Work Relationships in Different Workplaces Sectors: The Roles of Emotional Problems and Work-Related Factors

Siamak Khodarahimi[1,*], Mohammadhadi Nikpourian[2]

[1]Department of Psychology, Eghlid Branch, Islamic Azad University, Eghlid, Iran
[2]Business Administration Department, Corvinus School of Management, Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary

Abstract This study was purposed to examine the confirmatory factorial structure of the Work Relationships Scale (WRS); to investigate the correlations between work relationships, perceived stress, anxiety, and depression; and to explore the roles of a few workplace-related factors on these constructs. Participants were 318 employees that selected by random sampling method within a survey from the higher education, governmental and industrial workplace sectors, Eghlid city, Iran. A demographic questionnaire and four self-rating measures were used in this study. The validity and reliability of the WRS were affirmed in this study. Resulting data showed that the WRS is a multifaceted construct with three factors: (1) criticism, procrustean, and coercion, (2) satisfactory; and (3) supportive and empathic relationships. The first factor was significantly and positive correlated with work stress, depression, and anxiety. The second factor was not significantly correlated to work stress, depression, and anxiety. The third factor was negative and significantly correlated to the work stress. Work stress, depression, and anxiety were positive and significantly correlated to each other. The type of workplace; work experience, type of job, and the level of professional expertise were significantly effective on the dependents variables in this sample.

Keywords Work Relationships, Work Stress, Depression, Anxiety, Work-related Factors

1. Introduction

The social nature of human is recognized by many scholars in personality and social psychology theories[1-4]. In fact, all interpersonal relationships build at multiple levels in different social situations and all they have the major roles in the human mental wellbeing. Since the nature of interpersonal relationships in various social settings is phenomenological; and it can be influenced by all things that have passed through an individual's mind in a given situation[5]. Walster, Walster and Berscheid noted that the effects of human relationships such as satisfaction and contribution initially are based upon the personal evaluations of how just or fair the distribution of costs and benefits for each member in a social interaction[6]. Hence, striking and good relationships have immense benefits for buffering the psychosocial stressors, perceived social support and psychological adjustment[7-9]. While negative and harsh relationships such as disgust, anger and hostility are linked to the higher levels of inter-group conflicts, narrow-mindness, discrimination, prejudice and rejection of out-groups members[10-11]. Evidence from social capital field indicated that the quality of relationships influences by networks, norms, trust, and attainable resources in different

social organizations[12-14].

The nature of interpersonal relationships in all institutions and organizations are formed by two natural and intentional mechanisms. The natural formation of relationships is the result of social interaction among individuals who are entered or leave the social networks. But intentional mechanism shows that individuals tendency for a few strategic behaviors by seeking some outside relationships and social networks which finally help them to create the social capital for their own benefit[12, 15]. Thereby, search for training of social and interpersonal skills was focused in many mental health programs because their positive outcomes can help societies to prevent the high risk and disruptive emotional problems in the specific populations. For example, mentoring of social relationships is one of the most popular social interventions in American society, particularly for improving of emotional functioning, psychological well-being and positive development in youth. Obviously, the rationale behind this program for youth is based on the assumption that social ties can put forward substantial benefits to young people in their emotional well being[16]. Therefore, this study is purposed to investigate the confirmatory validity of Work Relationships Scale (WRS), to investigate its associations with stress, depression and anxiety, and to explore the roles of work-related factors on these constructs in an Iranian sample.

1.1. Work Relationships, Stress and Emotional Problems in Workplace

* Corresponding author:
khodarahimi@yahoo.com (Siamak Khodarahimi)

