Original Research   WALDEN UNIVERSITY

Understanding the Relationship Between Perceived Organizational Support and Psychological Well-Being: Perspectives of Turkish Faculty Members

Ünal Deniz, PhD
The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK), Ankara, Turkey
(iD) https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7447-6050

Cihan Kocabaş, PhD
Turkish Maarif Foundation, Istanbul, Turkey
(iD) https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6511-9094

Contact: *unaldeniz23@gmail.com*

Abstract

Objective: The purpose of our quantitative correlational study is to investigate the relationship between the perceived organizational support of faculty members and their psychological well-being.

Methods: Our study included 450 faculty members from state universities in Istanbul who were selected using a simple random sampling method. We used descriptive statistics, *t*-test, ANOVA, and linear multiple regression analyses.

Results: We found that faculty perceptions of organizational support and psychological well-being vary according to academic title and tenure and are not different by gender. Perceived organizational support significantly predicted psychological well-being while controlling for gender, academic title, and tenure.

Conclusions: Ensuring organizational support for faculty can positively impact their psychological well-being.

Implication for Practice: Higher education institutions should diversify resources of support for faculty and make this approach a priority for the administration. The institution should make organizational changes that consider the needs and expectations of faculty members.

Recommended Citation

Deniz, Ü., & Kocabaş, C. (2024). Understanding the relationship between perceived organizational support and psychological well-being: Perspectives of Turkish faculty members. *Higher Learning Research Communications, 14*(1), 51–67. https://doi.org/10.18870/hlrc.v14i1.1441

Introduction

Faculty members contribute to the fundamental functions of higher education institutions, such as teaching, research, and community service activities (Komarraju et al., 2010; McGinn, 2012; Rinas et al., 2020; Watt & Richardson, 2020; Zepke & Leach, 2010). Fulfilling these functions can lead to negative consequences, such as work-life imbalance (Fontinha et al., 2019; Mudrak et al., 2018), burnout (Sabagh et al., 2018; Watts & Robertson, 2011), and stress (Gillespie et al., 2001). These consequences can have negative implications for higher education institutions and their students. Therefore, it is important to understand the factors that contribute to the well-being of faculty members (Diener et al., 2010; Sabagh et al., 2018; Salimzadeh et al., 2017).

Previous researchers have identified various institutional factors that influence the satisfaction of faculty members, such as the climate and culture of the institution; relationships with colleagues, students, and administrators; and effective leadership (e.g., Eagan et al., 2015; Hagedorn, 2000; Moors et al., 2014). Furthermore, it is assumed that the well-being of faculty members is rooted in cognitive, behavioral, and coping processes as well as in their perceptions of various work experiences and stress factors (Larson et al., 2019; Payne et al., 2007; Vera et al., 2010). While these studies indicate a potential relationship between perceived organizational support (POS) and psychological well-being (PWB) among faculty members, they also highlight the need for empirical research in this area. Particularly, considering the different cultural and socioeconomic conditions under which faculty members work in different countries, it is necessary to conduct more comprehensive studies on the relationship between organizational support and PWB.

The lack of existing studies examining the relationship between organizational support and PWB among faculty members in Turkey is an important factor that motivated our research. Despite the existing knowledge regarding the importance of PWB among faculty and, particularly, the positive role POS plays in Eastern compared with Western cultures (Eisenberger et al., 2020), there is still much to be learned regarding these constructs in different cultural and educational contexts. The results of our study will contribute to the understanding of the relationship between POS and PWB among faculty as well as how demographic variables (i.e., gender, academic title, and tenure) influence POS and PWB. Understanding these relationships can be an important reference point for policymakers in higher education institutions. On the other hand, since job satisfaction, commitment, and faculty performance directly impact the quality of teaching (Culver et al., 2020; Kezar, 2013), increasing PWB should be an important goal. Higher education institution leaders should strive to better understand the needs of faculty and develop supportive strategies that impact well-being. Thus, the aim of our study was to determine the relationship between faculty's POS and their levels of PWB in Turkey.

Literature Review

Perceived Organizational Support

POS is a multidimensional construct that encompasses employee beliefs about being valued, the sufficiency of resources and support, and PWB (Bai et al., 2023; Eisenberger & Stinglhamber, 2011; Giorgi, 2016). Studies have shown that employees who perceive high levels of support from their organizations report higher levels of performance, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Hakanen et al., 2008; Nguyen et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2017). However, according to social exchange theory, which suggests that employees feel obliged to reciprocate the physical, social, and/or emotional resources they receive from their organizations through effort and loyalty (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), employees generally compare the value they contribute to the organization with the rewards they receive (Bogler & Nir, 2012; Sluss & Ashforth, 2008; Turnley et al., 2003). This approach can occasionally diminish commitment to the organization, lower performance, and even lead to outcomes of alienation and turnover (Eder & Eisenberger, 2008; Edwards & Peccei, 2010).

Research on POS suggests that it is an important predictor of organizational commitment that reflects the institutional structure, administrative policies, and actions of leaders (Culver et al., 2020; Johnson, 2020; Kasalak & Aksu, 2014). However, the POS among faculty members in higher education institutions is influenced by various factors. These include opportunities for education and development, behaviors of managers and colleagues, support from supervisors, workplace justice, institutional policies and procedures, and work-life balance (Fleming, 2023; Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004; Kabanova et al., 2016; Kurtessis et al., 2017; Yu et al., 2021). For example, Levin and Shaker (2011) suggested that the development of policies and procedures to reduce faculty workload can enhance performance and job satisfaction. Altbach (2000) argued that the decline in organizational power and institutional community has led today's faculty to feel less connected to the institution compared with previous generations. Therefore, higher education institutions have the potential to enhance both faculty satisfaction and the quality of education by increasing their faculty's PWB (Caesens et al., 2016; Culver et al., 2020; Stuckey et al., 2019). Taken together, these findings demonstrate the importance of creating a supportive working environment for faculty members in achieving institutional success.

