RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP STYLE, WORKING STRESS AND ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AMONG UNIVERSITY EMPLOYEES IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Tanja Gavrić
University "Vitez" Travnik, Bosnia and Herzegovina,tanja.gavric@unvi.edu.ba,
Jamila Jaganjac
University "Vitez" Travnik, Bosnia and Herzegovina,jamila.jaganjac@unvi.edu.ba,

Abstract: Research about organizational justice addresses the impact of justice on the effective functioning of an organization (Colquitt et al., 2001). In the last 30 years or so, it has been extensively researched in the field of leadership and organizational behavior and has thus become an extremely popular field of research. Scientists have recognized its importance as a source of motivation at work, an essential factor in selection employees moral judgment, different leadership styles, work and organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational loyalty, work performance and responsible organizational behavior (Colquitt et al., 2001; Gilliland and Chan, 2001). Injustice carries a mechanism of stress and this idea is supported by studies showing that the perception of injustice creates stress and stress-related health problems through directly influence strain and mediating or moderating the relationship of stress and tension (Judge and Colquitt, 2004). The dimensions of organizational justice have significant connections between psychological distress and stress symptoms of depression, anxiety and emotional exhaustion (Tepper, 2000). Employees who are more stressed might be more alerted for unjust situations. Stressful situations and individual characteristics/attitudes might be more affective on the formation of justice perceptions in a highly complex work environment. Stress refers to the response of a person to the stimulus imposed on him. It is the situation where the well-being of an individual is challenged by different demands expected to be fulfilled at his end (Erkutlu & Chafra, 2006). Stress is recognized in the modern world as an important factor influencing health. Also, work stress can be increased or decreased by the impact of different leadership styles, which can also affect the employee perception of organizational justice. Leadership is a concept that has been seen as a key success factor since the first civilizations both smaller organizational units and even entire states. History tells us how leadership has been approached in different ways at different times, in accordance with which they are developed and many approaches to leadership as one of the fundamental phenomena of the organization and management field. Leadership, as the only real managerial function, is treated through a comparison of transactional and transformational styles, as two in the literature most often treated and in many ways almost opposed styles of leadership. A leadership style can also improve employee engagement, employee satisfaction, and employee enthusiasm for work (Alok & Israel, 2012). The aim of this paper is to investigate the role of leadership style and work stress on employees' perceptions of organizational justice in higher education. The paper also examines whether there are differences in perceptions of stressors and organizational justice between genders and scientific teaching title. Descriptive statistics and statistical tests were used to analyze the primary research data.
Keywords: work stress, leadership style, organizational justice, higher education.

1. INTRODUCTION

Organizational leaders play such an important role as they may shape follower's awareness of work through distributing tasks, setting goals, appraising performance, or motivating them. In general, leadership is an influencing process resulting from perceptions of leaders' behaviors from the perspective of followers (Bass, 1990). Per definition, leadership is "the ability of an individual to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organizations of which they are members" (House, Javidan, Hanges, & Dorfman, 2002, p. 5). Stress has become a major concern not only to the individuals, but also to the organizations (Yamaguchi, Kim, Oshio & Akutsu, 2017; Eddy, Wertheim, Kingsley & Wright, 2017). Literature identifies six basic environmental factors including demand, control, support, and relationship at work, roles and organizational change to have a potential impact on employees' well-being, ultimately leading to poor organizational outcomes (Mackay et al. 2004). A first promising link for organizations to handle the challenge of work stress and its consequences is to draw on supervisors and their influence on their employees. Supervisors may shape working conditions, attitudes and behaviors of their employees (Bass, 1990; Yukl et al., 2013) and, therefore, play a crucial role in the process of stress management in organizations.

