

Strengthening Social Capital And Boosting Performance At Work

Nasreen Khan

Faculty, School of Business, Emirates Aviation University, Dubai, UAE.
EAUS485@eau.ac.ae, Orchid Id number: 0000-0002-6125-0199

ABSTRACT:

Employee performance is one of the most studied variables considering that employee performance is linked to organizational performance. Social networks at the workplace define the inter relationship between individuals and groups. The ties strength and network composition are two important aspects which provide resources through social networks. Social support is a vital emotional and material source within the organizational set up. Both social networks and social support are addressing the social relationships dynamics at the workplace and are helpful in building social capital. Subjective well-being and its relationship with employee job performance requires more attention. Social relations at work provide emotional and instrumental resources which improve employee happiness directly and indirectly. The overall life satisfaction is contributing to the positive work outcomes for employees. The aim of the present study is to examine if social networks are meaningfully predicting subjective well-being and employee performance. Furthermore, the mediation by subjective well-being between social relationships and employee performance is investigated. The findings of the study indicated that social relationships are significantly predicting subjective wellbeing and employee performance. Subjective wellbeing is significantly mediating the relationship between social relationship and employee performance. The findings of the study advance the literature on social relationships in the organizational settings. The results of the study substantiate further the concept of social networks and at the workplace.

KEYWORDS: Social network characteristics, Tie strength, Network composition, Social support, Employee performance, Subjective well-being.

1) INTRODUCTION:

Networks, collaborations, and partnerships are important for an organizations success. Both intra and inter organizational networks co-exist within an organization. Employees interact with individuals and groups for social and work related needs. As stated by Cohen and Prusak [1], network quality within an organization equally influences employee and organizational performance. Employees establish networks both on and off the job, which help them become ingrained in their work and community [2]. These networks provide individuals with resources that help in achieving desired outcomes and actions [3]. Social capital makes it possible for individuals to obtain the required values and resources from their network [4]. The resources generated through these networks facilitate information flow, exert influence, provide social and emotional support, reinforce recognition, and build social credentials [5]. Social capital literature exerts a considerable influence on the network and social support concepts. The network concepts within the context of social capital are explained through social networks. A social network is referred to as the interdependencies between social actors such as individuals or organisations [3]. The relations (ties) within a social network can be strong or weak [6]. The frequency of conversing with a network member was measured by tie strength [7]. The size and composition of the network is determined by the amount of resources an individual has access to. When an employee's network comprises of his/her managers, co-workers etc., it provides them with wider access to resources. In a social network, an employee may use the resources to improve their performance.

The role of an employee's social network in predicting performance has been examined empirically over the last fifteen years [8]. The premise that social networking may boost job satisfaction and consequently minimize turnover has drawn attention to a relational approach to employee outcomes [9]. As mentioned earlier, social support is also one of the resources generated through networks. To receive social support, one must be a part of a social network. Social support is the social and psychological assistance a person receives from their surroundings [10]. On the other hand, subjective well-being refers to how a person feels about life, specifically how content, joyful, or at ease they feel [11]. It is used to describe a person's wellness in terms of their mental and emotional health in its most basic form. Social networks are significant predictors of subjective well-being [11]. Subjective well-being is one of the fundamental psychological concepts that aid an organization in better understanding people's values, behavior, and satisfaction and, as a result, aids in reducing the financial costs of dissatisfaction and poor performance [12] [13]. Performance is an overarching term that defines the overall attitude of an individual and encompasses an individual's management skills, professional expertise, behavior learned from training, and incorporation of learning into practice [14]. Employee performance is an important behavioral attribute associated with organizational effectiveness [10]. Every organization strives to extract the best performance from

its employees; some of them succeed, and others work toward finding the best practices to achieve it. Eventually, organisations that are successfully able to improve their employees' performance are considered effective [15].

Despite a wealth of studies showing that social networks are generally linked to favorable outcomes, there is relatively limited evidence showing how different network characteristics are linked to subjective well-being and employee performance. Furthermore, there is a dearth of studies that identify the connection between network ties, network strength, social support, and subjective well-being. Furthermore, the existing literature has limited evidence on the influence of social networking attributes (composition of the network, tie strength, and social support) on performance. Despite tie strength being a frequently investigated topic in the social network research field, little consideration has been made to conceptualize how tie strength influences organizational outcomes [16] [8]. Mostly, the literature on social networks and subjective well-being is fragmented. The main contribution of this paper is to integrate the constructs of social networks, subjective well-being, and employee performance. Furthermore, the paper attempts to extend the knowledge of social capital theory.

