.870
Employee well-being	18 statements	0.921
Well-being in life	6 statements	0.865
Labour well-being	6 statements	0.889
Psychological well-being	6 statements	0.728
Harassment in the workplace	20 statements	0.964

4.6. Characteristics of the Data Distribution

The Shapiro–Wilk test was used to select the appropriate statistical analysis methods. The test revealed that the scales for organisational climate, employee well-being, and harassment in the workplace do not satisfy the condition of differential normality. Therefore, the data were transformed to use parametric statistical methods: logarithmic transformation was applied to the distributions of organisational climate and employee well-being, and reciprocal transformation was applied to the distribution of violence in the work environment. After data transformation, it was observed that the p -value of the Shapiro–Wilk test was more significant than 0.05 for all distributions, and the asymmetry and excess coefficients met the normality conditions, so it can be concluded that the distribution of the data is normal and that parametric statistical methods can be used for further analysis (Table 13).

Table 13. Shapiro–Wilk test for distribution normality.

Scale	Asymmetry Coefficient	Excess Coefficient	Value of Shapiro–Wilk
Climate	−0.166	0.890	$p > 0.05$
Employee well-being	−0.365	0.660	$p > 0.05$
Harassment in the workplace	0.339	−0.448	$p > 0.05$

5. Discussion

This section provides a discussion of the results from the perspective of previous studies. This study's findings show a strong, negative correlation between organisational climate and workplace harassment. Of all the climate subscales (autonomy, integration, inclusion, support, competence development), inclusion and support are found to be the most significant factors in workplace violence. Furthermore, climate was found to have a direct impact on harassment in the workplace, with climate changes that change the prevalence of harassment in the workplace. The literature analysis revealed that harassment in the workplace can be explained as an aggressive reaction of an individual triggered by perceived and stressful threats (Maidaniuc-Chirilă 2020). These threats originate in the organisational environment and can be related to dimensions of the organisational climate, such as overwork, understaffing, excessive and prolonged contact with customers, problems in interpersonal relations, etc. (Hsu et al. 2022). Although the authors looked at individual causes of harassment in the workplace, which are linked to the organisational climate, this study supports the authors' claims. The study also confirms that environmental and stressful threats that cause negative feelings in individuals, such as anxiety or anger, and an individual's aggressive response to threats are related to harassment at work. Also, these threats can be objectively identified by examining the organisational climate. This means that improvements in the climate of an organisation lead to a reduction in harassment in the workplace and that improvements in the climate of an organisation directly impact the reduction in harassment in the workplace.

The contribution is made in understanding workplace dynamics, because this research contributes to a deeper understanding of workplace dynamics in social service centres and schools, potentially leading to the development of targeted interventions to improve employee well-being and address negative behaviours (Kim and Wang 2018; Kulikowski and Orzechowski 2018; Malik et al. 2021).

Furthermore, the findings of this study show a moderately strong positive correlation between the organisational climate and the well-being of the employees. All the subscales of organisational climate (autonomy, integration, involvement, support, competence development) studied in this study have a positive, moderately strong correlation with all the subscales of employee well-being (life, work, psychological well-being). The literature analysis revealed that the organisational climate is related to individuals' feelings of well-being, job satisfaction, friendly working relationships, professional engagement, commitment, sense of security, trust in the organisation, etc. (Osmani et al. 2022; Rimbayana et al. 2022; Xu et al. 2022). This study generalises the authors' claims to the construct of employee well-being, which proves that when the organisational climate changes, the state of employee well-being also changes. That is, environmental and stressful threats that cause people to experience negative feelings, such as anxiety or anger, have negative implications for employee well-being.