Psychological Well-Being

PWB refers to positive emotions, life satisfaction, a sense of meaning and purpose, and the ability to effectively manage one's daily life (Diener et al., 2010). It is the subjective evaluation of happiness and satisfaction that arises from the alignment between an individual's personal needs and expectations (Engels et al., 2004; Yukhymenko-Lescroart & Sharma, 2019). PWB encompasses various dimensions, such as positive emotions, life satisfaction, self-acceptance, autonomy, and personal growth (Price & McCallum, 2015; Ryff & Singer, 2008). The state of well-being in the workplace is a result of the interaction between the organizational environment and personal characteristics (Abid et al., 2020; Mascarenhas et al., 2022; Salimzadeh et al., 2020). Research indicates that employees with high levels of PWB are more productive, engaged, and committed to their organizations (Bakker et al., 2014; Saks, 2006). Furthermore, employees' well-being is a determinant of organizational outcomes, such as absenteeism, turnover, and performance (Hakanen et al., 2008; Judge & Bono, 2001; Wright et al., 2007).

Research indicates that faculty with higher levels of PWB are more engaged in their work, have higher levels of job satisfaction, and participate more in innovative and creative activities (Van Horn et al., 2004; Maslach et al., 1996). Numerous studies have shown that PWB is closely related to job satisfaction, self-efficacy, organizational support, and work-life balance (Butts et al., 2013; Chung et al., 2010; Demerouti et al., 2001; Grawitch et al., 2007; Ilies et al., 2007; Salanova et al., 2000). Job satisfaction has been found to positively influence PWB and reduce the intention to leave one's job (Damiri et al., 2015). Similarly, PWB has positive effects on teaching performance, student satisfaction, and overall university quality (Fontinha et al., 2018; Maslach et al., 2001).

In addition to these factors, research on PWB has focused on a range of factors that hinder faculty well-being. In this regard, various studies demonstrate that job demands, such as heavy teaching loads, publication expectations, and excessive administrative duties, are associated with high levels of stress and burnout among faculty (Berg & Seeber, 2016; Bothwell, 2018; Seldin, 1987; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2018). Research conducted by Kinman (2014) and Kinman and Wray (2019) on public sector employees in the United Kingdom and Australia, respectively, indicate that academics reported higher levels of psychological distress compared with other public sector workers. Recent studies have shown that the COVID-19 pandemic increased stress and created new challenges for faculty members, such as sudden changes in teaching formats, increased workloads, and social isolation (Besser et al., 2022). Despite experiencing significant difficulties in the workplace, many academics remain hesitant to speak about experiences related to self-stigmatization or the shame associated with reduced productivity due to stress, anxiety, and seeking support (Livingston, 2013, 2020; Smith et al., 2022).

Linking Perceived Organizational Support and Psychological Well-Being

Due to the critical importance of PWB on employee performance, organizations adopt various strategies to support and sustain employee well-being (Culver et al., 2020; Guan et al., 2014). Organizational support is an important factor in promoting employees' PWB (Harrill et al., 2015; Jiang & Probst, 2016; Kurtessis et al., 2017). This topic has received increasing attention in recent years, and studies examining the relationship between POS and PWB in various contexts, such as in nongovernmental organizations (Amundsen & Martinsen, 2015), tourism (Bai et al., 2023), K–12-level education (Malik & Noreen, 2015; Suleman et al., 2018), and other organizational types (Bakker et al., 2004; Saks, 2006), have demonstrated a positive relationship between the two. Furthermore, research indicates that the relationship between organizational support and PWB is mediated by various factors, including perceived social support from coworkers and supervisors (Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004) and job satisfaction (Grant et al., 2007).

Experiences at work that give meaning to individuals' lives can contribute to their well-being by meeting various needs (Diego-Medrano & Salazar, 2021; Haviland et al., 2023; Ni & Wang, 2015; Reybold, 2005). Similarly, work-related expectations and challenges among employees can result in high levels of stress, burnout, and decreased job satisfaction. This can impact employee PWB in various ways (Kinzie, 2005; Tijdink et al., 2014). However, little is known about how POS can affect the PWB of faculty (Black & Gregerson, 1999; Liu & Ipe, 2010). Overall, findings from multiple studies suggest that organizational support may play a significant role in promoting the PWB of faculty (Afif, 2018; Crucke et al., 2022; Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2009; Ryff & Singer, 1998).

Demographic variables have frequently been examined as factors influencing POS and PWB of individuals working in different sectors. In some studies, no significant differences have been found regarding the impact of gender on organizational support perception (Büyükgöze & Kavak, 2017; Collins, 2017; Fuller et al., 2006; Yirci, 2014; Yu & Frenkel, 2013) and PWB (Arslan & Tura, 2022; Aydoğan, 2019; Koç, 2017; Madhuchandra & Srimathi, 2016). However, tenure (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Serinkan & Tülü, 2020; Yılmaz et al., 2023; Yirci, 2014) and academic title (Aydın & Belli, 2023; Benlioğlu, 2014; Kalağan, 2009; Yirci, 2014) have been found in the literature to be significant factors associated with POS and PWB.

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The main purpose of our study was to investigate the relationship between POS and PWB among faculty. Questions were addressed that involved understanding (a) the relationship between POS and PWB and (b) differences in POS and PWB scores by gender, academic title, and tenure. The following hypotheses were tested to address the research questions.

H1. POS and PWB do not differ by gender.

H2. POS and PWB differ by academic title.

H3. POS and PWB differ by tenure.

H4. There is a positive relationship between POS and PWB when controlling for covariates of gender, academic title, and tenure.

Methods

Research Design

We used a quantitative correlational study using multiple linear regression to examine the relationship between faculty POS and faculty PWB.

