Employee Well-Being and Mental Health: Determinants of Workplace Productivity in the Contemporary Economy

Darshan M[1]*, Ms Muthamma B U[2]

[1] **Student, B.Com, School of Economics & Commerce, CMR University, Bangalore**

[2] **Faculty of Commerce, CMR University, Bangalore**

***Corresponding Author**

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2026.1304000157

Received: 16 April 2026; Accepted: 21 April 2026; Published: 09 May 2026

ABSTRACT

Well-being and mental health of employees have become significant contributors to productivity in today's global economy. Failing employee engagement, burnout, and the huge lost economics of low productivity are important business concerns. This study examines relationships between well-being, mental health, and performance. A qualitative secondary analysis of secondary data from Google Scholar, SSRN, PubMed, and ScienceDirect is conducted, along with a review of major reports from Gallup, World Health Organization, National Alliance on Mental Illness, and McKinsey & Company. Key theories used to understand employee well-being and its impact on work performance include Job Demands–Resources, Self-Determination Theory, and Conservation of Resources Theory. Employees missing work due to illness is a significant factor in lost productivity, with studies indicating annual lost productivity of around $600 billion in the U.S. alone due to presenteeism (47% of the global workforce is affected by presenteeism) and motivational withdrawal (around $438 billion in global lost productivity due to worker disengagement by 2024, Gallup, 2025). However, the evidence is clear that the crisis is driven by more fundamental organisational issues including poor quality management, unsafe psychological environments, and toxic cultures. Importantly, there is strong evidence that well-designed well-being interventions have a return on investment of 4:1 or more. This paper sets out recommendations for organisational leaders, human resources specialists, and public policymakers based on the existing evidence. Manager development, psychological safety, a broader perspective on measuring well-being, and an integrated approach to supporting mental health are identified as the highest-return organisational interventions to tackle the well-being and productivity challenge.

Keywords: Employee well-being, mental health, workplace productivity, burnout, psychological safety

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Well-being at work and its relationship to workplace productivity has become a key area of research within organisational science and across all sectors and geographies. Employee well-being — physical, psychological, and emotional is shown to have a significant impact on workplace productivity. Well-being has historically been considered in some models of productivity yet has rarely been addressed in the design and delivery of workplace wellness initiatives and Employee Assistance Programmes (EAPs). Until wellness interventions are more fully embedded in work design, management practices, and organisational culture, there is a risk that they will continue to have limited positive impact on employee well-being.

The 21st century is forcing a new reality upon the relationship between employee well-being and workplace productivity. Global COVID-19, AI, hybrid/remote work, the new workforce, and a global mental health epidemic are all competing for the attention of managers and policymakers at the same time. The pandemic did not introduce the relationship between employees' well-being and work performance; it exposed the calamitous results of ignoring employees' psychological and physical well-being in search of bottom-line gains.

Mental illness such as depression and anxiety is costing the world 12 billion days of work every year, amounting to $1 trillion. The Gallup State of the Global Workplace Report 2025 found that global employee engagement had dropped to 21%, the sharpest annual decline since the 2020 COVID-19 lockdowns, resulting in $438 billion lost in productivity opportunities, as employees fail to fully contribute to their work because of disengagement. Yet there are a number of things that organisations can do to help the hundreds of millions of working people around the world who are failing to thrive at work. This paper provides an overview of the current workplace in India. It goes on to explore the key drivers behind the relationship between well-being and productivity and considers the best-practice knowledge that organisations in India can use to build healthy, productive, and resilient workplaces.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Well-being has become a vital issue for employees and their organisations. The theoretical views on the relationship between well-being and work-related productivity have been discussed in the literature from four different frameworks. The Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) theory is the most researched theory explaining the association between work characteristics, well-being, and work-related performance. The theory was introduced by Demerouti, Jayaraman, and Erzar in 2001 and has since been expanded and refined by Bakker and Demerouti in the past two decades. Demerouti et al. (2001) have conceptualised all job characteristics from two perspectives. First, employees spend their work time on tasks and activities that demand from them physical as well as psychological energy. Second, some job characteristics can provide employees the necessary resources to carry out their work. Job resources not only protect employees against negative effects of job demands but also facilitate employees' work-related activities. Adequate job resources foster work-related positive affect (engagement) and promote intrinsic work motivation. Furthermore, resources can buffer the negative impact of demands on burnout and foster well-being. In a 10-year update, Bakker et al. (2023) found that the same patterns of findings were evident in more than 300 studies conducted in work settings (public and private sector) in at least 12 countries.