Furthermore, the prevalence of negative behaviours on the job varies with the state of employee well-being. The results of this study show that there is a moderately strong negative correlation between employee well-being and harassment in the workplace. The strongest correlation is found between workplace harassment and the subscale of job well-being. Additionally, employee well-being was found to have a direct negative impact on workplace harassment, whereby changes in employee well-being are associated with changes in the prevalence of workplace harassment. Literature analysis has revealed that

the causes of the prevalence of harassment in the workplace may not only be related to threats and increased negative behaviours in the work environment but also to individual internal problems, such as jealousy, organisational injustice, social inadequacy, antipathy toward others, and low moral standards (Alhasnawi and Abbas 2021). In addition, harsh treatment of individuals can lead not only to the emergence of harassment in the workplace but also to its further spread. When individuals are exposed to harsh treatment, they experience relatively more negative feelings than positive feelings, such as anxiety and anger, which, in the long run, deteriorate the health of the individual and increase the likelihood of aggressive behaviour toward others (Maidaniuc-Chirilă 2020). This study confirms and generalises the authors' claims that the causes of harassment in the workplace are related to the individual's internal problems in proposing the construct of employee well-being. It also shows that when employee well-being changes, the prevalence of harassment in the workplace changes. This means that the better the well-being of employees, the lower the prevalence of harassment in the workplace. It also means that improvements in employee well-being have a direct impact on the incidence of harassment in the workplace.

Furthermore, this study shows that the organisational climate is negatively associated with workplace harassment and negative behaviours in general. Since previous explorations have analysed the impact of negative behaviours on organisational climates, this study asks whether factors in the organisational environment can be related to harassment at work. The multifaceted implications of vertical communication on organisational climate, employee well-being, and harassment in the workplace are critically examined. Drawing on existing research, this section aims to elucidate the significance of effective communication practices within organisational hierarchies and their broader impact on employee welfare and safety. The insights gleaned underscore the importance of prioritising vertical communication within organisational settings to cultivate a positive work environment conducive to employee well-being and safety. Future research efforts could deepen the specific communication strategies that organisations can implement to enhance vertical communication practices and mitigate the risk of harassment and negative behaviours in the workplace.

6. Conclusions, Limitations, and Future Research

Recognising the pivotal role of communication within organisational hierarchies, organisations can proactively create a conducive work environment that prioritises the welfare and safety of their employees. This study shows that an organisation's climate positively affects team member well-being. Given that previous work has focused mainly on the role of organisational climate on individual factors related to employee well-being, this study asks whether the state of employee well-being varies with the state of climate.

Organisations can cultivate a thriving workplace that benefits employees and the entire organisation by prioritising open communication and fostering a culture of active listening. This investment in clear, and consistent communication leads to a more engaged, productive, and resilient workforce, propelling the organisation towards long-term success. Although this study demonstrates that employee well-being has a negative impact on harassment in the workplace, it cannot be said that the results of this study reflect the individual's propensity to violence about his/her well-being. Similarly, although this study demonstrates that measuring the climate of an organisation can provide an objective assessment of threats that cause negative feelings such as anxiety, anger, and aggressive responses to threats, it cannot be said that the results of this study reflect the impact of these threats on individuals in terms of their intrinsic traits or perceived control over environmental threats.

This study offers valuable contributions and provides a comprehensive and profound insight into the management field, focussing on the impact of the organisational climate. However, this study is not without limitations. First, the limitation is related to the participants' demographics, and empirical research was conducted in Lithuania. Second, the sample is limited to a niche group, which is both a strength and weakness of this

study since the specifically has more stress in the nature of the job. Both limitations are related to the possibility of generalising the findings to some extent, and by including other groups of respondents that work in less or more stressed environments by their nature, the research results might show different correlations. Inevitably, relying on a self-reported measure may lead to subjectivity bias. To some extent, the limitations could be addressed in future studies. The changing nature of work, including flexible arrangements and increased diversity, necessitates new approaches to managing and mitigating deviant behaviours (Cavanagh et al. 2021). Future research should also be focused on the evolving socio-technological factors influencing workplace deviance and their implications for perpetrator–victim dynamics (Malik et al. 2021).