Research Context and Participants

Istanbul, the most populous and cosmopolitan city in Turkey, provided a suitable context to answer the research questions in our study. The city of Istanbul is representative of Turkey in terms of sociocultural and economic structure. Furthermore, the presence of nine state universities specializing in different disciplines, including social, health, and technical sciences, provided adequate diversity. During the 2022–2023 academic year, 40,140 faculty members were working in Istanbul. A roster of approximately 1,500 faculty member email addresses was assembled by sourcing data from the Council of Higher Education (https://akademik.yok.gov.tr). Email addresses were systematically collected from web page links containing faculty contact information. We used the web tool, Octoparse (www.octoparse.com). Subsequently, a digital questionnaire was dispatched via email to these addresses.

Instrumentation

Demographic Information Form
This information form included questions to determine the gender, academic title (assistant, associate, or full professor), and tenure (<5 years; 5–10 years; and ≥10 years) of the participants. We used this demographic information to examine the impact of faculty on POS and PWB variables.

Perceived Organizational Support
We used the 8-item short form of the POS scale (Eisenberger et al., 1986) to assess participants' perceived levels of support from their organization. Eisenberger et al. (1999) reduced the item count of the original scale to eight items and treated them as a single dimension. A 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree) was used. The reported internal consistency coefficient was .90. The scale was translated into Turkish (Yokuş, 2006). Factor analysis revealed that the items in the reduced scale were like those in the study by Eisenberger et al. (1999) and were grouped under a single factor. In our study, Cronbach's alpha was .89. Example items included (a) *The organization values my contribution to its well-being;* (b) *The organization would ignore any complaint from me;* and (c) *The organization shows very little concern for me.*

Psychological Well-Being Scale
The PWB scale (Ryff, 1989) was adapted into Turkish by Telef (2013) and yielded a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .87. The item-total correlations of the PWB scale ranged from .41 to .63. There are eight items in the scale, and the items are assessed using a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). All items are expressed positively. Scores range from 8 (strongly disagree with all items) to 56 (strongly agree with all items). A high score indicates that the person has many psychological resources and strengths. As a result of the validity study conducted by Telef (2013), it was determined that the scale consisted of a single factor and the total explained variance was 53%. Examples include: (a) *I lead a purposeful and meaningful life;* (b) *My social relationships are supportive and rewarding;* and (c) *I am a good person and live a good life.* Cronbach's alpha in our study was .92.

Procedures

Istanbul Medeniyet University Social and Human Science Ethics Committee gave us permission to conduct our study. In November 2022, an online form was distributed to faculty. This form was accompanied by essential information regarding the questionnaire, including an approximate completion time of 10 minutes and a statement regarding voluntary participation. A digital form was sent to the 1,500 addresses via email as described previously. Assuming that participation in online forms was low, the forms were randomly sent to the first 1,500 email addresses. Answers were obtained from 450 participants (30% response rate) within a 2-week period. No further emails were sent at this stage, in line with the related literature (e.g., Cohen et al., 2011); it was assumed that the sample of 450 faculty members would represent all faculty members in Istanbul based on 95% confidence and a 5% error rate. All data were complete; we minimized possible data

loss by requiring answers to all questions. To prevent potential online fraud, the Completely Automated Public Turing Test to Tell Computers and Humans Apart (CAPTCHA) verification method was used.

Data Analysis

The participant responses obtained through the online form were transferred to SPSS V25 software. Data were checked for outliers and consistency. The variables were examined for normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity to ensure the appropriateness of assumptions required for correlational analysis. Next, descriptive statistics were calculated to present the mean, standard deviation, and other relevant measures of POS and PWB. Pearson correlation was conducted to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between POS and PWB. We analyzed differences by gender, academic title, and tenure using the *t*-test and ANOVA. We then employed multiple linear regression analysis to explore whether POS predicts PWB while controlling for potential confounding factors. The significance level of 0.05 was used to determine statistical significance.

Results

Table 1 provides descriptive information for key study variables. Approximately 50% of the sample is male, most are at the assistant professor level, and tenure is fairly broadly distributed.

Table 1. *Demographic Information*

Characteristics	Category	*N*	%
Gender	Female	221	49
	Male	229	51
Academic title	Assistant professor	313	70
	Associate professor	108	24
	Full professor	29	6
Tenure	<5 years	152	33
	6–10 years	117	26
	≥11 years	181	40

Table 2 provides information on means for POS (*M* = 4.28, *SD* = .95) and PWB (*M* = 5.29, *SD* = 1.18). Skewness and kurtosis values indicated variables that are normally distributed.

Table 2. *Descriptive Information for Perceived Organizational Support and Psychological Well-Being*

Variables	Mean	*SD*	Skewness	Kurtosis
POS	4.28	.95	-.352	-.546
PWB	5.29	1.18	-.793	-.473

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1:
POS and PWB do not differ by gender. There were no significant differences by gender for POS (*t* = -.415, *p* = .68) or PWB (*t* = -.668, *p* = .50).

Hypothesis 2:

POS and PWB differ by academic title. The overall *F*-test for POS was not statistically significant, F (2, 447) = .909, p = .404. However, there were significant differences for PWB, F (2, 447) = 10.251, p < .001. The Games-Howell test showed that faculty members with the title of full professor (*M* = 5.69; *SD* = .67) and associate professor (*M* = 5.65; *SD* = .91) had significantly higher levels of PWB compared with faculty members with the title of assistant professor (*M* = 5.12; *SD* = 1.26).

Hypothesis 3:

POS and PWB differ by tenure. One-way ANOVA was conducted to determine differences by tenure. There was a significant difference in POS, F (2, 447) = 11.826, p < .01 and PWB, F (2, 447) = 34.824, p < .01. The Games-Howell test showed that faculty members with a tenure of 5 years or fewer (*M* = 4.54; *SD* = .80) have significantly higher POS compared with faculty members with a tenure of 11 years or more (*M* = 4.05; *SD* = .96). Faculty with a tenure of 5 years or fewer (*M* = 5.83; *SD* = .67) reported significantly higher PWB compared with faculty members with a tenure of 6–10 years (*M* = 5.29; *SD* = 1.12) and 11 years or greater (*M* = 4.83; *SD* = 1.35). Additionally, faculty with a tenure of 6–10 years (*M*= 5.29; *SD* = 1.12) have significantly higher perceptions of PWB compared with faculty members with a tenure of 11 years or greater (*M* = 4.83; *SD* = 1.35).

