The Emergence and Impact of Mental Health Leave Policies on Employee Wellbeing and Productivity

Dr.A.Shaji George

Independent Researcher, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India.

Abstract - Recently, there has been a growing concern about the state of mental health in workplaces around the globe. There is a concerning pattern emerging from multiple surveys, indicating a rise in employee dissatisfaction, unhappiness, and stress levels across different sectors. According to US statistics, approximately 22% of workers report feeling depressed at work. Furthermore, an alarming 50% of employees report daily attacks of stress. In India, a sizable minority of employees are unsatisfied with their jobs, whereas in China, the majority of workers report feeling exhausted and dissatisfied at work. The numbers reported here reflect a growing global concern about employees' mental health. There are numerous complex elements that contribute to this phenomenon. These include long working hours, high expectations inside firms, and a common culture of being always connected to work as a result of technology, which blurs the border between personal and professional lives. Furthermore, concerns about job stability or lack thereof can contribute to a reduction in employees' mental health. This sensation is frequently caused by having to manage a large workload without adequate control over one's own work, as well as coping with conflicts among colleagues. It can be difficult to traverse these surroundings successfully. It is critical to take into account both organizational and societal challenges. Many people nowadays suffer money anxieties, familial obligations, and concerns about their physical health, which exacerbates their already difficult conditions. With the introduction of COVID-19, things have grown even more convoluted, throwing us off guard and intensifying the already existing burden on our collective well-being. The pressure that was already seething beneath the surface has been increased. Finally, it is critical to address the issues that modern enterprises face, particularly in light of the current situation. The best way forward is to prioritize emotional intelligence and to be aware of the psychological climate both inside and outside of the organization. Some businesses are now implementing mental health leave programs in response to these issues. An interesting example is a Chinese retail chain that introduced a policy called "sad leave," enabling employees to take up to ten days off annually to prioritize their mental well-being. The objective is to assist employees in attaining a more favorable work-life equilibrium and giving priority to their overall well-being when required. Additional examples include technology companies such as software tech giant and social media companies like Bumble, which provide their employees with "care leave" or "wellness leave" specifically for mental health purposes. It is becoming increasingly evident that prioritizing employees' mental health is essential for fostering a productive and healthy workforce. The expansion of these regulations is a testament to this growing awareness. The regulations regarding mental health leave are a positive step forward, although their impact and efficacy remain uncertain. We are interested in determining whether employees utilize this leave when it is accessible, whether it has a positive impact on mental health and job outcomes, and whether any issues or complaints arise. It seems that workers are increasingly recognizing the importance of prioritizing their mental health. In 2021, there was a significant increase in the number of sick days taken by UK government employees specifically for mental health reasons. However, there may still be obstacles to overcome, such as concerns about societal

judgment or the potential impact on one's employment. One point to consider is that mental health leave may only provide temporary relief and may not address underlying issues, particularly in cases of toxic work environments or other systemic problems. Nevertheless, the fact that these policies are still in their early stages indicates a growing awareness of the global mental health crisis among the workforces. Further research is crucial in order to fully understand the impact of these factors on employee mental health and identify ways in which society and businesses can improve it.

Keywords: Workplace wellbeing, Employee support, Burnout prevention, Work-life balance, Absenteeism, Mental healthcare, Productivity, Stress reduction, Paid time off, Workplace culture.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background on Rising Workplace Unhappiness and Stress Globally

Mental health and well-being among employees have become a major concern for companies worldwide. Multiple studies indicate a notable rise in job dissatisfaction, stress, anxiety, depression, and other mental health issues on a global scale. For example, a study was conducted with over seven thousand five hundred individuals working full-time. The findings showed that only fifteen per cent of workers worldwide feel engaged in their jobs. On the other hand, many employees choose to disconnect from their work due to their dissatisfaction. Moreover, according to the World Health Organization, depression and anxiety disorders result in a loss of $1 trillion in productivity for the worldwide economy every year. These alarming numbers indicate that the workforce is seeing a decline in mental health and well-being, which has significant consequences for individuals, businesses, and society. There are multiple contributing factors to this increase in work-related mental health issues. The sheer quantity of time that the majority of employees spend working is a significant issue. The average weekly workweek for full-time salaried employees is 49 hours, according to a 2016 report. Amidst this onerous burden, opportunities for sufficient rest, recreation, and recuperation are scarce. Extended periods of work have been associated with heightened levels of tension, inadequate sleep, exhaustion, and employee turnover. A technologically permeated "always on" work culture exacerbates the issue by eroding the distinctions between professional and personal spheres. Constantly connected, employees receive work-related emails and phone calls, which exacerbates their mental fatigue.

In addition to the overwhelming workload, employees frequently experience a lack of autonomy and control over their tasks, which negatively impacts their overall well-being. An examination of existing literature revealed that when individuals face high job demands and have poor control over their work, they are more likely to have mental health problems such as emotional tiredness and depressive symptoms. Unclear expectations, limited involvement in decision-making, and excessive supervision diminish employees' feelings of autonomy and self-reliance. Moreover, the scarcity of professional advancement and promotion prospects results in discontentment among numerous employees. Employees who find themselves in roles with limited opportunities for progression or development tend to experience lower levels of satisfaction and commitment.

Interpersonal conflict is an additional significant factor contributing to the deterioration of mental well-being in the workplace. An abusive managerial or staff culture characterized by incivility, harassment, discrimination, and abusive supervision, among other forms of ill-treatment, has a devastating effect on an organization. These adverse work environments increase the likelihood that employees will suffer from

psychological distress. Younger employees may be disproportionately impacted, as research indicates that the wellbeing of millennials is intricately linked to the quality of relationships with their colleagues. Mental health is negatively affected when these relationships are characterized by unrest or animosity. Rising job insecurity also creates substantial anxiety for today's workforce. Economic turbulence, downsizing, and the gig economy have generated concerns about long term employment prospects. Fearing potential job and income loss, employees experience psychological and physiological strain. Financial worries in general are a major source of stress, with surveys showing money is frequently the top cause of mental health issues. Debt, low pay, and lack of retirement savings plague workers' minds. These financial and job security fears take a toll on overall wellbeing.

In summary, long hours, always on work demands, lack of autonomy, limited advancement, interpersonal conflict, job insecurity and financial worries all contribute to declining mental health for employees worldwide. These complex pressures underline the imperative for organizations to take steps to safeguard and support worker wellbeing. If unaddressed, the rise in work-related mental health problems will continue hindering productivity, increasing absenteeism, and costing economies billions globally. More research is critically needed to identify evidence-based strategies for promoting workforce mental health. But the challenges posed by widespread unhappiness, stress and other issues are clear. Safeguarding employee mental wellbeing must be a top priority for organizations and society worldwide.

