ICTHM 2023
International Conference in Technology, Humanities and Management

GOVERNANCE FOR WORKPLACE CULTURE: LEVERAGING POSITIVE PEER RELATIONSHIPS TO DRIVE EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

Batuhan Sarıgül (a)*, Nor Balkish Zakaria (b), Naila Erum (c)
*Corresponding author

(a)   Istanbul Medipol University, Istanbul, Turkey, batuhan.sarigul@medipol.edu.tr
(b)   Accounting Research Institute (HICoE), Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM), Shah Alam, Malaysia,
norbalkish@uitm.edu.my
(c)   Accounting Research Institute (HICoE), University Teknologi MARA (UiTM), naila@uitm.edu.my

Abstract

Peer Relationship is one of the fundamental issues that have an important role in the effective governance of business performance. In parallel, the authors found that performance among employees had a strong and positive effect on their level of peer relationship and their supportive behaviour towards each other. Research show that there is a relationship between peer relationships and job performance, including the factors that contribute to positive or negative outcomes. For this purpose, the literature studies have been conducted on these issues and as a result of the researches, it has been shown that the peer relationship is effective on the job performance and the peer relationship affects the job performance of the employees. In addition, studies show that employees with good peer relationships have higher job performance. Also, the studies emphasize that the importance of better governance practices for improving workplace culture, positive peer relationships, characterized by good communication, collaboration, and teamwork, in enhancing job performance.

Keywords: Governance, Job Performance, Peer Relations, Teamwork

1. Introduction

The basis of the success of the enterprises lies in the efficient working of the employees and establishing good relations with each other. Therefore, peer relationships have a huge impact on job performance. Peer relations increase the productivity and motivation of the employees by increasing the cooperation, solidarity and communication among the employees. Studies show that positive peer relationships increase job performance. Therefore, developing a positive workplace culture and strengthening peer relations among the employees of the enterprises is an important step to increase job performance. At the same time, peer relations are also effective on factors such as cooperation in the workplace, communication and teamwork. For example, in a study conducted by Kozlowski and Bell (2003) It was found that good relations between employees increase team performance and increase job satisfaction. Therefore, studies on peer relationships in the workplace can help better understand relationships in the workplace and help employees work in a healthier, happier and more productive environment.

This study highlights the importance of governance in shaping a healthy workplace culture and utilizing positive peer relationships to enhance employee performance. In today's organizations, governance plays a crucial role in establishing effective structures and processes that shape the overall workplace culture. Studies consistently demonstrate that positive peer relationships have a significant impact on employee performance by fostering employee engagement, creativity, and innovation. Recognizing this, organizations are increasingly recognizing the need to leverage governance practices to cultivate a workplace culture that supports and nurtures positive peer relationships. By establishing clear policies, guidelines, and structures, governance can create an environment that encourages collaboration, mutual respect, and support among employees. This, in turn, drives motivation, job satisfaction, and overall performance. Effective governance strategies are key to harnessing the power of positive peer relationships, allowing organizations to tap into the full potential of their workforce.

This research conceptualizes the relationship between governance, workplace culture, and employee performance, focusing on the role of positive peer relationships as a driving force. By examining the influence of governance practices on fostering a culture of collaboration and leveraging positive peer relationships, organizations can unlock new avenues to enhance employee performance and achieve sustainable success.

2. Governance and Workplace Culture

The relationship between governance, workplace culture, and employee performance has been widely studied, highlighting their interconnectedness and impact on organizational outcomes. Governance practices play a crucial role in shaping workplace culture (Davis & Rothstein, 2018). By establishing clear policies, guidelines, and structures, governance frameworks provide the foundation for fostering a positive and inclusive culture (Schein, 2010).

Workplace culture, in turn, influences employee performance by creating an environment that promotes collaboration, trust, and support (Schneider et al., 2013). Positive peer relationships, as a significant component of workplace culture, have been shown to enhance employee engagement,

creativity, and innovation (Grant, 2013). When employees feel valued, supported, and connected to their peers, they are more likely to be motivated and perform at higher levels (Grant & Parker, 2009).