Self-Determination Theory (SDT), which Deci and Ryan created in 1985 and 2000, serves as an additional perspective because environments which support autonomy, competence, and relatedness needs lead people to develop intrinsic motivation and psychological health and maintain their work involvement. Research shows that autonomy-supportive management leads to better intrinsic motivation and performance results than controlling management approaches (Deci et al., 2017). Conservation of Resources (COR) theory, which Hobfoll introduced in 1989, explains that stress emerges when resources face threats or disappear. Losing resources produces more psychological damage than gaining an equal amount of resources, which explains why burnout becomes so difficult to treat after it develops. The Dual Continuum Model of Mental Health, which Keyes (2002) and Follmer and Jones (2018) developed, opposes the traditional view of mental health as a single scale because it demonstrates that people need to build their positive psychological functioning to solve the well-being crisis instead of relying on mental illness treatment.

The body of empirical evidence exists in large amounts and maintains a uniform pattern throughout the research. The World Health Organization (2024) estimates that depression and anxiety cost the global economy approximately USD $1 trillion annually through absenteeism, presenteeism, and reduced productive capacity. The Gallup State of the Global Workplace Report (2025) found that disengagement cost the global economy USD $438 billion in 2024, at a time when global engagement had fallen to 21%. The critical review by de Oliveira et al. (2023) established that mental health disorders function as principal factors which lead to productivity reduction in present-day economic systems. The cross-sectional study conducted by Fleming (2024) on UK workers showed that personal-level interventions, which included mindfulness and resilience training, did not produce significant results for positive psychological functioning. The research results suggest that organisations need to develop interventions that focus on modifying their cultural environment, leadership practices, and work structure. The findings demonstrate that workplace atmosphere directly affects employee efficiency and mental health, but these effects mainly stem from organisational components instead of personal characteristics.

Research Gap, Questions, And Objectives

Research Gap

The literature contains multiple detailed studies about well-being and productivity relationships, burnout, presenteeism, psychological safety, and employee assistance program effectiveness, but the field needs a unified model which combines research results from different academic fields, organisational levels, and program types into a single operational framework for business leaders. Research on burnout rarely converses with research on presenteeism; research on psychological safety rarely integrates with research on physical health; and research on Employee Assistance Programmes rarely synthesises with research on leadership development. The existing theoretical models together with intervention proof have not yet combined the workplace well-being obstacles which emerged after the pandemic with the AI workplace transformation, the decreasing social interactions, the rising workplace presence requirements, and the reduced supervisory involvement shown by Gallup (2025). The paradox of increasing wellness problems among employees even though companies allocate their highest ever budgets for wellness programs needs to be studied through a structured analytical method.

Research Questions

1. How do the mechanisms of absenteeism, presenteeism, and motivational withdrawal translate poor employee well-being into reduced workplace productivity, and what are their relative magnitudes?

2. What are the primary organisational, leadership, and cultural determinants of employee well-being, and which interventions most robustly improve both well-being and productive performance?

3. What evidence-based recommendations can be developed for organisational leaders, human resources professionals, and policymakers seeking to build the well-being infrastructure required to maximise employee productivity in the contemporary workplace?

Research Objectives

1. To examine the conceptual and empirical foundations of the relationship between employee well-being, mental health, and workplace productivity, drawing on the most recent and methodologically rigorous evidence from academic and industry literature.