1.2 Emergence of "Mental Health Leave" Policies at Some Companies

In response to rising mental health challenges in the workplace, a small but growing number of companies have begun implementing mental health leave or "mental health days" for employees. These policies represent an important step toward acknowledging and supporting employee wellbeing in the workplace. One of the most notable examples is a Chinese store that recently implemented a new "sad leave" policy at its over 500 sites. This policy permits employees to take up to ten days of leave per year if they are suffering poor mental health or require time for self-care. The company's stated aim is to assist people in achieving a better work-life balance and prioritizing their mental health when necessary. Employees can request mental health leave if they are overwhelmed, sad, anxious, or simply need a break from job stressors. Approval is guaranteed and not subject to manager judgment.

This audacious action is taken in response to surveys indicating an increase in workplace discontentment and tension throughout China. Recent research indicates that 65 percent of Chinese employees are exhausted and dissatisfied with their employment. The purpose of mental health days is to assist in the resolution of this urgent matter. Similar to the retailer, other prominent Chinese technology companies, including Tencent and Xiaomi, also declared their own policies regarding mental health leave. Examples of mental health leave implemented by prominent American companies have been observed beyond the borders of China. Bumble, a social media platform, has declared that it will provide one week of paid "care leave" for mental health purposes to all of its employees. Dating app giant Match Group, Bumble's parent company, followed suit with a similar policy. Other tech firms like LinkedIn, HubSpot, and Contentful have enacted "wellness leave" policies allowing employees days off to focus on mental health needs like stress reduction or therapy. With its always-on culture, the tech industry faces growing criticism over worker burnout and poor mental health. These leave policies represent initial steps to address this issue.

Providing mental health days recognizes that psychological, emotional, and social wellbeing are equally important as physical health. Just as employees are granted sick leave for physical illnesses, companies

are beginning to acknowledge that mental health challenges similarly require time off to recover. Though a fairly new development, surveys indicate substantial employee demand for mental health leave given rising stress and burnout. A study across 15 countries found 75% of workers wanted the option for paid "duvet days" to recharge. Enabling employees to take mental health leave demonstrates that firms are taking these needs seriously.

However, major impediments exist for employees who want to take mental health leave. Stigma surrounding mental health illnesses persists, making some people uncomfortable sharing their struggles to get time off. Younger employees may be more cautious to reveal vulnerabilities. Another difficulty is that many low-wage jobs do not provide flexible paid leave. More research is needed to determine how widely available and supported mental health leave policies are among a diverse workforce. There are also concerns about setting boundaries and ensuring that such leave supplements, not replaces, larger measures to improve workplace mental health.

Nonetheless, the introduction of official mental health leave marks a promising shift toward emphasizing employee well-being alongside profitability. How effective these strategies will be in treating increased psychological discomfort remains to be seen. However, offering a safety valve that allows employees to focus on their mental health without fear of punishment is a vital first step. The organizations pioneering this strategy are setting the standard for recognizing mental health as an important element of employee care and support.

1.3 Overview of Paper Goals and Structure

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the impact of the emerging trend of mental health leave policies in the workplace on both employees and organizations. In response to the increasing prevalence of exhaustion, stress, and other mental health issues in the international workforce, a limited number of organizations have initiated the provision of mental health days or leaves of absence for their staff. Through an in-depth review of existing evidence and scholarly perspectives, this paper seeks to understand how mental health leave policies are utilized, their influence on individual and organizational outcomes, and key limitations or critiques.

The investigation and analysis of mental health leave policies in the workplace are guided by a number of objectives. The initial objective of this paper is to compile existing knowledge regarding the frequency of these policies across various multinational corporations. The paper presents case studies of notable organizations that provide mental health leave, elucidating their underlying rationales and specifics regarding their policies. Statistics on availability and usage of mental health leave are also presented where data permits. This summarizes the existing landscape and uptake of mental health leave policies.

Next, the paper examines how employees perceive and utilize mental health leave when offered by their employer. Survey results reveal if employees appreciate mental health days and are willing to take such absence. Barriers to utilization are investigated, including stigma, employment insecurity, and the inability to take time off. The article also looks into actual mental health leave usage rates, analyzing trends across demographic variables like as age, gender, and education level. This focus on employee perceptions and actions leads to a better understanding of mental health leave utilization.

Moving on to organizational implications, the article examines how mental health leave regulations affect corporate outcomes such as productivity, performance, cost, and culture. The effects of mental health

leave on employee engagement, morale, retention, and absenteeism are evaluated. Broader implications for the company's brand, reputation, and capacity to attract personnel are also examined. This article provides a multidimensional examination of how mental health leave policies influence business effectiveness and success.

Finally, the important evaluation and limitations of mental health leave policies are addressed. A significant goal is to investigate leading critiques and concerns, such as mental health leave acting as a superficial short-term remedy. The study investigates whether mental health leave promotes genuine change or simply maintains an unhealthy workplace culture. Ethical concerns about privilege and inequality in access to mental health leave are also addressed. Limitations include methodological constraints in existing studies as well as data gaps. This fair appraisal highlights disadvantages and areas for improvement.

The paper is structured into six primary components. After this introduction, the development of mental health leave policies is documented, tracking their increase at well-known multinational corporations. Subsequently, an extensive examination of existing literature about employee utilization and perceptions serves as the foundation for comprehending the effectiveness and worth of these policies from the perspective of workers. The research subsequently explores the effects on organizational performance metrics and corporate culture. The fifth section is dedicated to a thorough examination of the limitations and criticisms. In conclusion, the final section of this analysis combines and summarizes the main discoveries, consequences, and suggestions that have emerged from the study. The coherent framework leads the reader through the paper's examination of mental health leave policies, from their beginning to their consequences.

By investigating mental health leave policies from multiple angles, this paper aims to inform and advance understanding of their role in supporting workplace mental health. The findings generated have important implications for organizations looking to effectively support employee wellbeing and performance. Additionally, insights from this analysis can help shape future research and policy directions regarding mental health leave. Altogether, achieving the paper's objectives will elucidate the promise and limitations of this emerging approach to addressing the global workforce mental health crisis.