Hypothesis 4:

There is a positive correlation between POS and PWB. A statistically significant positive correlation was found between these two variables (r = .645, p < .01). In a test of multiple regression (results reported in Table 3), PWB significantly predicts POS scores (B = 0.52, p < .001) when controlling for academic title and tenure; the covariates do not.

Table 3. *Multiple Regression Analysis to Examine Influence of Demographic Factors and PWB on POS*

Parameter	Unstandardized Coefficient		t	p	95% Confidence Interval	
	B	Standard Error			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Intercept	1.	0.34	5.003	< .001	1.032	2.367
PWB	0.	0.033	15.907	< .001	0.454	0.582
Assistant professor	-	0.301	-0.516	0.606	-0.748	0.437
Associate professor	-	0.332	-0.482	0.63	-0.814	0.493
Full professor	0[a]	.	.	.	.	.
≤5 years	-	0.341	-1.121	0.263	-1.053	0.288
6–10 years	-	0.438	-1.126	0.261	-1.355	0.368
≥11 years	0[a]	.	.	.	.	.
[Assistant professor] * [Less than 5 years]	0.	0.355	1.078	0.281	-0.315	1.082

[a]This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Discussion

The findings of our study indicate that faculty members have a moderate level of POS and high levels of PWB, consistent with findings by Panaccio and Vandenberghe (2009). Mascarenhas et al. (2022) suggested that the POS may vary depending on the sincerity and intensity of approval, praise, material, and social rewards. Therefore, it can be inferred that faculty members may not perceive a high level of organizational support due to insufficient tangible and intangible rewards. Another reason for the moderate level of POS could be the inadequacy of resources and incentives provided to faculty members (Culver et al., 2020; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Additionally, the lack of sufficient support from administrators, such as deans and

department chairs, regarding their profession can be considered as a reason for the perceived low level of organizational support (Kasalak & Aksu, 2014). Furthermore, as faculty prioritize research duties over administrative tasks, their levels of burnout decrease while their commitment to the organization and intrinsic satisfaction significantly increase (Vera et al., 2010). Therefore, limiting teaching and nonresearch-related responsibilities could be beneficial in improving faculty POS. It is well known that teaching and research are the most important duties of faculty members. Faculty teaching and research motivation is positively influenced when they feel a strong sense of organizational support (Nguyen et al., 2021). The high levels of PWB among faculty suggest that they are able to maintain work-life balance and establish positive social relationships with their colleagues. Faculty who can integrate life activities, experience less conflict, and have a strong commitment to their work are expected to have higher life satisfaction and subjective happiness (Yukhymenko-Lescroart & Sharma, 2019).

Although gender-based discrimination is considered a crime in many countries and higher education institutions, there are still hidden or explicit institutional barriers, especially for women and underrepresented minorities. Unconscious bias and exclusion can create obstacles in the workplace, particularly for women (Stuckey et al., 2019). Salimzadeh et al. (2020) argued that female faculty members may face significant additional challenges compared with their male counterparts, which may lead to lower levels of well-being. However, our study shows no significant difference based on gender in both the POS and PWB among faculty members. Although men may have higher expectations regarding organizational support (Mascarenhas et al., 2022), both male and female faculty members demonstrate similar perceptions of the work environment and their own well-being.

In our study, no differences were found by academic title in terms of POS, similar to findings by Yu et al. (2021). However, PWB varied according to academic title. One possible reason for this difference is that academics with different titles may have different workloads. Assistant professors may have more teaching responsibilities or may have less job security compared with their higher-title colleagues (Haviland et al., 2023). Additionally, as different academic titles often coincide with early career stages, during which serious responsibilities, such as parenting young children and establishing work-life balance are undertaken, it can be inferred that doctoral faculty members exhibit lower levels of well-being (Diego-Medrano & Salazar, 2021; Fleming, 2023; Reybold, 2005).

We found significant differences in the POS and PWB levels of faculty members based on their tenure. However, Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) found that demographic factors, such as age and tenure, showed very little relationship with POS. Data from our study suggest that POS tends to decrease as tenure increases. This is contrary to findings in prior studies (Johnson, 2020; Solmaz & Akdoğan, 2023; Yirci, 2014) and may be attributed to the fluctuating nature of POS. Considering that roughly half of the overall variance in POS stems from individual experiences and perceptions on a regular basis (Caesens et al., 2016), this could potentially be a causal factor for the trend observed in our study. Our results show that the PWB of faculty decreases significantly as their tenure increases, which is inconsistent with findings by Fontinha et al. (2018). According to Culver (2020), extended tenure at an institution may lead to faculty members forming stronger relationships with colleagues and administrators over time, consequently contributing to a higher level of PWB.

Limitations

There are some limitations that need to be considered. All participants included in our research were faculty members working only in Istanbul. However, of a total of 205 universities in Turkey, 57 (~28%) are located in Istanbul. Therefore, Istanbul represents an important part of the overall academic population. Furthermore, quantitative research often emphasizes generalizability and causality, but it may not fully explore the underlying mechanisms or processes that drive the observed relationships between variables. Thus, our current study does not capture contextual factors or the potential richness of participants' perspectives.

Measures used also may not fully capture the complexity and diversity of factors influencing faculty members' experiences in the academic context.

Implications for Research and Practice

Future studies should adopt diverse methodological approaches when investigating POS and PWB. Combining quantitative surveys with qualitative interviews or focus groups can provide a more comprehensive understanding of the complex factors influencing faculty experiences in higher education institutions. Additionally, longitudinal studies can offer insights into the dynamic nature of faculty well-being over time. By employing mixed-methods research, researchers can delve into the nuances of faculty members' perceptions, motivations, and challenges, uncovering valuable insights that inform the development of supportive work environments and policies, ultimately contributing to enhanced job satisfaction and PWB in universities.