2. To analyse the specific mechanisms through which well-being affects productivity — including absenteeism, presenteeism, employee engagement, turnover, creativity, collaboration, and organisational resilience — and to assess the relative contribution of physical health, mental health, and social well-being to these outcomes.

3. To evaluate the organisational, leadership, and cultural determinants of employee well-being, and to assess the range of well-being interventions documented in the secondary literature in terms of effectiveness, scalability, and cost-benefit profiles across different organisational contexts.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study follows a qualitative, interpretive secondary data research design, structured as a narrative synthesis of the available evidence on the relationship between employee well-being, mental health, and workplace productivity. A qualitative secondary data analysis is appropriate when research objectives require a comprehensive, interpretive account of a complex phenomenon more suitably addressed through the synthesis of existing knowledge than through the generation of primary data (Saunders et al., 2019). The design is appropriate for three reasons: the research objectives are inherently integrative and interpretive; the scope of the inquiry — spanning multiple industries, geographies, and organisational types — could not be addressed through primary data collection within the practical constraints of a single research project; and the quality and quantity of existing secondary literature on this topic is sufficient to support a high-quality, evidence-grounded synthesis.

The research philosophy underlying this study is broadly interpretivist-realist in character: it assumes that the phenomena of interest — employee well-being, burnout, presenteeism, and disengagement — are real phenomena that exist independently of the researcher's observation and that have properties and regularities that can be studied through systematic inquiry, while acknowledging that these phenomena are socially and organisationally embedded in ways that require interpretive rather than purely positivist methods. The research paradigm is interpretivism, which holds that the goal of social scientific inquiry is to understand and interpret social phenomena from within the framework of meaning that participants and researchers bring to them.

Data Collection

All research in this study depends on secondary data — previously gathered and published information by other researchers and institutions. The secondary data approach was selected because the subject matter is extensively documented from official institutional sources, which provide the best understanding of the evolving well-being and productivity landscape, and the research design requires demonstration of advanced knowledge synthesis through critical evaluation of existing information. Academic literature was identified through systematic searches of Google Scholar, SSRN, PubMed/MEDLINE, PsycINFO, and ScienceDirect. Key journals targeted included the Journal of Applied Psychology, Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, Applied Health Economics and Health Policy, and Health Promotion International.

Research data was collected from five source categories: (a) peer-reviewed academic literature from major psychology and management databases; (b) major industry research reports from Gallup, the World Health Organization, the National Alliance on Mental Illness, Mind Share Partners, McKinsey & Company, and Deloitte; (c) government and regulatory publications from public health and labour market authorities in the United States, United Kingdom, European Union, and Australia; (d) systematic reviews and meta-analyses identified through backward and forward citation tracking from key sources; and (e) credible specialist organisational literature from Spill, High5Test, and Manage2Retain for recent developments not yet captured in academic literature.

Mode of Collection

The search strategy employed Boolean operators, controlled vocabulary terms, and free text keywords organised around three core concepts: employee well-being, mental health, and workplace productivity. Primary search terms included "employee well-being," "workplace mental health," "burnout," "presenteeism," "psychological safety," "workplace productivity," "absenteeism," "employee engagement," "Job Demands–Resources," and "well-being interventions." Searches were conducted using AND/OR Boolean operators to combine terms across concept categories. Sources were filtered to prioritise publications from 2019 to early 2026, with earlier foundational works included where their theoretical significance warranted. Results were supplemented by citation tracking to ensure that significant contributions were not missed by keyword searches alone.

Analytical Approach

The analytical method is narrative synthesis — a systematic, interpretive approach integrating findings from multiple secondary sources appropriate when the evidence base is heterogeneous in methodology, disciplinary origin, and level of analysis. The analytical framework is derived from the four theoretical frameworks reviewed in Chapter 1: JD-R theory provides the primary organising logic; SDT provides the framework for understanding motivational quality; COR theory provides the framework for resource depletion and recovery dynamics; and the dual continuum model provides the framework for evaluating intervention evidence. This multi-framework analytical approach enables integration of findings from the diverse disciplinary traditions — occupational psychology, management science, public health, and economics — that have contributed to the well-being and productivity literature. As a qualitative, secondary-data study, no statistical techniques such as regression or hypothesis testing were employed; the study uses interpretive synthesis, evidence triangulation, and comparative analysis as its core analytical methods.