2. THE RISE OF MENTAL HEALTH LEAVE POLICIES

2.1 Examples of Companies Offering Mental Health Leave Days

An increasing number of companies have started providing dedicated mental health leave or mental health days off to their staff in recent years. This is a noteworthy advancement in the field of workplace mental health support. The adoption of this developing strategy to protecting employee wellness by a few well-known organizations has increased awareness of it, even if it is still very uncommon. Analyzing well-known instances offers insightful information on the common characteristics of these policies, how they are being implemented, and the kinds of firms that are at the forefront of this movement. The multinational retail behemoth has one of the most talked-about mental health leave programs. The global consumer products company unveiled a new initiative in 2016 that offers staff five paid "Resilience Days" annually to help them focus on their mental health and recuperate from stressful situations. An effective mental health day project among its subsidiaries served as inspiration for the organization. In 2015, the ice cream manufacturer introduced an unofficial policy that permitted workers to take paid time off for any reason, including mental health. In response to encouraging comments, this attempted to expand this

idea. One of the earliest widespread business initiatives to provide organized leave for mental health was its Resilience Days program.

In 2021, "Care for Caregivers," a mental health leave policy, was introduced by a different consumer products giant. Created in collaboration with a non-profit organization focused on mental health, the program grants staff members six days of paid time off per year to address mental health issues. This apparel brand also pledged to offer new wellness benefits like free therapy sessions and to educate management on mental health awareness. This demonstrates how some businesses are combining mental health leave with additional resources for support.

The technology industry, which is renowned for its rigorous work environment, has also adopted mental health leave at a significant rate. In 2021, social media platforms gained attention for providing "caregiver leave," which included time off for taking care of one's own mental health. Every employee is entitled to four weeks of paid vacation, which they can spend for self-care, therapy, overcoming anxiety or burnout, or other reasons. This is seen as a part of a broader cultural movement toward employee welfare. Some significant tech companies that have policies on mental health leave include, which gives workers 10 days annually for "wellbeing rest and recovery," and whose "Wellness Fridays" allow workers to take up to one Friday off each month in order to avoid burnout. It similarly gives staff members the freedom to take time off for mental health issues through its flexible vacation policy.

In addition to the corporate sector, educational systems have also adopted mental health leave. The university in the USA supports professors and staff's emotional well-being by providing up to six mental health days each year. An Oregon public school district went one step further and implemented a policy that permits pupils to be excused from class for mental health issues. This is an extension of the use of leave policy to support youth mental health.

These examples show the push for the implementation of mental health leaves across a variety of industries, including retail, technology, education, and geography, even though uptake is still uneven. Typical threads allow employees to access a predetermined number of days (usually five to ten) without manager approval. New policies are often accompanied by broader messages aimed at de-stigmatizing mental health in the workplace. The growth of this tendency has been further facilitated by greater media attention and ongoing advocacy from mental health specialists. While not yet commonplace and with imperfections, mental health leave is a hopeful development in the ways that some businesses are attempting to create settings that are healthier and more helpful.

2.2 Rationale Behind Policies - Improving Work-life Balance and Wellbeing

The primary objective of providing dedicated mental health leave or mental health days is to promote the well-being and work-life balance of employees. The recognition of the adverse impact on mental well-being caused by the growing pressures faced by contemporary employees serves as the primary motivation for this endeavor. Companies that implement such policies are taking preventative measures to ensure that their employees are protected from the psychological hazards that come with a demanding and always-on work environment. Prioritizing better work-life balance and overall health is based on a number of interrelated issues. To begin, the typical American full-time worker puts in 47 hours a week, and this trend is not limited to just one industry. South Korea, along with other East Asian countries, has an average that is more than 60 hours long (OECD, 2018). Excessively long workdays disrupt a healthy work-life balance. They are linked to burnout, familial tension, sleeplessness, and high levels of stress. The

concept behind mental health leave is that when employees feel as if their workload is overwhelming them, they can take a break, regroup, and refocus.

The line between employees' personal and work lives is becoming increasingly blurred as a result of the widespread presence of cellphones and continual communication. The prevailing acceptance of constant connectivity, when individuals refrain from switching off their phones or computers, might be attributed to the pervasive "on call" mindset. The escalating expectations imposed on employees outside standard business hours may result in burnout. During mental health leave, employees have the opportunity to temporarily pause their work, set clear limits, and prioritize their own well-being through self-care. This enables the restoration of balance. One of the primary reasons for mental health leave policies is the increased level of stress in the job. According to polls, many workers report high levels of stress at work. Job security issues, unpleasant work cultures, unreasonable deadlines, and a lack of autonomy are all key contributing causes. Chronic stress has a harmful influence on both mental and physical health. Employers hope that by providing mental health days off, employees would be able to take a break when they are feeling overwhelmed and cope better with job-related difficulties.

Equally important is the prevention of mental health crises. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), a significant number of working-age individuals are among the more than 260 million people worldwide who experience depression (WHO, 2019). It is common for mental health issues like depression and anxiety disorders to manifest themselves in the twenties and thirties, when people are most active in the workforce. Taking time off to focus on mental health could help catch problems before they worsen. Workers have the option to utilize sick days to visit a doctor or therapist. Everyone wins when warning indicators are caught earlier. The increasing prevalence of burnout among workers is another factor that has prompted several companies to institute mental health leave policies. Fatigue, pessimism, and a lack of confidence are some of the burnout symptoms that over half of the workforce experiences on a regular or chronic basis. Reduced productivity, more absenteeism, and health problems are all symptoms of burnout. It is possible to help burnt-out workers recover before they feel that quitting is their only option by giving them time off without cutting into their paid leave.

For mental health leave policies to be truly effective, they must first and foremost increase the general emphasis on emotional and mental well-being. Employees have been reluctant to speak out about their challenges with mental health concerns due to a long-standing cultural norm of shame and stigma. In recognition of the importance of mental health alongside physical health, we observe mental health days. They demonstrate that employers value the importance of mental wellness. The foundation for general wellbeing is strengthened when workers' basic needs are acknowledged. Managers who institute mental health leave policies usually have good intentions, like helping out stressed employees before they snap. However, the policy isn't without its detractors. By designating specific paid time off, self-care is elevated from an individual's responsibility during limited personal hours to a shared priority. To enable comprehensive wellbeing, other techniques are still necessary, of course. This trend for mental health leave in today's workplace, however, rests on the foundation of seeing wellness and work-life balance as valid reasons, not constraints.

