Mental Health at Work: A Cross-Sectoral and Cultural Analysis of Corporate Wellness Programs

Ms. Ketaki Shetye

Research Scholar- UIM, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India
Assistant Professor, TIMSR, Mumbai, India

Abstract

Mental health has emerged as a strategic concern for organizations globally, yet corporate wellness initiatives often remain generalized and disconnected from the diverse realities of employees across sectors and cultures. This study investigates how mental health programs vary by industry type, cultural setting, and level of organizational integration. Using secondary data from CSR reports, HR publications, and international policy documents, the research employs a three-dimensional analytical framework—Industry Sector × Cultural Context × Program Depth—to explore the structural, cultural, and programmatic nuances of corporate mental health efforts.

Findings reveal that while knowledge-intensive sectors such as IT and finance lead in digital wellness innovation, labour-intensive industries like manufacturing and construction lag behind in both awareness and implementation. Cultural attitudes significantly affect program engagement, with stigma and silence prevalent in collectivist societies, and more open, policy-supported models in individualistic contexts. Additionally, non-traditional workers—including gig, contract, and informal employees—are frequently excluded from wellness coverage.

The study contributes to organizational theory by highlighting the need for context-sensitive, inclusive, and deeply embedded mental health strategies. It offers a conceptual model that can guide policymakers and practitioners toward designing equitable workplace mental health systems tailored to local and sectoral realities.

Keywords: Workplace mental health, industry differences, cultural context, wellness strategy, program depth, inclusive HRM.

1. Introduction

The mental health landscape within the workplace is increasingly acknowledged as a critical dimension of organizational success and employee well-being. Yet, much of the discourse around corporate mental health remains overly generalized, failing to account for the diverse and complex needs of different employee groups. Most mental wellness strategies assume homogeneity in employee experiences, mental health risks, and access to support, despite clear differences based on industry type, job function, work conditions, and socio-cultural context (Keller, Meier, & Gross, 2021; American Psychological Association [APA], 2023). For instance, the emotional labour experienced by frontline healthcare staff differs dramatically from the cognitive stress of IT professionals or the physical-exhaustion-induced

anxiety in manufacturing settings (ILO, 2021; National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health [NIOSH], 2023). This overlooked diversity leads to misaligned or superficial wellness interventions that may not address the root causes of mental distress across roles and sectors.

In addition to occupational diversity, cultural attitudes toward mental health significantly shape the design, acceptance, and effectiveness of corporate initiatives. In collectivist cultures such as India, China, or Japan, mental health concerns are often stigmatized or silenced, which discourages open discussion and formal help-seeking behaviour (Hofstede Insights, 2023; Chandra & Chandwani, 2020). In contrast, Western societies, particularly in Scandinavia, tend to embrace more open dialogue and integrate mental health into organizational culture and public health systems. These cultural factors influence not only employee willingness to engage with mental health programs but also how corporations define and operationalize well-being (WHO, 2022). As a result, a global or even national program template may fail when transposed into different cultural or industry settings without contextual adaptation.

Given these nuances, there is a pressing need to examine corporate mental health initiatives through a sectoral and cultural lens—one that considers the interplay of occupational hazards, employment models (e.g., full-time, gig, hybrid), and regional belief systems around mental health. Such a perspective enables a more equitable and effective understanding of wellness practices, revealing who benefits from these programs and who remains excluded.

To explore these complexities, this study investigates how corporate mental health initiatives vary across industries and cultural contexts, and what gaps persist in their design and implementation. Drawing upon secondary data sources—including global Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) reports, industry-specific human resource publications, and international policy documents—this paper undertakes a thematic analysis to map the patterns, divergences, and emerging innovations in workplace mental health strategies. The objective is to uncover structural inequities in access and impact, and to identify context-sensitive practices that can guide the development of more inclusive and adaptive mental health frameworks within corporate environments.

2. Research Objectives

- To explore the diversity of mental health needs across different industries
- To examine how cultural attitudes influence the design and acceptance of corporate mental health initiatives
- To evaluate the depth and inclusivity of existing mental health initiatives using secondary data sources.
- To identify sector-specific patterns, innovations, and gaps in mental health strategies
- To recommend best practices for designing culturally sensitive and sector-relevant corporate mental health frameworks

3. Research Methodology

This study employs a qualitative, exploratory research design, focusing on a secondary data review to examine how corporate mental health initiatives differ across industries and cultural contexts. Given the diversity and complexity of workplace mental health challenges, a thematic analysis was selected as the most suitable method to interpret trends, patterns, and underlying themes in organizational practices.

This approach allows for a nuanced understanding of both sectoral and cultural variations, as well as the depth and inclusivity of various mental health programs (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Data was sourced from publicly available, credible secondary materials published between 2019 and 2024. These included Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) reports from multinational corporations across industries, white papers and benchmarking studies by human resource organizations such as the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) and NASSCOM, and global policy reports from entities such as the World Health Organization (WHO, 2022), the International Labour Organization (ILO, 2021), and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2023). Peer-reviewed academic journal articles and case studies on organizational mental health were also included to enhance the depth of analysis (Keller, Meier, & Gross, 2021).

To ensure relevance and rigor, the study applied specific inclusion and exclusion criteria. Sources were included if they addressed organizational-level mental health practices, offered industry-specific or culturally contextual insights, and discussed outcomes or implementation challenges. Materials that focused purely on individual-level psychological interventions without organizational application, or those unrelated to corporate settings (e.g., schools, prisons), were excluded from the analysis. Additionally, non-credible sources lacking clear authorship or methodological transparency were omitted to maintain academic integrity.

The analysis followed Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-step thematic process: data familiarization, code generation, theme identification, theme review, theme naming, and final synthesis. Themes were developed around three core axes: sectoral trends (e.g., in IT, healthcare, manufacturing), cultural influences on mental health engagement and stigma, and the inclusivity of wellness programs for various workforce types, including gig workers and remote employees. This multi-dimensional approach allowed the study to capture the complex interplay between occupational roles, cultural norms, and wellness practices.

As the research relies entirely on secondary data, no direct engagement with human subjects was required. Therefore, ethical concerns such as confidentiality and informed consent were not applicable. All sources were used responsibly and are appropriately cited to maintain transparency and uphold the standards of ethical academic research.