Analysis and Interpretation

Analytical Technique

Thematic content analysis functions as the primary analytical method, which operates under the four-framework analytical structure that the literature review has defined. Thematic analysis discovered common patterns which appeared in regulatory documents, industry reports, academic papers, and institutional publications, which were organised into five main thematic categories. The global well-being and productivity crisis represents the first thematic domain. The second thematic domain focuses on how absenteeism, presenteeism, and disengagement lead to reduced productivity. The third thematic domain explores how burnout, psychological safety, and leadership styles impact organisational performance. The fourth thematic domain shows evidence which proves the return on investment from well-being interventions. The final thematic domain consists of new market trends which transform the business environment. The comparative dimension allows researchers to connect their results with organisational data and macroeconomic information from Gallup (2025), WHO (2024), and NAMI (2025) data series. This enables them to verify their results through separate evidence sources.

The Global Well-Being and Productivity Crisis

The contemporary evidence shows two main features: the relationship between well-being and productivity that has been studied for many years, and the current patterns of this relationship. According to Gallup's State of the Global Workplace Report (2025), employee engagement worldwide reached its lowest point since the COVID-19 pandemic when it dropped to 21% in 2024. The employee engagement rate dropped by two percentage points from the previous year. Only one in five employees globally is engaged: invested, energised, and committed to delivering full contribution. The remaining four in five are either not engaged (attending, but investing minimal discretionary effort) or actively disengaged. The economic impact has become substantial: Gallup (2025) predicts that workplace disengagement will lead to $438 billion in productivity losses during 2024. The WHO (2024) calculates that depression and anxiety produce an additional $1 trillion in worldwide economic costs every year. Gallup (2025) identified manager engagement decline — from 30% to 27% — as the main factor, which makes managerial quality the top strategic focus for organisations that want to stop the downward trend.

Absenteeism, Presenteeism, and Motivational Withdrawal

Three fundamental systems connect the relationship between employee health and their work output. The total unplanned absence from work because of physical or mental health issues creates an annual financial burden of $600 billion for American businesses (Manage2Retain, 2025). The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that depression alone results in 200 million lost working days annually in the United States, costing employers between $17 billion and $44 billion per year (Three Sixty Safety, 2024). Every week in Canada, about 500,000 employees fail to work because of mental health problems, which result in $51 billion of yearly expenses (Manage2Retain, 2025).

Presenteeism — attending work while operating at reduced cognitive, emotional, or motivational capacity — has emerged as the more significant and more insidious mechanism. Forty-seven percent of all employees across sectors exhibit clinically significant presenteeism in any given period (Spill, 2025). A large-scale national study published in the Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (2025) found that presenteeism costs in Japan were more than 25 times higher than absenteeism costs in mental health-related productivity losses — a ratio that illustrates with striking clarity the degree to which the visible costs of absenteeism understate the total productivity burden of poor mental health. The cultural conditions that enable mental health disclosure are the conditions that enable early intervention, and early intervention is the most cost-effective point at which to address the well-being and productivity relationship.

The third mechanism — motivational withdrawal — is the most pervasive. Of the 79% of global employees who are not engaged or actively disengaged, approximately 62% of the global workforce fall into the not-engaged category: present, compliant, and technically adequate, but uninvested in the success of their organisation. Engaged employees demonstrate 20% higher productivity than their disengaged counterparts and are 87% less likely to leave their organisation (Gallup, 2025). Happy employees with genuinely high well-being are on

average 13% more productive than disengaged counterparts, and organisations with high engagement have experienced 19% higher-than-average shareholder returns (Meditopia, 2026). The SDT framework provides the most coherent account of disengagement: when the fundamental psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness are chronically frustrated, intrinsic motivation erodes and controlled or amotivated states replace it.