To enhance faculty satisfaction, commitment, motivation, and PWB, different strategies can be employed, such as providing support, balancing workload, offering leadership training, and providing training in conflict management. These strategies will not only enhance the satisfaction and motivation of faculty members but also contribute to the success of both students and the institution (Harrill et al. 2015; Kinzie, 2005). Universities and other educational institutions should provide organizational support to enhance the PWB of faculty and, thus, create a sustainable work environment. To achieve this, we suggest implementing strategies such as flexible scheduling and employee recognition programs. These initiatives communicate organizational care, reduce employee stress, and enhance job-related positivity, ultimately contributing to a more positive work attitude (Guan et al., 2014). In this context, it is important for higher education institutions to change and consider the needs and expectations of the faculty. Strategies such as psychological support programs for faculty members, activities that provide social support, diversification of teaching methods, and policies addressing work-life balance can be useful (Kabanova et al., 2016; Kurtessis et al., 2017). Emphasizing the researcher roles of faculty members and reducing the intensity of their teaching and administrative duties to allow more time for teaching and research activities will contribute to higher POS levels. In this context, it is necessary to increase active participation by faculty in research and provide them with a productive working environment. Policymakers hold the key to shaping the future of teaching and research in higher education institutions.

Conclusion

Providing organizational support to faculty members can positively influence PWB. When faculty members are supported by their organizations, they may experience lower levels of stress and job dissatisfaction, leading to better PWB. Additionally, when faculty members feel valued and supported, they may experience stronger job security, organizational commitment, and an increase in their levels of PWB. Fostering a positive and supportive working environment that acknowledges and evaluates the invaluable contributions of faculty members is paramount for higher education institutions. By creating such an atmosphere, institutions have the potential to elevate the job satisfaction, commitment, and PWB of their teaching staff. By prioritizing the well-being and professional development of their educators, institutions lay the foundation for a thriving academic community.

References

Abid, G., Ahmed, S., Elahi, N. S., & Ilyas, S. (2020). Antecedents and mechanism of employee well-being for social sustainability: A sequential mediation. *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, *24*, 79–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spc.2020.06.011

Afif, A. H. (2018). The relationship between perceived organizational supports with job satisfaction and organizational commitment at faculty members of universities. *Sleep and Hypnosis (Online)*, *20*(4), 290–293. https://doi.org/10.5350/Sleep.Hypn.2018.20.0164

Altbach, P. G. (2000). The deterioration of the academic estate: International patterns of academic work. In P. G. Altbach (Ed.), *The changing academic workplace: Comparative perspectives* (pp. 1–23). Center for International Higher Education.

Amundsen, S., & Martinsen, Ø. L. (2015). Linking empowering leadership to job satisfaction, work effort, and creativity: The role of self-leadership and psychological empowerment. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *22*(3), 304–323. https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051814565819

Arslan, A., & Tura, G. (2022). Examining teachers' psychological well-being according to some variables: Yüksekova example. *Educatione, 1*(2), 212–234.

Aydoğan, İ. (2019). *School climate perceptions of teachers as predictors of psychological well-being levels* (Unpublished master's thesis). Marmara University, İstanbul.

Bai, N., Yan, Z., & Othman, R. (2023). The moderating effect of perceived organizational support: The impact of psychological capital and bidirectional work-family nexuses on psychological wellbeing in tourism. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*, 1064632, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1064632

Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2014). Burnout and work engagement: The JD-R approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 1,* 389–411. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091235

Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the job demands-resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management*, *43*(1), 83–104. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20004

Benlioğlu, B. (2014). *The examination of the effect of perceived organisational support of university teaching staff on organisational commitment* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hacettepe University, Ankara.

Berg, M., & Seeber, B. K. (2016). *The slow professor: Challenging the culture of speed in the academy*. University of Toronto Press.

Besser, A., Lotem, S., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (2022). Psychological stress and vocal symptoms among university professors in Israel: Implications of the shift to online synchronous teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Voice*, *36*(2), 291–e9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvoice.2020.05.028

Black, J. S., & Gregerson, H. B. (1999). The right way to manage expats. *Harvard Business Review, 77,* 52–63.

Bogler, R., & Nir, A. E. (2012). The importance of teachers' perceived organizational support to job satisfaction: What's empowerment got to do with it? *Journal of Educational Administration, 50*(3), 287–306. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231211223310

Bothwell, E. (2018). *Work-life balance survey 2018: Long hours take their toll on academics*. Retrieved March 2, 2023, from https://www.timeshighereducation.com/features/work-life-balance-survey-2018-long-hours-take-their-toll-academics

Butts, M. M., Casper, W. J., & Yang, T. S. (2013). How important are work-family support policies? A meta-analytic investigation of their effects on employee outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 98,* 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030389

Büyükgöze, H., & Kavak, Y. (2017). The relationship of perceived organizational support and psychological capital: An investigation among high school teachers. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi (Educational Administration Theory and Practice), 23*(1), 1–32. https://doi.org/10.14527/kuey.2017.001

Caesens, G., Stinglhamber, F., & Ohana, M. (2016). Perceived organizational support and well-being: A weekly study. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 31*(7), 1214–1230. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-01-2016-0002

Chung, K. C., Song, J. W., Kim, H. M., Woolliscroft, J. O., Quint, E. H., Lukacs, N. W., & Gyetko, M. R. (2010). Predictors of job satisfaction among academic faculty members: Do instructional and clinical staff differ? *Medical Education, 44,* 985–995. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2010.03766.x

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education.* Routledge.

Collins, B. J. (2017). Fair? I don't care: Examining the moderating effect of workplace cynicism on the relationship between interactional fairness and perceptions of organizational support from a social exchange perspective. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *24*(3), 401–413. https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051816667896

Crucke, S., Kluijtmans, T., Meyfroodt, K., & Desmidt, S. (2022). How does organizational sustainability foster public service motivation and job satisfaction? The mediating role of organizational support and societal impact potential. *Public Management Review*, *24*(8), 1155–1181. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2021.1893801

Culver, K. C., Young, R. L., & Barnhardt, C. L. (2020). Communicating support: Examining perceived organizational support among faculty members with differing appointment types. *Innovative Higher Education*, *45*, 299–315. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-020-09503-z

Damiri, H., Neysi, A., Arshadi, N., & Na-ami, A. (2015). Effectiveness of comprehensive stress management training on depression symptoms and psychosomatic symptoms in employees. *Quarterly Journal of Health Psychology*, *4*(16), 69–78.