Research about the human relationships in workplaces is a relatively new field in organizational and industrial psychology. Thereby, there is a lack of theory, research and practice for work relationships and its possible roles on psychopathology among employee such as their stress and emotional problems in the workplaces. Work relationships are products of organizational cultures and their surrounded sociocultural contexts. Work relationships might influences by social associations, social connections, affiliations, goals, social settings, policies, and physical environment workplaces, and it would expect the work relationships affecting by multiple roles which employee are doing in different workplaces[5]. Altogether the ignorance of work relationships quality between personnel in a workplace is a major risk for its professional success. Therefore, the winner workplaces are motivated to promote the good working relationships. In contrast, the loser organizations are inattentive to the work relationships among their employee, and these negative relationships produce many adverse outcomes for them in advance[17]. In the recent study, Khodarahimi, Hashim and Mohd-Zaharim indicated that work relationships construct is a multidimensional issue with four factors: critical and procrustean, satisfactory, supportive and sympathic, and disciplinary. The critical and procrustean factor was positively associated to interpersonal sensitivity, work stress, depression and anxiety. The satisfactory factor was negatively correlated to depression and work stress. The supportive and sympathic factor was negatively linked with work stress. The disciplinary factor has positive correlation with interpersonal sensitivity and work stress. Their findings showed that work relationships could explain 30, 3 and 6 percents of variations in work stress, depression and anxiety constructs respectively[5]. Khodarahimi, Hashim and Mohd-Zaharim suggested that workplace relationships involve two positive and negative sides, and these factors could be explain by child rearing, attachment, cultural values, socialization and acculturations mechanisms in workplaces and their surrounded cultures[5]. A plausible explanation for the dark side of work relationships in workplaces is the general tendency of employee for attainment the higher social desirability. In line with this speculation, Uziel revealed that various forms of interpersonal orientations including predispositions, long-term relationships, friendships, and short-term reactions in all social contexts might be influence by social desirability in some degrees[18]. However, Uziel noted that social desirability is not as constructive for all types of interpersonal relationships in social contexts[18]. Uziel showed that interpersonally oriented self-control is more useful for personal well-being and interpersonal adjustment than mere social desirability [18]. Moreover, the roles of a few workplaces-related factors such as the level of education, type of job and the workplace classification on the work relationships were supported in the current study in a Malaysian sample[5].

1.2. Theoretical Conceptualizations

Theoretically, there is not a rigorous and well-tailored conceptualization about the work relationships in industrial and organizational psychology. This study tries to explain the nature of work relationships in this field by using two broad approaches which called interpersonal relationships and organizational theories. Attachment perspective, social relationships perspective, and gender-oriented perspective are three examples of interpersonal relationships theories. From an attachment perspective, Bowlby conceptualized that infantile relationships with the early caregivers in childhood are interojected by the child and then shape the prototype for all relationships in adulthood, including the work relationships[19]. Similarly, Hazan and Shaver suggested that individual' relationships to their colleagues in workplace can reflect the traits which present in their attachment styles[20]. This perspective is more beneficial for exploration the possible roles of attachment figures and childhood unconscious experiences on forming the work relationships across workplaces in adulthood.

According to the social relationships perspective, Reis and Collins suggested that there is a linear linkage between the quality and quantity of the human relationships and their functioning, including physical and mental health. They noted that innate systems for regulating of social relationships and responding to social circumstances might include: cooperation, competition, social norms, coalition formation, attachment, face perception, social inclusion and exclusion, communication of emotions, romantic jealousy, empathy, and commitment[21]. Reis and Collins indicated that all relationships can be defined in terms of the properties that describe the involved parties' interdependence with each other[21]. Reis and Collins suggested that relationship contexts have the potential to affect the different array of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral processes in people[21]. Reis and Collins noted that relationships could impact social cognition, emotion, and human development in different ways[21]. However, Reis and Collins argued that a few features of the environment have greater impact on the human relationships[21]. This conceptualization shows the impacts of societal and cultural factors on work relationships in different workplaces.

From the gender-oriented perspective, various kinds of social interactions and interpersonal relationships might influences by gender and body objectification in different social settings. For instance, Saguy, Quinn, Dovidio and Pratto indicated that sexual objectification on women's behavior in social interactions is an important factor in their relationships in workplaces, and it could affect their mental health and emotional functioning[22]. Based on the gender-oriented theory, the quality of work relationships is influences by gender and body language in the workplaces.