Burnout and Psychological Safety

Burnout — which consists of persistent fatigue, negative work attitudes, and decreased job performance — stands as the most extreme personal reaction to workplace dissatisfaction, and it produces the highest financial losses for organisations through their productivity issues. Mind Share Partners (2025) reported that more than 76% of U.S. workers experienced some level of burnout, with 53% experiencing moderate to severe levels. The research by High5Test (2025) shows that 66% of millennial employees experienced major burnout issues while only 39% of baby boomers did. This supports SDT theory about how organisations lacking autonomy and purpose create different burnout rates between generations. The turnover costs associated with burnout are particularly significant: 48% of American employees have voluntarily left a job specifically due to mental health reasons (Mind Share Partners, 2025), and Gallup (2025) estimates that replacing an employee costs between half and two times their annual salary.

Edmondson (1999) defined psychological safety as the group understanding which enables members to take interpersonal risks without facing negative consequences. Google's Project Aristotle research discovered that psychological safety stands as the most critical factor which determines team success from their five identified elements. McKinsey's research (2021) establishes psychological safety as consistently one of the strongest predictors of team performance, productivity, quality, creativity, and innovation. Yet only 26% of leaders display the consultative and supportive behaviours required to create it (McKinsey, 2021), and 63% of workers do not feel safe sharing their opinions at work (Mental Health America, cited in Niagara Institute, 2025). The percentage of employees who intend to leave their jobs stands at 3% when psychological safety is high but rises to 12% when it is low — a fourfold difference in retention risk (BCG Global, cited in Niagara Institute, 2025). NAMI (2025) found that workplaces offering mental health training reduced the proportion of employees whose productivity suffered from mental health from 38% to 21% — a 17-percentage-point differential representing one of the most compelling evidence-based arguments for organisational investment in mental health support available in the contemporary literature.

Organisational Determinants and Leadership Quality

The analysis of leadership and management as determinants of employee well-being converges on a finding of extraordinary practical importance: the quality of the manager–employee relationship is the single most powerful lever available to organisations for improving employee well-being and, through it, productive performance. Gallup's (2025) finding that 70% of the variance in team engagement is attributable to the manager is the convergent finding of decades of research across multiple methodological traditions. Through the JD-R lens, managers shape the demand–resource balance of their teams as primary allocators of workload, primary providers of feedback and social support, and primary enablers or inhibitors of autonomy. Through the SDT lens, managers are the primary determinants of whether employees experience their work environment as autonomy-supportive or controlling. The finding that fewer than 44% of managers globally have received formal management training (Gallup, 2025) is, in this context, one of the most significant organisational failures documented in the contemporary management literature. Basic management training in role clarity, communication, conflict management, and supportive leadership has been shown to cut active employee disengagement in half (Gallup, 2025). Managers trained in coaching practices see 20 to 28% improvements in team performance and their teams experience up to 18% higher engagement than those managed by untrained peers (Gallup, 2025).

Return on Investment and Emerging Trends

The evidence on the return on investment for well-being investment is among the most robust in the management literature. A comprehensive analysis of 100 medium-to-large companies found average returns on investment of

4:1 across comprehensive mental health programmes (ResearchGate, 2024). Mental health screening programmes generate returns of £6.30 per £1 invested (Spill, 2025). The WHO (2024) estimates that every dollar invested in mental health generates four dollars in return through increased productivity and reduced healthcare costs. Deloitte estimates returns of $1.50 to $4.00 per $1 invested through reduced absenteeism and healthcare costs. Gallup (2025) estimates that raising global engagement from 21% to 70% would add $9.6 trillion to global GDP.