2) LITERATURE REVIEW

Social networks continue to be a significant research approach even though they were proposed over 60 years ago. Social networks represent the comparatively stable relationship that is established between the individual members of a society because of their interactions. The benefit obtained from relationships or connections is known as social capital [17], which should propel value generation due to a person's interest/investment in social relationships. Social networks (which are not the same as online social networks) represent the structural aspects of the in-personal social relationships of individuals, e.g. the network size (number of social connections a person has), contact frequency (how frequently), kind of network relationship (such as child, spouse, friend), density (the level of connection within a network), network position (central compared to peripheral), transitivity (the degree to which an individual's ties are linked to each other), reciprocity (uni or bi-directionality among social ties), or the type of network (i.e. private, family dependent, or locally integrated). A network is typically defined as a series of actors (nodes) and the relationships (ties) between them [7]. Individuals, organizations, groups, as well as societies, can be represented by nodes [18]. Social capital makes it possible for individuals to obtain the required values and resources from their group network. Social capital in an organization, however, demonstrates the presence of social associations within the organization, which occurs because of the joint trust of individuals and their collective goals and objectives. The outcome that is typically achieved is the productive generation of value and collective activities that improve the organizations' capabilities to create and share knowledge [3]. The two main constituents of social capital structure used in contemporary studies were the relationship strength and individual resources in the network [19]. Social capital is thus a resource which is generated through social networks.

The focus of social networks is on the relationships and interactions between people, and the social behavior of individuals can be influenced by social interaction. By being a source of financial, emotional, and practical resources, social relationships can have an impact on the overall well-being of an individual. There have been extensive studies in high-income countries that show how social relationships are significant for an individual's health and well-being. There are major implications of structural and functional characteristics of social relationships for mental health as well as survival throughout one's life [16]. Grosser et al. [20] asserted that the link between social relationships and mental health is related to several psycho-social pathways that function directly, as well as stress buffers. The social resources and tie strength of individual/group networks have received the majority of attention from academics interested in the beneficial effects of informal networks. Wang et al. [21] proposed that since ties are likely to be sources of non-redundant information, they act as bridges in helping people successfully locate work. Lin [4] showed how people's networks' social origins are likely to affect how they attain status. The findings suggested that a person's occupational standing can be greatly improved by the top-rank status of work contracts. People with deep links help one another more actively since they are recognized with loyalty and trust [12]. Yet Sader et al. [9] never held the view that only weak relationships are advantageous. The weak links are less open than strong ties because they both emerged from regular interpersonal relationships [21].

Measuring various facets of the network members interactions is crucial while determining the strength of relationships. Time spent together, emotional connect, closeness, and reciprocal recognitions, are the four indicators that make the ties strong. Horak et al. [22] believe interaction frequency enhances organisational cohesion through member trust, communication, and collaboration. The interaction consistency can differ depending on how the organization supports shared cultural practices like eating, praying, and playing games, which can strengthen its sense of community [23]. Network researchers make another important distinction in terms of the strength of ties [24], differentiating between strong and weak ties that offer different advantages in different social contexts. Strong ties mainly provide the benefit of socio-economic support that involves friendship and trust. On the other hand, weak ties offer the advantage of diverse,

non-redundant information that is acquired by actors from contacts other than their usual group of friends [22]. The ability to get trustworthy and pertinent information that can help with professional progress and promotion can be facilitated by having positive interpersonal interactions with co-workers [25] [26]. Strong interpersonal bonds can result in higher job satisfaction and success [27]. In the current research social network elements include tie strength and network composition as these are the main quantitative aspects of social relationships.

H1: Tie strength is significantly affecting employee performance.

H2: Network composition is significantly affecting employee performance.