As it is their assignment to sustain and enhance the performance capability of the organization, supervisors have to lead the charge to influence their employees' levels of work stress. They may do this by creating calm working conditions or by directly supporting their employees. Organizational justice refers to an individual's personal

evaluation of whether or not an organization has treated him or her fairly from an ethical and moral standpoint. Organizational justice dimensions have significant relationships between psychological distress and stress symptoms of depression, anxiety and emotional exhaustion (Tepper, 2000 p. 2001). Researchers have investigated the relationship between work role stressors and a variety of consequences such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational justice, job performance and turnover (Cai, Jia & Li, 2017). Organizational justice perceptions are considered as an additional source of stress (Seckin-Celik & Çoban, 2016). Adams (1963) proposed that inequity carries a stress mechanism and this idea has been supported by further studies showing that injustice perception produces stress and stress related health problems via directly influence strain, and via mediating or moderating the stress and strain relationship.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1. Leadership style
While formal and empirical research on leadership dates back to the last centuries of the 1930s, (Alimo-Metcalfe, Alban-Metcalfe, 2001), where much of this research has begun debates about whether to measure leadership in terms of inherent abilities, skills, or style , many current theories of leadership are based on style. Leadership style refers to a kind of relationship whereby someone uses his ways and methods to make many people work together for a common task (Nwokolo, Ifeanacho & Anazodo, 2017). While traditional leadership theories are based on the leader's control of certain aspects of the environment such as reward and punishment, job characteristics, attitudes toward authority, resources, training, and the following perception of one's own environment, from the 1970s, a new generation of leadership theory emerged to inspirational, visionary, and symbolic behavior — which, according to Weber, is called charismatic (House et al., 1991). Unlike these traditional models where the leader-follower relationship is based on the assumption of economic costs and benefits, the new leadership models emphasize the symbolic behavior of the leader - visionaries, inspirational messages, emotional feelings, ideological and moral values, individualized attention, and intellectual stimulation. (Avolio et al., 2009). New leaders motivate followers to make significant personal sacrifices to the detriment of their own interests, and for the benefit of a larger collective.What is important to point out is that these leadership models depend on certain factors that can be quantified. Using the ideas originally presented by Burns in 1978, Bass applied the concept of transactional and transformational leadership to business organizations in 1985 (Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995). Bass's (1985) concept of transactional and transformational leadership is a Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) that includes seven leadership factors, labeled as: charismatic, inspiring, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, contingent reward, exception management, and laissez-faire leadership.

In later writings, Bass pointed out that, although charismatic and inspiring leadership represent a single creation, they often do not differ empirically, thus reducing the original multifactor model to six factors instead of seven (Bass, 1999). *Transactional leadership style* is defined as the exchange of rewards and targets between employees and management (Howell &Avolio, 1993). Transactional leaders fulfill employee needs of rewards when targets are met (Howell & Avolio, 1993). Pounder (2002) defines this style as the transaction of needs fulfillment from both sides of the organization and employees. Avolio et al. (2009) defined *transformational leadership* as a system of leadership which transforms and inspires followers to perform beyond expectations while transcending self-interest for the good of the establishment that employed them. Transformational leaders change their organization's culture by inspiring a sense of mission and purpose about the importance of the group's work and stimulating new ways of thinking and problem solving. They inspire the individuals within the organization to achieve high performance. Although some empirical research has confirmed the positive impact of a transformational leader on followers and organizational performance (Dvir, Eden, Avolio, Shamir, 2002), several authors have criticized transformational leadership (Beyer, 1999; Hunt, 1999; Yukl, 1999) because they were not in opportunities to replicate the six-factor model. Transformational leadership, also called charismatic leadership (House, 1976), is one of the most researched leadership styles. Transactional leaders are those who, through social change, as politicians who offer one thing for another, a job for a voice, or in the absence of productivity, do not provide benefits (Bass, 2006). The focus is therefore on exchanging benefits between leaders and followers. These exchanges enable leaders to achieve their goals, fulfill desired tasks, maintain the current organizational situation, motivate followers through contractual agreements, direct followers' behavior toward meeting set goals, focus on side rewards, avoid unnecessary risk, and focus on improving organizational efficiency (McCleskey , 2014). However, what has been shown through research is that transactional leadership alone does not have large effects on follower job satisfaction or performance, —it is more effective in combination with other leadership styles (Aldoory, Toth, 2004). Transactional leaders make an impact by setting goals, seeking desired outcomes, providing feedback, and rewarding for achievement (Dvir et al., 2002) A major aspect of transformational leadership is its emphasis on follower development. A transformational leader values the potential of his subordinates in terms of being able to meet current obligations, also anticipating an

increase in their future responsibilities. In contrast, transaction leaders expect subordinates to meet agreed goals, but do not encourage them to take greater responsibility for personal development as well as leading others (Dvir et al., 2002).