Research findings show that digital and AI-based well-being solutions have developed into essential tools which organisations now use to handle their declining productivity issues. Research published in JMIR Formative Research (2026) showed that users developed better concentration abilities and task completion precision, and they decreased their procrastination during a ten-week digital behavioural health program, which demonstrated its strongest effects after week eight. A 2025 industry survey revealed that 60% of HR leaders predict AI will become a major factor for workplace mental health solutions by 2030, while 77% of employees would accept AI-based well-being support through coach or chatbot systems (High5Test, 2025). The deployment of AI-based well-being solutions surpasses the available research evidence that supports their effectiveness. The implementation of AI-based well-being solutions faces significant ethical challenges because they require strict governance systems to protect data privacy, prevent algorithmic errors, and maintain proper human contact through technological assistance.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

Key Findings

This research yields five principal findings. First, employee well-being is the primary determinant of workplace productivity in the contemporary economy: the cumulative weight of the evidence — spanning four theoretical frameworks, empirical studies from multiple national contexts, and industry data from the most credible global research organisations — establishes that the conditions of the work environment that shape well-being are the conditions of productive performance. Second, the scale of the well-being and productivity crisis is without precedent: global engagement at 21%, burnout affecting more than 76% of the workforce, presenteeism imposing costs more than 25 times larger than absenteeism, and the economic toll measured in the multiple trillions of dollars. Third, the crisis is driven primarily by organisational rather than individual conditions — the quality of management, the architecture of psychological safety, and the culture of the organisation — challenging the dominant approach of individual-level wellness interventions. Fourth, the return on investment for well-being investment is among the most robustly documented in the management literature, with average returns of 4:1 across comprehensive mental health programmes and £6.30 per £1 for mental health screening. Fifth, the future of work will intensify both the well-being challenge and the strategic importance of an effective response: the AI transformation currently underway will increasingly automate routine cognitive tasks, making the well-being conditions that enable creativity, judgment, and collaborative problem-solving the most valuable source of competitive advantage available to organisations.

Conclusion

The evidence demonstrates that organisations generate results which differ from the work that people produce. The ability of individuals to deliver their highest quality work exceeds the boundaries which selection processes, training programs, and incentive systems establish. Work performance exists as a changing state which depends on the quality of work environments, the leadership support people receive, and how their work tasks match their essential human requirements for meaning, protection, development, and social bonds. Organisations which understand this fact have developed their strategies, cultures, and leadership practices based on the evidence presented in this review to achieve superior results in well-being metrics. These companies achieve better results than their competitors in their core performance indicators — which include productivity, innovation, retention, and organisational resilience — over time. The process encounters its main limitation at the stage of evidence gathering because the argument for well-being investment remains straightforward and supported by economic evidence. Strategic commitment represents the main obstacle because organisational leaders, human resources professionals, and policymakers need to establish employee well-being as their core foundation instead of viewing it as a cost to manage, a benefit to distribute, or a program to operate.

RECOMMENDATIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND SCOPE

Recommendations

Organisational leaders should reposition employee well-being as a board-level strategic priority, with explicit accountability at the chief executive and board level for engagement, burnout prevalence, presenteeism, and voluntary turnover metrics. Well-being metrics should be included in board reporting alongside financial performance indicators, and dedicated well-being investment budgets should be protected from short-term cost management pressures. Manager development should be prioritised as the highest-return well-being intervention available: comprehensive, sustained, and evidence-based management development programmes should specifically target the consultative, supportive, and psychologically safe leadership behaviours most strongly associated with team well-being and productive engagement. Organisations should measure psychological safety at team and department level using validated instruments, embed psychological safety metrics into performance management frameworks for managers, and address the specific barriers to psychological safety identified by NAMI (2025): the stigma that prevents 42% of employees from discussing mental health concerns. Systematic job demands audits should be conducted to identify structural demand overloads driving burnout, presenteeism, and voluntary turnover, with flexible working policies and four-day work week pilots considered as structural interventions with demonstrated well-being benefits.