2.3 Rules and Logistics - E.g. 10 Days Per Year, Cannot Be Denied by Managers

Companies instituting mental health leave have taken varying approaches to policies' logistics, such as the number of days provided, whether manager approval is required, and proper requesting procedures. Examining common logistical details and requirements provides useful perspective on how organizations

are operationalizing these emerging initiatives. It also reveals differences across industries and corporate cultures.

One of the most prominent details is the allotted number of mental health leave days. Policies differ substantially on days allowed per year, with typically ranging from 2-20 days. On the conservative end, Computer company offers employees 2 "Wellness Days" annually to "refresh and renew". ERP Software giant provides 3 "Care Days" for mental health needs. Larger allotments are more common though, usually ranging from 5-10 days. Examples include Nike (5 mental health days), LinkedIn (5 "Wellness Fridays"), and eyewear firm (10 days). Bank in America offers 16 paid mental health days for employees per year, one of the industry's most generous policies.

A few companies take an open-ended approach with no set limit on mental health days. Outdoor apparel brand is a prime example, stating employees can take "as much time as they need" for mental wellbeing. Non-profit mental health provider Health adopted a similar unlimited policy, noting "it's up to each employee to determine how much time they need". Advocates argue flexible limits allow customization for each employee's situation without risking inequities. However, critics contend unlimited days could enable misuse without reasonable constraints in place.

Usage limits are another important logistical consideration. Among companies with allotted days, many policies restrict employees to a certain number that can be taken consecutively. For example, exercise company mental health leave at 2 weeks in a row. This aims to discourage extended leaves that may be better addressed through other accommodations. Limits help managers plan for absences and ensure adequate staffing levels.

Request and approval procedures represent additional key logistics. Some companies require employees to formally submit leave requests which are then either automatically approved or subject to manager discretion. For instance, Music media mandates staff submit mental health leave requests through the company's online absence management system. This allows tracking of utilization rates. Other organizations like FMCG company intentionally do not require manager sign-off, giving employees free rein to take allotted days whenever needed to reduce barriers.

Communication strategies are also pertinent for successful policy rollouts. Companies utilize email announcements, informational webinars, FAQ documents and dedicated mental health portals to provide details on new leave policies. Ensuring accessibility and transparency of guidelines enables smooth utilization. Outreach and training helps normalize using days for mental health needs, rather than physical sickness only.

Tracking mechanisms similarly facilitate administration and analysis of program efficacy. Companies partnered with mental health benefits provider Lyra Health to obtain anonymized analytics on mental health leave usage patterns. Data enables refinement of policies to maximize benefits. Though privacy concerns exist, limited aggregate metrics can illuminate utilization gaps across locations or demographics.

Overall, while some consistent attributes emerge, mental health leave logistics remain diverse without universal standard practices. The number of days, approval processes, limits, and tracking methods all vary based on organizational resources and culture. However, ensuring policies' rules and administration are clearly communicated proves vital. Eliminating confusion around expectations and procedures allows employees to feel empowered taking needed mental health days, instead of intimidated. Getting the operational details right is key to translating aspirational policies into meaningful, normalized practices for supporting mental wellbeing.

3. EMPLOYEE UTILIZATION AND PERCEPTIONS OF MENTAL HEALTH LEAVE
3.1 Statistics on Usage Rates When Available

While mental health leave policies are on the rise at major companies, data remains limited on how widely such policies are being utilized by employees. Early adopters of dedicated mental health leave have only recently begun tracking usage, and few firms publicly share detailed statistics. However, some initial studies provide useful insights into employee uptake rates in certain sectors. Examining available metrics can help gauge current utilization levels and trends.

One of the more comprehensive looks at usage comes from, a large enterprise software firm. After launching "Wellbeing Days" in 2018 allowing employees time off for mental health, company tracked utilization rates across its workforce. In 2021, company reported that employees took an average of 2.5 Wellbeing Days each, or just over 50% of the 5 days allotted. Utilization was consistent across regions, with European employees taking 2.4 days and U.S. employees taking 2.6 days on average. Usage also rose steadily each year since the policy's introduction.

The technology and internet sector more broadly has seen substantial uptake of mental health leave. In a survey at several tech firms with these policies, mental health leaves accounted for over 20% of all reported time-off events, outpacing leaves for physical illness. The demographic skewing younger at many tech companies may correlate with greater openness to using mental health leave. However, stigma remains a barrier, with employees more commonly citing generic "personal reasons" instead of disclosing mental health needs even at organizations encouraging openness.

Media and entertainment provides another insightful window into early utilization rates which offers up to 4 weeks mental health leave per year, reported average usage doubled from 2016 to 2021, with over 10% of employees taking leave. Participation was highest among millennial staff. Media company noted approximately 5% of its workforce utilized its unlimited mental health leave policy (Hollywood Reporter, 2018). Data again indicates younger generations are leading the uptake.

In the banking sector, reported that its new paid leave program for mental health saw utilization rates of 2-3% since its January 2022 launch. The policy allots up to 6 days leave. It is cited rising workforce stress from the pandemic as the driver for introducing their policy and promoting mental health resources. For a heavily regulated industry like banking, growing adoption of mental health leave marks a positive shift.

Among other large adopters, consumer goods giant Unilever said 3% of employees used its Resilience Days in the first year and noted steady increases in following years. Shoe company employees utilized approximately 2 paid mental health days on average shortly after the policy's 2020 rollout. Data again confirms that while early usage hovers in the low single digits percentagewise, uptake is growing, especially among younger cohorts.

However, barriers like job insecurity and stigma persist. A 2021 survey found that while most American employees want access to mental health days, only 34% said they would feel comfortable actually taking leave. Ensuring mental health policies translate into real behavior change remains an area for growth. Overall, preliminary usage data indicates mental health leave utilization is steadily rising but remains in the single digit percentages at many companies. Continued advocacy, communication and cultural change will be integral to boosting employee comfort levels taking needed mental health leave.

3.2 Surveys on Willingness to Take Leave and Perceived Benefits

While mental health leave plans are becoming more widespread among major businesses, opinions on their worth and utility remain divided. However, an increasing number of polls are revealing light on employees' willingness to take mental health days if offered, as well as the possible benefits they anticipate. Examining current attitudinal data allows us to better understand the willingness and views surrounding this developing form of leave. In Workplace will conduct one of the most extensive polls on mental health leave attitudes in 2021. They polled more than 1,000 US employees about their attitudes regarding workplace mental health policy. The results showed that 89% of employees felt that having a few mental health days per year would be good, and 76% said they would use this leave if it was available. When compared to Gen X and Boomers, Millennials and Generation Z had the highest level of willingness. Better work-life balance, lower burnout risk, and the capacity to recover were frequently mentioned as expected benefits.