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(3), 499. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499

Diego-Medrano, E., & Salazar, L. R. (2021). Examining the work-life balance of faculty in higher education. *International Journal of Social Policy and Education, 3*(3), 27–36. https://www.ijspe.com/vol-3-no-3-march-2021-3.pdf

Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D. W., Oishi, S., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2010). New well-being measures: Short scales to assess flourishing and positive and negative feelings. *Social Indicators Research*, *97*, 143–156. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-009-9493-y

Eagan, M. K., Jaeger, A. J., & Grantham, A. (2015). Supporting the academic majority: Policies and practices related to part-time faculty's job satisfaction. *The Journal of Higher Education, 86*, 448–483. https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2015.0012

Eder, P., & Eisenberger, R. (2008). Perceived organizational support: Reducing the negative influence of coworker withdrawal behavior. *Journal of Management*, *34*(1), 55–68. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307309259

Edwards, M. R., & Peccei, R. (2010). Perceived organizational support, organizational identification, and employee outcomes: Testing a simultaneous multifoci model. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, *9*(1), 17–26. https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000007

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *71*(3), 500–507. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500

Eisenberger, R., Pierce, W. D., & Cameron, J. (1999). Effects of reward on intrinsic motivation—Negative, neutral, and positive: Comment on Deci, Koestner, and Ryan (1999). *Psychological Bulletin, 125*(6), 677–691. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.125.6.677

Eisenberger, R., Rhoades S. L., & Wen, X. (2020). Perceived organizational support: Why caring about employees counts. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 7,* 101–124. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012119-044917

Eisenberger, R., & Stinglhamber, F. (2011). *Perceived organizational support: Fostering enthusiastic and productive employees.* APA Books.

Engels, N., Aelterman, A., Petegem, K. V., & Schepens, A. (2004). Factors which influence the well-being of pupils in Flemish secondary schools. *Educational Studies, 30*(2), 127–143. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305569032000159787

Fleming, R. S. (2023). Early career challenges. *In: Preparing for a Successful Faculty Career*. Springer Texts in Education. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-50161-6_40

Fontinha, R., Easton, S., & Van Laar, D. (2019). Overtime and quality of working life in academics and non-academics: The role of perceived work-life balance. *International Journal of Stress Management, 26*(2), 173–183. https://doi.org/10.1037/str0000067

Fontinha, R., Van Laar, D., & Easton, S. (2018). Quality of working life of academics and researchers in the UK: The roles of contract type, tenure and university ranking. *Studies in Higher Education*, *43*(4), 786–806. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1203890

Fuller, J. B., Hester, K., Barnett, T., Frey, L., & Relyea C. (2006). Perceived organizational support and perceived external prestige: Predicting organizational attachment for university faculty, staff, and administrators. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 146*(3), 327–347. https://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.146.3.327-347

Gillespie, N. A., Walsh, M. H. W. A., Winefield, A. H., Dua, J., & Stough, C. (2001). Occupational stress in universities: Staff perceptions of the causes, consequences and moderators of stress. *Work & Stress*, *15*(1), 53–72. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370117944

Giorgi, G., Dubin, D., & Perez, J. F. (2016). Perceived organizational support for enhancing welfare at work: A regression tree model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *7*, 1770, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01770

Grant, A. M., Christianson, M. K., & Price, R. H. (2007). Happiness, health, or relationships? Managerial practices and employee well-being tradeoffs. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *21*(3), 51–63. https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2007.26421238

Grawitch, M. J., Trares, S., & Kohler, J. M. (2007). Healthy workplace practices and employee outcomes. *International Journal of Stress Management, 14*(3), 275–293. https://doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.14.3.275

Guan, X., Sun, T., Hou, Y., Zhao, L., Luan, Y. Z., & Fan, L. H. (2014). The relationship between job performance and perceived organizational support in faculty members at Chinese universities: A questionnaire survey. *BMC Medical Education*, *14*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6920-14-50

Hagedorn, L. S. (2000). Conceptualizing faculty job satisfaction: Components, theories, and outcomes. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 15,* 5–20. https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.10501

Hakanen, J. J., Schaufeli, W. B., & Ahola, K. (2008). The Job Demands-Resources model: A three-year cross-lagged study of burnout, depression, commitment, and work engagement. *Work & Stress, 22*(3), 224–241. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370802379432

Halbesleben, J. R. B., & Buckley, M. R. (2004). Burnout in organizational life. *Journal of Management 30*(6), 859–879. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jm.2004.06.004

Harrill, M., Lawton, J. A., & Fablanke, J.-C. (2015). Faculty and staff engagement: A core component of student success. *Peer Review*, 17(4), 11–15. Retrieved January 2, 2024, from https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A452288432/AONE?u=anon~cc520ed3&sid=googleScholar&xid=3c62d4e3

Haviland, D., Ortiz, A. M., & Henriques, L. (2023). *Shaping your career: A guide for early career faculty*. Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003446958.

