Exploring the Impact of Indian and Non-Indian Holiday Schedules on Organizational Stress

Soma Sharma [1]
Sarbjit Singh Oberoi [2]
Gayathri Band [3]

Abstract

Purpose : The study examined the impact of work-holiday schedules on organizational stress levels among Indian employees. We discovered the significance of sustainability reports in the minds of shareholders as a result of the increased importance of responding to global warming.

Methodology : In the information technology and service industries, 193 workers were taken into consideration for this study; 100 of them observed the Indian Holiday Calendar (IHC), whereas 93 observed the Non-Indian Holiday Calendar (NIHC). The stress levels were measured using the AUDIT organizational stress screening tool, and any significant differences between the two groups were found using independent sample *t*-tests and correlational analyses.

Findings : The findings demonstrated that workers who observed non-Indian holiday schedules had considerably higher levels of organizational stress, as indicated by lower work-life balance, holiday satisfaction, control, and organizational commitment toward workers, as well as higher levels of overload and job characteristics.

Practical Implications : The study proved that organizational commitment acted as a mediator in reducing the negative impacts of stressors on employee wellness, with significant relationships between stress variables and organizational commitment measures observed in the IHC group.

Originality : The study covered the effects of holidays, particularly on information technology, in contrast to earlier studies on organizational stress.

Keywords : **organizational stress, workplace stress, holiday schedule, work calendar**

JEL Classification Codes : J21, J29, J78

Paper Submission Date : May 18, 2024 ; Paper sent back for Revision : July 19, 2024 ; Paper Acceptance Date : August 20, 2024 ; Paper Published Online : October 15, 2024

The information technology and IT-enabled services industry has generated significant employment opportunities, with an estimated workforce of 5.43 million professionals, marking an increase of 60,000 individuals over the fiscal year 2022–2023. Women make up 36% of the total workforce in the industry. India is a major provider of human capital for both the South Asian region and the global economy. Stress is a

[1] *Assistant Professor (Corresponding Author),* Symbiosis Institute of Business Management, Nagpur, Bhandewadi, Nagpur - 440 008, Maharashtra. (Email : soma.sharma@sibmnagpur.edu.in)
ORCID iD : https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9919-165X
[2] *Associate Dean (Research & Accreditations) & Professor,* Institute of Management Technology, Nagpur, 35 Km Milestone Katol Road, Nagpur - 441 502, Maharashtra. (Email : ssingh@imtnag.ac.in)
[3] *Assistant Professor,* School of Management, Ramdeobaba University, Nagpur, Katol Road, Nagpur - 440 013, Maharashtra. (Email : gayathriswapnil@gmail.com) ; ORCID iD : https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6602-2040

DOI : https://doi.org/10.17010/pijom/2024/v17i10/173994

prevalent occurrence among skilled workforces. It is a psychological response to external actions, stimuli, circumstances, or events that impose unique demands on an individual and are influenced by certain characteristics. Stressors, defined as specific actions, stimuli, situations, or events that provoke a particular response in an individual, are regarded as precursors to stress. Rao and Ramesh (2015) calculated that 18% of Bangalore, India's industrial workers reported having stress. In a similar vein, samples from global firms' IT and BPO divisions also showed high levels of stress, suggesting a general pattern. Stress is a complex phenomenon subject to individual variability and tolerance levels. Individuals with a high-stress tolerance can handle a variety of workplace pressures, which may even enhance their performance. Some individuals require a high-stress level to activate and motivate them to perform at their best. However, there are those with a low-stress tolerance who become immobilized when faced with seemingly harmful everyday circumstances.

There has been a significant increase in empirical studies on stress in recent decades. Studying organizational stress is important, especially when it comes to role stress. Levinson (1965) is credited with originating the concept of organizational stress. Organizational stress, as defined by Mirela and Mădălina-Adriana (2011), is the term used to describe the behavioral, emotional, cognitive, and physiological reactions to the negative and aggressive characteristics of the workplace, work environment, and organizational climate. To explain the causes of organizational stress, various theoretical models have been developed that identify the factors in the workplace that contribute to stress. The person-environment (P-E) fit theory asserts that stress results from a discrepancy between an individual and their environment (Edwards, 1998; Harrison, 1978). Stressful experiences and pressures arise not solely from the individual or the situation but from an imbalance between an individual's subjective environment and themselves. This imbalance is influenced by objective factors within and outside the individual. When the demands and expectations outweigh available resources, strain increases.