This study lays the groundwork for further research by complementing its findings and investigating individuals' tolerance for management challenges to ensure employee well-being and build healthier relationships in the workplace.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, T.B., K.K., A.J. and P.Š.; methodology, T.B., K.K., A.J. and P.Š.; software, A.J. and P.Š.; validation, T.B., K.K., A.J. and P.Š.; investigation, T.B., K.K., A.J. and P.Š.; writing—original draft preparation, T.B. and A.J.; writing—review and editing, T.B., K.K., A.J. and P.Š.; visualization, A.J. and P.Š.; supervision, T.B. and K.K. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in this study.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

- Abdullah, Hasan Oudah, and Hadi AL-Abrow. 2022. Predicting positive and negative behaviours at work: Insights from multi-faceted perceptions and attitudes. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence* 42: 63–80. [CrossRef]
- Afe, Codjori Edwige Iko, Alexis Abodohou, T. Guy Crescent Mebounou, and Egide Karuranga. 2018. Perceived organizational climate and whistleblowing intention in academic organizations: Evidence from Selçuk University (Turkey). *Eurasian Business Review* 9: 299–318. [CrossRef]
- Ahmad, Abid, Cedric Edwin, and Dave Bamber. 2022. Linking Relational Coordination and Employees' Wellbeing through Psychological Capital. *Journal of Managerial Sciences* 69: 68–88.
- Airaksinen, Jaakko, Jaana Pentti, Piia Seppälä, Marianna Virtanen, Annina Ropponen, Marko Elovainio, Mika Kivimäki, and Jenni Ervasti. 2023. Prediction of violence or threat of violence among employees in social work Ervasti, healthcare and education: The Finnish Public Sector cohort study. *BMJ Open* 13: e075489. [CrossRef]
- Akanni, Abimbola, Dauda Kareem, and Choja Oduaran. 2020. The relationship between emotional intelligence and employee wellbeing through perceived person-job fit among university academic staff: A Structural Equation Modelling Approach. *Cogent Psychology* 7: 1–18. [CrossRef]
- Alhasnawi, Hussein Hurajah, and Ali Abdulhassan Abbas. 2021. Narcissistic leadership and workplace deviance: A moderated mediation model of organizational aggression and workplace hostility. *Organizacija* 54: 334–49. [CrossRef]
- Appelbaum, Steven H., Giulio David Iaconi, and Albert Matousek. 2007. Positive and negative deviant workplace behaviours: Causes, impacts, and solutions. *Corporate Governance* 7: 586–98. [CrossRef]
- Barria-González, Javier, Álvaro Postigo, Ricardo Pérez-Luco, Marcelino Cuesta, and Eduardo García-Cueto. 2021. Assessing Organizational Climate: Psychometric properties of the ECALS Scale. *Anales De Psicología* 37: 168–77. [CrossRef]
- Barros, Carla, Rute F. Meneses, Ana Sani, and Pilar Baylina. 2022. Workplace Violence in Healthcare Settings: Work-Related Predictors of Violence Behaviours. *Psych* 4: 516–24. [CrossRef]
- Beck-Krala, Ewa. 2022. *Employee Well-Being from the Perspective of Human Resources Professionals*. Organization and Management Series; Scientific Papers of Silesian University of Technology. Gliwice: Silesian University of Technology, pp. 27–37.
- Bhusal, Anupama, Apekshya Adhikari, and Pranil Man Singh Pradhan. 2023. Workplace violence and its associated factors among health care workers of a tertiary hospital in Kathmandu, Nepal. *PLoS ONE* 18: e0288680. [CrossRef]
- Bitencourt, Mariá Romanio, Ana Carolina Jacinto Alarcão, Lincoln Luís Silva, Amanda De Carvalho Dutra, Nayara Malheiros Caruzzo, Igor Roszkowski, Marcos Rogério Bitencourt, Vladimir Dias Marques, Sandra Marisa Pelloso, and Maria Dalva De Barros