Human resources professionals need to create a complete well-being assessment system which measures employee attendance, work performance, mental state, and work involvement through established assessment tools. The current Employee Assistance Programmes need to become unified well-being systems which combine first-stage support with active contact programs and staff member assistance, together with medical care services. Organisations need to establish mental health awareness programs which fight stigma through workplace mental health acceptance and provide managers with effective communication tools to support their teams. Organisations can decrease employee work performance loss because of mental health issues by 17 percentage points through implementing these programs (NAMI, 2025). Large employers must follow mental health reporting standards established by policymakers. Governments should boost funding for community mental health programs which deliver first-stage care and support working people who experience mild mental health issues. Governments need to create workplace well-being standards based on scientific evidence — which function like occupational health and safety standards — and provide tax benefits to businesses that make qualifying well-being investments.

Limitations of the Study

The research contains multiple restrictions which affect its findings. The study depends on previously collected data because it fails to obtain employee experiences through direct employee surveys or interviews. The research fails to show how employees experience their work at small businesses, outside Western countries, and in manual labor positions, because it focuses mainly on big organisations and knowledge-based work. The research depends solely on English-language sources, which could miss important insights from German, French, Japanese, and Chinese academic communities who might study well-being and productivity through different approaches than English-language sources. The fast-changing work environment — which includes employee health management, mental health rules, and technological advancements — has brought about new developments. These developments researchers need to study because these changes emerged after the initial data collection period. Researchers need to test their findings against new scientific discoveries which will become available in the future. The evidence base contains various types of studies, which include randomised controlled trials, large-scale longitudinal surveys, cross-sectional workplace studies, and industry polls with convenience samples that need evaluation to determine their evidential value.

Scope of the Study

The research investigates how employee health status and mental wellness affect work output levels through analysis of secondary data, which spans from 2019 until early 2026 across various business sectors, locations, and organisational structures. Organisations began to rebuild their workplaces after the pandemic while researchers identified AI technologies which would transform work during the years 2023 to 2025. The paper

presents the theoretical framework which explains the connection between employee well-being and their work output. The paper presents evidence which supports the mechanisms that explain absenteeism, presenteeism, and disengagement behaviour. The paper investigates how organisational elements and leadership approaches affect employee well-being at work. The paper presents evidence about the operational success of diverse well-being programs. The well-being challenge and organisational response continue to evolve because of new trends. Research in the future needs to use original employee data which spans different company sizes and multiple geographic areas, economic modelling for different management development investment alternatives, and longitudinal tracking of AI work transformation effects on employee well-being because the current evidence base exists only during the initial phase of AI implementation.

Ethical Considerations

This study involved the synthesis of previously published secondary data and did not involve any direct interaction with human subjects or animals. No ethical approval was therefore required. All sources consulted are cited and publicly available.

Conflict Of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest related to this research.

Data Availability Statement

This study is based entirely on publicly available secondary data. All reports, peer-reviewed articles, and institutional publications referenced in this paper are accessible through the sources and URLs listed in the references section.

REFERENCES

1. American Psychological Association. (2023). 2023 Work in America survey: Workplaces as engines of psychological health and well-being. https://www.apa.org/pubs/reports/work-in-america/2023-workplace-health-well-being
2. American Psychological Association. (2025). Work in America survey 2025: Job security and workplace stress. https://www.apa.org/pubs/reports/work-in-america
3. Bagasi, A., Al-Harbi, N., Alshammari, M., & Al-Otaibi, S. (2025). Effectiveness of workplace mental health programs in reducing occupational burnout: A systematic review. PMC Open Access. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12375206/
4. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22(3), 309–328. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115
5. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22(3), 273–285. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056
6. Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. (2023). Job demands–resources theory: Ten years later. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 10, 25–53. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-053933
7. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2024). Depression in the workplace: Economic burden and employer response. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. https://www.cdc.gov
8. Deci, E. L., Olafsen, A. H., & Ryan, R. M. (2017). Self-determination theory in work organizations: The state of a science. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 4, 19–43. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032516-113108
9. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. Plenum Press.
10. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The ‘what’ and ‘why’ of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. Psychological Inquiry, 11(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