Conversely, when an individual's capabilities exceed their needs, stress may remain constant, rise or fall. Similarly, when resources exceed needs, stress may fluctuate as well. The representation of relationships in a P-E fit model varies depending on the importance and content of the relevant dimension. The IT industry is known for its stressful work environment, heavy workloads, and strict deadlines, all of which add to employee stress. It is vital to grasp how holiday schedules affect stress in this field to develop ways to boost employee wellness and increase productivity. This review explores recent research and findings on the impact of both Indian and non-Indian holiday schedules on employee stress in the IT industry.

Bedarkar et al. (2016) studied how public holidays affect productivity in Indian IT companies. They found that well-planned holiday schedules boost employee morale and productivity. On the other hand, unplanned holidays can disrupt workflows, causing stress for employees struggling to meet deadlines. Farooq's (2014) study indicated that holidays enable employees to disconnect from work, engage in cultural activities, and spend time with family, which contributes to improved mental health. Companies that align their holiday schedules with cultural norms experience a notable reduction in employee stress and an increase in job satisfaction. Khatri and Raina (2017) did a study comparing the holiday schedules of Indian and non-Indian IT companies. They discovered that variations in holiday schedules across regions lead to increased stress for employees in multinational companies. When employees adjust to new time zones and holiday schedules, this mismatch frequently results in additional work and communication issues. Thakur (2011) highlighted how flexible holiday policies can reduce stress in IT organizations. The research indicates that letting workers pick holidays based on their interests and cultural origins improves their work-life balance. This adaptability reduces stress and improves job satisfaction and productivity.

Patra and Tripathi (2019) examined how different holiday calendars affect stress in multinational IT companies. The study showed that when global offices do not have matching holiday schedules, it can lead to more stress and less efficient operations. The authors suggested using global HR strategies to align holiday schedules, which could help reduce stress and improve teamwork across borders. Ramaprasad et al. (2017)

examined the problems cross-cultural teams face because of different holiday schedules. The research stresses the importance of being sensitive to cultures and for managers to make room for various holiday preferences to reduce stress and bring teams closer together. Chandel et al. (2023) studied how planning holidays affect bank employees' engagement. Their study showed that planning holidays ahead of time can make employees more engaged and less stressed. Employees who think their personal needs are respected tend to stay loyal to their companies. Baid et al. (2024) examined how holiday schedules related to keeping employees in the IT field. They discovered that businesses with well-thought-out holiday plans have less employee attrition because their staff members are happier and less anxious.

In the present scenario, stress impacts all employees' lives, and previous studies have established a negative association between organizational stress and work-related outcomes, including employee performance, productivity, and more (Harrison, 1978). Numerous well-known causes of organizational stress are identified by the literature, such as changes in the organizational climate, harassment, role ambiguity, role conflict, and hostile work environments (Edwards, 1998).

The Rationale Behind the Study

The impact of work holiday schedules on the stress levels of multinational company employees across diverse industrial and services sectors needs to be better understood. This is particularly relevant as these employees are often required to work for clients outside India. Therefore, there is a need to investigate how work holiday schedules may contribute to organizational stress among such employees. Employees of multinational corporations frequently adhere to work and vacation schedules depending on the locations of their clients rather than their own place of residence because of the transnational nature of their work. This can lead to conflicts with local holidays and cause scheduling difficulties, which is not a concern for many other professions. These employees must work varying shifts, including those outside regular business hours, and may have to work on local holidays. This can increase stress levels due to irregular work schedules and the inability to take time off during local holidays. The work schedule of these employees often aligns differently with the schedules of their family and friends. Additionally, they may be required to work unplanned overtime due to unexpected staff absences or events. These inherent features of the job can cause organizational stress and result in a poor work-life balance.