4. Literature Review

The increasing prevalence of stress, burnout, anxiety, and depression in workplace settings has pushed mental health to the forefront of organizational agendas globally. The World Health Organization (2022) estimates that poor mental health costs the global economy nearly $1 trillion each year in lost productivity. As businesses recognize that employee well-being directly impacts performance, retention, and organizational culture, corporate mental health programs have seen significant growth. However, despite this progress, research highlights considerable gaps and inconsistencies in how these programs are designed, implemented, and experienced across different sectors, cultures, and workforce types.

Sectoral Differences in Mental Health Priorities and Program Models

Studies indicate that mental health support varies widely across industries, with some sectors taking the lead and others lagging significantly. The IT and financial services industries tend to offer more comprehensive mental health programs, such as Employee Assistance Programs (EAPs), counselling access, stress management workshops, and digital wellness apps. These initiatives are often well-funded, structured, and tied to performance and retention goals (Keller, Meier, & Gross, 2021). For instance,

tech companies like Google and Microsoft have pioneered in-house therapy sessions, resilience training, and mental health days, positioning well-being as a strategic priority.

In contrast, manufacturing, logistics, construction, and agriculture sectors remain underrepresented in wellness research and program development, despite high levels of occupational stress, job insecurity, and physical strain (ILO, 2021). Many companies in these sectors focus primarily on physical safety rather than psychological well-being. As a result, frontline workers often receive little or no emotional support, even though they face risks such as burnout, monotony, long working hours, and lack of autonomy (Singh & Kaur, 2022). These discrepancies indicate that organizational mental health initiatives are not equally prioritized across sectors, and that the structure and depth of wellness interventions are closely linked to industry norms and economic positioning.

Cultural Influences on Mental Health Perception and Participation

Culture plays a critical role in shaping how mental health is understood, communicated, and managed in the workplace. In collectivist cultures such as those in India, China, and Japan, mental health concerns are often stigmatized, perceived as personal weaknesses or family dishonour. As a result, employees are less likely to seek help even when support systems are in place (Chandra & Chandwani, 2020). A study by Hofstede Insights (2023) emphasized that power distance and uncertainty avoidance are higher in Asian workplaces, making it harder for employees to approach managers about mental health concerns.

Conversely, in Western countries—particularly in Scandinavia, Canada, and the UK—there is greater openness in discussing psychological well-being. Mental health is more integrated into policy, and employers are legally or socially expected to support it (OECD, 2023). Countries like Sweden and Finland, for example, include mental health training in leadership development and offer community-based employee support systems. These differences suggest that corporate wellness models are culturally embedded, and global organizations must localize their strategies to fit regional norms and sensitivities.

Multinational corporations often face challenges in deploying uniform programs across global offices. A policy effective in the United States may fail in India or China due to cultural hesitancy around help-seeking and fear of workplace discrimination (WHO, 2022). Therefore, the success of mental health interventions is not only dependent on the quality of the programs but also on their cultural alignment with employee beliefs and behaviours.

Inclusivity Gaps: Who Is Left Out?

While mental health initiatives are becoming more common, they often cater predominantly to full-time, urban, white-collar employees, leaving out a significant portion of the modern workforce. Remote workers, gig economy participants, part-time staff, and blue-collar employees are frequently excluded from structured support systems (Sinha & Narayan, 2022). For example, food delivery executives, warehouse labourers, and ride-share drivers may suffer from chronic stress and isolation but have limited access to company-led mental health services due to their contractual or freelance status.

The situation is particularly acute in developing economies like India, where informal employment dominates. Even within formal sectors, wellness services are concentrated in headquarters and urban centres, while branch offices and rural sites remain underserved. This urban-rural and permanent-temporary divide in access to mental health support represents a major equity issue in organizational well-being (Deloitte, 2023).

Women and gender-diverse individuals also face specific mental health challenges at work, such as emotional labour, workplace harassment, and dual responsibilities at home. Yet, many wellness

programs are gender-neutral by design and fail to address the unique stressors experienced by marginalized groups (SHRM, 2023). The literature increasingly calls for a more intersectional approach that considers gender, socio-economic status, disability, and job type when designing mental health interventions.

Innovation and Emerging Practices in Workplace Wellness

Technological innovation has enabled companies to rethink how they deliver mental health services. Digital therapy platforms, AI-driven chatbots, mindfulness apps, and wearable tech are now part of many corporate wellness packages, especially in large tech firms and health-conscious organizations (SHRM, 2023). These tools provide accessibility, anonymity, and 24/7 support, making them attractive options in high-pressure environments. However, access to digital wellness is still largely limited to sectors with high digital literacy and infrastructure.

Some companies are experimenting with expressive arts therapy, storytelling sessions, and nature-based interventions to promote emotional expression and collective healing (Keller et al., 2021). Other organizations are piloting trauma-informed management training, mental health first aid, and neurodiversity-friendly workplaces—especially in the education and healthcare sectors. While these innovations are promising, their uptake is fragmented and lacks standardization. Moreover, many programs still fail to move beyond surface-level wellness messaging into the realm of systemic change, where leadership behaviour, organizational policies, and workplace culture are aligned with mental health priorities (WHO, 2022).

Need for Localized and Multi-Stakeholder Strategies

The literature suggests that corporate mental health must shift from being a standalone CSR or HR initiative to becoming a core part of organizational strategy, supported by leadership, line managers, and external stakeholders. It must also engage with public health systems, community organizations, and government regulation to create a shared responsibility model for workplace wellness (ILO, 2021). Context-sensitive frameworks like the WHO's "Healthy Workplaces" model emphasize participatory approaches, continuous evaluation, and employee voice as key components of effective mental health interventions.

Despite this awareness, most existing programs lack rigorous evaluation, and there is limited comparative research that maps differences across cultures, sectors, and employment models (OECD, 2023). As such, the literature calls for a thematic, intersectional review of mental health practices, which this paper aims to contribute through a secondary data-based analysis.

5. Framework for Analysis: Industry-Sector × Cultural-Context × Program-Depth Matrix

To systematically analyze corporate mental health initiatives, this study employs a three-dimensional analytical matrix that considers the industry sector, cultural context, and program depth of wellness interventions. This framework enables a nuanced exploration of how mental health strategies are shaped by operational demands, cultural attitudes, and the degree of organizational integration. Drawing on previous conceptual models of organizational health (Keller, Meier, & Gross, 2021; WHO, 2022), the matrix facilitates a comparative and intersectional analysis that highlights both patterns of effectiveness and areas of exclusion.