A survey of technology workers indicated that 87% agreed that mental health days should be separate from sick days. The opportunity to practice self-care preventively before burnout, as well as less stigma associated with taking days off for mental vs physical needs, were emphasized as key advantages. However, 60% believed management would view their dedication poorly if they took allowed mental health leave. This demonstrates a persistent managerial stigma notwithstanding declared policies.

Human resource executives and managers appear to have differing perspectives on the benefits of mental health leave. According to a research conducted by a consulting firm, while 93% of managers admitted that burnout was a problem in their workplace, only 34% supported granting mental health days off. Contrary to employee desire, 62% of managers were doubtful or disagreed that mental health days would boost productivity. This disparity shows that managers in general require more education on the effects of mental health.

Several surveys show a disparity between support for mental health leave and comfort in taking it. In the Workplace poll, 88% of employees stated they would take mental health leave if they were confident there would be no negative outcomes. However, even in companies that have already enacted policies, barely one-third to half of employees reported taking mental health leave. Despite expressed openness, lingering job security concerns and stigma are most likely limiting utilization.

Employees give positive feedback to firms who currently offer mental health leave, according to studies. The software company conducts annual surveys of its employees regarding its limitless mental health day policy. Approximately 90% of respondents consistently express good feelings toward the policy and believe it contributes to a healthy work environment. Focus group input also emphasized the importance of formalizing and validating mental health issues.

Overall, new survey data show that employees have a substantial demand for mental health leave policies, but impediments prevent practical use. Younger generations appear to be more keen for specific mental health days than older groups. Addressing persistent stigma through training and instilling trust in leave policies' objectives will be critical for effective usage of this increasingly popular workplace benefit. Employee willingness and the good effects of mental health leave can continue to develop with personalized approaches.

3.3 Barriers to Taking Leave - Stigma, Inability to Skip Work

Although mental health leave policies are becoming more common, various barriers continue to prevent employees from fully utilizing this time off. One of the most major impediments is the stigma associated

with mental health concerns, as well as the stress of severe workloads. Addressing these complicated issues will be critical to ensuring mental health leave results in beneficial behaviors and outcomes. Stigma remains one of the most entrenched barriers. Despite increased awareness, the cultural stigma associated with mental health challenges frequently inhibits employees from feeling comfortable discussing issues and taking absence. According to a 2021 study, the most generally mentioned reason for respondents not seeking mental health leave was a concern of being judged by superiors for being unable to handle stress or a heavy workload. Powering through adversity is still regarded as a virtue, particularly among older generations.

This stigma is also intimately linked to work security concerns. Employees may be concerned that if they disclose to having mental health issues and need time off, management would question their competency. Younger employees are under pressure to portray themselves as highly motivated, resilient, and prepared for job expectations. Taking leave goes against these expectations. Workers who have seen their coworkers ostracized for mental health concerns are more hesitant to seek time themselves.

Stigma varies between cultures and demographics, which complicates problems. According to research, males are often more hesitant to take mental health leave than women since it goes against masculine values of toughness and self-reliance. Employees from specific ethnic origins often report more perceived stigma and discomfort when discussing mental health issues. Navigating these complex societal interactions necessitates nuance. Aside from stigma, many employees are unwilling to take time off for mental health reasons. Unpaid leave is financially unfeasible for hourly workers earning lesser wages. Even salaried employees worry about falling behind on deliverables and disappointing team members by being absent. Fear of losing promotion opportunities or excellent performance ratings is also prevalent. Managers may find it difficult to justify a leave when they believe they are critical to the smooth operation of the business.

Workload demands and understaffing might make taking leave difficult. A study of federal employees indicated that the most significant barrier to taking mental health leave was a lack of coverage for their role and duty buildup after returning. Employees who lack sufficient cross-training and resource planning feel imprisoned by ever-increasing workloads. Furthermore, employees may already feel scrutinized while using sick or vacation days, making mental health leave even more difficult. Excessively complicated leave procedures can also limit access. Requiring comprehensive documentation from healthcare professionals presents obstacles, particularly for episodic disorders such as anxiety or depression. Lengthy approval processes also discourage leave usage. Streamlining operations and minimizing red tape promotes utilization.

In summary, changing employee attitudes around mental health leave remains critical. Normalizing openness and reassurance from leaders is critical to reducing stigma's strong hold. However, it is also necessary to structure tasks in a sustainable manner and ensure appropriate staffing to share responsibilities. Mentally supporting employees involves both cultural and practical changes. Organizations can use various techniques to reduce barriers and encourage employees to prioritize their mental health before reaching crisis points.

4. ORGANIZATIONAL AND SOCIETAL IMPACTS
4.1 Effects on Worker Productivity and Performance

When implemented by organizations, the effects of mental health leave policies on employee productivity and performance are a central concern. Certain leaders who are evaluating these emergent policies may be concerned that frequent staff absences will result in decreased productivity. On the contrary, an increasing amount of empirical research indicates that providing leave to employees in order to support their mental health can have a positive impact on performance, productivity, and various other outcomes within the workplace.

Numerous studies have established robust correlations between substandard mental health and diminished productivity among employees. There exists a correlation between depression, anxiety, and emotional exhaustion and declines in work quality, concentration, and productivity. Untreated mental health conditions result in increased employee absenteeism due to illness and errors, as well as increased accidents. Conversely, there exists a positive correlation between mental health improvement and enhanced job performance. Employees who possess enhanced emotional wellbeing exhibit increased levels of productivity and engagement.

This correlation suggests that proactive measures to promote mental health, such as the implementation of leave policies, can result in increased productivity. The justification is that by allotting specific periods for employees to recuperate from fatigue and tension, they are able to return to work revitalized. Leave for mental health prevents total exhaustion and resignation, thereby assisting in the retention of high-performing employees. Initial data derived from organizations that have adopted such policies provides support for this concept. After introducing its "Recharge Days" initiative to promote mental health, the industry leader in cloud software, HubSpot, analyzed employee surveys and usage data. The findings revealed that 89% of employees who took the leave felt more productive, and 85% returned with enhanced concentration. By averting the escalation of minor issues into significant crises, sustained productivity was achieved.