2.2.Working stress

A state of stress at work can be defined as a series of, for an individual, harmful, physiological, psychological and behavioral reactions to situations in which the demands of the job are not in line with his abilities, capabilities and needs (Sauter and Murphy, 1998). In the European Union, work-related stress (WRS), right after back pain, is the second most common work-related problem affecting 28% of workers in the EU. Literature identifies six basic environmental factors including demand, control, support, and relationship at work, roles and organizational change to have a potential impact on employees 'well-being, ultimately leading to poor organizational outcomes (Mackay et al. 2004). Among these, role stressors have been identified as common sources of work stress in the literature (Hill, Chênevert & Poitras, 2015). Stress is considered to not only affect the physical and mental health of employees, but the business as well. Stressed workers show withdrawal behaviors such as a cynicism toward work, lack of organizational commitment and intention to leave the organisation. Stress will lead to lower productivity and this is a threat to the organizational competitiveness (Vanishree, 2014). Keeping in view the empirical, academic, theoretical and practical importance, the present study has focused on three important types of role stressors as explanatory variables; i.e. role ambiguity, role conflict and role overload. Role ambiguity represents the uncertainty felt by a focal actor and occurs when an individual does not have clear or explicit information about the expectations of his or her role in the job or organization (Rizzo, House & Lirtzman, 1970). role conflict is understood as the simultaneous occurrence of two (or more) role outputs or requirements, in such a way that the performance of one of them makes the performance of the other more diffcult (Katz & Kahn, 1970, p. 213). Role overload refers to the sheer amount of work required and a limited time frame in which work must be completed.

2.3.Organizational justice

Organizational justice is a personal evaluation of the ethical and moral standings of managerial conduct (Van der Bank et al., 2010). organizational justice perceptions may lead to significant organizational outcomes, such as well-being, satisfaction, emotional exhaustion, and performance (Colquitt et al., 2013). Justice within the organization is viewed as a subjective and descriptive concept because it captures what the individual employees believe to be right, rather than an objective reality or a prescriptive moral code (Nwokolo et.al., 2016). Employees appraise the outcome in workplace based on three components of justice namely: distributive, procedural and interactional justice (Cropanzano, Bowen and Gillland, 2007). *Distributive justice* pertains to an employees" perception of fairness in decision outcomes and resource allocation (Saks, 2006). *Procedural justice* refers to employees" perceptions of fairness in the means and processes used to determine the amount and distribution of resources (Saks, 2006). *Interactional Justice* refers to the quality of interpersonal treatment employees receive when procedures are implemented (Colquitt et al, 2001).

Based on preceding literature review, the following hypotheses are developed:

H1: There are differences in perceptions of organizational justice and stressor between genders and academic title

H2: Leadership style is posetively related with perceived organizational justice among academic staff

H3: Work stress is negatively related with perceived organizational justice among academic staff

3. METHODOLOGY

Sample Design: There were 100 responses to the questionnaire, among 116 invited to participate. An invitation to complete the online questionnaire was sent to professors, assistant professors, assistants, and lecturers of University „Vitez„ and of some partner institutions from Croatia, Serbia, and Slovenia. There were 61 male and 39 female participants in the survey. 29% of respondents are between 35 and 44 years old, followed by 27% of respondents between 25 and 34 years old; 21% between 45 and 55 years old, 18% are over 55 years, while only 5% are up to 25 years old. The majority of respondents have between 5 and 10 years of work experience in higher education (34%). 29% of respondents have less than 5 years of work experience; 23% of respondents have more than 15 years of work experience, and 14% have between 10 and 15 years of work experience. Most of the respondents are Assistant Professor, 39% of them; 32% are Assistant or Senior Assistant, 28% are professors and only 1% proofreaders.