1. Industry Sector Dimension

The industry sector axis categorizes organizations based on their primary domain of operation, recognizing that different industries expose employees to distinct stressors, work structures, and mental

health risks. In knowledge-intensive sectors such as Information Technology (IT) and finance, mental health interventions tend to be more digitally integrated and well-funded, offering tools like therapy apps, online counselling, and resilience coaching (SHRM, 2023). These sectors also often incorporate wellness initiatives into performance metrics and talent retention strategies.

In contrast, sectors like healthcare face high emotional labour and burnout risk due to direct human service, yet they may benefit from informal peer support systems and some institutional awareness of mental health (ILO, 2021). Meanwhile, manufacturing, logistics, and construction sectors are marked by physical demands, low job control, and limited mental health infrastructure, making these workers more vulnerable to stress and anxiety with fewer coping resources (Singh & Kaur, 2022). Education and public-sector roles face emotional overload, rigid structures, and often suffer from underinvestment in employee wellness (Chandra & Chandwani, 2020). These differences necessitate a sector-specific lens in analysing the implementation and impact of corporate wellness strategies.

2. Cultural Context Dimension

The cultural context axis focuses on the societal norms, values, and workplace hierarchies that influence how mental health is perceived, discussed, and addressed. Culture not only affects employee willingness to engage with wellness programs but also determines how organizations define mental well-being and appropriate support mechanisms. In collectivist societies such as India, China, and Japan, mental health issues are often stigmatized, viewed as personal weaknesses, or sources of familial dishonour, which discourages open dialogue and help-seeking (Hofstede Insights, 2023; Chandra & Chandwani, 2020). Organizations in these regions may struggle to gain traction for wellness initiatives despite growing awareness of mental health risks.

In contrast, individualistic societies, particularly in Scandinavia, Canada, and the UK, have made mental health a visible part of workplace culture and public health policy. Employers are expected to support emotional well-being through legal compliance, flexible work arrangements, and psychologically safe leadership (OECD, 2023). Cultural dimensions such as power distance and uncertainty avoidance, as defined in Hofstede's framework, also impact how employees interact with superiors and HR departments regarding mental health disclosures. A culturally informed framework ensures that corporate mental health programs are contextually aligned, rather than being one-size-fits-all transplants from Western models (WHO, 2022).

3. Program Depth Dimension

The third axis evaluates the depth and inclusivity of mental health programs within organizations. It considers not just the presence of initiatives, but how deeply embedded they are in company culture and whether they serve a diverse workforce. Surface-level programs are typically limited to token efforts like one-off workshops or stress-relief events with minimal follow-up. These programs may raise awareness but fail to address systemic causes of stress or create lasting impact (Keller et al., 2021).

Moderately integrated programs offer structured support such as Employee Assistance Programs (EAPs), wellness applications, hybrid work models, and basic manager training. While these programs are more formalized, they often remain accessible only to full-time, urban, or white-collar staff. At the highest level, deeply integrated programs embed mental health into performance evaluation, leadership development, DEI strategies, and policy review. They promote psychological safety through regular feedback loops and include initiatives for marginalized groups, remote workers, and gig economy participants (Sinha & Narayan, 2022). This dimension is critical to identifying which programs go beyond lip service and create organizational cultures that normalize and sustain mental well-being.

Application of the Matrix

By cross-tabulating data across these three dimensions, the matrix facilitates a comparative and intersectional evaluation of mental health practices. For example, in the IT sector in India—a collectivist setting—digital wellness platforms are available, but stigma and hierarchical work cultures limit participation (SHRM, 2023). In contrast, healthcare organizations in the UK show high integration of peer support networks and trauma-informed practices, benefiting from public policy backing (OECD, 2023). In manufacturing sectors in China, mental health remains largely unacknowledged, with limited program visibility due to both cultural norms and economic constraints (ILO, 2021). Finally, education systems in Nordic countries benefit from national-level mental health policy support, though teachers still experience high emotional exhaustion due to workload (Keller et al., 2021).

This matrix not only surfaces patterns and gaps but also enables identification of best practices, policy mismatches, and innovative approaches that may be transferable or adaptable across settings. By grounding analysis in this structured framework, the study aims to offer a more equitable and context-aware understanding of workplace mental health interventions globally.

6. Limitations

While secondary data offers a cost-effective and time-efficient means of conducting research—particularly in multi-sectoral, cross-cultural studies such as this one—it is not without its limitations. One of the primary concerns with secondary data is the lack of control over the data collection process, which can lead to inconsistencies in quality, depth, and relevance (Johnston, 2017). Because the data used in this study—such as CSR reports, global surveys, and HR benchmarking documents—were collected for purposes other than academic research, they may reflect organizational self-interest, be selectively reported, or lack standardization across industries and countries.

A related limitation is the potential for reporting bias. Corporate sources such as sustainability reports and wellness dashboards often emphasize positive outcomes and may omit challenges, failures, or employee-level dissatisfaction with mental health programs. This phenomenon, known as "social desirability bias," is particularly prominent in CSR communications, where companies are motivated to project socially responsible images (Baumgartner & Ebner, 2010). Moreover, data may be unevenly distributed across sectors and geographies, with large multinational corporations in high-income countries more likely to publish detailed wellness information compared to SMEs or firms in developing economies.

Another critical limitation is the absence of primary, employee-level perspectives. This study relies entirely on secondary sources and therefore lacks direct insights into how workers perceive and experience wellness programs. As a result, the analysis may not fully capture ground realities, especially from marginalized or informal workforce segments. Future studies should incorporate surveys, interviews, or ethnographic methods to center employee voice and validate top-down data claims.

Geographically, the paper emphasizes Asia, Europe, and North America, with limited attention to Africa and South America. Similarly, sectors like agriculture, public administration, retail, and transport are underexplored. These exclusions limit the generalizability of findings. Researchers are encouraged to expand the framework's application to these underrepresented regions and industries in future work.

The analysis also underrepresents the unique challenges faced by SMEs, startups, and informal sector enterprises, especially in developing economies. As wellness resources, funding, and digital

infrastructure vary drastically in such settings, future studies should examine how mental health programs are designed and implemented in low-resource or low-formality environments.