Workload model, control-stress model, situated inference model and the organizational view of social development are four examples of organizational theories. According to the workload model, there is a significant linkage between the workload and workers' perceptions from their colleagues. Wicker and August indicated that the understaffed workers

as relatively insensitive and non-evaluative about the personal characteristics of their colleagues; because their main concern is keeping the setting that operating for themselves[23]. The workload model is predicts that workers with heavier work loads would be expecting to make less extreme judgments about their colleagues than workers with lighter work loads. This model suggested that workload is negatively correlated to the favorability of workers' ratings of their colleagues. The propositions just classified link the working condition and workload with two kinds of experience that workers may have on the job (i.e. setting claim and favorable views of colleagues). This model is suggests that these work experiences are linked to three kinds of more long-term outcomes that including: job satisfaction, work self-esteem, and stress symptoms[23]. Altogether, the workload model conceptualized that organizational size, workload, work experience factors (i.e. assessments of colleagues), and work outcomes (job satisfaction, work self-esteem, stress symptoms) are linked to the work relationships. Findings based on this conceptualization were affirmed significant differences between employees from two contrasting occupational groups (i.e. professional-technical workers and operative workers) that show its application in the work relationships. This finding is supporting the workload model prediction in different work settings[23]. It seems this model is working suitably for explanation the work relationships and its possible correlations with stress and emotional problems in the workplaces.

Based on the control-stress model, the inherent stressors in work relationships such as conflicts with co-workers or abusive behaviors by supervisors can produce some emotional problems such as stress, anxiety and depression among employee in organizations[24]. This theory predicted that employee perceptions of their control on stressors in workplaces have an important role on their emotional functioning and well-being[24]. Therefore, this theory is helpful for exploration the associations between work relationships, stress and emotional problems in different workplaces.

In situated inference model, it would expect that relationships in workplaces influence the prime-related behavior and goal striving among employee, and these factors are influential on their judgment, behavior, or motivation in the workplace[25]. This model suggested that a prime's effects for positive and negative relationships in the workplaces and its role on judgment (construal priming), action (behavior priming), and motivation (goal priming) of employee can be produced through the same basic process. Thereby, it seems the primes of work relationships influences employee mental health and their emotional reaction toward the work perceptions[25].

From an organizational view on social development, work relationships have four basic principles[26]. First, the meaning of work relationships depends on how it is appropriateness with global behaviors in a specific workplace. Second, the way that people regulates their emotions in work relationships; and how they regulated their emotions with their caregivers earlier in life. Third, mental representations of the self and work relationships with colleagues formed early in life can guide interactions patterns in their later relationships across workplaces. Fourth, experiences from the early relationships with parents and in later relations to colleagues in work relationships should together influence what happens later in social development[26]. The organizational view predicted that the early interpersonal experiences in life can determine how well individuals resolve their relationship conflicts, recover from conflicts, and have stable, satisfying relationships in workplaces[26].

1.3. The Present Study

Founded on the aforesaid literature and conceptualizations, the work relationships as a new field in the industrial and organizational psychology needs to investigate the measurement of work relationships and to explore its associations with work stress, emotional problems and work-related factors in the workplaces. Therefore, this study is purposed to examine the validity of the work relationships scale by conducting a confirmatory factors analysis, to investigate the interrelatedness between work relationships, perceived stress, anxiety and depression, and to explore the roles of workplace-related factors on aforesaid constructs in an Iranian sample. Since there is a lack of evidence in the factorial structure of workplace relationships and its possible roles on work stress and emotional problems in the country, this investigation could bring up some valuable insights for industrial and organizational counseling, and psychological interventions in the workplaces. This study speculated that the factorial structure of work relationships scale is culture-bounded, there are significant associations between work relationships, work stress, depression and anxiety constructs, and it is predicted that all they would influence by a few workplace-related factors. The first hypothesis of the present study is that the workplace relationships would have a multidimensional nature. The second hypothesis of this study is that work relationships, stress, depression and anxiety in the workplaces would have significant correlations in this sample. The third hypothesis of this study is that type of work location, type of employment, work experience per year, the level of education, type of job, and the level of professional expertise would have significant roles in the work relationships, stress and emotional problems in this sample.