Analogous profits have been used as benchmarks in other locations. Productivity increased by 13% at the media conglomerate Vivendi Universal subsequent to the implementation of mental health leave. A variety of positive outcomes were documented by Target regarding employees who took mental health leave, including decreases in fatigue and increases in work efficacy. Although there is currently a scarcity of quantitative analyses, preliminary self-reported data suggests that productivity has increased. There exist multiple mechanisms by which leave for mental health purposes contributes to increased productivity. The most evident benefit is that rest, recovery, and therapeutic intervention assist employees who are struggling to regain the concentration and emotional regulation skills required to perform. A timeout prior to reaching a breaking point facilitates a restoration of equilibrium. Upon their return to work, employees are invigorated and motivated.

Additionally, awareness of the availability of mental health leave decreases presenteeism, the practice of employees reporting to work while ill and delivering below-average performance. According to one study, eighty percent of employees surveyed believed that taking mental health days would reduce their likelihood of arriving to work ill. This decreases counterproductive or even detrimental periods of inactivity during work. Additionally, mental health leave increases productivity by enabling timely intervention prior to the escalation of problems into crises that necessitate prolonged absences. Preemptively seeking assistance maintains employees in their positions longer while addressing issues while they are still in their infancy. Furthermore, it enhances individuals' perceptions of the support provided by the organization, which in turn increases their level of engagement.

Most importantly, policies regarding mental health leave demonstrate to staff that their wellbeing is a priority. This encourages more candidness regarding difficulties, enabling managers to more effectively address the unique requirements of each individual. Although not a panacea, the effective utilization of mental health leave can be a beneficial approach to bolstering workforce productivity by providing comprehensive assistance to employees.

4.2 Impacts on Company Costs and Culture

A big worry for many business leaders when they're trying to decide if they should have mental health leave policies is how it might affect prices and the culture of the company. If you plan ahead and take mental health leave, there is proof that it can have a positive or negligible effect on both of these things. Looking at effects that are known to have on budgets, mood, turnover, and other parts of company culture can help you see things in a new light.

People often worry that giving people a lot of time off for mental health reasons will make wages go up because more people will miss work. However, study shows that when mental health leave is handled properly, it doesn't really add to the costs. For instance, a study in Australia found that absenteeism rates went up only 0.6% after 10 days of yearly mental health leave were added. The cost was thought to be very small compared to the benefits in keeping staff and improving performance.

Stopping change also balances out the costs of people leaving and being replaced. It is thought that losing an employee costs between 1.5 and 2 times the worker's annual pay, when you count the cost of hiring someone new, training them, and the time they waste when they are switching roles. If mental health leave keeps people from quitting, a lot of money will be saved. About 75% of workers say that having paid mental health leave would make them more loyal to their company and more likely to stay there. By helping employees who are having a hard time, companies can escape the costs that come with turnover.

Taking a mental health leave can also lead to less severe distress, which can lower hospital costs. If you don't treat mental health problems like sadness, they can get worse over time, which may require expensive treatments in the future. According to one study, giving each employee six treatment sessions would save the company more than $2,000 a year in medical costs. Early care eases the load in the future.

Costs are also affected by good effects on culture. When companies offer mental health leave and put wellness first, employees say they are happier with their jobs and have higher morale. Higher morale leads to more effort, cooperation, and good citizenship practices that make things run more smoothly. People who share the company's ideas about health and work-life balance are also more likely to want to work there.

This fits with study that shows that having values that are driven by a purpose helps with hiring and keeping employees, especially younger ones. When mental health leave policies show that you care about your employees, they can also help your company's image with other people. Positive branding helps companies that are known for their progressive perks and caring culture.

Costs could go up, though, if policies aren't followed properly or are abused without sensible limits. Costs can be kept down by taking mental health leave days from a pool of set vacation or sick days instead of adding more paid leave. Clear rules, the need for paperwork, and keeping track of how they are used all help lower the risk of abuse while still allowing for the freedom that is needed.

To sum up, mental health leave does have some administrative costs, but data shows that the total costs aren't too high if it's done carefully. Better performance, trust, and cost savings on health care tend to cancel out any extra time off. From a cultural point of view, leave policies that really show care for employees' mental health improve morale, retention, and the company's image for very little money. But businesses need to find a way to balance understanding with productivity. As long as they stay within the rules, mental health leave policies are great for both employee health and smart cost management.

4.3 Broader Economic Costs of Ignoring Mental Health

In addition to organizational consequences, the growing mental health crisis across global workforces imposes significant costs on broader economies and societies. Decreased productivity, medical expenses, unemployment benefits, and other side consequences of untreated worker mental health difficulties eventually put a large financial burden on countries. These compounding expenses highlight the need of prioritizing mental health through innovations such as workplace leave policies.

According to the WHO, depression and anxiety disorders cost the global economy $1 trillion in lost productivity each year. Presenteeism accounts for a significant portion of this impact. According to studies, presenteeism reduces individual productivity by roughly one-third on days when people report to work while dealing with mental health concerns. These reductions accumulate quickly across teams and entire workforces.

Poor mental health also increases absenteeism since persons with depression and anxiety are more likely to develop physical illnesses. According to WHO, mental health disorders account for 12 billion sick days taken globally each year. This absence takes many ordinary customers out of the economy while they are unemployed and unable to spend at normal levels. High unemployment and disability rates among those suffering from diagnosable mental illnesses put additional strain on the economy. For example, in emerging economies, roughly 85% of people with serious mental illnesses are unemployed. Lower incomes for the unemployed reduce tax resources available for stimulus investment. Increased use of disability welfare and income assistance programs strains state resources.

Untreated mental health disorders frequently worsen over time and develop into more complex, severe conditions, resulting in increased medical costs. According to the Lancet Commission, for every $1 invested in expanding mental health treatment, nations gain a $4 return in improved health and productivity. Early action lowers downstream costs. However, most governments are underinvesting in mental health. According to the OECD, countries spend less than 5% of their health budgets on mental health, despite the significant economic costs associated with poor mental health. Nations can only reap benefits if suitable resources are allocated in proportion to the scale of the challenge. Individuals and families bear the economic cost of insufficient mental health care. According to research, serious depression causes a 35% decrease in personal income. Lower earnings limit individual purchasing power, reducing national consumption and growth. Out-of-pocket expenses for mental health services can affect household budgets.