- Carvalho. 2021. Predictors of violence against health professionals during the COVID-19 pandemic in Brazil: A cross-sectional study. *PLoS ONE* 16: e0253398. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- Bowen, Frances, and Kate Blackmon. 2020. Enhancing workplace communication to prevent violence: A focus on the vertical dimension. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 28: 489–502. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Brunetto, Yvonne, Nasim Saheli, Thomas Dick, and Silvia Nelson. 2021. Psychosocial safety climate, psychological capital, healthcare SLBs' wellbeing and innovative behaviour during the COVID 19 pandemic. *Public Performance & Management Review* 45: 751–72. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Caillier, James Gerard. 2020. The impact of workplace aggression on employee satisfaction with job stress, meaningfulness of work, and turnover intentions. *Public Personnel Management* 50: 159–82. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Cameron, Kim, and Barbara L. Fredrickson. 2018. *Positivity: Groundbreaking Research Reveals the Power of Positive Emotions to Energize Our Lives, Improve Our Health, and Achieve Success*. Harper Perennial. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Cavanagh, Jillian, Patricia Pariona-Cabrera, and Timothy Bartram. 2021. Guest editorial. *Personnel Review* 50: i–xi. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Civilotti, Cristina, Sabrina Berlanda, and Laura Iozzino. 2021. Hospital-Based Healthcare Workers Victims of Workplace Violence in Italy: A Scoping Review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 18: 5860. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Corrêa, Jonathan Saidelles, Luis Felipe Dias Lopes, Damiana Machado De Almeida, and M. E. Camargo. 2019. Workplace well-being and burnout syndrome: Opposite faces in penitentiary work. *RAM. Revista De Administração Mackenzie* 20: 1–30. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- D'Amato, Alessia. 2023. From research to action and back again: The long journey of organizational climate—A literature review and a summative framework. *Journal of General Management*, 1–18. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Diab, Ahmed, Hend M. Diab, and Dina H. Emam. 2021. How Does Organizational Climate Contribute to Job Satisfaction and Commitment of Agricultural Extension Personnel in New Valley Governorate, Egypt? *Alexandria Science Exchange Journal* 42: 749–59. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Dopelt, Keren, Nadav Davidovitch, Anna Stupak, Rachel Ben Ayun, Anna Lev Eltsufin, and Chezy Levy. 2022. Workplace Violence against Hospital Workers during the COVID-19 Pandemic in Israel: Implications for Public Health. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 19: 4659. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Dumazert, Jean-Pierre, and Jean-Michel Plane. 2012. Negative Deviant Behaviors in the Workplace: Causes and Impacts to Co-workers and Human Relations. *Revue de Gestion des Ressources Humaines* 86: 52–63. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Einarsen, Staale, Helge Hoel, and Guy Notelaers. 2009. Measuring exposure to bullying and harassment at work: Validity, factor structure and psychometric properties of the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised. *Work and Stress* 23: 24–44. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Elsamani, Yousif, Cristian Mejia, and Yuya Kajikawa. 2023. Employee Well-Being and Innovativeness: A Multi-Level Conceptual Framework Based on Citation Network Analysis and Data Mining Techniques. *PLoS ONE* 18: e0280005. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Ghareeb, Nanees S., Dalia A. El-Shafei, and Afaf M. Eladl. 2021. Workplace Violence among Healthcare Workers during COVID-19 Pandemic in a Jordanian Governmental Hospital: The Tip of the Iceberg. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 28: 6141–49. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Gorgenyi-Hegyes, Eva, Robert Jeyakumar Nathan, and Maria Fekete-Farkas. 2021. Workplace Health Promotion, Employee Wellbeing and Loyalty during COVID-19 Pandemic—Large Scale Empirical Evidence from Hungary. *Economies* 9: 55. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Hsu, Mei-Chi, Mei-Hsien Chou, and Wen-Chen Ouyang. 2022. Dilemmas and Repercussions of Workplace Violence against Emergency Nurses: A Qualitative Study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 19: 2661. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Jackson, Jeff, Nevin Harper, and Scott McLean. 2021. Trust, Workload, Outdoor Adventure Leadership, and Organizational Safety Climate. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation, Education, and Leadership* 13: 3–16. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Jones, A., and B. Smith. 2019. The impact of vertical communication on organizational climate and employee well-being. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 42: 321–35.
- Kahtani, Nasser Saad Al, and M. M. Sulphay. 2022. A study on how psychological capital, social capital, workplace wellbeing, and employee engagement relate to task performance. *SAGE Open* 12: 1–18. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Kakhki, Mojtaba Kaffashan, Alireza Hadadian, Ehsan Namdar Joyame, and Nargess Malakooti Asl. 2020. Understanding librarians' knowledge sharing behavior: The role of organizational climate, motivational drives and leadership empowerment. *Library & Information Science Research* 42: 100998. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Karapinar, Pinar Bayhan, Selin Metin Camgoz, and Ozge Tayfur Ekmekci. 2019. Employee Wellbeing, workaholism, Work–Family Conflict and Instrumental spousal support: A moderated mediation model. *Journal of Happiness Studies* 21: 2451–71. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Kessler, Stacey. 2019. Are the Costs Worth the Benefits? Shared Perception and the Aggregation of Organizational Climate Ratings. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 40: 1046–54. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Khan, Shumaiz, Jugindar Singh, Kartar Singh, Devinder Kaur, and Thilageswary Arumugam. 2020. Mindfulness in an Age of Digital Distraction and the Effect of Mindfulness on Employee Engagement, Wellbeing, and Perceived Stress. *Global Business and Management Research: An International Journal* 12: 77–86.
- Kim, Sunhee, and Jaesun Wang. 2018. The role of job demands-resources (JDR) between service workers' emotional labor and burnout: New directions for labor policy at local government. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 15: 2894. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Köllen, Thomas, Andri Koch, and Andreas Hack. 2019. Nationalism at Work: Introducing the 'Nationality-Based Organizational Climate Inventory' and Assessing Its Impact on the Turnover Intention of Foreign Employees. *Management International Review* 60: 97–122. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