This symbiotic relationship between governance, workplace culture, and employee performance emphasizes the importance of integrating governance practices to foster a positive culture and leverage positive peer relationships. By aligning governance frameworks with the desired workplace culture, organizations can create an environment that nurtures employee performance and contributes to overall organizational success (Cameron & Quinn, 2011).

3.   Peer Relationship

A peer is an individual who is on an equal footing with another and belongs to a particular social group and shares distinctive features with that group. As a dictionary meaning, peer, age, profession, social status, etc. are equal to each other in terms of (TDK, 2019). Peers are individuals of the same age, social and psychological communication (Tozoğlu et al., 2015). Peer relationship is a kind of interpersonal relationship characterized by mutual respect, trust and equality. Peers are individuals who are at the same social or developmental level and typically have similar interests, abilities, and experiences. Peer relationships are important for people of all ages as they provide opportunities for social interaction, support and personal growth. They can be created with people of the same age or just a few years older or younger. Peer relationships can be positive or negative, and it is important for individuals to choose their peers wisely and set healthy boundaries in their relationships. Derived from the Latin word 'par' meaning equal, peers (Brown & Larson, 2009) describe individuals who are equal, for example, in terms of age, status or skill. In the adolescent literature, the term peer generally refers to individuals in the same life stage, namely adolescent friends (Brown & Larson, 2009). The term peer, in other words, friendship has been defined many times. Peer can also be defined as the similarity of individuals to each other in terms of some factors. These can be in terms of age, gender, behavior (Spencer et al., 2013)

Developmental psychologists have linked three main situations at which peer relations do (Brown, 2004; Brown & Larson, 2009). At the lowest position, there are dyadic peer connections that are generally made up of dyads of musketeers. With the emergence of romantic connections in nonage, bilateral connections also include couples. Bilateral connections live in nonage long before puberty and can also be set up in toddlers. At the coming position, there are lower peer groups (also called sets) whose members meet and interact with each other regularly and live before puberty (Brown, 2004). There are crowds of people who don't have to know each other tête-à-tête (Brown, 2004; Brown & Larson, 2009; Rubin et al., 2007). One of the most important characteristics of crowds is that they can be fairly abstract without peers actually interacting with each other. Peer crowd cooperation is grounded on common characteristics similar as neighborhood or race, as well as participated identification with certain stations, participated values or cultures (Brown, 2004; Rubin et al., 2007)

Studies of character- grounded crowds among generally White, American adolescents, for illustration, many recreating crowds similar as academic-focused crowds ("smarts"), high-status crowds ("Popular" or "Medications"), athletically- acquainted crowds ("Athletes" determined), counterculturist oranti-social crowds(" Burnouts" or" Assholes"), and numerous incomparable adolescents ("Lonelies")

(Prinstein & La Greca, 2002; Rubin et al., 2007). A British study set up some imbrication between American and British character- grounded crowds, although they differ in labeling (Thurlow, 2001). Adolescents' connections with their peers are veritably dynamic, that is, peer connections aren't veritably stable and status within the group also changes constantly (Brown, 2004; Brechwald & Prinstein, 2011).

3.1. Peer Influence

Peer influences live in the plant when individual geste is told by the geste or characteristics of teammates. For illustration, a person who sees that his talented musketeers, who are his peers in the football platoon, work more efficiently, will work harder by being told by his musketeers. Interest in similar peer goods among economists is growing significantly. Naturally detecting peer influences in the plant has been a growing field of behavioral economics and of great interest for optimal incitement designs. Also, peer monitoring, knowledge sharing, and therefore productivity spillovers among platoon members in the plant play a central part in the proposition of" high performance work system" or" high participation work system" (Appelbaum, 2000; Boning et al., 2007; Gant et al., 2002). Also, peer influences play an important part in the frugality of the association (Aoki, 1986; Kandel & Lazear, 1992), growth proposition (Lucas, 1988), and FDI (Fosfuri et al., 2001).