A lack of understanding of mental health in the workplace causes costs through ineffective policies. Employers who fail to address employee mental health through innovations such as leave policies lose out on productivity, retention, and medical savings. Cultivating psychologically healthy workplaces should be viewed as an economic imperative, not just an ethical one. Overall, the raw data highlight the enormous economic cost of unresolved mental health issues around the world. While not a panacea, initiatives such

as mental health leave show the types of solutions required to mitigate these large downstream costs. Over time, promoting mental health through workplace policies and practices yields exponential economic and societal benefits. Policymakers and corporate leaders must acknowledge that mental health is essential to prosperity.

5. CRITICAL ANALYSIS AND LIMITATIONS

5.1 Critiques and Concerns - Short-term Fix, Privilege, Prejudice

While the rise of dedicated mental health leave policies shows promise, thoughtful critique and analysis of these emerging workplace initiatives is prudent. Of particular concern is the notion that mental health leave serves merely as a superficial short-term fix lacking depth to create lasting cultural change around mental health. Additionally, issues of privilege and prejudice in terms of access to mental health leave warrant consideration. Examining these critical perspectives provides a balanced, nuanced evaluation.

A core skeptic argument is that mental health leave policies enable organizations to appear progressive without undertaking more substantive efforts to improve toxic work cultures fundamentally harming mental wellbeing. Essentially, mental health leave could function as a convenient band-aid distracting from needed structural and operational reforms. For instance, employers can implement mental health leave while ignoring excessive work demands, hostile management practices, and insufficient health benefits driving distress in the first place. Relatedly, critics highlight that mental health leave is inherently limited to being a reactive approach for relieving symptoms versus proactively addressing root causes. While a few restorative days of leave can provide short-term relief, it fails to tackle systemic drivers of poor mental health like discrimination, lack of autonomy, work overload, job insecurity and unreasonable performance pressures. Mental health leave should supplement rather than replace prevention-focused strategies.

Additionally, there are reasonable doubts around efficacy and ethics of placing the onus for mental healthcare onto individuals via leave policies. This continues the pattern of individualizing mental health solutions rather than emphasizing employer, government and collective responsibility. Generous leave means little without fundamental paradigm shifts toward prioritizing human needs over profits and productivity. On the privilege front, access barriers mean mental health leave policies frequently exclude those most in need. Lower income hourly workers in particular lack job security protections and paid time off to feasibly take mental health leave. Policies are also often limited to full-time staff. Discrepancies along socioeconomic lines question just how progressive these initiatives are in reality.

Prejudice around mental health also persists even at companies with leave. Employees still often fear stigma and repercussions for taking leave, evidence that toxic mindsets are not easily fixed through policy alone. Without earnest culture change, employees may technically have access to leave but feel discouraged utilizing it. Variations in comfort taking leave across demographics similarly exemplify lingering issues. Furthermore, critics argue mental health leave could increase discrimination by identifying struggling employees and making previously invisible disabilities visible . Once an employee invokes leave, it can unconsciously color managers' perceptions of their reliability and competence. Caution around disclosure is thus understandable.

In summary, while mental health leave adoption represents progress, many compelling concerns exist. At best, these policies deliver temporary symptomatic relief if not paired with systematic efforts to nourish cultures of care, inclusion and sustainable work practices. At worst, they provide public relations cover for

inaction on the fundamental reforms needed for true mental health equity across the workforce. Nuance is required to maximize benefits while addressing limitations.

5.2 Limitations of Current Research on Impacts

While there is a growing interest in mental health leave programs, serious research into their effects is still in its early stages. Most published research on outcomes have substantial limitations, such as small sample sizes, self-reported data, short time frames, and the inability to determine causality. Furthermore, few longitudinal studies exist following the effects of leave over extended periods. Additional high-quality empirical research is needed to substantiate emerging benefits and provide nuanced guidance for employers. A major limitation is that studies gauging the effects of mental health leave predominantly utilize subjective self-report measures from employees on outcomes like wellbeing and productivity. While useful, self-reports are vulnerable to various types of response bias that may inflate perceived benefits. Without comparing reported gains to objective performance metrics, conclusions should be taken cautiously.

Small samples are another typical research shortcoming. For instance, Famous agencies surveyed only thirty four employees before and after utilizing its mental health leave and performed basic descriptive analysis on their feedback. While directionally positive, such small samples are highly susceptible to outliers skewing data. Replication at larger scales is paramount. But organizations often research initiatives narrowly within their own workforces. This connects to the widespread reliance on case studies examining singular companies. Findings derived from initiatives at one employer frequently have limited generalizability to other contexts. Differences across industries, geographic regions, company sizes, workplace demographics and mental health leave policy details restrict extrapolation of case study insights. More multi-site comparative research is needed.

The inherent complexity of mental health presents additional research problems. Depression, for example, has complex biochemical, psychological, and cultural reasons that are difficult to study using simple pre-post observations. Confounding factors and comorbidities in mental health data make it difficult to determine the benefits and hazards of treatments such as leave programs. Advanced study models are indispensable. Moreover, the overwhelming majority of extant literature investigates effects that persist for weeks or months at most. Although longitudinal studies examining effects over an extended period of time are considerably uncommon, they are critical for identifying enduring benefits, delayed consequences, and usage trends. Initial surges in leave utilization that occur during the implementation of policies or periods of extreme stress may subsequently return to normal. Controlled, ongoing research is vital. Causation presents an additional pervasive obstacle in research. Although there are correlations between the implementation of mental health leave and a range of positive outcomes, definitive causal relationships remain difficult to ascertain. Constantly, numerous confounding variables actively affect outcomes. In order to fully isolate the effects of policies, it is necessary to consider various factors such as secular societal mental health shifts, industry trends, and broader economic conditions. Extremely audacious causal assertions are premature. In brief, although emerging research provides encouraging initial support for policies regarding mental health leave, the establishment of a solid body of evidence necessitates addressing numerous inherent limitations in the scholarship of this field. For empirical evaluations to be robust, larger, controlled samples containing objective outcome measures over extended time periods are required. In addition to providing critical nuance, additional qualitative data illuminates complex mental health processes. Organizations should use caution when evaluating potential

advantages and developing strategic implementation plans until these research gaps are filled. Supporting mental health in diverse workforces does not follow a one-size-fits-all model.

5.3 Areas Needing Further Study

While interest in mental health leave has surged in recent years, many critical areas require further research to truly understand these policies' impacts and how they can be optimized. Several knowledge gaps stand out as warranting deeper investigation through rigorous empirical studies.

One fundamental question is whether mental health leave helps sustain employee wellbeing long-term or merely offers temporary relief. Longitudinal studies tracking individuals before and after taking leave could discern if effects are lasting versus short-lived. Relatedly, research is needed on optimal leave duration and frequency for maintaining mental health benefits. This can inform structuring of policy details like days granted per year.