2. Method

2.1. Participants

Participants were 318 working individuals (male $n = 260$ and female $n = 58$) from the governmental (n=146), the higher education (n=38), and the industrial (n=134) organizations in Eghlid, Fars province, Iran. Individuals from the governmental sector were recruited in the public

education office, banks, agriculture, telecommunication and health care institutions. Individuals from the higher education sector were recruited in the Eghlid Branch, Islamic Azad University. Individuals from the industrial sector were recruited in slaughterhouse, steel, and sugar factories. Therefore, participants from the three sectors are representing various job categories and workplaces. The means (and standard deviations) of age for males and females were 35.74(7.20) and 38.61 (8.90) respectively. Participants were recruited from the three sectors by simple random sampling within a survey design. All participants were full-time employee in the aforesaid workplaces sectors. After informed consent was obtained, participants completed a demographic questionnaire and four inventories in the Persian language.

2.2. Instruments

The demographic questionnaire was contained age, gender, religion, ethnicity, level of education, marital status, order of birth, number of siblings, the title of workplace, type of workplace, type of employment (i.e. formal full-time, experimental full-time, contractual full-time), work experience per year, job title, and job classification. The four inventories used were: (1) the Work Relationships Scale (WRS), (3) the Workplace Stress Scale (WSS), (4) the Center for Epidemiologic Studies-Depression (CES-D); and (5) the Beck Anxiety Inventory (BAI).

Work Relationships Scale (*WRS*). The WRS is a 15-item scale that measures the work relationships[5]. This scale measures the nature, content and quality of relationships from a phenomenological perspective in the workplace. Participants reply to all items using a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The WRS factor analysis was indicated four factors that are including: Critical and procrustean, satisfactory, supportive and sympathic, and disciplinary[5]. The WRS concurrent validity was measured by Interpersonal Sensitivity Scale[27], and Workplace Stress Scale[28]; that showed .27 and .40 correlations to them respectively. The internal reliability of the WRS factors and its total scale by using Cronbach's alpha was ranged from .81, .82, .86, .85 to .83 in a Malaysian sample (5).

Workplace Stress Scale (*WSS*). The WSS is a short version of Karasek's 49-items questionnaire[28]. The WSS is contains three factors: demands (5 items), control (6 items), and support (5 items). Participants' response to items using a scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 4 (strongly disagree). The reliability of the WSS and its subscales by using Cronbach's alpha for all domains ranged from .63 to .86[28]. The WSS internal reliability using Cronbach's alpha was .84 in this study.

The Center for Epidemiologic Studies-Depression (*CES-D*). The CES-D includes 20 items that showing the main symptoms of depression[29]. For each item, the participant has to response with a Likert scale from 1 (Rarely or none of the times to 4 (Most or all the time). The CES-D

concurrent and construct validity by clinical and self-report criteria has been demonstrated in different cultures[30-32]. The CES-D internal consistency has been reported with Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranging from .85 to .90 across studies (Radloff, 1977). The CES-D internal reliability by using Cronbach's alpha was .82 in this study.

Beck Anxiety Inventory (*BAI*). The BAI is a 21-item self-report instrument that measures the total anxiety[33]. Participants are asked to rate the severity of each symptom by using a 4-point scale ranging from 0 (Not at all bothered) to 3 (Severely bothered). The internal consistency of the BAI by using Cronbach's alpha has ranged from .90 to .94 in both clinical and nonclinical samples[33-34]. Validity of the BAI has also been confirmed in community samples[35]. The BAI internal reliability by using Cronbach's alpha was .90 in this study.

3. Results

To test the first hypothesis a confirmatory factor analysis of data was conducted to evaluate the construct validity and the possible multidimensional nature of Work Relationships Scale in this sample. Principal factor analysis with varimax rotation was used to determine the construct validity, considering Eignvalues higher than 1. Factor analysis specification was satisfactory (*KMO*=.848, *Bartlett's Test of Sphericity*=2.90, *df*=105, *p*=.0001, *Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings* =68.53). Table 1 shows the significant rotated correlation higher than .30 for 15 items in 7 iterations.