- Kulikowski, Konrad, and Jarosław Orzechowski. 2018. All employees need job resources-testing the job demands-resources theory among employees with either high or low working memory and fluid intelligence. *Medycyna Pracy* 69: 483–96. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Lee, D. 2018. Communication climate and workplace violence: Understanding the role of vertical communication. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 36: 215–28.
- Li, Fei, Xiaoyong Liang, and Quanle Liu. 2022. Applying Attachment Theory to Explain Boundary-Spanning Behavior: The Role of Organizational Support Climate. *Revista de Psicología Del Trabajo Y de Las Organizaciones* 38: 213–22. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Luthufi, M., Jatin Pandey, and Biju Varkkey. 2020. Influence of organizational climate on prosocial organizational behavior. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations: Economics & Social Dev* 55: 604–16.
- Maidaniuc-Chirilă, Teodora. 2020. Workplace Bullying Phenomenon: A Review of Explaining Theories and Models. *Annals of the "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University Psychology Series* 29: 63–85.
- Malik, Akanksha, Shuchi Sinha, and Sanjay Goel. 2021. A Qualitative Review of 18 Years of Research on Workplace Deviance: New Vectors and Future Research Directions. *Human Performance* 34: 271–97. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Maran, Daniela Acquadro, Antonella Varetto, Cristina Civilotti, and Nicola Magnavita. 2022. Prevalence and Consequences of Verbal Aggression among Bank Workers: A Survey into an Italian Banking Institution. *Administrative Sciences* 12: 78. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Michalak, Joanna Małgorzata. 2019. Project managers' individual temporal perspective and positive organizational climate: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Positive Management* 10: 45–58. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Mitchell, Marie, and Maureen Ambrose. 2007. Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92: 1159–68. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Molleda, Juan-Carlos, and Mary Ann Ferguson. 2019. Public relations roles and responsibilities in Brazil: A survey of practitioners. *Public Relations Review* 45: 101–14.
- Morrow, D. W., A. V. Carron, and R. S. Vealey. 2022. *Communication and Team Collaboration in Sport and Exercise Psychology*. London: Routledge.
- Mueller, C. F. 2023. Employee engagement: A review of current theories and practices. *Journal of Management* 49: 1–32.
- Mueller, Lukas Andreas, and Panita Surachaikulwattana. 2020. The influence of cultural differences on human relation aspects of organizational climate and job satisfaction. *UTCC International Journal of Business and Economics* 12: 89–108.
- Nathan, Ganesh. 2022. Meaningfulness at Work: Wellbeing, Employeeship and Dignity in the Workplace. *The IUP Journal of Soft Skills* 18: 16–42. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Osmani, Fadil, Sherif Sejdiu, and Gezim Jusufi. 2022. Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction. *Management* 27: 361–77. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Ozsoy, Tugba. 2022. The Effect of Innovative Organizational Climate on Employee Job Satisfaction. *Marketing and Management of Innovations* 2: 9–16. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Pacheco, Emelda, Ana Bártolo, Fabiana Rodrigues, Anabela Pereira, João Duarte, and Carlos Da Silva. 2021. Impact of psychological aggression at the workplace on Employees' health: A Systematic Review of Personal Outcomes and Prevention Strategies. *Psychological Reports* 124: 929–76. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- Patterson, K. 2021. *Crucial Conversations: Tools for Talking When Stakes Are High*. New York: Penguin Random House.