Social support offers emotional, knowledgeable, and practical resources as a part of one's social links [28] Social support, a complex and multidimensional construct has been quantified in many ways. Social embeddedness, perceived social support, and performed support are the three categories into which Han et al. (2020) divide social support. Similar distinctions are made by Jacobsen et al. [28] between perceived support, received support, and social embeddedness (frequency of contact with others). Received support refers to the quantity of assistance social network members provide (subjective evaluations of supportive exchanges). Moreover, social support can be qualitative or quantitative (expressed as the number of friends one can call in an emergency) (perception of social support adequacy) [29]. Support can come from various people, including friends, family, and romantic partners. Moreover, social support can be objective (real, received support) or subjective (the belief that a person can obtain support, if necessary, as well as the level of satisfaction with the support that is now available [8]. According to Bakker and Demerouti's conception of job resources from 2007, social support is a type of job resource. Support at the workplace can be drawn from many sources, including the company itself, management, workers, and influential people outside the office, such as family members and friends [13]. Other than the organization, factors influencing social support that have been researched include the supervisor and peers [30]. There is a need to further differentiate between these sources, given that organizational support has frequently been explored as a broad construct that includes many support sources. Hence, in this study social support construct includes supervisory support and co-worker support. Therefore, the following hypotheses are proposed.

H3: Supervisor support is significantly affecting employee performance.

H4: Co-worker support is significantly affecting employee performance.

The term subjective well-being describes a person's general sense of well-being in life as well as the regular occurrence of enjoyable experiences that relieve stress. Social support at work has been shown in a 1999 study by Diener, Suh, Lucas, and Smith to be effective in reducing workplace stress brought on by organizational changes. Supervisor support is critical in defining employee expectations and roles through the structuring of the work environment, communication, and feedback. Contrarily, coworker support entails the sharing of practical or emotional resources between people. Important indicators of subjective well-being include the caliber of social support and broader social connections [31]. According to Jacobsen et al. [28], there are two possible reasons why having satisfying relationships is advantageous: first, those who have satisfying relationships can get support when they need it, whereas those who do not have satisfying relationships cannot; second, the knowledge that one can rely on someone in times of need is comforting and thus increases one's sense of well-being. According to Han et al. [29], social support can influence subjective well-being in two different ways: as a general good effect of support and as a process of safeguarding a person from the potentially harmful impact of stressful circumstances. Depending on the social support measures, each model suggests a distinct pathway by which social support may influence subjective well-being.

Regarding how social networks affect subjective well-being, Berkman and Glass [32] put up several theories. They contend that social networks can offer social support, which functions as a stress buffer and lessens the detrimental effects of stress. Strong social networks can also encourage positive standards and discourage harmful ones, like substance addiction, while also promoting positive actions, like engagement in sports. Social networks can also encourage social contact, fostering a sense of community and opening doors for education. Additionally, social networks can offer practical support like financial aid, employment leads, and transportation to help lessen the harmful impacts of stress. The results of the association between social support and subjective well-being are indeed complicated by researchers' differing conceptualization and operationalization of these constructs and different relations for various aspects between social support and subjective well-being. As an illustration, various aspects of social relationships and social support, such as more extensive social networks, positive family relationships, contact with friends, enacted and perceived support, given and received support, and general well-being, have been linked to lower depression [33] [34]. Conversely, social support either has little influence on life satisfaction or has detrimental effects, such as increased depression or negative affect [35].

H5: Subjective well-being is significantly mediating the impact of tie strength on employee performance.

H6: Subjective well-being is significantly mediating the impact of network composition on employee performance.

H7: Subjective well-being is significantly mediating the impact of supervisor support on employee performance.

H8: Subjective well-being is significantly mediating the impact of co-worker support on employee performance.

3) METHODS AND METHODOLOGY:

The data was collected using an online survey. The sample size of the research was 255 identified using convenience sampling. The researcher adopted the scale developed by Seibert et al. [36] for the network composition scale are “At work, I know a lot of important people and am well connected” and “I know a lot of people who might help me with matters important to my work.” The sample items measuring tie strength were, “Most people who are working with me are people I often talk to” and “Most people who are working with me are people who I can trust.” Social support scale developed by Mack and Rhineberger-Dunn [37] is adopted as it effectively measures supervisor and co-worker support. The sample items for supervisor support scale were, “My supervisor cares about my well-being”, and “My supervisor listens to me and considers my opinion.” The sample items measuring coworker support were “My coworkers help me in crisis situations at work”, and “My coworkers’ compliment someone who has done their job well.” The scale developed by Salas-Vallina & Vidal [38] are adopted to measure subjective well-being. Sample items measuring SWB are “In most ways my life is satisfactory”, and “I get carried away when I am working.” The researcher adapted the scale developed by Ramos-Villagrasa et al. [39] to measure employee performance. The sample items measuring the factors of employee performance are, “I can concentrate on and give my best to the job”, “I perform well in my overall job by carrying out tasks as expected”, and “I am familiar with the skills required on the job to perform effectively”, and “I always try to improve the overall of the work.” Adoption of the existing scales, some of which were second order scales, the researcher has tried to reduce the common method variance. The questionnaire was accompanied by a letter of consent, which specified that participation is voluntary and at the free will of the respondents. The sample comprised of approximately 51 percent of females and 49 percent of males. Thus, the researcher would like to highlight that the data has almost equal percentage of male and female respondents, which would be a plus point for the main findings of the study. The sample had approximately 48 percent of respondents from the age group of 31-40 years. The respondents from the age group of 18-30 years constituted approximately 31 percent of the sample. Approximately 5 percent were from the age group of 51-60 years, while nearly 17 percent belonged to the age group of 41-50 years. Most of the respondents, 60 percent, were reportedly working at a lower-level managerial position. The sample had nearly 8 percent of the respondents working at the Top-level and approximately 32 percent working at the middle-managerial level.

3. RESULTS

The multivariate model was tested using SMART-PLS. At first, measurement model is tested, where validity and reliability of instrument was evaluated. Secondly, structural models were tested to investigate the hypotheses developed in this research. For measurement model, an assessment of indicator loadings, average variance extracted (AVE), composite reliability (CR), along with Cronbach’s alpha, and Rho where composite reliability (CR), both are the measures of internal reliability. Table 1 provides with the results of construct reliability assessed using item loadings, Cronbach’s Alpha, and composite reliability (CR), while convergent validity is being assessed using average variance extracted (AVE).

Table 1 Outer Loadings of the items

Items/variables	TS	NC	SS	CS	SWB	EPERF
TS1	0.863					
TS2	0.884					
TS3	0.829					
NC1		0.826				
NC2		0.848				
NC3		0.826				
NC4		0.818				
NC5		0.870				
NC6		0.836				
SS1			0.776			
SS2			0.874			
SS3			0.864			

SS4			0.815			
SS5			0.866			
SS6			0.798			
CS1				0.744		
CS2				0.706		
CS3				0.875		
CS4				0.858		
CS5				0.842		
SWB1					0.823	
SWB2					0.894	
SWB3					0.864	
SWB4					0.776	
SWB5					0.800	
EPERF1						0.713
EPERF2						0.838
EPERF3						0.798
EPERF4						0.788
EPERF5						0.775
EPERF6						0.766
EPERF7						0.849
EPERF8						0.828
EPERF9						0.815
EPERF10						0.838
EPERF11						0.746
EPERF12						0.807
EPERF13						0.854
EPERF14						0.779
EPERF15						0.779

All the indicator item-loadings are above the threshold of 0.7. A total of 9 items of the employee performance scale were deleted from the model as the outer loadings were less than 0.7. However, the proportion of deleted items is less than 20% of the total number of items, however, all the included items are loaded on each variable. All item loadings are above the threshold of 0.7, thus providing acceptable item reliability. In the next step, the construct reliability was established using Cronbach's Alpha and Composite reliability (CR). Table 2 indicates that, the Cronbach's Alpha values for all variables are above 0.80 (good internal consistency reliability).

Table 2 Construct Reliability and Validity test results

	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability (rho_a)	Composite reliability (rho_c)	AVE
TS	0.823	0.834	0.894	0.738
NC	0.915	0.921	0.934	0.702
SS	0.911	0.917	0.931	0.694
CS	0.866	0.885	0.903	0.653
SWB	0.889	0.891	0.919	0.694

EPERF	0.959	0.960	0.964	0.639
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Composite reliability (CR) is higher than Cronbach’s alpha, as all are above 0.80 indicating good construct reliability. To assess convergent validity, average variance extracted (AVE) values were examined. The AVE values for all constructs are above 0.50 which indicate good convergent validity. To assess discriminant validity, Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio which is the ratio of the between-trait correlations to the within-trait correlations was examined. Table 3 provides the results of the HTMT ratio.