We conducted a comprehensive search of research databases using terms like "organizational stress," "holiday schedule," and "work calendar," including Google Scholar, ProQuest, and Web of Science. There is a need for more accessible literature because the results did not produce any pertinent conclusions. This gap in our knowledge emphasizes the necessity for more investigation to fully comprehend how holiday schedules affect organizational behavior.

Research Objectives

This study examines the impact of work holiday schedules on the level of organizational stress experienced by multinational company employees across various sectors. We hypothesize that employees following an Indian holiday schedule will experience significantly lower organizational stress levels than those following non-Indian holiday schedules. We also aim to investigate other socio-demographic factors related to organizational stress. Our study aimed to investigate the differences in the level of organizational stress among employees following different holiday schedules. The results showed that the employees following the non-Indian holiday calendar (NIHC) had significantly higher levels of organizational stress than those following the Indian holiday calendar, which was consistent with our hypothesis. The higher organizational stress levels in the NIHC group could be due

to their work schedules in different time zones compared to the IHC group. These differences in stress levels may be related to the employees' working arrangements.

The majority of the participants in the NIHC group worked remotely, which differs from a conventional working arrangement where employees can leave the workplace after their shifts are over. Many firms have had to switch to remote work due to the pandemic, but now that employees have access to their office desktops from home, it's easier to call them in to work past their regular hours or finish deadlines. This can create time-based conflicts, hindering their ability to spend time with family and friends and resulting in increased stress levels. Experiencing similar situations on a regular basis could raise their stress levels.

Research Framework

The following describes the research framework that was used for this investigation.

- A socio-demographic data sheet was used to gather essential information from the participants, including their age, gender, educational background, marital status, employment status, job title, work experience, and income.

- The present study employed the visual analog scale (VAS) to evaluate the participants' subjective perceptions of their work holiday schedule in relation to their current occupations. The tool employed a continuous scale to gauge the construct, with values ranging from 1 (*poorly satisfied*) to 10 (*extremely satisfied*).

- Potential exposure to common workplace stressors was evaluated using Cartwright and Cooper's ASSET (An Organizational Stress Screening Tool). The tool includes four subscales, with the first consisting of 37 items designed to measure an individual's level of workplace stress. This subscale comprises seven domains: resources and communication, job security, work-life balance, control, overload, job characteristics, and work relationships. The ASSET tool includes a second subscale comprising nine items, measuring an individual's commitment to their organization. The third subscale, consisting of 19 items, assesses the individual's physical and mental well-being. The fourth survey includes 24 items requesting additional information. The first three subscales of the ASSET tool are rated on a 6-point scale, with 1 indicating *strong disagreement* and 6 indicating *strong agreement*. The fourth subscale of the ASSET tool is rated on a 4-point scale, with one indicating *"never"* and four indicating *"often."* All coefficients are more than 0.70, ranging from 0.60 to 0.91, according to the Guttman split-half coefficient analysis (Cartwright & Cooper, 2008), with the exception of two components. Johnson and Cooper (2003) reported that the psychological well-being subscale of the ASSET tool demonstrated strong convergent validity with an established measure of psychiatric illnesses, the General Health Questionnaire (Goldberg & Williams, 1988).

Methodology

This study was designed as a cross-sectional survey, and the methodologies used are described in more detail in the subsection that follows. Siegrist's (1996) effort-reward imbalance model, which contends that stress results from an imbalance between an individual's job expenses and benefits, is a variation on the P-E fit model. According to this model, an individual's health and well-being depend significantly on whether their efforts at work are recognized and rewarded appropriately. The study is based on a priori G*Power analysis, which was conducted to determine the necessary sample size. The sample size estimation method was set for *t*-tests, and the statistical test used was Means: Difference between two independent means (two groups). The approach chosen was *a priori* power analysis. Based on the effect size, power, and alpha, the required sample size was calculated. An effect size (d) of 0.5 was selected for this analysis, with an alpha error probability of 0.05. The G*Power analysis indicated that a minimum total sample size (N) of 176 was required, with each group consisting of $n = 88$

individuals. The study recruited employees from diverse backgrounds, including industrial and service sectors, working in multinational corporations following Indian and non-Indian holiday schedules. Participants with multiple jobs were excluded from the study. Potential participants were found between April and November of 2022 using the snowball sampling approach, and they were informed of the study's objectives. All participants who expressed interest in participating provided written informed consent and data were collected from each one of them separately using an online form that was supplied to them over the Internet. Participants received no compensation for their time spent in the study.