Additionally, the study acknowledges the digital divide as a structural barrier to equitable wellness access. Many wellness tools highlighted—such as AI-enabled apps or digital therapy platforms—assume high levels of digital literacy and internet access, excluding workers in rural, low-income, or older demographic groups. Program design must therefore consider both access and usability in tech-based interventions.

While some references are made to intersectionality, the paper only briefly touches on how overlapping identities—such as gender, caste, class, disability, or LGBTQ+ status—shape access to and impact of mental health services. Future research should adopt a more robust intersectional lens to explore disparities in wellness outcomes.

To address these limitations and minimize bias, this study employs several strategies. First, triangulation is used by integrating multiple types of secondary data—ranging from policy documents and academic journals to industry reports and multinational CSR disclosures. This allows for a broader and more balanced perspective that is not overly reliant on any single source (Flick, 2018). Second, the analysis is guided by a transparent inclusion and exclusion criteria, ensuring that only credible, recent, and thematically relevant documents are considered. Sources that lack author accountability, methodological clarity, or organizational transparency are excluded from the dataset.

In addition, the study applies a critical lens during thematic analysis, acknowledging the limitations of each source and focusing on identifying not only what is present but also what is omitted. Particular attention is given to underrepresented regions, informal labour sectors, and culturally sensitive issues such as stigma and disclosure, where data may be sparse or ambiguous. By cross-referencing these gaps with existing scholarly literature and international health reports, the analysis seeks to reconstruct a more inclusive and context-aware understanding of workplace mental health.

Finally, all data are interpreted within the constraints of the original reporting context, avoiding overgeneralization or unwarranted causal inferences. While secondary data cannot substitute for lived experiences or employee testimonials, it can effectively highlight broad trends, structural gaps, and emerging innovations when analysed rigorously and reflexively.

7. Typology of Corporate Mental Health Initiatives: A Cross-Industry Matrix

Corporate mental health strategies are not uniform across industries or organizational types. Instead, they vary significantly based on the nature of work, organizational maturity, labour intensity, and market competition. Understanding these variations is crucial for designing interventions that are both context-sensitive and inclusive. This section presents a typology of mental health practices, highlighting trends across industries, comparing approaches between startups and legacy firms, and evaluating the balance between standardized versus customized wellness programming.

A. Industry-Specific Trends

The mental health needs of employees differ considerably by sector due to the nature of occupational stressors and the resources available to address them. In Information Technology (IT) and financial services, companies are often at the forefront of digital wellness. These sectors, marked by high competition and cognitive workload, tend to implement structured Employee Assistance Programs (EAPs), therapy access, flexible schedules, and mindfulness apps (SHRM, 2023). However, the

programs often emphasize productivity over long-term emotional resilience (Keller, Meier, & Gross, 2021).

In manufacturing, logistics, and construction, the emphasis traditionally lies on physical safety, with limited attention to psychological well-being. These sectors often experience high rates of fatigue, repetitive strain, and job insecurity, yet offer minimal mental health support due to low formalization and budgetary limitations (ILO, 2021). Education and healthcare, on the other hand, are emotionally demanding sectors that have begun to integrate trauma-informed approaches and peer-based mental health resources, although these are often fragmented and underfunded (Chandra & Chandwani, 2020).

In the hospitality and service industry, characterized by shift work, emotional labour, and customer-facing stress, wellness initiatives are typically underdeveloped. Programs, if they exist, tend to be reactive—such as crisis counselling after an incident—rather than preventive or structural in nature (Sinha & Narayan, 2022). These sectoral contrasts reflect a broader issue of misalignment between workplace stressors and the nature of mental health responses.

B. Unique Approaches in Startups vs. Legacy Corporations

Organizational maturity also plays a significant role in shaping mental health initiatives. Startups, especially those with millennial and Gen Z leadership, often emphasize openness, flexibility, and informality in wellness practices. Many integrate mental health into company culture through Slack channels for emotional check-ins, access to mindfulness apps, and open-door leadership policies (Deloitte, 2023). However, these programs may lack formal structure, documentation, and long-term evaluation, making them vulnerable to inconsistency.

In contrast, legacy corporations tend to have more formalized mental health programs embedded within corporate HR systems. These include structured EAPs, insurance-covered therapy sessions, and leadership training on psychological safety. However, such initiatives may face bureaucratic inertia and low employee engagement due to stigma, rigid hierarchies, or outdated delivery models (Keller et al., 2021). While startups may innovate quickly and foster emotional openness, legacy firms often have greater capacity to scale and institutionalize wellness efforts. The challenge lies in finding a balance between agility and formal accountability.

C. Customization vs. Standardization in Wellness Programs

A key debate in the mental health field is whether corporate wellness programs should be customized to local or team-specific needs or standardized across the organization for consistency and scalability. Standardized programs—common in multinational corporations—offer uniformity in benefits, access, and evaluation. For example, global firms may deploy a centralized wellness platform with access to multilingual therapists and universal wellness leave policies (WHO, 2022). This approach supports benchmarking and aligns with global ESG goals but often overlooks cultural or role-specific nuances.

In contrast, customized mental health interventions are increasingly advocated by scholars and practitioners alike. These include programs tailored to frontline workers in high-risk roles, culturally adapted counselling for regional offices, or flexible policies based on employee demographics and roles (Hofstede Insights, 2023). Customization allows for deeper relevance and uptake but may create fragmentation and inconsistency if not coordinated centrally.

The emerging consensus suggests a hybrid approach—where standardized frameworks provide the foundation for psychological safety, while customization is encouraged at the implementation level to reflect cultural, demographic, and functional realities (OECD, 2023). This typology underscores the

importance of aligning mental health strategy with organizational diversity—not just demographically but structurally and operationally.

8. Analysis

This section presents the core analytical findings derived from a thematic review of secondary data sources, including corporate social responsibility (CSR) reports, HR policy documents, wellness trend surveys, and international policy briefs. The analysis is organized across the three intersecting dimensions of industry sector, cultural context, and program depth, as outlined in the conceptual framework. The goal is to uncover sectoral disparities, cultural mismatches, and levels of mental health program maturity across diverse organizational landscapes.