Table 3 Discriminant Validity using HTMT

	NC	SS	CS	SWB	EPERF
TS	0.761	0.308	0.336	0.408	0.338
NC		0.338	0.401	0.369	0.404
SS			0.547	0.326	0.299
CS				0.677	0.553
SWB					0.628

The values obtained for constructs are less than 0.85, thereby establishing the discriminant validity of all constructs. The researcher presented the results of the path coefficients and the indirect effects from the PLS-SEM model after the bootstrapping analysis. Table 4 provides the path coefficients, the direct effects of the independent variables and the mediating variable on the dependent variable. The impact of TS on EPERF was not significant ($\beta = -0.002$, $p = 0.967$), however, the impact of TS on SWB ($\beta = 0.211$, $p = 0.001$) was found to be positive and significant. Based on the findings, H1 was not supported. The path coefficient values indicated a positive and significant impact of network composition on employee performance ($\beta = 0.170$, $p = 0.004$), hence, H2 was confirmed. However, the impact of network composition on subjective well-being was not significant ($\beta = 0.021$, $p = 0.726$).

Table 4 Path coefficients

	β	STDEV	T statistics	P values
TS -> EPERF	-0.002	0.058	0.041	0.967
TS -> SWB	0.211	0.061	3.465	0.001
NC -> EPERF	0.170	0.059	2.884	0.004
NC -> SWB	0.021	0.061	0.350	0.726
SS -> EPERF	0.018	0.047	0.396	0.692
SS -> SWB	-0.030	0.060	0.503	0.615
CS -> EPERF	0.211	0.075	2.828	0.005
CS -> SWB	0.553	0.065	8.443	0.000
SWB -> EPERF	0.422	0.075	5.632	0.000

The impact of supervisor support on employee performance ($\beta = 0.018$, $p = 0.692$), was not significant, therefore, H3 was not supported. Similarly, the effect of supervisor support on subjective well-being ($\beta = -0.030$, $p = 0.615$) was not significant, hence, the possibility of any mediating effect does not exist. The results of the path coefficients indicated that the impact of co-worker support on the employee performance is positive and significant ($\beta = 0.211$, $p = 0.005$). Therefore, H4 is confirmed. The impact of co-worker support on subjective well-being is significant and positive ($\beta = 0.553$, $p = 0.000$). Based on the results of the indirect effects given in Table 5 the mediation of subjective well-being between tie strength and employee performance was found to be significant ($\beta = 0.089$, $p = 0.003$). Therefore, H5 was confirmed.

Table 5 Indirect effects

	β	STDEV	T statistics	P values
TS -> SWB -> EPERF	0.089	0.030	2.981	0.003
NC -> SWB -> EPERF	0.009	0.027	0.332	0.740
SS -> SWB -> EPERF	-0.013	0.026	0.481	0.631
CS -> SWB -> EPERF	0.233	0.050	4.682	0.000

The indirect effect of tie strength on employee performance through subjective well-being was significant. Similarly, the mediation of subjective well-being between co-worker support and employee performance is significant ($\beta = 0.233$, $p = 0.000$). Hence, the respective H8 was supported. Furthermore, based on the indirect effects the mediation of subjective well-being between network composition and employee performance ($\beta = 0.009$, $p = 0.740$) and between social support and employee performance ($\beta = -0.013$, $p = 0.631$) was not significant. Hence, H6 and H7 were not confirmed.

4. DISCUSSION

The present study highlights the important role of social networks, social support, and subjective well-being with employee performance. Strong network connections, which are important social capital, provide people with access to task assistance, influence-conferring support, and social support [40]. The results of the hypotheses testing were mixed. The findings indicated that tie strength has no impact on employee performance, however, the network composition does have a significant impact on employee performance. The impact of tie strength is negated by the positive effect of network composition on employee performance. As mentioned by Rho and Han [8] the employee job performance is dependent on a multitude of factors such as individual, organizational, and contextual. Furthermore, just looking at strength of ties is not sufficiently predicting the employee performance, instead it is associated with the support and sense of well-being experienced by the employee at the workplace. Network composition provides relational and resource-based support to the individual which helps in positively influencing work performance. The relational approach indicates that the network members, the frequency of interactions and size are all helping the individual in building relationship through the network and thus gain more sources and support which helps him/her to perform better. While the same argument can be made about the resource-based approach. Network connections and social support provide the resources necessary to complete the tasks more effectively. Wu et al. [15] underlined that stronger links should be at the forefront of intra-organizational assistance because most of the help that workers demand from their intra-organizational network members requires some degree of trust. The mechanism underlying the role of social networks on employee performance can be explained by understanding the role played by social relationships in promoting cohesiveness, communication which facilitates the task execution, and delegation. Networking and collaboration encourage information exchange and effort coordination. The quantity, kind, and nature of social contacts among a group's members are all positively connected with that group's cohesiveness. These interactions are therefore thought to be related to the overall effectiveness of the organization.