Instruments and Measures: Both primary and secondary data have been used to draw appropriate conclusions. Multiple regressions analysis was applied to find out the impact of work stressors and leadership styles onorganizational justice. The research employed three different instruments namely, Multifactor Leadership questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and Avolio, (1989) and it comprises eight items, measuring the perception of transactional and transformational leadership styles, with four (4) Items for each. The instrument used a five point scale the Likert-type response categories: (1) Strongly, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree and (5) Strongly Agree. The second instrument was adapted from Organizational justice Scale. It was developed by Moliner (2004).

The scale measure distributive, procedural and interactional justice and was based on a five-point Likert scale and responses were based on (strongly disagree-1 to strongly agree-5). Third instrument used in the study measures work stress scale was adopted by Vanishree (2014). The response options for each item ranged from strongly disagree-1 to strongly agree-5.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 illustrates the summary table of mean and standard deviation of organizational justice and work stressors among academic staff. Also, the T-test was used to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference in perception between men and women, as well as the difference based on the academic title. Respondents were asked to evaluate certain statements describing organizational justice, work stress, and leadership style. The questions were evaluated on a 5-point Likert scale, where 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = mostly disagree; 3 = not sure; 4 = mostly agree; 5 = I completely agree. When it comes to organizational justice, both groups of respondents generally disagree or are unsure how their compensation is related to the quality of the work they perform, and they often do not feel rewarded in their work. They generally disagree or are unsure that the procedures used to evaluate their performance are fair, as well as the procedures used in their promotion. Also, respondents are unsure whether their supervisor is very honest with them, whether it offers adequate justification for decisions made related to their work, and generally disagrees that he treats them with respect and dignity. The T-test showed that there was no significant statistical difference in responses between women and men. Respondents have a similar attitude when it comes to work stress, that is, there is no statistically significant difference in responses. Thus, respondents generally disagree with the statements that "They are not sure what is expected of them," There is a mismatch between their abilities and the demands of their job, "and generally disagree with the statement that they receive incompatible requests from two or more people at the same time.

Tabel 1. Descriptive statistics – gender differences

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	T-test
ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE	Female	60	2,7667	,90884	,11733	t = -0,804, p = 0,403 >0,05. There is no significant statistical difference between the two groups of respondents
	Male	39	2,9231	,89984	,14409	
	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	T-test
WORK STRESSORS	Female	60	2,450	1,03211	0,13325	t = -0,800, p = 0,426 >0,05 There is no significant statistical difference between the two groups of respondents
	Male	39	2,6154	0,96287	0,15418	
	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	
TRANSFORMATIONAL	Female	60	3,0500	1,08025	,13946	t = -0,555, p = 0,245 >0,05 There is no significant statistical difference between the two groups of respondents
	Male	39	3,1795	1,21117	,19394	
	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	T-test
TRANSACTIONAL	Female	60	3,3167	1,17158	,15125	t = -1,172, p = 0,244 >0,05 There is no significant statistical difference between the two groups of respondents
	Male	39	3,5897	1,06914	,17120	

Table 2, similar to the previous table, shows the answers between two groups of respondents who differ by academic title. Thus, there is a statistically significant difference in the perception of organizational justice as well as leadership style between professors and assistants. Namely, assistants and senior assistants perceive more organizational justice in relation to their professors (full-time, part-time). Assistants and senior assistants rate their leaders or superiors more as transformational leaders, while professors generally disagree with claims that their superiors closely monitor their work to ensure they are doing their job properly, not allowing others to think about

old problems in new ways. There is no statistically significant difference (t = 1,880, p = 0.056> 0.05) when it comes to transactional leadership style, as both groups of respondents generally agree that their superior is satisfied when the agreed standards are met and gives recognition / awards when achieve goals. Both groups of respondents generally disagree with the statement describing work stress.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics – academic title differences

	Academic title	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	T-test
ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE	profesor (redovni, vanredni)	27	2,5926	,84395	,16242	t=2,089 (p= 0,041 < 0,05)
	asistent/viši asistent	32	3,0625	,87759	,15514	
STRESSORS	profesor (redovni, vanredni)	27	2,7407	,94432	,18173	t=0,304 (p= 0,762 > 0,05)
	asistent/viši asistent	32	2,6563	1,15310	,20384	
TRANSFORMATIONAL	profesor (redovni, vanredni)	27	2,7778	1,18754	,22854	t=2,515 (p= 0,015 < 0,05)
	asistent/viši asistent	32	3,5000	,98374	,17390	
TRANSACTIONAL	profesor (redovni, vanredni)	27	3,1852	1,27210	,24482	t=1,880 (p= 0,056 > 0,05)
	asistent/viši asistent	32	3,7188	,81258	,14364	