Table 1. Rotated Component Matrix of Work Relationships Scale

Items	Components		
	1	2	3
1.			.825
2.			.768
3.			.768
4.	.711		
5.	.757		
6.	.801		
7.	.592		
8.	.790		
9.	.801		
10.		.780	
11.		.834	
12.		.888	
13.		.829	
14.	.807		
15.	.760		

Factor analysis indicated that the WRS consist of three factors and Eignvalues for four factors ranged 1.31 to 5.21. These three factors explained 68.53% of variance. They were: Criticism, procrustean, and coercion (There is someone at

this workplace that often look out for my faults or put me down; 8 items), Satisfactory (I am satisfied with my relationship at this work place; 4 items); and Supportive and empathic (There is someone at this workplace that I can turn to for support with personal problems; 3 items) factors (table 2). In this study the WRS concurrent validity measured by Interpersonal Sensitivity Scale[27] and it showed .33 correlations coefficients to them respectively. The internal reliability by using Cronbach's alpha was been .82, .80, .86, and .84 for the WRS factors and its total scale in this study.

Table 2. Factors and Items of Work Relationships Scale

Factors	Items	Cumulative %
1.Criticism, procrustean, and coercion relationships (CPCR)	4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15	30.82
2.Satisfactory relationships (SR)	10, 11, 12, 13	52.16
3. Supportive and empathic relationships(SER)	1, 2, 3	68.53

Table 3. Work Relationships, Stress, Depression and Anxiety Correlations

Variables	WRS2	WRS3	WRS	WSS	depression	Anxiety
WRS1	.192**	.133*	.802**	.299**	.120*	.163**
WRS2		.548**	.692**	-.008	-.094	-.076
WRS3			.567**	-.113*	-.048	.051
WRS				-.174**	-.032	-.098
WSS					.181**	.180**
Depression						.371**

Note: *$p \leq .05$, **$p \leq .01$. WRS1= Criticism, procrustean, and coercion relationships, WRS2=Satisfactory relationships, WRS3= Supportive and empathic relationships, WRS= Work Relationships Scale, WSS=Work Stress Scale.

To evaluate the second hypothesis, a correlation analysis was computed to evaluate the relationships between the WRS, work stress, depression and anxiety in the workplace. This was computed among the 7 variables in an effort to assess the degree that these quantitative variables were positive and linearly related in the sample. Results indicated significant relationships between the WRS subscales. The first subscale of the WRS, work stress, depression and anxiety are positively correlated to each other in this sample (Table 3).

To examine the third hypothesis for the possible effects of type of work location, type of employment, work experience per year, the level of education, and type of job, the level of professional expertise differences; and their interactions in dependent variables, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was computed with these and their interactions as independent variables and work relationships, work stress, depression and anxiety as dependent variables. There were significant differences for type of workplace, *Wilks' k* = .670; $F(42, 1) = 2.92$; $p = .0001$, in all dependents variables. The type of employment, *Wilks' k* = .984; $F(6, 293) = .778$; $p = .58$, was not effective on the dependents variables. Work experience (per year), *Wilks' k* = .914; $F(6, 293) = 4.58$; $p = .0001$, was only effective on the satisfactory relationships. The level of education, *Wilks' k* = .960; $F(6, 293) = 2.03$; $p = .06$, was not effective on the dependents variables. Type of job, *Wilks' k* = .926; $F(6, 293) = 3.90$; $p = .001$, was only effective on anxiety construct. The level of professional expertise, *Wilks' k* = .897; $F(6, 293) = 5.60$; $p = .0001$, was effective on the work stress and anxiety constructs (tables 4 and5).