1. Sectoral Divergences in Mental Health Investment

Across the industries analysed, significant variation is observed in how mental health is prioritized and funded. The **IT sector**, especially in countries like India and the U.S., emerges as a leader in digital-first wellness solutions. These include AI-enabled self-care apps, access to online therapists, wellness stipends, and flexible work hours (SHRM, 2023). However, many of these interventions are deployed unevenly—high-level developers and core staff receive enhanced access, while outsourced support teams or gig workers often remain excluded (Sinha & Narayan, 2022).

In contrast, the **manufacturing sector**, particularly in developing economies such as China or Mexico, exhibits low program depth. Mental health initiatives here are often absent or limited to reactive crisis management. Structural factors such as low job autonomy, shift-based labour, and informal employment hinder both program implementation and participation (ILO, 2021). Meanwhile, the healthcare sector, especially in high-income countries, shows moderate to high engagement. Peer counselling, burnout prevention workshops, and trauma-sensitive management are increasingly integrated into institutional routines, albeit inconsistently across departments (OECD, 2023).

The education sector presents a paradox: while countries like Finland and Sweden provide state-supported mental health resources for school staff, educators globally report high emotional exhaustion and inadequate support, especially during and after the COVID-19 pandemic (Keller, Meier, & Gross, 2021). Thus, the sectoral analysis reveals not just differences in resource allocation but also a misalignment between occupational stressors and the type or depth of mental health programming.

2. Cultural Filters on Program Effectiveness and Participation

Cultural context strongly mediates both the perceived legitimacy and employee uptake of mental health programs. In collectivist societies like India, Japan, and China, workplace hierarchies and social stigma restrict open dialogue on mental health. Despite the introduction of EAPs and awareness campaigns in urban corporate offices, participation rates remain low due to concerns about confidentiality and career repercussions (Hofstede Insights, 2023; Chandra & Chandwani, 2020). Companies in these regions tend to adopt Western-style interventions without sufficient cultural adaptation, leading to low engagement and limited effectiveness.

Conversely, in individualistic cultures, such as those in Scandinavia, Canada, and the UK, mental health is more normalized. Organizations often integrate mental health into performance management, leadership training, and collective bargaining agreements. Employees are more likely to utilize counselling services and participate in psychological safety initiatives (OECD, 2023). However, even in these contexts, challenges remain. For example, low-income workers or marginalized ethnic groups may

still face barriers in accessing high-quality mental health care due to systemic inequities or language gaps.

This cultural analysis highlights the inadequacy of one-size-fits-all programs. Even among multinational firms, uniform wellness strategies often fail to account for regional attitudes toward disclosure, masculinity norms, or religious interpretations of mental health. Context-sensitive models that incorporate local languages, belief systems, and trust-building practices are more likely to succeed.

3. Gaps in Program Depth and Inclusivity

While many organizations now have wellness initiatives in place, their depth and inclusivity vary widely. Surface-level interventions—such as "Mental Health Week" campaigns or mindfulness webinars—are common across sectors but lack sustained impact. In the reviewed data, several Fortune 500 companies promoted their mental health efforts in annual CSR reports but offered limited evidence of long-term follow-up, measurable impact, or employee feedback mechanisms (Deloitte, 2023).

Moderately integrated programs—such as EAPs, stress assessments, and flexible scheduling—were more common in large IT firms and healthcare institutions. However, these programs often catered only to full-time, salaried employees. Gig workers, contract staff, and low-level labourers remained largely excluded, despite facing disproportionate mental health risks (Sinha & Narayan, 2022). Very few organizations demonstrated deep integration, where mental health is embedded into core business strategy, leadership metrics, and diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) frameworks.

One standout practice identified in some Nordic and Canadian firms is the use of mental health scorecards, where managers are evaluated on how they support employee well-being. Another promising model is the inclusion of neurodiversity and trauma-informed design in workspace planning, found in select progressive education and healthcare institutions (Keller et al., 2021). These examples demonstrate what deep integration can look like—but they remain the exception rather than the rule.

4. Emerging Patterns and Tensions

Across the dataset, three major patterns emerge:

- **Innovation without equity**: Tech-enabled programs are growing, but often cater to digitally literate, urban, white-collar employees, leaving vulnerable groups behind.
- **Cultural misalignment**: Western mental health models are often transplanted without adaptation, leading to ineffective implementation in non-Western contexts.
- **Symbolism vs. substance**: Many companies publicly endorse mental health support while failing to address toxic leadership, excessive workloads, or insecure contracts—the root causes of workplace distress.

These tensions suggest that while awareness of workplace mental health is increasing, the transition from intent to meaningful impact remains uneven and fraught with gaps. The matrix-based approach enables us to identify where these gaps cluster—whether in low-depth programs in high-stress sectors, or in culturally mismatched interventions in multinational environments.

Sector	Cultural Context	Program Depth	Observations
IT (India)	Collectivist	Moderate	Digital tools used, but stigma hinders engagement
Healthcare (UK)	Individualist	High	Peer-led programs & institutional support present
Manufacturing	Collectivist	Low	Programs rare; mental

(China)			health not openly discussed
Education (Nordics)	Individualist	Moderate–High	National backing strong, but teacher burnout persists

Table 1: Summary of key analytical insights [Source: Author's Compilation]

9. Findings

A thematic review of cross-sectoral corporate mental health initiatives revealed substantial variation based on industry, culture, and program design. The findings reflect emerging tensions between awareness and implementation, technological innovation and equity, and global standardization versus local adaptation.

1. Industry Influences Program Investment and Framing

Mental health programming varies significantly across industry sectors, influenced by both the type of labour involved and sectoral norms around employee care. The IT and financial services sectors, for instance, often lead in digital-first wellness innovations. Multinationals like Google and Infosys have invested in AI-powered well-being chatbots, 24/7 helplines, and resilience training workshops (PwC, 2021). However, these benefits are usually confined to white-collar professionals, excluding subcontracted or outsourced teams who perform equally stressful roles under precarious contracts (Choudhury & Banerjee, 2020).

Conversely, sectors like manufacturing and construction display minimal mental health infrastructure, primarily due to informality of labour, low union penetration, and absence of policy mandates. These workers face daily physical risk and high emotional stress without support mechanisms, as observed in studies of India's industrial belts and China's factory towns (Lee & Chan, 2022). Healthcare and education sectors face emotional overload and burnout but receive inconsistent support depending on national health and education policies (Maben & Bridges, 2020).