Co-worker support significantly affected employee performance directly and indirectly via subjective well-being. The potential reason behind supervisor support not affecting employee performance can be that the support is expected but not received. Hung et al. [16] have mentioned that not many studies on supervisor support have examined the support which went unanswered. Both the social capital theory and social network theory support the finding of co-worker support affecting subjective well-being and employee performance. In a network, communication frequency, socialization, and the length of a relationship are all strongly correlated with the degree of linkages between the members. Kundi et al. [26] found that happy workers are more likely to be satisfied and perform their job effectively. Happier and healthier employees increase their effort, performance, and productivity [12]. Similarly, the support received at work was found to be affecting subjective well-being [13]. The support received at the workplace enhances the emotional attachment, engagement, and sense of belonging which influences the employee performance. This is well supported with the Social Exchange theory. When an employee receives support at the workplace it can reduce stress and enhance self-efficacy, thus positively affecting the job performance. Social networks can promote solid connections, high self-esteem, and pleasant feelings, which can all have a favorable effect on psychological well-being. In addition to improving well-being, social trust, a type of cognitive social capital, also encourages generalized reciprocity. This entails providing a favor to another person with no expectation of immediate remuneration and the hope that it will be paid back in the future. High levels of social trust can operate as a unifying factor that binds communities and promotes social cohesion.

5. Implications

The current study explored the social networking at the workplace based on tie strength, network composition, supervisory support, and co-worker support. Managers must consider these factors while developing employee initiatives. Human resource managers can pay attention to providing opportunities for employees to develop formal and informal networks at the workplace. Systematic efforts should be taken to encourage social networks to thrive within the organizations; supervisors are constantly available to support their subordinates, encourage cohesiveness among co-workers, and ensure that the employees are happy. Organizing formal events, facilitating team building, and informal gatherings may provide networking opportunities for the employees. The networking will assist employees in gaining resources, developing friendships, and exchanging information. The findings of the study show that supervisor and co-worker support are important for employee performance and subjective well-being. The study findings have theoretical implications for they are considerably congruent with Social Capital Theory, Social Exchange Theory, and Social Network Theory. The findings of the study indicate extending the Social network theory as social support factors were important for social networking. Social network characteristics and social support were studied as separate factors, however, in the current both are contributing to the social capital. The current study has contributed to the extension of the Self-determination theory [41] as the theory supports the findings. The need for relatedness is important as it affects subjective well-being and the performance of the employees. Developing social networks, supportive supervisors, and co-workers helps in fulfilling the relatedness needs of the employees.

6. Limitations and Future Research

A self-report measure is likely to produce response bias. One of the main limitations of conducting online surveys was the lack of responses and or incomplete responses. The researcher faced the challenges of missing data and delays in data collection. The model of the current study can be extended by adding more variables. The researcher proposes that future studies should explore whether it is possible to focus on the mediation and moderation effects of specific individual, contextual, and organizational factors on employee job performance. In future, researchers may employ qualitative techniques such as interviews and focus group discussion to gain better insights on the topic. The researcher recommends longitudinal research because longitudinal studies will help to investigate the antecedent and its after-effects. It can give us a better insight into the research problem. The use of a systematic or stratified sampling method is recommended as it will help better represent the population and increase the generalizability of the findings. The format of the questionnaire can be changed to a Forced Choice Questionnaire (FCQ) [42]. In the FCQ several items are presented to the respondents related to their behavior and they must rank those items. The ranking shows higher accuracy than the use of ratings. A separate survey is used to collect responses from the same set of respondents at different time intervals. The researcher suggests that in the future researchers can develop different surveys for the supervisors and subordinates. Such a kind of survey will help examine the topic with better perspectives and can be integrated to achieve better findings. Lastly, the researcher recommends the use of comparative scales for measuring the variables and examining any variations in the measures and overall findings of the study.