Table 4. Multivariate Test for the Effects of Organizational Factors on Work Relationships, Work Stress, Depression and Anxiety

Independent variables	Wilks' Lambda	F	df	p
Type of workplace	.670	2.92	42,1	.0001
Type of employment	.984	.778	6,293	.58
Work experience per year	.914	4.58	6,293	.0001
The level of education	.960	2.03	6,293	.06
Type of job	.926	3.90	6,293	.001
The level of professional expertise	.897	5.60	6.293	.0001

Table 5. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for Type of Workplace, Work Experience, Type of Job and the Level of Professional Expertise on the Dependents Variables

Variables	Type of workplace		Work experience per year		Type of job		Specialty in work	
	F	p	F	p	F	p	F	p
WRS1	2.40	.021	.37	.543	1.05	.304	.24	.625
WRS2	2.96	.005	22.81	.0001	.05	.814	1.89	.170
WRS3	2.24	.031	2.81	.095	3.08	.080	.33	.566
WRS	3.45	.001	3.58	.059	.02	.891	.12	.726
WSS	7.26	.0001	.44	.503	3.43	.065	6.38	.012
Depression	3.41	.002	.61	.433	3.77	.053	18.98	.0001
Anxiety	2.33	.025	1.00	.318	5.51	.020	.26	.610

Note: WRS1= Criticism, procrustean, and coercion relationships, WRS2=Satisfactory relationships, WRS3= Supportive and empathic relationships, WRS= Work Relationships Scale, WSS=Work Stress Scale.

4. Conclusions

The confirmatory factor analysis of work relationships scale in the first hypothesis of the present study showed that the WRS is a multidimensional construct with three factors in this sample. The WRS subscales in this confirmatory factor analysis were including: criticism, procrustean, and coercion, satisfactory; and supportive and empathic relationships. Altogether, there are five possible explanations for the multifaceted structure of the WRS in workplaces. First, the WRS factors are congruent with predictions from social and personality theories which they claim individuals search for social bounds in all social situations include the workplaces[1-4]. Second, the multifaceted nature of the WRS is already confirmed in the current study in a Malaysian sample[5]. However, this study is only showed three factors for the WRS in this sample. Therefore, the factorial structure of the work relationships might influences by some cultural backgrounds of workplaces in different countries. Third, the factorial structure of the WRS in this study is resembled with predictions from both social capital and attachment style theories in adulthood[13-15, 19-20, 36-37]. Fourth, the multifaceted nature of the human relationships in workplaces in this essay is similar to domains of interpersonal relationships in social networks such as family, inter-group and friendship. Moreover, the nature of factorial structure of the WRS in this study can be classified to two positive (i.e. satisfactory; and supportive and empathic relationships) and negative (i.e. criticism, procrustean, and coercion) dimensions. This classification is consistent with the earlier investigations. These positive and negative sides of work relationships might shape by attachment, cultural values, sex-linked roles, socialization and work-related factors which working in different organizations[5, 10-11, 13-14, 18-22, 38-39]. Fifth, the multifaceted nature of work relationships in the present study is congruent with predictions from interpersonal relationships and organizational theories about work relationships[23-26]. According to these theories, a few workplace-related factors such as workload, work stress, sense of self-control, the types of self-attributions, and the types of emotions in the workplaces can produce positive and negative dimensions of work relationships with colleagues in a given organization.

The results from the second hypothesis indicated that criticism, procrustean, and coercion factor of work relationships was positively correlated with work stress, depression and anxiety. The satisfactory factor of work relationships was not significantly correlated to work stress, depression, and anxiety. The supportive and empathic subscale of work relationships was negatively correlated to the work stress. The WRS total score was negatively correlated to the work stress but it has not significant correlations with depression and anxiety. Additionally, work stress, depression, and anxiety scales were positive and significantly correlated to each other. All of the WRS subscales were significantly and positively related to the WRS total scale. These findings showed the significant roles of criticism, procrustean, and coercion relationships at work in elevated work stress, anxiety and depression. These findings are consistent with previous literature about the possible roles of negative work relationships on emotional problems among employee in different workplaces[5, 17, 24]. Based on the rejection sensitivity model in social relationships[40], it seems that negative side of work relationships influences the self-perceived work stress, anxiety and depression in the workplaces by change of individuals appraisal framework about some threatening events in the workplace settings, and in turn this self-perception about negative work relationships can increase the interpersonal sensitivity among employee for more negative emotional problems in organizations.