2. Cultural Norms Shape Engagement and Accessibility

Mental health practices do not operate in a cultural vacuum. In collectivist and high power-distance cultures like India, Indonesia, and South Korea, mental illness is still associated with shame and weakness. As a result, uptake of even well-intentioned wellness programs remains low unless there is a visible push from top leadership (Jeong & Choi, 2022). A study by Aon (2021) highlighted that in such cultures, employees prefer anonymous or indirect forms of counselling, such as online forums or storytelling circles, over traditional therapy.

In contrast, individualist cultures, particularly in Northern Europe, report more open dialogue and higher engagement with mental health policies, aided by national legislation and welfare infrastructure (Koskinen Sandberg, 2020). Nordic companies, for example, often tie employee well-being to collective bargaining agreements and workplace democracy practices (Koskinen Sandberg, 2020). Even so, disparities remain for marginalized groups, such as immigrants, LGBTQ+ employees, or remote workers, who may feel culturally disconnected from "mainstream" wellness narratives.

3. Superficial Programs Dominate the Corporate Landscape

Many companies still operate at a symbolic level of wellness—offering yoga sessions, stress awareness days, or mindfulness apps without addressing structural causes of burnout. A survey by McKinsey Health Institute (2022) found that while 80% of large organizations report having mental health programs, only 17% of employees believe those programs meet their actual needs ((McKinsey Health Institute, 2022; Deloitte, 2022).

Superficiality is especially evident in firms that promote well-being in CSR reports or diversity brochures, but show little investment in manager training, workload reduction, or inclusive mental health policies (Goyal & Kiran, 2021). These efforts often lack measurable outcomes, fail to reach lower-tier staff, and are not sustained beyond public relations cycles.

4. Gig Workers and Informal Staff Remain Excluded

A consistent pattern across industries and geographies is the exclusion of gig, contract, and informal workers from wellness initiatives. These workers—who constitute nearly 40% of the global labour force—lack access to organizational health insurance, counselling services, or leave policies (ILO, 2022). Platforms like Uber or Swiggy often claim to offer wellness programs, but these typically consist of generic app notifications or access to discounted self-help content, rather than live, tailored support (Woodcock & Graham, 2020).

This structural inequity is not only unethical but economically counterproductive (ILO, 2023; Sinha & Narayan, 2022). A study by WHO (2022) suggests that companies investing in inclusive mental health programs see a return of $4 for every $1 spent, through reduced absenteeism and improved morale.

5. Best Practices Are Emerging—But Not Yet Scaled

Despite these limitations, several emerging practices show promise. Some Scandinavian firms have begun integrating trauma-informed HR practices, where managers are trained to recognize signs of emotional distress and respond empathetically (Koskinen Sandberg, 2020). In the U.S., Salesforce and Unilever have created mental health dashboards that measure not only usage of services but also psychological safety indicators and turnover rates (PwC, 2021).

A particularly impactful model is the peer-support network, used in UK's National Health Service (NHS), where trained non-clinical staff support colleagues in high-stress environments (Maben & Bridges, 2020; Harvard Business Review, 2022). However, these practices remain isolated and are not yet institutionalized across sectors or adopted widely in low- and middle-income countries.

6. Standardization vs. Customization: The Emerging Tension

A final insight involves the ongoing tension between global standardization and localized customization of wellness programs. While standardization offers administrative ease and branding consistency, it often lacks cultural fit or relevance for employees in different regions. Customization, though more resource-intensive, allows for deeper employee engagement and psychological trust (Jeong & Choi, 2022).

A hybrid approach appears most effective—where companies deploy core wellness pillars globally (e.g., EAP access, stigma reduction, flexible work) but leave room for culturally and functionally tailored interventions (e.g., language-specific helplines, regional mental health literacy programs, or frontline trauma protocols).

10. Theoretical Implications

This study advances the theoretical understanding of workplace mental health by challenging universalistic models of wellness and offering a more nuanced, intersectional perspective on how corporate mental health initiatives function across different industry and cultural contexts. It contributes to a growing body of literature in organizational behaviour, occupational health psychology, and cross-cultural human resource management by introducing a multi-dimensional framework that contextualizes mental health practices within structural and socio-cultural realities.

1. Reframing Mental Health as Contextual and Relational

Traditional organizational theories have often conceptualized employee mental health through a universal lens, if standardized interventions (e.g., EAPs, stress workshops) are equally effective across settings (Keller et al., 2021). This study challenges that assumption by demonstrating that mental health risks—and the success of interventions—are highly contingent upon industry-specific stressors, employment models, and work environments. For example, the emotional exhaustion of nurses cannot be treated through the same mechanisms used for screen fatigue in software engineers.

This supports the need for a contingency theory approach in mental health strategy—wherein organizational practices must be tailored to the environmental, occupational, and cultural contingencies they operate within (Donaldson, 2001). It also aligns with relational models of well-being, which emphasize that mental health arises from the interplay of institutional, interpersonal, and individual factors (Grant & Parker, 2009).

2. Expanding the Scope of Psychological Safety Theory

The study also deepens the application of psychological safety theory (Edmondson, 1999; APA, 2023) by showing that safety is not just a product of team dynamics but is also culturally mediated and hierarchically distributed. In high power-distance and collectivist cultures, the fear of reputational damage or authority retaliation suppresses open engagement with mental health services—even when programs exist (Jeong & Choi, 2022). This implies that psychological safety must be reconceptualized to account for cultural norms, leadership behaviour, and sectoral structures, extending beyond team trust to include systemic design.

3. Integration with Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Theories

This research highlights the theoretical need to integrate mental health into DEI frameworks. Current DEI models largely focus on visible identities such as gender, race, and disability, with less emphasis on neurodiversity, emotional labour, or mental health vulnerability. The findings suggest that wellness programs often fail to serve non-dominant employee groups—such as contract workers, caregivers, or culturally stigmatized populations—thereby reinforcing occupational and emotional exclusion (Goyal & Kiran, 2021).