Social commerce in the plant can also lead to a "knowledge overflow" where associates learn from each other and develop chops they might not else have. Both peer pressure and knowledge prolixity indicate that workers are more productive when theirco-workers are more productive and that the establishment's total productivity exceeds the sum of individual hand productivity. Therefore, in addition to the sale bring savings stressed by Coase (1993), peer goods give one of the reasons for enterprises' actuality. Peer influences can complicate original productivity differences among workers and increase long- term inequality when high- quality workers come together in the same peer groups. While knowledge prolixity is also an important source of agglomeration husbandry (Lucas, 1988; Marshall, 1890), social pressure also means that workers respond to not only financial but also social impulses; workers work together in a platoon (Kandel & Lazear, 1992). Yet despite the profitable significance of peer goods, empirical substantiation for similar goods in the plant is limited to a sprinkle of studies that relate to veritably specific settings grounded on laboratory trialsor real- world data from a single establishment or profession. For illustration, Mas and Moretti's (2009) study of a large supermarket chain provides compelling substantiation that workers' productivity increases when they work with further productiveco-workers; this finding is attributed to adding social pressure.

We'll argue that similar peer influences in the social network, coupled with the presence of a provocation to outperform teammates in this company, are largely harmonious with recent empirical substantiation of the important part that group individualities play in easing humanitarian 4 actions (Chen & Li, 2009). When probing the implicit part of peer influences in the plant, a naive estimation strategy of regressing a focus hand's current productivity over the current productivity of their peers leads to prejudiced estimates of peer influence due to the problem of reflection (Manski, 1993). To avoid these and other difficulties in relating unproductive peer influences, numerous studies use destined measures of peer capability or enduring productivity as well as principally arbitrary hassles with peers. In doing so, these studies measure the impact of associates' enduring productivity on a hand's current productivity (for

illustration, Guryan et al., 2009; Mas & Moretti, 2009). In Manski (1993), similar peer influences are called external peer influences. Still, we may also be interested in measuring natural peer influences, i.e., the effect of associates' current productivity on a hand's current productivity, especially if current and enduring productivity can potentially differ from peer pressure, literacy, etc. if we believe that it represents the mechanisms (Bandiera et al., 2010; Kandel & Lazear, 1992; Mas & Moretti, 2009). Eventually, we may be interested in carrying measures of bot goods in a single environment, which has been shown not to be trivial.

3.2. Peer Support

Peer support can be defined as the support given by a person belonging to the same group or sharing the same experience (Mead, 2003). Unlike mentoring, where assistance is provided by an expert, in peer-to-peer support all partners are equally qualified to help each other. More importantly, peer-to-peer support is built on mutual trust between individuals, enabling them to articulate issues that are difficult to articulate in classical mentoring. Peer support refers to the practice of providing emotional, social and/or practical support to someone going through a difficult time or facing a challenge. Peer support can include a range of activities such as listening, giving advice or suggestions, providing encouragement and motivation, or simply being around someone as a source of emotional support. Peer support can be a valuable resource for individuals experiencing a variety of issues, including mental health issues, addiction, trauma or other life challenges. It can be especially helpful for people who don't feel comfortable getting support from family members or professionals, or who don't have access to these resources.

Peer support can be provided by anyone who has had a similar experience and has the knowledge and skills to offer support. This may include those who have had professional training in peer support, as well as those with personal experience in a particular subject and a desire to help others. Peer support can take place in a variety of settings, including online communities, support groups, or one-on-one interactions. Support consists of sharing information or experience, providing emotional and social support, or giving practical advice (Peterson et al., 2008; Pfeiffer et al., 2011; Solomon, 2004).

3.3. Peer at Job

Peer relationships in the workplace are an important factor affecting many critical variables such as employee job satisfaction, job performance and intention to stay. Research shows that good co-worker relationships enable employees to work happily, productively and longer at their jobs (Sias & Shin, 2019). In addition, it has been found that creating a positive social support network among colleagues helps employees cope with stress, cope with workplace challenges, and maintain work balance (Holtom & O'neill, 2004). Therefore, it is important for employers to invest in collaborative relationships and create a positive workplace culture. In addition, peer relations can also help employees to share their workload, collaborate and improve their problem-solving skills (Dionne et al., 2004). On the other hand, bad peer relations can negatively affect the atmosphere in the workplace, reduce the motivation of employees and even cause them to leave the job (Leiter & Maslach, 2004).