The results from the third hypothesis indicated that the type of workplace; work experience, the type of job, and the level of professional expertise were significantly effective on work relationships, work stress, anxiety, and depression in this sample. But this study not showed significantly effects for the type of employment and the level of education on these dependents variables. The posteriori following test for between-subjects and group differences indicated that individuals who working in the higher education had the higher significantly criticism, procrustean, and coercion relationships, the WRS, work stress, depression and anxiety than individuals who working in both industrial and governmental sectors. In addition, individuals in two the higher education and the governmental sectors had significant higher satisfactory relationships than employee in the industrial sector. Also, individuals in the governmental sector had significant higher supportive and empathic relationships than employee in the higher education and the industry sectors. Also, individuals with work experience more than 15 years had significant higher satisfactory relationships in compare with employee with work experience less than 15 years. In addition, employee in public services jobs had significantly higher anxiety than individuals were employed in others job categories like teachers, administrators, physicians, engineers, faculty staff, nurses, and skilled workers. Finally, the employee with low professional expertise had significantly higher work stress and anxiety than individuals with moderate to the high levels of professional expertise. These findings are consistent with predictions from social and organizational theories about the roles of workplace-related and intrapersonal factors in self-perceived stress and emotional problems in organizations[5, 15-16, 18-21, 23-26, 36]. Particularly, these results in field of workplace and its impact on the work relationships are congruent with a current study in an Asian sample[5]. Specifically, it seems that some organizational management factors like ambiguity, job insecurity, and rewards and primes have significant roles for explanation the roles of workplace sectors on work relationships and emotional problems which they require to further investigations.

In conclusion, this study adds to organizational and

industrial psychology literature and theory because it is explored the multifaceted nature of work relationships and its correlations with stress, depression and anxiety in different workplaces, and it demonstrated the roles of a few workplace-related factors on work relationships and emotional problems. These results can be applied for the human resources and social skills training programs in workplaces, and they are beneficial for establishment of positive organizations in practice. However, the present study limited because it is only relied on a survey data and self-rating scales. Future studies might to investigate these constructs and their possible relationships within cross-cultural, longitudinal and experimental designs in different workplaces, and to explore the roles of work relationships on others organizational factors.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

[1] Aronson, E. (2008). *The social animal.* (10th Ed.). New York: Worth Publishers.

[2] Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D., & Akert, R. M. (2010). *Social psychology.* (7th Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

[3] Baron, R. A., Branscombe, N. R., & Byrne, D. (2009). *Social psychology* (12th Ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.

[4] Feist, J., & Feist, G. (2002). *Theories of personality.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

[5] Khodarahimi, S., Hashim, I.M. & Mohd-Zaharim, N. (2012). Workplace relationships, stress, depression and anxiety in a Malaysian sample. *International Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(1), 1-8.

[6] Walster, E., Walster, G. W., & Berscheid, E. (1978). *Equity: Theory and research*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

[7] Hatch, E. *J.,* & Guerney, B. A. (1975). Pupil relationship enhancement program. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 54, 103-105.

[8] House, J.S., D. Umberson, and K.R. Landis. (1988). Structures and processes of social support. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 14, 293-318.

[9] Schwarzer, R., & Leppin, A. (1988) Social support: The many faces of helpful social interactions. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 12(3), 333-345.

[10] Faulkner, J., Schaller, M., Park, J. H., & Duncan, L. A. (2004). Evolved disease avoidance mechanisms and contemporary xenophobic attitudes. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 7,* 333-353.

[11] Hodson, G., & Costello, K. (2007). Interpersonal disgust, ideological orientations and dehumanization as predictors of intergroup attitudes. *Psychological Science, 8,*691-698.

[12] Coleman, J.S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, 95-120.

[13] Fine, B. (2001). *Social capital versus social theory: Political economy and social science at the turn of the millennium.* London and New York, Routledge.

[14] Putnam, R. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy,* 6(1), 65-78.