Ilies, R., Schwind, K. M., Wagner, D. T., Johnson, M. D., DeRue, D. S., & Ilgen, D. R. (2007). When can employees have a family life? The effects of daily workload and affect on work-family conflict and social behaviors at home. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(5), 1368. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.5.1368

Jiang, L., & Probst, T. M. (2016). Transformational and passive leadership as cross-level moderators of the relationships between safety knowledge, safety motivation, and safety participation. *Journal of Safety Research*, *57*, 27–32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsr.2016.03.002

Johnson, A. (2020). *The impact of compensation on engagement and organizational tenure: The moderating role of perceived organizational support* (Doctoral dissertation, San Jose State University, Order No. 28264145). https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/impact-compensation-on-engagement-organizational/docview/2491108003/se-2

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(1), 80. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.80

Kabanova, N. N., Pankova, N. M., Hollenbeck, J. E., & Prokhorova, K. E. (2016). Challenges of scientific knowledge visualization in publication productivity of the university academic staff. In *SHS Web of Conferences* 28, 01047 (2016), EDP Sciences. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20162801047

Kalağan, G. (2009). *The relationship between research assistants? Perceived organizational support and organizational cynicism* (Unpublished master's thesis). Akdeniz University, Antalya.

Kasalak, G., & Aksu, M. B. (2014). The relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational cynicism of research assistants. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 14*(1), 125–133. https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2014.1.1765

Kezar, A. (2013). Examining non-tenure track faculty perceptions of how departmental policies and practices shape their performance and ability to create student learning at four-year institutions. *Research in Higher Education, 54,* 571–598. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-013-9288-5

Kinman, G. (2014). Doing more with less? Work and wellbeing in academics. *Somatechnics, 4*, 219–235. https://doi.org/10.3366/soma.2014.0129

Kinman, G., & Wray, S. (2019). Wellbeing in academic employees—A benchmarking approach. In R. Burke & S. Pignata (Eds.), *Handbook of research on stress and well-being in the public sector* (pp. 152–166). Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.

Kinzie, J. (2005). Promoting student success: What faculty members can do. *National Survey of Student Engagement*. Retrieved January 2, 2024, from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED506532

Koç, M. (2017). *Predicting psychological well-being levels of research assistants working at Hacettepe University* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hacettepe University, Ankara.

Komarraju, M., Musulkin, S., & Bhattacharya, G. (2010). Role of student-faculty interactions in developing college students' academic self-concept, motivation, and achievement. *Journal of College Student Development, 51*(3), 332–342. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.0.0137

Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., Stewart, K. A., & Adis, C. S. (2017). Perceived organizational support: A meta-analytic evaluation of organizational support theory. *Journal of Management, 43*(6), 1854–1884. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315575554

Larson, L. M., Seipel, M. T., Shelley, M. C., Gahn, S. W., Ko, S. Y., Schenkenfelder, M., Rover, D. T., Schmittmann, B., & Heitmann, M. M. (2019). The academic environment and faculty well-being: The role of psychological needs. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *27*(1), 167–182. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072717748667

Levin, J. S., & Shaker, G. G. (2011). The hybrid and dualistic identity of full-time non-tenure-track faculty. *American Behavioral Scientist, 55,* 1461–1484. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764211409382

Liu, Y., & Ipe, M. (2010). The impact of organizational and leader-member support on expatriate commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *21*(7), 1035–1048. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585191003783496

Livingston, J. D. (2013). *Mental illness-related structural stigma: The downward spiral of systemic exclusion*. Mental Health Commission of Canada. https://www.mentalhealthcommission.ca/sites/default/files/MHCC_OpeningMinds_MentalIllness-RelatedSructuralStigmaReport_ENG_0_0.pdf

Livingston, J. D. (2020). *Structural stigma in health-care contexts for people with mental health and substance use issues: A literature review*. Mental Health Commission of Canada.

Madhuchandra, M. K., & Srimathi, N. L. (2016). Psychological well-being among doctors and nurses: A comparative study. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology, 3*(4), 203–210. https://doi.org/10.25215/0304.212

Malik, S., & Noreen, S. (2015). Perceived organizational support as a moderator of affective well-being and occupational stress. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, *9*(3), 865–874.

Mascarenhas, C., Galvão, A. R., & Marques, C. S. (2022). How perceived organizational support, identification with organization and work engagement influence job satisfaction: A gender-based perspective. *Administrative Sciences*, *12*(2), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci12020066

Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1996). *Maslach burnout inventory manual*. Consulting Psychologists.

Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *52*(1), 397–422. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397

McGinn, M. K. (2012). Being academic researchers: Navigating pleasures and pains in the current Canadian context. *Workplace: A Journal for Academic Labor, 21*, 14–24.

Moors, A. C., Malley, J. E., & Stewart, A. J. (2014). My family matters: Gender and perceived support for family commitments and satisfaction in academia among postdocs and faculty in STEMM and non-STEMM fields. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 38*(4), 460–474. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684314542343

Mudrak, J., Zabrodska, K., Kveton, P., Jelinek, M., Blatny, M., Solcova, I., & Machovcova, K. (2018). Occupational well-being among university faculty: A job demands-resources model. *Research in Higher Education*, *59*, 325–348. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-017-9467-x

Nguyen, T. D., Bui, T. H. V., Nguyen, T. L. T., Tran, M. D., & Tran, T. K. N. (2021). Perception of organizational support to lecturers' research motivation: The case of Vietnam. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, *8*(2), 657–666. https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2021.vol8.no2.0657

Ni, C., & Wang, Y. (2015). The impact of perceived organizational support and core self-evaluation on employee's psychological well-being. *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, *3*(2), 73–81. https://doi.org/10.4236/jhrss.2015.32011

Panaccio, A., & Vandenberghe, C. (2009). Perceived organizational support, organizational commitment and psychological well-being: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 75*(2), 224–236. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2009.06.002

Payne, S. C., Youngcourt, S. S., & Beaubien, J. M. (2007). A meta-analytic examination of the goal orientation nomological net. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(1), 128–150. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.128

Price, D., & McCallum, F. (2015). Ecological influences on teachers' well-being and "fitness." *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *43*(3), 195–209. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2014.932329

Reybold, L. E. (2005). Surrendering the dream. *Journal of Career Development, 32*(2), 107–121. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845305279163

Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(4), 698–714. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698

Rinas, R., Dresel, M., Hein, J., Janke, S., Dickhäuser, O., & Daumiller, M. (2020). Exploring university instructors' achievement goals and discrete emotions. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*(1484), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01484

Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. (1998). The contours of positive human health. *Psychological Inquiry, 9*, 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli0901_1

Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. H. (2008). Know thyself and become what you are: A eudaimonic approach to psychological well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *9*, 13–39. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-006-9019-0

Sabagh, Z., Hall, N. C., & Saroyan, A. (2018). Antecedents, correlates and consequences of faculty burnout. *Educational Research, 60*(2), 131–156. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2018.1461573

Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *21*(7), 600–619. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169

Salanova, M., Schaufeli, W. B., Llorens, S., Peiró, J. M., & Grau, R. (2000). Desde el "burnout" al "engagement": ¿una nueva perspectiva? [From "burnout" to "engagement": A new perspective?]. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones, 16*(2), 117–134.