Incorporating mental health into DEI discourse encourages the development of intersectional models of inclusion (Crenshaw, 1991; Accenture, 2022), which recognize how race, class, employment status, and mental health intersect to shape workplace experiences. This expands the theoretical understanding of inclusion as not just physical access or demographic representation but emotional and psychological integration.

4. Contributions to Cross-Cultural Management Theory

The study contributes to cross-cultural management literature by offering empirical support for the idea that wellness is a culturally defined construct. While prior work has explored differences in communication styles or motivation (Hofstede, 2011), few have examined how mental health norms influence organizational practices. By showing how stigma, power distance, and collectivism shape program effectiveness, the study extends the theoretical repertoire of institutional theory in international HRM—demonstrating how organizational practices are filtered through national culture and informal norms (Scott, 2008; World Economic Forum, 2023).

5. Theoretical Framework Contribution: A Tri-Axial Model

The introduction of the Industry-Sector × Cultural-Context × Program-Depth Matrix provides a theoretical lens to analyse mental health interventions in complex and layered organizational ecosystems. This

matrix not only offers a descriptive taxonomy but serves as a diagnostic and evaluative tool for scholars examining the contextual embeddedness of well-being programs. It encourages future research to adopt multi-dimensional models that resist over-simplification and surface-level program evaluations.

6. Future Directions for Theorizing Workplace Wellness

This research suggests that future theories of workplace wellness must move beyond individual resilience and stress coping to focus on structural, institutional, and cultural drivers of well-being. The integration of critical theory perspectives—especially those focused on power, access, and labor precarity—can enrich organizational wellness literature by interrogating who benefits from wellness programs and who is left out (Woodcock & Graham, 2020). Additionally, ecosystem models of organizational health—incorporating policy, technology, and stakeholder roles—may offer more holistic theorizing than siloed HRM approaches

11. Practical Implications

The findings of this study offer several practical implications for human resource managers, organizational leaders, policymakers, and wellness consultants seeking to enhance the inclusivity, effectiveness, and contextual relevance of mental health strategies in the workplace. As mental well-being becomes central to employee retention, engagement, and productivity, the need for intentional and evidence-based interventions has never been greater.

1. Design Sector-Specific Wellness Interventions

A one-size-fits-all approach to workplace mental health is inadequate. Organizations must align mental health initiatives with the specific stress profiles of their industry. For instance, high cognitive-load sectors like IT and finance may benefit from digital fatigue management and mindfulness-based stress reduction (MBSR), while emotionally intensive sectors like healthcare or education require trauma-informed support structures and peer-support systems (Maben & Bridges, 2020). Leadership metrics should include psychological safety, inclusive access, and program effectiveness (Deloitte, 2022).Labor-intensive sectors such as manufacturing or logistics should integrate mental wellness into occupational safety programs, especially targeting fatigue, insecurity, and isolation (Lee & Chan, 2022).

2. Culturally Adapt Mental Health Programming

Organizations, especially multinational corporations, must culturally adapt their wellness initiatives rather than transplanting Western models into collectivist or high power-distance contexts. Mental health messaging should reflect local language, idioms, and values, and incorporate culturally acceptable forms of expression such as storytelling, group rituals, or family engagement (Jeong & Choi, 2022). Incorporating cultural brokers or local champions into wellness planning can improve program acceptance and uptake in traditionally stigmatizing environments.

3. Extend Wellness Access to All Employee Types

Corporate mental health strategies must move beyond the full-time, white-collar workforce to include gig workers, contract staff, front-line employees, and marginalized demographic groups. This requires rethinking eligibility criteria for wellness benefits, extending EAP access through mobile platforms, and designing inclusive communication strategies. By democratizing mental health access, organizations not only fulfil ethical obligations but also reduce the hidden costs of absenteeism, presenteeism, and turnover across the workforce (Woodcock & Graham, 2020; WHO, 2022).

4. Move from Symbolic to Embedded Mental Health Practices

The shift from symbolic gestures to systemic integration is critical. Organizations should embed mental

health into core business functions such as onboarding, leadership KPIs, performance management, and DEI (Diversity, Equity, Inclusion) policies. Psychological safety must be part of manager training, and regular feedback loops should be created to adapt programs to changing needs. Transparent reporting and data-driven evaluations—such as pulse surveys or wellness dashboards—can enhance accountability and impact (PwC, 2021).

5. Leverage Hybrid Wellness Models

Organizations should adopt a hybrid approach that combines global best practices with local customization. Central HR or corporate wellness teams can offer standardized frameworks (e.g., mental health days, remote work policies, resilience training), while local managers adapt delivery to suit regional norms, employee demographics, and team-specific needs (Koskinen Sandberg, 2020). This balance maximizes program effectiveness while preserving cultural sensitivity and operational flexibility. Advanced analytics can support personalized mental health strategies and real-time feedback systems (IBM Institute for Business Value, 2023).

6. Collaborate with Public and Sectoral Institutions

Corporate wellness cannot function in isolation. Partnerships with public health agencies, NGOs, sectoral associations, and local mental health professionals can improve outreach, credibility, and cost-effectiveness. For example, organizations in the healthcare or education sectors can tap into state-supported wellness infrastructure, while manufacturing firms may benefit from ILO or WHO regional toolkits (ILO, 2022; WHO, 2022). Collaborating with public health agencies and NGOs can scale reach and credibility (ILO, 2023; OECD, 2023).

7. Reframe Mental Health as a Strategic Asset

Finally, companies must reframe mental health not merely as a compliance or welfare concern, but as a strategic enabler of innovation, retention, and long-term growth. Evidence increasingly shows that psychologically safe workplaces foster creativity, reduce litigation risk, and enhance employer branding (McKinsey Health Institute, 2022). Viewing mental health as a business priority encourages leadership buy-in and sustainable investment.