4. Job Performance

The concept of performance, in words, is the degree to which a person uses all the qualities he has and the level of output as a result of any action. It is also defined as the level of fulfilment of the assigned duties and responsibilities of the employees. Performance is the completion of a predetermined task evaluated against cost or speed factors. In terms of employees, it can be defined as the effort they make to reach the goals of the organization (Yucel & Chung, 2023). Work performance; It refers to the rate at which the organization or person realizes the goals at the planned time in order to realize the goals of the organization (Barutçugil, 2002). In some sources, the expression of job performance and employee performance is also included in the same sense. In this study, only job performance expression is used instead of both expressions (Li et al., 2012). Job performance refers to the total value that the individual adds to the organization, including different behavioral parts in a certain period of time.

4.1. Importance of Job Performance

Performance, which is an important issue for organizations, is an indicator of the success of organizations and the achievement of goals. Individual performance, which is a result of employee behavior, is an important issue for managers. Because the total performance of the employees in the organization greatly affects the performance of the organization. Since it is the duty of the manager to increase the performance of the organization, it is the manager's responsibility to increase the performance of the employees (Bayram, 2006, p. 48). Considering the pleasure that individuals feel while successfully fulfilling their duties, their awareness and appreciation of quality work outputs, it is also very important for individuals and can be a source of internal motivation. In low-performing employees, the situation of not being able to reach their goals and feeling the feeling of failure can be seen (Sonnentag & Frese, 2002). Business performance is given a high level of importance by businesses due to the organization's aim to provide high efficiency. However, the most important point about this subject is that the concept of performance not only explains the results, but also requires understanding the behaviors shown. Thus, performance should focus on observable behaviors that employees encounter (Cook, 2008, pp. 17-18).

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, the relationship between governance, workplace culture, and employee performance highlights their interconnectedness and profound impact on organizational outcomes. Governance practices shape workplace culture by establishing clear policies and structures that foster a positive and inclusive environment. A positive culture, in turn, influences employee performance by promoting collaboration, trust, and support. Positive peer relationships within the workplace culture enhance employee engagement, creativity, and innovation, leading to improved performance. Integrating effective governance practices with a desired workplace culture allows organizations to nurture employee performance and achieve overall organizational success. Prioritizing governance, fostering a positive

workplace culture, and facilitating positive peer relationships contribute to enhanced employee performance and long-term organizational success.

As a result, peer relations have a great impact on job performance and businesses need to pay attention to this issue. Establishing and strengthening workplace culture increases work performance by enabling employees to cooperate with each other, increase their solidarity and communication. Studies show that positive peer relationships positively affect job performance by increasing factors such as employee engagement, creativity and innovation. For this reason, creating a healthy workplace culture among employees and supporting peer relations is an effective way to increase the motivation of the employees and increase their work performance. A study has shown that support among co-workers improves job performance by increasing job satisfaction and motivation (Wagner & Rush, 2000). Similarly, another study concluded that social connections among colleagues increase creativity and innovation (Perry-Smith & Shalley, 2003). For example, a study by Hakanen et al. (2006) showed that there is a positive relationship between support given by colleagues and managers and work engagement. In addition, a study by Liden et al. (2014) revealed that there is a strong correlation between support given by colleagues and performance All these studies support the positive effect of peer relationships on job performance. The fact that businesses strengthen social connections between employees, increase communication, encourage teamwork and support their colleagues, increase the factors such as employee dedication, creativity and innovation, and enable them to positively affect work performance. In a meta-analysis study by Ma and MacMillan (2021), they revealed that a good peer relationship increases job performance and employees have higher job satisfaction and motivation. In addition, Yu et al. (2022) found in a study they conducted that conflict in peer relationships reduces job performance and this effect also has a negative effect on job satisfaction and motivation.

Acknowledgment

References

Aoki, M. (1986). Horizontal vs. vertical information structure of the firm. *The American Economic Review*, *76*(5), 971-983.

Appelbaum, E. (2000). *Manufacturing advantage: Why high-performance work systems pay off*. Cornell University Press.