The Table 3 result of Anova test jointly showed Regression value of 38.926 with 4 degree of freedom and P-value of .000 which is less than alpha value. Since the p-value (probability) of .000 is less than 0.05, the results indicate that the overall model is statistically significant (F = 37.134, p = 0.000). This illustrates that leadership style and work stressors significantly impact on perceived organizational justice among university professors and assistants.

Table 3. Analysis based on the ANOVA table

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	38,926	4	9,732	37,134	,000[b]
	Residual	24,634	94	,262		
	Total	63,560	98			

a. Dependent Variable: ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE
b. Predictors: (Constant), STRESSORS, TRANSACTIONAL, TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADER

Table 4. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,709[a]	,502	,486	,64788

a. Predictors: (Constant), STRESSORS, TRANSFORMATIONAL, TRANSACTIONAL LEADER

The result in table 5 indicates final findings of the second and third hypothesis of this paper which stated that leadership style is posetively related with perceived organizational justice among academic staff, and work stress is negatively related with perceived organizational justice. Table 5 shows a regression model of the influence of selected independent variables on the dependent variables. The transactional leader has the greatest influence on the perception of organizational justice " 0.340, and it is also statistically significant, because p = 0.000 <0.05. Also, the transformational leader has a positive influence on the perception of organizational justice, the beta coefficient is 0.241, p = 0.009> 0.05. As assumed in the third hypothesis, work stressors has a negative impact on organizational justice, because the beta coefficient is -0.179, and at the significance level of 5%, the p-value is 0.007> 0.05.

Table 5. Value of the model coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1,367	,265		5,149	,000
	TRANSFORMATIONAL	,241	,090	,301	2,687	,009
	TRANSACTIONAL	,340	,089	,427	3,808	,000
	STRESSORS	-,179	,065	-,199	-2,743	,007

Dependent Variable: ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE

This research resulted in partial acceptance of the first hypothesis and acceptance of the second and third hypotheses. The difference in responses between men and women in the perception of organizational justice and work stress was tested. However, there was no statistically significant difference in responses. There is a difference in responses at the academic level, so professors experience greater organizational injustice than assistants. These results indicate that professors most often feel that the procedures used to decide on compensation and other income (premiums, etc.), to evaluate their work, and for their advancement are not fair enough. The second hypothesis showed how the academic staff from the sample perceived positively both the transformational leadership style and the transactional leadership style, that is, that these two styles positively affect the perceived organizational justice of 0.232. Similarly, not rejecting the third hypothesis shows stress negatively affecting organizational justice among academic staff.

5. CONCLUSION

The aim of this research is to broaden the understanding of the role of work stress and leadership style on the perception of organizational justice of individuals in the workplace. The results of the study showed that work stress negatively affects the overall perception of organizational justice of academic staff. Also, leadership style is positively related to the overall perception of justice, especially transactional leadership style. Both leadership styles, transformational and transactional leadership, have a statistically significant impact on the perception of organizational justice among academic staff. Work stressors and leadership styles explain 48.60% of the perception of organizational justice (Table 4). Thus, there are other variables besides stress and leadership style in explaining employees 'perceptions of justice. The characteristics of the work environment can be examined in more detail, and additional variables such as organizational culture / climate, ethical behavior in the workplace can be used to better understand organizational justice. The results also support management in creating cerating policy and designing training programs with an emphasis on leadership, stress, and organizational justice. Because work stressorss leads to a reduction in organizational equity, managers and other individuals in leading positions need to adopt a transactional leadership style or a transformational leadership style because it will improve perceived organizational justice.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Adams, J. S. (1963). Towards an understanding of inequity. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *67*(5), 422.

Aldoory, L., & Toth, E. (2004). Leadership and gender in public relations: Perceived effectiveness of transformational and transactional leadership styles. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *16*(2), 157-183.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B., & Alban-Metcalfe, R. J. (2001). The development of a new transformational leadership questionnaire. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, *74*(1), 1-27.