Ethical Considerations

This study adhered to the ethical guidelines and considerations for human research in India and the standards established by the American Psychological Association. Participants were informed of their rights under the Helsinki Declaration before enrolling in the study.

Data Analyses

A distribution analysis was performed using the Shapiro–Wilk statistics on data received from 193 participants. According to the test findings, the data could be used in parametric statistical analysis with SPSS. An independent samples *t*-test was conducted to investigate the differences between the grouping variables, such as gender and holiday schedule, and the study variables. Pearson correlation was used to analyze the relationships between demographic variables, including age and years of experience, and study variables, such as VAS and ASSET subscales. Correlational analysis was performed separately for each group. For the ASSET tool analysis, only subscales 1 and 2 were considered.

Analysis and Results

The results of the descriptive analysis of the socio-demographic variables of the study participants are presented in Table 1. The mean age of the participants was found to be 28 ± 5.63 years. The majority of the study sample consisted of males (78%), married individuals (63%), working in the IT sector (56%), and holding non-managerial positions (62%). Of the total sample, 52% (n = 100) followed the IHC, while 48% (n = 93) followed the NIHC. Employees who followed the IHC had an average working duration of 8.78 ± 0.56 hours, while those who followed the NIHC had an average working duration of 9.56 ± 0.37 hours. The findings show that compared to the NIHC group, the IHC group had considerably greater levels of work-life balance, control, and employee loyalty to the organization, as well as holiday satisfaction. However, the NIHC group had significantly higher levels of overload and job characteristics. Additionally, we found no significant gender differences in the ASSET subscale scores or the VAS scores of holiday satisfaction.

Table 1. ***Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Participants***

Variables	*N*	%	Mean (*SD*)
Age (in years)	–	–	28 ± 5.63
Gender			–
(i)	Male	151	78
(ii)	Female	42	22
Educational Qualification			–
(i)	Undergraduate		

(ii)	Postgraduate		
Marital Status			–
(i)	Unmarried	122	63
(ii)	Married	71	37
Work Sector			–
(i)	IT Sector	108	56
(ii)	Other Service Sector	85	44
Designation			–
(i)	Top Managerial Employee	0	0
(ii)	Middle Managerial Employee	0	0
(iii)	First-line Managerial Employee	73	38
(iv)	Non-Managerial Cadre	120	62
Holiday Calendar Schedule			–
(i)	Indian	100	52
(ii)	Non-Indian	93	48
Working Duration	–	–	9.17 ± 0.46
Working Arrangement			–
(i)	Brick & Mortar/ Conventional	91	47
(ii)	Remote/Work from Home	102	53

The results of the correlational analysis revealed significant negative correlations between the VAS scores of holiday satisfaction and control ($r = –0.36, p < 0.01$), pay and benefits ($r = –0.421, p < 0.05$), work-life balance ($r = –0.54, p < 0.01$), and job characteristics ($r = –0.318, p < 0.05$) for the NIHC group. The strength of the correlation coefficient (CEff) and total variance (σ^2) explained by the variables is as follows: VAS scores of holiday satisfaction and control (σ^2 –13%, CEff – weak), pay and benefits (σ^2–18%, CEff – moderate), work-life balance (σ^2 – 29%, CEff – moderate), and job characteristics (σ^2–10%, CEff – weak). Furthermore, we found a positive inter-correlation between the domains of employee commitment toward the organization and commitment of the organization toward employees ($r = 0.653, p < 0.05$) in the organizational perception subscale for the NIHC group. Furthermore, there was a significant positive correlation between the commitment of the organization toward employees and pay and benefits ($r = 0.472, p < 0.05$), resources and communication ($r = 0.430, p < 0.05$), work relationships ($r = 0.32, p < 0.01$), and job security ($r = 0.11, p < 0.01$). Moreover, employee commitment toward the organization showed a significant positive correlation with job security ($r = 0.34, p < 0.05$) and overload ($r = 0.31, p < 0.05$).