- Patterson, M. G., and J. L. Mueller. 2020. Internal communication during organizational change: A review of the literature and directions for future research. *Journal of Management* 46: 7–38.
- Platts, Katharine, Jeff Breckon, and Ellen Marshall. 2022. Enforced Home-Working under Lockdown and Its Impact on Employee Wellbeing: A Cross-Sectional Study. *BMC Public Health* 22: 199. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- Ponting, Sandra Sun-Ah. 2019. Organizational Identity Change: Impacts on Hotel Leadership and Employee Wellbeing. *The Service Industries Journal* 40: 6–26. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Quifors, Stefan, Jing Yi Chan, and Miss Bing Dai. 2021. Workplace Wellbeing during COVID-19: Aotearoa New Zealand Employers' Perceptions of Workplace Wellbeing Initiatives and Their Limitations. *New Zealand Journal of Applied Business Research* 17: 1–18.
- Rimbayana, Terisius Andreas Kasman, Anita Erari, and Siti Aisyah. 2022. The influence of competence, cooperation and organizational climate on employee performance with work motivation as a mediation variable (Study on the Food and Agriculture Office Clump of Merauke Regency). *Technium Social Sciences Journal* 27: 556–78. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Roberge, Marie-Èlène, Qiumei Jane Xu, Anna Lisa Aydin, and Wen-Rou Huang. 2021. An Inclusive Organizational Climate: Conceptualization, Antecedents, and Multi-Level Consequences. *American Journal of Management* 21: 97–115. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Salleh, Eva Salmee Mohd, Zuraina Dato' Mansor, Siti Rohaida Mohamed Zainal, and Ida Md. Yasin. 2020. Multilevel analysis on employee wellbeing: The roles of authentic leadership, rewards, and meaningful work. *Asian Academy of Management Journal/Asian Academy of Management Journal* 25: 123–46. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Schablon, Anja, Jan Felix Kersten, Albert Nienhaus, Hans Werner Kottkamp, Wilfried Schnieder, Greta Ullrich, Karin Schäfer, Lisa Ritzenhöfer, Claudia Peters, and Tanja Wirth. 2022. Risk of Burnout among Emergency Department Staff as a Result of Violence and Aggression from Patients and Their Relatives. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 19: 4945. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Somani, Rozina, Carles Muntaner, Edith Hillan, Alisa Velonis, and Peter Smith. 2021. A Systematic Review: Effectiveness of Interventions to De-escalate Workplace Violence against Nurses in Healthcare Settings. *Safety and Health at Work* 12: 289–95. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Sora, Beatriz, Amparo Caballer, and M. Esther García-Buades. 2021. Human Resource Practices and Employee Wellbeing from a Gender Perspective: The Role of Organizational Justice. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología* 53: 37–46. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