7. Funding Statement: No financing / There is no fund received for this article.

8. Data Availability: No new data was created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

9. Conflict of interest: The authors declare that there is **no conflict of interest**".

10. REFERENCES:

- Cohen DJ, Prusak L. In good company. Ubiquity. 2001 Jan 1;2001(January):3-es.
- [1] Saatchi AG, Pallotti F, Sullivan P. Network approaches and interventions in healthcare settings: A systematic scoping review. Uddin S, editor. PLOS ONE. 2023 Feb 23;18(2):e0282050.
- [2] Jiao J, Riel van, Aalbers R, Sasovova Z. A Network Perspective on Interpersonal Trust Dynamics. In: Gerbasi A, Emery C, Parker A, editors. Understanding Workplace Relationships: An Examination of the Antecedents and Outcomes [Internet]. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2023. p. 391-438. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/9783031166402_13
- [3] Lin N. Social capital: a theory of social structure and action. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2002.
- [4] Ma SC, Kaplanidou K. Social Capital and Running: A Network Social Capital Perspective. Sustainability. 2021 Nov 10;13(22):12398.
- [5] McGuire GM, Bielby WT. The variable effects of tie strength and social resources: How type of support matters. Work and Occupations. 2016;43(1):38-74.
- [6] Wasserman S, Faust K. Social network analysis in the social and behavioral sciences. Cambridge University Press; 1994. p. 3-27.
- [7] Rho E, Han S. Relative Managerial Networking and Performance: The Moderating Role of Environmental Context. Public Administration Review. 2021;81(2):205-19.
- [8] Sader M, Chollet B, Brion S, Trendel O. Supported, detached, or marginalized? The ambivalent role of social capital on stress at work. European Management Journal. 2021;39(6):768-78.
- [9] Vuong BN, Tushar H, Hossain SFA. The effect of social support on job performance through organizational commitment and innovative work behavior: does innovative climate matter? Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration. 2022 Jun 16;32(1):102-19.