In the NIHC group, we found a significant positive correlation between age and pay and benefits ($r = 0.533, p < 0.05$), resources and communication ($r = 0.146, p < 0.05$), work relationships ($r = 0.45, p < 0.01$), and work-life balance ($r = 0.218, p < 0.05$). In the NIHC group, the working hours had a significant negative correlation with work-life balance ($r = –0.319, p < 0.05$) and a significant positive correlation with overload ($r = 0.513, p < 0.05$). The analysis reveals that the CEff strength and total variance (σ^2) explained by the variables is as follows: commitment of the organization toward employee and pay and benefits (σ^2 –22%, CEff – moderate), resources and communication (σ^2 –18%, CEff – moderate), work relationship (σ^2 –10%, CEff – weak), and job security (σ^2 –1%, CEff – weak). Employee commitment toward the organization has a significant positive correlation between overload (σ^2 –9%, CEff – weak) and job security (σ^2 –2%, CEff – weak). Furthermore, there are a number

of intercorrelations for IHC and NIHC groups between the ASSET's domains and subscales; these are not addressed because they are unrelated to the study's primary goals (refer to Tables 2 and 3).

Stressors can harm employees' health and well-being if they lack the resources to cope with the demands. Past research suggests that people's attitudes and dispositional factors, such as self-efficacy, resilience, optimism, and hope, are significant resources that can help them manage stress. Psychological capacities such as self-efficacy,

Table 2. ***Descriptive and Independent Sample t-Test Statistic for Study Variables for the IHC and NIHC Groups***

Variables	IHC (Mean ± *SD*)	NIHC (Mean ± *SD*)	*t*-value	Sig.
VAS – Holiday Schedule	8.26 ± 0.78	6.43 ± 1.72	2.782	0.032*
Resources & Communication – ASSET	14.38 ± 1.34	13.87 ± 1.46	1.212	0.156
Job Security – ASSET	16.61 ± 0.16	15.98 ± 0.31	1.317	0.278
Work-Life Balance – ASSET	18.42 ± 0.52	13.16 ± 1.08	3.387	0.001**
Control – ASSET	20.13 ± 0.89	16.72 ± 0.45	3.709	0.021*
Overload - ASSET	14.48 ± 0.33	19.28 ± 0.83	3.058	0.012*
Job Characteristics – ASSET	28.89 ± 1.45	30.14 ± 0.88	1.409	0.197
Work Relationship – ASSET	36.21 ± 1.33	30.43 ± 0.84	3.879	0.043*
Pay & Benefits – ASSET	3.12 ± 0.14	4.48 ± 0.32	1.535	0.376
ECTO – ASSET	15.79 ± 1.54	19.55 ± 0.77	2.749	0.018*
COTE – ASSET	24.11 ± 0.72	19.78 ± 1.15	3.078	0.000**

Note. *significant at the 0.05 level, **significant at the 0.01 level. #ECTO – Employee commitment toward organization; COTE – Commitment of organization towards employee.

Table 3. ***Pearson Correlation Statistic for Study Variables among the IHC Group***

Variables	*Age*	*WH*	*VAS*	*R&C*	*WLB*	*CON*	*OL*	*JC*	*WR*	*JS*	*P&B*	*ECTO*	*COTE*
Age	–												
Working Hours	0.311	–											
VAS	0.117		–										
R&C	0.271	0.118	0.203	–									
WLB	0.218*	–0.319*	–0.54**	0.131	–								
CON	0.372	–0.128	–0.36**	0.129	0.398	–							
OL	0.219	0.513*	0.331	0.237	–0.246	–0.222	–						
JC	0.143	0.386	–318*	0.169	0.113	0.196	0.360	–					
WR	0.45**	0.112	0.196	0.318	0.425	0.349	0.226	0.21	–				
JS	0.010	0.018	0.268	0.269	0.404	0.151	0.249	0.31	0.181	–			
P&B	0.533*	0.461	–0.421*	0.148	0.277	0.358	0.320	0.321	0.342	0.103	–		
ECTO	0.146*	0.562	–0.288	0.582	0.394	0.197	0.110	0.216	0.105	0.338	0.285	–	
COTE	0.197	0.176	0.401	0.430*	0.281	–0.210	–0.279	0.49	0.32**	0.11*	0.472*	0.653*	–