11. Deloitte. (2024). Mental health and employers: The case for investment. Deloitte Insights. https://www2.deloitte.com
12. de Oliveira, C., Saka, M., Bone, L., & Jacobs, R. (2023). The role of mental health on workplace productivity: A critical review of the literature. Applied Health Economics and Health Policy, 21(2), 167–193. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40258-022-00761-w
13. Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. (2023). Job demands-resources theory in times of crises: New propositions. Organizational Psychology Review, 13(1), 3–26. https://doi.org/10.1177/20413866221135022
14. Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3), 499–512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499
15. Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44(2), 350–383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999
16. Fleming, W. (2024). Employee well-being outcomes from individual-level mental health interventions: Cross-sectional evidence from the United Kingdom. Industrial Relations Journal, 55(2), 162–182. https://doi.org/10.1111/irj.12418
17. Follmer, E. H., & Jones, K. S. (2018). Mental illness in the workplace: An interdisciplinary review and organizational research agenda. Journal of Management, 44(1), 325–351. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206317741194
18. Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff burn-out. Journal of Social Issues, 30(1), 159–165. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1974.tb00706.x
19. Gallup. (2025). State of the global workplace: 2025 report. Gallup Press. https://www.gallup.com/workplace/349484/state-of-the-global-workplace.aspx
20. High5Test. (2025). Employee wellbeing and mental health workplace statistics (2024–2025). https://high5test.com/employee-wellbeing-statistics/
21. Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. American Psychologist, 44(3), 513–524. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513
22. Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine. (2025). The impact of productivity loss from presenteeism and absenteeism on mental health in Japan. Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 67(9), 699–704. https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000003431
23. Keyes, C. L. M. (2002). The mental health continuum: From languishing to flourishing in life. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 43(2), 207–222. https://doi.org/10.2307/3090197
24. Manage2Retain. (2025). Employee retention's sisters: Absenteeism and burnout—the hidden workplace crisis. https://manage2retain.com
25. Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. Journal of Occupational Behavior, 2(2), 99–113. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030020205
26. McKinsey & Company. (2021). Psychological safety and the critical role of leadership development. McKinsey Quarterly. https://www.mckinsey.com
27. McKinsey & Company. (2023). What is psychological safety? McKinsey Explainers. https://www.mckinsey.com
28. Meditopia for Work. (2026). Workplace mental health statistics for 2026. https://meditopia.com/en/forwork/articles/workplace-mental-health-statistics
29. Mind Share Partners. (2025). Workplace mental health and wellness: Forecasts and trends 2025. https://www.mindsharepartners.org
30. National Alliance on Mental Illness. (2025). The 2025 NAMI workplace mental health poll. NAMI. https://www.nami.org/support-education/publications-reports/survey-reports/the-2025-nami-workplace-mental-health-poll/
31. Niagara Institute. (2025). 30+ psychological safety at work statistics (2025). https://www.niagarainstitute.com/blog/psychological-safety-at-work
32. ResearchGate. (2024). The economic impact of workplace mental health initiatives: A comprehensive analysis of return on investment and organizational performance. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/384711449
33. Rice, N., Roberts, J., & Sechel, C. (2025). Mental health and labour productivity. Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization, 236, Article 106532. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2025.106532

34. Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). Research methods for business students (8th ed.). Pearson Education.
35. Spill. (2025). 53 workplace mental health statistics you can't ignore in 2025. https://www.spill.chat/mental-health-statistics/workplace-mental-health-statistics
36. Three Sixty Safety. (2024). Revealing the numbers: Key statistics on employee mental health and wellness. https://threesixtysafety.com
37. Warr, P. (1987). Work, unemployment, and mental health. Oxford University Press.
38. World Health Organization. (2022). Guidelines on mental health at work. WHO. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240053052
39. World Health Organization. (2024). Mental health at work. WHO Fact Sheet. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/mental-health-at-work