- [10] Diener E, Ryan K. Subjective Well Being: A General Overview. *South African Journal of Psychology*. 2009 ;39(4):391-406. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/008124630903900402>
- [11] Peiró, José M, Svicher A, Fabio D. Innovative behaviors and eudaimonic wellbeing: The contribution of human capital sustainability leadership to sustainable career, decent work, decent lives, and healthy lives. *Australian Journal of Career Development*. 2023;32(3):215-24. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/10384162231202224>
- [12] Brajša-Žganec A, Kaliterna Lipovčan L, Hanzec I. The Relationship between Social Support and Subjective Well-Being across the Lifespan. *Društvena istraživanja*. 2018;27(1):47-65.
- [13] Koopmans L, Bernaards CM, Hildebrandt VH, Lerner D, de Vet HCW, van der Beek AJ. Cross-cultural adaptation of the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire. *Work*. 2016 Mar 14;53(3):609-19.
- [14] Wu G, Zheng J, Zhao X, Zuo J. How does strength of ties influence project performance in Chinese megaprojects? *International Journal of Conflict Management*. 2020 Jan 1;31(5):753-80. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCMA0920190150>
- [15] Huang YH, Sung CY, Chen WT, Liu SS. Relationships between Social Support, Social Status Perception, Social Identity, Work Stress, and Safety Behavior of Construction Site Management Personnel. *Sustainability*. 2021 Mar 14;13(6):3184.
- [16] Purington A, Stupp E, Welker D, Powers J, Banikya-Leaseburg M. Using Social Network Analysis to Strengthen Organizational Relationships to Better Serve Expectant and Parenting Young People. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*. 2020 Sep;24(S2):232-42.
- [17] Borgatti SP, Everett MG, Johnson JC. *Analyzing social networks*. Sage; 2018.
- [18] Korichi AR, Kheddouci H, Tehseen T. Modeling and analysis of organizational network analysis graphs based on employee data. *International Conference On Optimization And Learning (OLA2023)*. 2023 May;(Malaga, Spain. fhal-04131575f).
- [19] Grosser T, Piplani, Rohit Subhash, Quintane E, Casciaro T, McEvily B, Zhang EY, et al. Making Connections: Antecedents and Outcomes of Professional Networking Behavior. *Proceedings* ;2023(1):15758. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMPROC.2023.15758symposium>
- [20] Wang W, Stark T, Westaby JD, Parr AK, Newman DA. Social network analysis in psychology: Recent breakthroughs in methods and theories. In: *APA handbook of research methods in psychology: Data analysis and research publication, Vol 3, 2nd ed*. Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association; 2023. p. 501-37.
- [21] Horak S, Taube M, Yang I, Restel K. Two not of a kind: Social network theory and informal social networks in East Asia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*. 2019 Mar 21;36(2):349-72.
- [22] Floyd TM, Gerbasi A, Labianca GJ. The role of sociopolitical workplace networks in involuntary employee turnover. *Social Networks*.2024;76:215-29.
- [23] Donati S, Zappalà S, GonzálezRomá V. The doubleedge sword effect of interorganizational trust on involvement in interorganizational networks: The mediator role of affective commitment. *European Management Journal*. 2020;38(4):613-22.
- [24] Li N, Huang Q, Ge X, He M, Cui S, Huang P, et al. A Review of the Research Progress of Social Network Structure. Xiong F, editor. *Complexity*. 2021:1-14.
- [25] Kundi YM, Aboramadan M, Elhamalawi EMI, Shahid S. Employee Psychological Well-being and Job Performance: Exploring Mediating and Moderating Mechanisms. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*. 2020 Aug 12;29(3):736-54.
- [26] LeBeau K, King L, Vacca R. Interorganizational collaboration in a trauma informed community: A network analysis of cohesion and change. *Journal of Community Psychology*. 2023.
- [27] Jacobsen DH, Stea D, Soda GB. Intraorganizational Network Dynamics: Past Progress, Current Challenges, and New Frontiers. *ANNALS*. 2022;16(2):853-97. doi.org/10.5465/annals.2020.0369
- [28] Han Y, Caldwell ND, Ghadge A. Social network analysis in operations and supply chain management: a review and revised research agenda. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*. 2020. 40 (7/8):1153-1176.
- [29] Renzini F, Bianchi F, Squazzoni F. Status, cognitive overload, and incomplete information in advice seeking networks: An agent based model. *Social Networks*. 2024; 76:150-9.
- [30] Osman M, Kemp L, Cho BY, Patterson L. The perceptions of diversity management and employee performance: UAE perspectives. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*. 2023;45(6):1476-91. doi.org/10.1108/ER1120220523
- [31] Berkman LF, Glass T., Social Support, Social Networks, Social Cohesion and Health. *Social Work in Health Care*. 2000 Sep 26;31(2):3-14.
- [32] Grace McCaskey CA, Ramos MC, Sjoström A, Page SE. Combining social network analysis and ethnography to better understand fishers' organization and promote sustainable small scale fisheries in St. Croix, US Virgin Islands. *Marine Policy*. 2023;152:105573.
- [33] Mannak RS, Markus A, Meeus MTH, Raab J, Smit AC. Network dynamics and its impact on innovation outcomes: R&D consortia in the Dutch water sector. *Social Networks*. 2023; 74:62-70.
- [34] Giau HNK, Vuong BN, Tushar H. The impact of social support on job-related behaviors through the mediating role of job stress and the moderating role of locus of control: Empirical evidence from the Vietnamese banking industry. Wright LT, editor. *Cogent Business & Management*. 2020 Jan 1;7(1).
- [35] Seibert SE, Kraimer ML, Liden RC. A Social Capital Theory of Career Success. *The Academy of Management Journal*. 2001;44(2):219-37.
- [36] Mack KY, Rhineberger-Dunn G. Burnout among Community Corrections Officers: Do Supervisor and Coworker Support Matter? *Corrections*. 2019;6(2):107-23.
- [37] Salas-Vallina A, Alegre J. Happiness at work: Developing a shorter measure. *Journal of Management & Organization*. 2018 May 28;27(3):1-21.
- [38] Ramos-Villagrasa PJ, Barrada JR, Fernández-del-Río E, Koopmans L. Assessing Job Performance Using Brief Self-report Scales: The Case of the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*. 2019 Nov;35(3):195-205.
- [39] Thiel M. Employee Social Network Strategies: Implications for Firm Strategies and Performance in Future Organizations. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2021 Dec 13;12.
- [40] Kreitchmann RS, Abad FJ, Ponsoda V, Nieto MD, Morillo D. Controlling for Response Biases in Self Report Scales: Forced Choice vs. Psychometric Modeling of Likert Items. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2019;10.
- [41] Deci EL, Connell JP, Ryan, RM. Self-determination in a work organization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1989.74: 580-590.