Note. * The *p*-value is significant at the 0.05 level, **the *p*-value is significant at the 0.01 level. # *R&C* – Resources and Communication, *WLB* – Work-Life Balance, *CON* – Control, *JS* – Job Security, *JC* – Job Characteristics, *WR* – Work Relationship, *P&B* – Pay and Benefits, *OL* – Overload, *ECTO* – Employee commitment towards organization, *COTE* – Commitment of organization towards employee.

resilience, optimism, and hope can help alleviate the adverse impacts of performance pressure and inspire individuals to strive for greater success and overcome more significant challenges. In addition to developing psychological capacities, organizations should also strive to cultivate positive organizational attitudes, such as work satisfaction and organizational commitment, as these can enhance organizational performance. Previous research revealed that work satisfaction and organizational commitment may be negatively impacted by organizational stress. Wayne et al. (1997) suggested that organizational commitment significantly moderates stress.

According to Wayne et al. (1997), commitment can offer a shield against the detrimental effects of stress by giving people a feeling of direction and purpose in their work. Organizational commitment can provide a sense of security and belonging to employees. Furthermore, Cohen and McKay (1984) suggested that employees' beliefs in their employer's loyalty can be a barrier when facing challenging working conditions. Therefore, it is arguable that fostering pleasant social interactions through emotional links to the company may improve employee performance (Cohen & Wills, 1985). Thus, it can also be argued that the perceived commitment of an organization may serve as a protective factor for employees' physical and mental well-being when dealing with work demands. Hence, perceived commitment can enhance employees' health and well-being, and it may mediate between organizational stressors and indicators of health and well-being.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

The findings reveal that employees from organizations following non-Indian holiday and working schedules experienced significantly lower levels of work-life balance, holiday satisfaction, control, the organization's commitment toward employees, employee commitment toward the organization, and higher levels of overload and job characteristics. These results suggest that employees who follow non-Indian holidays and working schedules experience high organizational stress levels. Although stressors can negatively affect employees' commitment and health, responsibility can act as a potent mediator to reduce the negative impact of stressors on employees' well-being. Our study reveals a significant relationship between measures of organizational commitment and other stress variables (such as work-life balance, control, and overload) among the IHC group, who had lower levels of organizational stress than the NIHC group. It is important to note that commitment is not only influenced by workplace stressors but also by other factors, both within and outside the individual, such as self-efficacy, age, education, tenure, organizational support, fairness, and justice. Employees' positive emotional reactions may also help mitigate the adverse effects of stressors. The study results indicate that employees who follow non-local holiday calendars in their organizations may be at higher risk of experiencing organizational stress due to poor work-life balance, lack of control, and potentially increased work overload.

Organizational commitment provides physical and psychological benefits to employees and moderates the relationship between stressors and health. Therefore, the impact of organizational commitment on employees depends on workplace stressors (Wayne et al., 1997). The stress variables of the ASSET instrument, such as overload, control, and work-life balance, and individual and organizational commitment to the NIHC group of employees—who reported greater levels of stress — are not found to be significantly correlated in our study. However, for the IHC group, which had significantly lower stress levels, the correlation analysis shows a relationship between stress variables and employee commitment toward the organization and commitment of the organization toward an employee. These results are consistent with existing literature.

In addition to fostering organizational commitment among employees, organizations should also consider implementing stress management programs to mitigate workplace stress. Such programs can help reduce individual stressors and inform participants of modifiable aspects of their workplace. To alleviate personal stressors, individuals generally require some degree of control over their jobs or access to resources. At work,

control and competencies, or skills, are two crucial resources that provide employees with a sense of control or participation in decision-making. With these tools, users can effectively regulate their stress levels and have an impact on how they carry out their obligations.