12. Conclusion

The global recognition of mental health as a cornerstone of workplace sustainability has prompted a surge in corporate wellness initiatives. Yet, as this study demonstrates, the design and effectiveness of such programs are far from uniform. Drawing on secondary data from CSR reports, HR whitepapers, and international mental health policies, this paper applied a tri-dimensional analytical matrix—*Industry Sector × Cultural Context × Program Depth*—to unpack the overlooked diversity in workplace mental health practices (World Economic Forum, 2023)

The findings reveal that while mental health discourse is becoming more visible, actual implementation remains fragmented and often superficial. Organizations in knowledge-intensive sectors like IT and finance lead in digital innovation but often fail to include contract workers or address systemic stressors. In contrast, labour-intensive sectors and those rooted in collectivist cultures frequently lag due to stigma, hierarchical rigidity, or policy gaps. Furthermore, many wellness programs operate at a surface level—focused more on visibility than impact—while non-traditional workers such as gig and freelance professionals remain excluded from the wellness ecosystem (APA, 2023)

These insights have critical theoretical and practical implications. Theoretically, they call for a shift from universalist wellness paradigms to context-sensitive, intersectional models that incorporate industry-

specific stress profiles, cultural attitudes, and organizational power structures. Practically, the study highlights the need for customized, inclusive, and embedded wellness strategies that reflect the lived realities of diverse workforce segments.

For corporate leaders, this means moving beyond performative wellness gestures to systemic reform—embedding psychological safety in leadership KPIs, extending wellness access to all employment categories, and designing culturally relevant interventions. For policymakers and scholars, the study signals an urgent need to rethink how workplace wellness is regulated, funded, and researched, especially in underrepresented geographies and informal economies.

While secondary data provides valuable macro-level insights, future research should include primary, employee-centred perspectives to assess how workers experience and perceive mental health interventions. Longitudinal studies, particularly across low- and middle-income countries, would also help evaluate the sustained effectiveness and cultural adaptability of wellness frameworks.

Ultimately, as the nature of work continues to evolve—through automation, hybrid models, and global mobility—mental health strategies must evolve too. A nuanced, sectoral, and culturally grounded approach is no longer optional but essential to building truly inclusive and resilient organizations.

13. References

1. Accenture. (2022). *The value of mental wellness: Economic returns on inclusive workplace mental health*. Accenture Research. https://www.accenture.com/us-en/insights
2. American Psychological Association. (2023). *Stress in America 2023: The state of mental health and stigma*. https://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/stress/2023-report
3. Aon. (2021). *Global wellbeing survey 2021–2022*. Aon PLC.
4. Baumgartner, R. J., & Ebner, D. (2010). Corporate sustainability strategies: Sustainability profiles and maturity levels. *Sustainable Development*, 18(2), 76–89.
5. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
6. Chandra, A., & Chandwani, R. (2020). Stigma and silence: The challenges of mental health care in India. *Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine*, 42(2), 97–103.
7. Choudhury, A., & Banerjee, R. (2020). Mental health neglect in India's IT workforce: The invisible burden. *Asian Journal of Management Cases*, 17(1), 23–35.
8. Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241–1299.
9. Deloitte. (2022). *2022 global human capital trends: Mental health as a leadership priority*. Deloitte Insights. https://www2.deloitte.com
10. Deloitte. (2023). *Mental health and well-being at work: Global perspectives*. Deloitte Insights.
11. Donaldson, L. (2001). *The contingency theory of organizations*. Sage Publications.
12. Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383.
13. Flick, U. (2018). *An introduction to qualitative research* (6th ed.). Sage.
14. Goyal, K., & Kiran, R. (2021). Symbolic versus substantive CSR in Indian companies: A study of wellness disclosures. *Indian Journal of Corporate Governance*, 14(2), 101–116.
15. Grant, A. M., & Parker, S. K. (2009). Redesigning work design theories: The rise of relational and proactive perspectives. *Academy of Management Annals*, 3(1), 317–375.

16. Greenwood, K., & Anas, J. (2022). The manager's role in employee mental health. *Harvard Business Review*. https://hbr.org/2022/03/the-role-of-managers-in-supporting-mental-health

17. Hofstede Insights. (2023). *Cultural dimensions*. https://www.hofstede-insights.com

18. Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), 1–26.

19. IBM Institute for Business Value. (2023). *AI, analytics, and wellness: Reimagining mental health in the workplace*. IBM Research. https://www.ibm.com/thought-leadership/institute-business-value

20. International Labour Organization (ILO). (2021). *Mental health and the world of work*. Geneva: ILO.

21. International Labour Organization (ILO). (2022). *Mental health at work: Policy responses and practices*. Geneva: ILO.

22. International Labour Organization. (2023). *Extending wellness protection to gig and informal workers: Global policy responses*. Geneva: ILO. https://www.ilo.org

23. Jeong, Y., & Choi, S. (2022). Workplace mental health in East Asia: Cultural implications for policy design. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 60(1), 74–90.

24. Johnston, M. P. (2017). Secondary data analysis: A method of which the time has come. *Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries*, 3(3), 619–626.

25. Keller, A., Meier, A., & Gross, J. J. (2021). Workplace mental health programs: A review of research and practice. *Human Resource Management Review*, 31(3), 100763.

26. Koskinen Sandberg, P. (2020). Collective care and psychological safety in Nordic employment models. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, 10(S6), 3–21.

27. Lee, Y. J., & Chan, S. M. (2022). Stress and silence: Mental health in China's manufacturing sector. *Global Labour Journal*, 13(1), 99–115.

28. Maben, J., & Bridges, J. (2020). Covid-19: Supporting nurses' psychological and mental health. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 29(15–16), 2742–2750.

29. McKinsey Health Institute. (2022). *Addressing employee burnout and disengagement*. McKinsey & Company.

30. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. (2023). *Mental health in the workplace: Industry-specific insights and risks*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/mentalhealth

31. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2023). *Mental health and work: Promoting well-being in the workplace*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

32. PwC. (2021). *Future of wellness at work: Insights from leading companies*. PricewaterhouseCoopers.

33. Scott, W. R. (2008). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas and interests* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

34. SHRM. (2023). *State of workplace mental health 2023*. Society for Human Resource Management.

35. Singh, R., & Kaur, P. (2022). Stress and safety: Mental health in the manufacturing sector. *Indian Journal of Occupational Health*, 64(2), 112–120.

36. Sinha, S., & Narayan, S. (2022). Mental health and the gig economy in India: A growing challenge. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 58(1), 50–68.

37. WHO. (2022). *World mental health report: Transforming mental health for all*. Geneva: World Health Organization.

38. Woodcock, J., & Graham, M. (2020). *The gig economy: A critical introduction*. Polity Press.

39. World Economic Forum. (2023). *Shaping the future of work: Mental health and hybrid workplaces*. https://www.weforum.org/reports/shaping-the-future-of-work-mental-health