Bandiera, O., Barankay, I., & Rasul, I. (2010). Social Incentives in the Workplace. *Review of Economic Studies, 77*(2), 417-458. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-937x.2009.00574.x

Barutçugil, İ. (2002). Performance management. *Kariyer Yay., İstanbul*, 83-84.

Bayram, L. (2006). A new alternative to traditional performance evaluation methods: 360 degree performance evaluation. *Journal of the Court of Accounts, 62*, 47-65.

Boning, B., Ichniowski, C., & Shaw, K. (2007). Opportunity Counts: Teams and the Effectiveness of Production Incentives. *Journal of Labor Economics, 25*(4), 613-650. https://doi.org/10.1086/519539

Brechwald, W. A., & Prinstein, M. J. (2011). Beyond Homophily: A Decade of Advances in Understanding Peer Influence Processes. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 21*(1), 166-179. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00721.x

Brown, B. B. (2004). Adolescents' Relationships with Peers. *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780471726746.ch12

Brown, B. B., & Larson, J. (2009). Peer Relationships in Adolescence. In L. Steinberg, & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology* (3rd Ed., Vol. 1, pp. 74–103). John Wiley & Sons Inc. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470479193.adlpsy002004

Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2011). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework*. John Wiley & Sons.

Chen, Y., & Li, S. X. (2009). Group Identity and Social Preferences. *American Economic Review, 99*(1), 431-457. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.99.1.431

Coase, R. H. (1993). *The nature of the firm*. Oxford University Press.

Cook, L. A. (2008). *Job satisfaction and performance: Is the relationship spurious*. [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, UMI Dissertation Service].

Davis, G. F., & Rothstein, H. (2018). Corporate governance and the financial crisis. *Annual Review of Sociology, 44*, 21-38.

Dionne, S. D., Duffy, M. K., & Shaw, J. D. (2004). An examination of the definition and consequences of engagement in work. *Journal of management, 30*(6), 900-913.

Fosfuri, A., Motta, M., & Rønde, T. (2001). Foreign direct investment and spillovers through workers' mobility. *Journal of International Economics, 53*(1), 205-222. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-1996(00)00069-6

Gant, J., Ichniowski, C., & Shaw, K. (2002). Social Capital and Organizational Change in High-Involvement and Traditional Work Organizations. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy, 11*(2), 289-328. https://doi.org/10.1111/jems.2002.11.2.289

Grant, A. M. (2013). Rocking the Boat but Keeping It Steady: The Role of Emotion Regulation in Employee Voice. *Academy of Management Journal, 56*(6), 1703-1723. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0035

Grant, A. M., & Parker, S. K. (2009). 7 Redesigning Work Design Theories: The Rise of Relational and Proactive Perspectives. *Academy of Management Annals, 3*(1), 317-375. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520903047327

Guryan, J., Kroft, K., & Notowidigdo, M. J. (2009). Peer Effects in the Workplace: Evidence from Random Groupings in Professional Golf Tournaments. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 1*(4), 34-68. https://doi.org/10.1257/app.1.4.34

Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology, 43*(6), 495-513. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2005.11.001

Holtom, B. C., & O'neill, B. S. (2004). Job embeddedness: A theoretical foundation for developing a comprehensive nurse retention plan. *JONA: The Journal of Nursing Administration*, *34*(5), 216-227.

Kandel, E., & Lazear, E. P. (1992). Peer Pressure and Partnerships. *Journal of Political Economy, 100*(4), 801-817. https://doi.org/10.1086/261840

Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Bell, B. S. (2003). Work Groups and Teams in Organizations. *Handbook of Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1002/0471264385.wei1214

Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2004). *Areas of worklife: A structured approach to organizational predictors of jobs burnout _ Of Research in occupational stress and well-being* (Vol. 3, pp. 91-134). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Li, X., Sanders, K., & Frenkel, S. (2012). How leader-member exchange, work engagement and HRM consistency explain Chinese luxury hotel employees' job performance. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 31*(4), 1059-1066. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.01.002

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Liao, C., & Meuser, J. D. (2014). Servant Leadership and Serving Culture: Influence on Individual and Unit Performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 57*(5), 1434-1452. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2013.0034

Lucas, R. E., Jr. (1988). On the mechanics of economic development. *Journal of Monetary Economics, 22*(1), 3-42. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3932(88)90168-7

Ma, L., & MacMillan, K. (2021). The relationship between peer relationship and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 94*(3), 582-602.