Consequently, it is frequently necessary for someone to have some control over their job and access to resources in order to reduce personal pressures. The best method to lessen the stress brought on by new technology is to provide materials that have an impact on one's line of work. Increasing workplace expectations and commitments may also help us feel less stressed by altering the way we operate.

Conclusion

The present study uses the AUDIT organizational stress screening tool to explore the impact of different holiday work schedules on organizational stress. The findings indicate that employees from organizations following non-Indian holidays and working schedules reported significantly lower levels of work-life balance, holiday satisfaction, control, and commitment of the organization toward employees and employees' commitment toward the organization. In contrast, they report higher levels of overload and job characteristics. The study uses the AUDIT organizational stress screening tool to examine the impact of different holiday work schedules on organizational stress. The research points out that holiday schedules significantly affect stress in IT companies. Holidays tied to culture, flexible holiday rules, planning those lines up, and thinking about cross-cultural differences — all play key parts in lowering stress and making employees feel better. Organizations that prioritize holiday scheduling as part of their HR strategies can improve employee satisfaction, productivity, and retention rates, ultimately contributing to a healthier work environment. As the IT sector expands globally, understanding and accommodating diverse holiday needs becomes increasingly critical for success.

The study's results provide insights into the role of employers and other managerial executives in addressing organizational stress. From the standpoint of a positive company culture, encouraging more upbeat attitudes ought to be a priority. This can increase psychological capital and serve as a motivator, lessening the negative effects of stress on one's physical and mental health. Lower organizational performance and increased attrition rates can be avoided by taking this action. Still, this study has shed important light on the possibility that work-holiday plans that are not in line with an employee's location could result in increased levels of stress within the firm.

Limitations of the Study and Scope for Future Research

The cross-sectional design and excessive reliance on self-reported ratings are two of the study's shortcomings. However, the results imply that work-holiday plans that aren't dependent on an employee's present location may have a detrimental effect on their degree of stress at work. The present study underscores the significance of employers and administrative executives in establishing a constructive work environment that nurtures positive outlooks and mitigates the harmful impacts of stressors on the well-being of employees and the overall performance of the organization. Moreover, the results of this study may need to be generalizable to other cultural contexts or sectors. Future studies could explore the impact of work-holiday schedules on stress levels across different geographical locations and professional settings.

Authors' Contribution

Dr. Soma Sharma conceived the idea and developed qualitative and quantitative designs to undertake the empirical study, extracted research papers of high repute, filtered these based on keywords, and generated concepts and codes relevant to the study design. Dr. Sarbjit Singh Oberoi verified the analytical methods and

supervised the study. The interviews were conducted both in colloquial language and in English. Dr. Sarbjit Singh Oberoi did the numerical computations using SPSS 20.0. Dr. Soma Sharma and Dr. Gayathri Band wrote the manuscript in consultation with Dr. Sarbjit Singh Oberoi.

Conflict of Interest

The authors certify that they have no affiliations with or involvement in any organization or entity with any financial interest or non-financial interest in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript.

Funding Acknowledgment

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or for the publication of this article.

References

Baid, C., Baid, D., & Bhuyan, A. K. (2024). Exploring organizational performance: A multidimensional construct. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management, 17*(4), 29–42. https://doi.org/10.17010/pijom/2024/v17i4/173426

Bedarkar, M., Pandita, D., Agarwal, R., & Saini, R. (2016). Examining the impact of organizational culture on customer centricity in organizations: An analysis. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management, 9*(2), 19–28. https://doi.org/10.17010/pijom/2016/v9i2/87229

Cartwright, S., & Cooper, C. L. (Eds.). (2008). *The Oxford handbook of personnel psychology*. Oxford Handbooks Online.

Chandel, S., Chanda, K., & Chandel, K. (2023). Factors influencing organizational commitment, job involvement, and work-life balance among employees of banks: An analysis. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management, 16*(7), 43–58. https://doi.org/10.17010/pijom/2023/v16i7/172927

Cohen, S., & McKay, G. (1984). Social support, stress and the buffering hypothesis: A theoretical analysis. In S. E. Taylor, J. E. Singer, & A. Baum (eds.), *Handbook of psychology and health* (1st ed., Vol. 4). Routledge.

Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *98*(2), 310–357. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.98.2.310

Edwards, J. R. (1998). Chapter: 6, Cybernetic theory of stress, coping, and well-being: Review and extension to work and family. In C. L. Cooper (ed.), *Theories of organizational stress* (pp. 122–152). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198522799.003.0007

Farooq, R. (2014). A clever approach to measure organizational performance: An overview. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management*, *7*(5), 34–46. https://doi.org/10.17010/pijom/2014/v7i5/59321

Goldberg, D., & Williams, P. (1988). *A user's guide to the General health questionnaire*. NFER – Nelson.

Harrison, R. V. (1978). Person-environment fit and job stress. In C. L. Cooper & R. Payne (eds.), *Stress at work* (pp. 175–205). Wiley.

Johnson, S., & Cooper, C. (2003). The construct validity of the ASSET stress measure. *Stress and Health: Journal of the International Society for the Investigation of Stress, 19*(3), 181–185. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1002/smi.971

Khatri, P., & Raina, K. (2017). A study of protean career orientation and organizational commitment of permanent and contractual faculty teaching professional courses in Delhi - NCR. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management, 10*(4), 7–18. https://doi.org/10.17010/pijom/2017/v10i4/112762

Levinson, H. (1965). [*Review of Organizational Stress:* Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity., by R. L. Kahn, D. M. Wolfe, R. P. Quinn, J. D. Snoek, & R. A. Rosenthal]. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 10*(1), 125–129. https://doi.org/10.2307/2391654

Mirela, B., & Mădălina-Adriana, C. (2011). Organizational stress and its impact on work performance. *Annals of Faculty of Economics*, *1*, 333–337.

Patra, Y., & Tripathi, S. (2019). Contriving human capital practices which influence organizational commitment: Reimagine future skills of HR. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management, 12*(10), 20–32. https://doi.org/10.17010/pijom/2019/v12i10/147814

Ramaprasad, B. S., Prabhu, K. P., Lakshminarayanan, S., & Pai, Y. P. (2017). Human resource management practices and organizational commitment: A comprehensive review (2001–2016). *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management, 10*(10), 7–23. https://doi.org/10.17010/pijom/2017/v10i10/118810

Rao, S., & Ramesh, N. (2015). Depression, anxiety and stress levels in industrial workers: A pilot study in Bangalore, India. *Industrial Psychiatry Journal*, *24*(1), 23–28. https://doi.org/10.4103/0972-6748.160927

Siegrist, J. (1996). Adverse health effects of high effort/low reward conditions. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *1*(1), 27–41. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.1.1.27

Thakur, S. (2011). A study of Indian organizational development at present. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management, 4*(4), 40–47. https://doi.org/10.17010/pijom/2011/v4i4/62421

Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, *40*(1), 82–111. https://doi.org/10.2307/257021

About the Authors

Dr. Soma Sharma has 18 years of teaching experience in the field of management at several prestigious universities and colleges. She is proficient in corporate trainings and research in the fields of industrial relations, consumer behavior, and human behavior. She has completed her Ph.D. from RTMNU Nagpur University and MBA from ICFAI University, Dehradun. She qualified the UGC NET in 2013 and has over 10 research papers to her credit in various journals of national and international repute.

Dr. Sarbjit Singh Oberoi is working as a Faculty in the area of quantitative techniques and operations management. He is currently holding the position of Chairperson Research and Accreditations. He received his Ph.D. degree and Master's in Mathematics from Chaudhary Charan Singh University, Meerut. He has qualified CSIR(NET) Exam. He has done PGDBA from Symbiosis University. His research interests include inventory management, supply chain management, project management, business analytics, and operations research. He has published 40 research papers in various international and national journals.

Dr. Gayathri Band has 17 years of teaching experience in various reputed institutes. She is currently associated with Ramdeobaba University, Nagpur. She completed her Ph.D. from RTMNU Nagpur University and has published several research papers in journals of high repute.