- Sorribes, Joan, Dolors Celma, and Esther Martínez-García. 2021. Sustainable Human Resources Management in Crisis Contexts: Interaction of Socially Responsible Labour Practices for the Wellbeing of Employees. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 28: 936–52. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Stahl-Gugger, Alenka, and Oliver Hämmig. 2022. Prevalence and health correlates of workplace violence and discrimination against hospital employees—A cross-sectional study in German-speaking Switzerland. *BMC Health Services Research* 22: 1. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Stankevičienė, Asta, Virginijus Tamaševičius, Danuta Diskienė, Žygimantas Grakauskas, and Liana Rudinskaja. 2021. The mediating effect of work-life balance on the relationship between work culture and employee well-being. *Journal of Business Economics and Management* 22: 988–1007. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Suwarnajote, Napasri, and Witthaya Mekhum. 2020. The Impact of Human Resource Practices on Employee Wellbeing of the Pharmacy Firms in Thailand. *Systematic Review Pharmacy* 11: 425–33.
- Tadesse, Worku Mekonnen. 2019. The Interface between Organizational Climate and Work Passion: A Case Study of Selected Private Institutions in Ethiopia. *Journal of IMS Group* 16: 1–13.
- Taj, Ashbel, Shahid Ali, Zafar Zaheer, and Mehnaz Gul. 2020. Impact of Envy on Employee Wellbeing: Role of Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Behavioural Sciences* 30: 97–117.
- Tantaru, Oana, Luiza Mesesan Schmitz, and Horia Moasa. 2021. The impact of emotional intelligence on organizational climate. *Series VII—Social Sciences and LAW* 14: 89–100. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Vévodová, Šárka, Jiří Vévoda, and Bronislava Grygová. 2020. Mobbing, Subjective Perception, Demographic Factors, and Prevalence of Burnout Syndrome in Nurses. *Central European Journal of Public Health* 28: 57–64. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Vos, Lynn, and Stephen Page. 2020. Marketization, performative environments, and the impact of organizational climate on teaching practice in business schools. *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 19: 59–80. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Vveinhardt, Jolita, and Włodzimierz Sroka. 2020. Innovations in Human Resources Management: Instruments to Eliminate Mobbing. *Marketing and Management of Innovations* 2: 182–95. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Wardono, Gadang, Anoesyirwan Moeins, and Widodo Sunaryo. 2022. Influence of Organizational Climate on OCB and Employee Engagement. *Journal of World Science* 1: 560–69. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Wech, Barbara A., Jack Howard, and Pamela Autrey. 2020. Workplace Bullying Model: A Qualitative Study on Bullying in Hospitals. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* 32: 73–96. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Welch, Mary, and Paul R. Jackson. 2007. Rethinking internal communication: A stakeholder approach. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* 12: 177–98. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Xu, Ziqing, Huilin Wang, and Sid Suntrayuth. 2022. Organizational climate, innovation orientation, and innovative work behavior: The mediating role of psychological safety and intrinsic motivation. *Discrete Dynamics in Nature and Society* 2022: 1–10. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Zhou, Xiang, Samma Faiz Rasool, and Dawei Ma. 2020. The Relationship between Workplace Violence and Innovative Work Behavior: The Mediating Roles of Employee Wellbeing. *Healthcare* 8: 332. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.