Manski, C. F. (1993). Identification of Endogenous Social Effects: The Reflection Problem. *The Review of Economic Studies, 60*(3), 531. https://doi.org/10.2307/2298123

Marshall, A. (1890). *Principles of economics*. Macmillan.

Mas, A., & Moretti, E. (2009). Peers at work. *American Economic Review*, *99*(1), 112-145.

Mead, S. (2003). Defining peer support. *Intentional Peer Support: an alternative approach*. Intentional Peer Support.

Perry-Smith, J. E., & Shalley, C. E. (2003). The Social Side of Creativity: A Static and Dynamic Social Network Perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 28*(1), 89-106. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2003.8925236

Peterson, U., Bergström, G., Samuelsson, M., Åsberg, M., & Nygren, Å. (2008). Reflecting peer-support groups in the prevention of stress and burnout: randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 63*(5), 506-516. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2008.04743.x

Pfeiffer, P. N., Heisler, M., Piette, J. D., Rogers, M. A. M., & Valenstein, M. (2011). Efficacy of peer support interventions for depression: a meta-analysis. *General Hospital Psychiatry, 33*(1), 29-36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2010.10.002

Prinstein, M. J., & La Greca, A. M. (2002). Peer Crowd Affiliation and Internalizing Distress in Childhood and Adolescence: A Longitudinal Follow-Back Study. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 12*(3), 325-351. https://doi.org/10.1111/1532-7795.00036

Rubin, D. M., O'Reilly, A. L. R., Luan, X., & Localio, A. R. (2007). The Impact of Placement Stability on Behavioral Well-being for Children in Foster Care. *Pediatrics, 119*(2), 336-344. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2006-1995

Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th Ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., & Macey, W. H. (2013). Organizational Climate and Culture. *Annual Review of Psychology, 64*(1), 361-388. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143809

Sias, P. M., & Shin, Y. (2019). Workplace Relationships. *Origins and Traditions of Organizational Communication*, 187-206. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203703625-13

Solomon, P. (2004). Peer Support/Peer Provided Services Underlying Processes, Benefits, and Critical Ingredients. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal, 27*(4), 392-401. https://doi.org/10.2975/27.2004.392.401

Sonnentag, S., & Frese, M. (2002). Performance concepts and performance theory. *Psychological management of individual performance*, *23*(1), 3-25.

Spencer, S. V., Bowker, J. C., Rubin, K. H., Booth-LaForce, C., & Laursen, B. (2013). Similarity Between Friends in Social Information Processing and Associations With Positive Friendship <i>Quality and Conflict</i>. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 59*(1), 106-134. https://doi.org/10.1353/mpq.2013.0006

TDK. (2019). *Turkish Language Institution, Current Turkish Dictionary*. http://sozluk.gov.tr/

Thurlow, C. (2001). The Usual Suspects? A Comparative Investigation of Crowds and Social-type Labelling among Young British Teenagers. *Journal of Youth Studies, 4*(3), 319-334. https://doi.org/10.1080/13676260120075437

Tozoğlu, E., Bayraktar, G., Cingöz, B., & Yurttaş, H. (2015). The Effect of Sport and Different Variables on the Level of Peer Support. *Journal of Academic Social Research, 3*(9), 57-67.

Wagner, J. A., & Rush, M. C. (2000). The relative importance of actual and perceive support in the relationship between coworkers and employee job satisfaction. *Journal of Social Psychology, 140*(6), 774-784.

Yu, X., He, B., Liu, M., Wang, A., & Yuan, Y. (2022). The effect of distributive justice climate on virtual team performance: A moderated mediation model. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.950581

Yucel, D., & Chung, H. (2023). Working from home, work-family conflict, and the role of gender and gender role attitudes. *Community, Work & Family, 26*(2), 190-221. https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2021.1993138