Alok, K., & Israel, D. (2012). Authentic leadership & work engagement. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 498-510.

Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual review of psychology*, *60*, 421-449.

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational dynamics*, *18*(3), 19-31.

Bycio, P., Hackett, R. D., & Allen, J. S. (1995). Further assessments of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of applied psychology*, *80*(4), 468.

Cai, Y., Jia, L., & Li, J. (2017). Dual-level transformational leadership and team information elaboration: The mediating role of relationship conflict and moderating role of middle way thinking. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, *34*(2), 399-421.

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: a meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of applied psychology*, *86*(3), 425.

Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *Academy of management perspectives*, *21*(4), 34-48.

Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of management journal*, *45*(4), 735-744.

Eddy, P., Wertheim, E. H., Kingsley, M., & Wright, B. J. (2017). Associations between the effort-reward imbalance model of workplace stress and indices of cardiovascular health: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *83*, 252-266.

Erkutlu, H. V., & Chafra, J. (2006). Relationship between leadership power bases and job stress of subordinates: example from boutique hotels. *Management Research News*.

Gilliland, S. C. D. (2001). Justice in organizations: Theory, methods, and applications. U N. Anderson, DS Ones, HK Sinangili C. Viswesvaran (Ur.), Handbook of industrial, work and organizational psychology (Vol. 2, str. 143–165).

Hill, K., Chênevert, D., & Poitras, J. (2015). Changes in relationship conflict as a mediator of the longitudinal relationship between changes in role ambiguity and turnover intentions. *International Journal of Conflict Management*.

House, R., Javidan, M., Hanges, P., & Dorfman, P. (2002). Understanding cultures and implicit leadership theories across the globe: an introduction to project GLOBE. *Journal of world business*, *37*(1), 3-10.

House, R.J.,& Spangler, W.D., & Woycke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in the U.S. presidency: A psychological theory of leadership effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 36, 364—396.

Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. *Journal of applied psychology*, *78*(6), 891.

Judge, T. A., & Colquitt, J. A. (2004). Organizational justice and stress: the mediating role of work-family conflict. *Journal of applied psychology*, *89*(3), 395.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. (1970). Open systems theory. *Readings on Organization Theory: Open-Systems Approaches*, 13-32.

MacKay, D. G., Shafto, M., Taylor, J. K., Marian, D. E., Abrams, L., & Dyer, J. R. (2004). Relations between emotion, memory, and attention: Evidence from taboo Stroop, lexical decision, and immediate memory tasks. *Memory & Cognition*, *32*(3), 474-488.

McCleskey, J. A. (2014). Situational, transformational, and transactional leadership and leadership development. *Journal of business studies quarterly*, *5*(4), 117.

Nwokolo, E. E., Ifeanacho, N. C., & Anazodo, N. N. (2017). Perceived organizational justice and leadership styles as predictors of employee engagement in the organization. *Nile Journal of Business and Economics*, *2*(4), 16-28.

Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative science quarterly*, 150-163.

Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of managerial psychology*.

Sauter, S. L., Hurrell, J., Murphy, L., & Levi, L. (1998). Psychosocial and organizational factors. *Encyclopaedia of occupational health and safety*, *2*, 34-1.

Seckin-Celik, T., & ÇOBAN, A. (2016). The Effect of Work Stress and Coping on Organizational Justice: An Empirical Investigation of Turkish Telecommunications and Banking Industries. *Management (18544223)*, *11*(4).

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of management journal*, *43*(2), 178-190.

Vanishree, P. (2014). Impact of role ambiguity, role conflict and role overload on job stress in small and medium scale industries. *Research Journal of Management Sciences*, *3*(1), 10-13.

Yamaguchi, A., Kim, M. S., Oshio, A., & Akutsu, S. (2017). The role of anger regulation on perceived stress status and physical health. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *116*, 240-245.

Yukl, G., Mahsud, R., Hassan, S., & Prussia, G. E. (2013). An improved measure of ethical leadership. *Journal of leadership & organizational studies*, *20*(1), 38-48.