[15] Gabbay, S.M., & Leenders, R.A.J. (2001). Social capital of organizations: From social structure to the management of corporate social capital. In Gabbay, S.M. and Leenders, R A.J. (Ed.), *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, Vol. 18, pp. 1-20, Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

[16] Rhodes,J.E., & DuBois, D.L. (2008). Mentoring relationships and programs for youth. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 17(4), 254-258.*

[17] Vajda, P. (2008). *Creating positive workplace relationships.* Retrieved 20 March 2012 from http://www.management-issu es.com/2008/1/10/opinion/creating-positive-workplace-relati onships.asp

[18] Uziel, L. (2010). Rethinking social desirability scales: From impression management to interpersonally oriented self-control. *Perspectives on Psychological Science,* 5(3), 243–262.

[19] Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss. Vol. 2: Separation.* New York: Basic Books.

[20] Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1990). Love and work: An attachment-theoretical perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59,* 270-280.

[21] Reis, H.T, & Collins, W.A. (2004). Relationships, human behavior and psychological science. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 13(6), 233-237.*

[22] Saguy, T., Quinn, D.M., Dovidio, J.F., & Pratto, F. (2010). Interacting like a body : Objectification can lead women to narrow their presence in social interactions. *Psychological Science,* 21(2), 178–182.

[23] Wicker, A.W., & August, R.A. (1995). How far should we generalize?: The case of a workload model. *Psychological Science, 6(1), 39-44.*

[24] Spector, P.E. (2002). Employee control and occupational stress. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 11(4), 133-136.*

[25] Loersch,C., & Payne, B.K., (2011). The situated inference model: An integrative account of the effects of primes on perception, behavior and motivation. *Perspectives on Psychological Science,* 6(3), 234–252.

[26] Simpson, J.A., Collins, W.A., & Salvatore, J.E. (2011). The impact of early interpersonal experience on adult romantic relationship functioning: Recent findings from the Minnesota longitudinal study of risk and adaptation. *Current Directions in Psychological Science,* 20(6), 355-359.

[27] Sato, T. (2003). Sociotropy and autonomy: The nature of vulnerability. *Journal of Psychology, 137,* 447-466.

[28] De Mello Alves, M.G., Chor, D., Faerstein, E., Lopes, D,, Werneck, G.L. (2004). Short version of the job stress scale: A

Portuguese-language adaptation. *Review Saude Publication*, 38 (2), 1-7.

[29] Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D Scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 1*, 385-401.

[30] Finch, B.K., Kolody, B., & Vega, W.A. (2000). Perceived discrimination and depression among Mexican-origin adults in California. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior,* 41, 295-313.

[31] Knight , R. G., Williams, S., McGee, R., & Olaman, S. (1997). Psychometric properties of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) in a sample of women in middle life. *Behavior Research & Therapy, 35(4),* 373-380.

[32] Roberts, R., Vernon, S. W., & Rhoades, H. M. (1989). Effects of language and ethnic status on reliability and validity of the CES-D with psychiatric patients. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 177*, 581-592.

[33] Steer, R., Kumar, G., Ranieri, W., & Beck, A. (1995). Use of the Beck Anxiety Inventory with adolescent psychiatric outpatients. *Psychological Reports, 76,* 459-465.

[34] Kabakoff, R., Segal, D., Hersen, M., & Van Hasselt, V. (1997). Psychometric properties and diagnostic utility of the Beck Anxiety Inventory and State-Trait Anxiety Inventory

with older adult psychiatric outpatients. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 11,* 33-47.

[35] Creamer, M., Foran, J., Bell, R. (1995). The Beck Anxiety Inventory in a nonclinical sample. *Behavior Research and Therapy, 33,* 477-485.

[36] Coleman, J.S. (1990). *Foundations of Social Theory*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

[37] Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D. (2009). Methods and measures: The network of relationships inventory: Behavioral systems version**.** *International Journal of Behavioral Development*; 33 (5), 470–478.

[38] Bartholomew, R., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6,* 226-244.

[39] Norenzayan, A., Choi, I., & Nisbett, R. E. (2002). Cultural similarities and differences in social inference: Evidence from behavioral predictions and lay theories of behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28,* 109-120.

[40] Levy, S. R., Ayduk, O., & Downey, G. (2001). The role of rejection sensitivity in people's relationships with significant others and valued social groups. In M. R. Leary (Ed.), *Interpersonal rejection* (pp. 251–289). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.