Salimzadeh, R., Hall, N. C., & Saroyan, A. (2020). Stress, emotion regulation, and well-being among Canadian faculty members in research-intensive universities. *Social Sciences*, *9*(12), 1–37. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci9120227

Salimzadeh, R., Saroyan, A., & Hall, N. C. (2017). Examining the factors impacting academics' psychological well-being: A review of research. *International Education Research, 5*(1), 13–44. https://doi.org/10.12735/ier.v5n1p13

Seldin, P. (1987). Research findings on causes of academic stress. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 1987*(29), 13–21. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.37219872904

Serinkan, C., & Tülü, M. (2020). Perception of personnel's organizational support at universities: The case of Pamukkale University. *Pamukkale Journal of Business and Information Management*, *7*(1), 46–63.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2018). Job demands and job resources as predictors of teacher motivation and well-being. *Social Psychology of Education*, *21*(5), 1251–1275. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-018-9464-8

Sluss, D. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (2008). How relational and organizational identification converge: Processes and conditions. *Organization Science, 19,* 807–823. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1070.0349

Smith, J. M., Smith, J., McLuckie, A., Szeto, A. C., Choate, P., Birks, L. K., Burns, V. F., & Bright, K. S. (2022). Exploring mental health and well-being among university faculty members: A qualitative study. *Journal of Psychosocial Nursing and Mental Health Services*, *60*(11), 17–25. https://doi.org/10.3928/02793695-20220523-01

Solmaz, H., & Akdoğan, A. (2023). Investigation of the relationship between organizational support and organizational citizenship perceived by teachers working in the field of secondary education. *TURAN Center for Strategic Research, 15*(59), 163–170. http://dx.doi.org/10.15189/1308-8041

Stuckey, S. M., Collins, B. T., Patrick, S., Grove, K. S., & Ward, E. (2019). Thriving vs. surviving: Benefits of formal mentoring program on faculty well-being. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education, 8*(4), 378–396. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMCE-02-2019-0024

Suleman, Q., Hussain, I., Shehzad, S., Syed, M. A., & Raja, S. A. (2018). Relationship between perceived occupational stress and psychological well-being among secondary school heads in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *PloS ONE*, *13*(12), e0208143, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0208143

Telef, B. (2013). The adaptation of psychological well-being into Turkish: A validity and reliability study. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, *28*(3), 374–384.

Tijdink, J. K., Vergouwen, A., & Smulders, Y. M. (2014). Emotional exhaustion and burnout among medical professors: A nationwide survey. *BMC Medical Education*, *14*(1), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6920-14-183

Turnley W. H., Bolino M. C., Lester S. W., & Bloodgood J. M. (2003). The impact of psychological contract fulfillment on the performance of in-role and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, *29*(2), 187–206. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630302900204

Van Horn, J. E., Taris, T. W., Schaufeli, W. B., & Schreurs, P. J. (2004). The structure of occupational well-being: A study among Dutch teachers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *77*(3), 365–375. https://doi.org/10.1348/0963179041752718

Vera, M., Salanova, M., & Martín, B. (2010). University faculty and work-related well-being: The importance of the triple work profile. *Electronic Journal of Research in Education Psychology*, *8*(2), 581–602. https://doi.org/10.25115/ejrep.v8i21.1373

Watt, H. M. G., & Richardson, P. W. (2020). Motivation of higher education faculty: (How) it matters! *International Journal of Educational Research, 100* (2020), 101533, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101533

Watts, J., & Robertson, N. (2011). Burnout in university teaching staff: A systematic literature review. *Educational Research*, *53*(1), 33–50. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2011.552235

Wright, T. A., Cropanzano, R., & Bonett, D. G. (2007). The moderating role of employee positive well being on the relation between job satisfaction and job performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *12*(2), 93–104. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.2.93

Yılmaz, A., Uçum, Y., Kızılırmak, E., Aktepe, H., Petek, S., & Gündüz, H. (2023). Investigation of psychological well-being levels of teachers working at various education levels according to various variables. *Socrates Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Studies*, *9*(27), 13–23.

Yirci, R. (2014*). Comparison of academicians' perceived organizational support, organizational commitment levels and opinions about privatization in higher education at state and foundation universities* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Fırat University, Elazığ.

Yokuş, İ. (2006). *The relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational commitment in male dominated professions* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hacettepe University, Ankara.

Yu, C., & Frenkel, S. J. (2013). Explaining task performance and creativity from perceived organizational support theory: Which mechanisms are more important? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34,* 1165–1181. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1844

Yu, X., Wu, S., Chen, W., Zheng, W., Huang, M., Yang, L., & Zhou, S. (2021). Exploring the associations between perceived organizational support and job burnout among Chinese academic journal editors: A moderated mediation model. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18*(22), 12167. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182212167

Yukhymenko-Lescroart, M. A., & Sharma, G. (2019). The relationship between faculty members' passion for work and well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *20*, 863–881. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-018-9977-z

Zepke, N., & Leach, L. (2010). Improving student engagement: Ten proposals for action. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 11*(3), 167–177. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787410379680

Zhang, L., Qiu, Y., & Teng, E. (2017). Cross-level relationships between justice climate and organizational citizenship behavior: Perceived organizational support as mediator. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, *45*(3), 387–397. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.4842