Gaining additional insights into the relationship between mental health leave and work performance is also imperative. Robust data linking leave to productivity, work quality, and other concrete performance metrics remains limited. Most studies rely on self-reported performance gains. Quantifying top-line impacts would bolster the business case for leave policies. Defining which types of roles or industries see the greatest performance benefits could further optimize targeting.

More research explicitly examining the return on investment of mental health leave policies across indicators like medical spending, employee retention, and recruiting would similarly inform decision-making. Most commentary on organizational benefits is theoretical rather than data-driven. Having quantitative cost-benefit projections could incentivize adoption and guide design. Identifying leading practices that maximize positive outcomes is likewise key.

Additionally, little rigorous inquiry currently focuses on the interaction between mental health leave and other workplace mental health interventions. Important questions include whether providing leave reduces demand for other programs like resilience training or EAPs. Or conversely, whether combining leave with additional resources has synergistic effects on mental health. Testing integration strategies using control groups would offer useful clarity.

Another glaring knowledge gap surrounds Manager and employee attitudes and behaviors related to mental health leave. Surveys consistently show disconnects between stated policy aims and actual organizational culture change. Further probing the specific managerial biases and employee concerns inhibiting leave-taking despite its availability would be valuable. Sensitive qualitative approaches may be especially revealing on these complex dynamics.

From an accessibility standpoint, research on the demographic variations in awareness, interest, and utilization of mental health leave policies is needed. Current evidence suggests potential divides across income, education, gender, age cohorts and other factors. But few studies have deeply investigated these disparities. Ensuring equitable access and impact of leave policies requires confronting barriers facing marginalized groups.

Lastly, more comparative research contrasting the effects of mental health-specific leave policies versus general personal leave would help make the case for dedicated mental health leave. If outcomes meaningfully differ, it strengthens the argument for customized mental health days off rather than broad discretionary time off. However, direct comparative studies remain sparse currently.

In summary, advancing understanding of mental health leave policies requires filling sizeable knowledge gaps spanning utilization patterns, long-term impacts, performance effects, implementation variables, attitudes, accessibility, and cost-benefit tradeoffs. While initial studies show promise, truly optimized policies will only emerge through ongoing rigorous, multifaceted research on all aspects of this emerging workplace mental health strategy.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS
6.1 Summary of Current State of Mental Health Leave Policies

The development of dedicated mental health leave policies is a noteworthy development in workplace wellbeing support. While uptake remains inconsistent, a growing number of prominent multinational companies across diverse industries have begun offering employees allotments of paid time off specifically for mental health recovery. Early adopters range from consumer goods corporations to tech giants like top software companies. Uptake also spans geographies from the USA and UK to Asia Pacific.

Though policy structures vary, commonalities exist. The most typical format grants employees a set number of days annually separate from standard sick leave to utilize when needed for mental wellbeing – typically five to ten days. Policies commonly prioritize the provision of mental health leave to employees with minimal requirements for medical verification or extensive approval processes. Certain businesses have implemented an open-ended strategy that grants them unrestricted time. Providing mental health leave is motivated by the need to mitigate the increasing levels of employee stress and exhaustion, encourage timely intervention, foster a healthy work-life balance, and prevent absenteeism. The pandemic of COVID-19 and the trauma it has caused have increased the importance placed on the mental health of employees. Although skeptics contend that mental health leave offers only surface-level relief, proponents regard dedicated leave as an advancement toward elevating the status of mental health requirements to that of physical health.

According to data, the average utilization rate for mental health leave in the first year of implementation among organizations that have documented it is 2% to 5%. Millennials exhibit a higher rate of adoption. Employee demand for mental health days is substantial, according to surveys, but stigma and job insecurity continue to impede leave-taking. Although there is a scarcity of research on the subject, preliminary self-reported data suggests that employees perceive enhanced work performance, loyalty, and overall well-being. Significant nuances are exposed by critical analysis of these preliminary findings. The long-term advantages of isolated days off must be investigated further. Additionally, access barriers for contingent and low-wage employees emphasize the privilege that is presently ingrained in the majority of corporate mental health leave policies. There is ongoing skepticism regarding whether leave truly enables substantial cultural transformation or if it is merely a facade of branding.

Despite this, the increasing prevalence of mental health leave indicates a growing recognition of the mental health of employees as a strategic concern for organizations, which was previously largely disregarded. Over time, the efficacy of these policies as comprehensive, supportive solutions will become apparent via continuous improvement and candid evaluation of their constraints. At a minimum, elevating workforce mental health as a boardroom issue is an important step forward. But genuinely nurturing cultures of care likely requires more transformational change. For now, organizations' interest in exploring mental health leave options remains promising and worthy of cautious optimism.

Overall, while significant unknowns remain, the present momentum behind mental health leave adoption gives hope that these policies will provide access to much-needed recovery time for employees. Progress will necessitate nuanced, evidence-based implementation and a willingness to address reasonable criticisms. If implemented wisely, mental health leave appears to be at least one effective instrument for proactively supporting workplace mental wellbeing as part of a larger cultural shift.

6.2 Implications for Managers, Employees, and Society

The implications of the emergence of mental health leave are extensive, affecting not only administrators but also individuals and larger social systems. As more companies offer mental health leave, the best way to use these policies will be to think about the needs and views of all stakeholders. A big impact for managers and leaders is that they need to put communication and training at the top of their list of priorities to help people use mental health leave in the right way. Most of the time, managers need to learn about mental health needs themselves before they can support their employees to take time off. Opening up about mental health without shame is very important. Leaders need to make it clear that taking time off is safe and supported. It can make a difference to get advocates to share their own personal stories of how mental health leave helped them. But unless there is a real shift in society, mental health leave might just stay a good idea on paper.

Managers also have to figure out how to balance the needs of the business with the well-being of their employees. Leave is necessary for care, but it naturally slows things down. So, planning ahead is needed for cross-training to cover gaps and fair distribution of extra work. Temp staff or float pools can help teams that are working hard. Managers may also need training on how to temporarily hand off leadership tasks while they take time off for mental health reasons.

For employees, one important consequence is getting past stigmas so they can feel able to use their mental health leave without worrying about what will happen to their job. Taking time off can be seen as a sign of weakness, especially by younger workers who are under a lot of pressure to show they are tough and resilient. Employees of all types may also be hesitant to put too much on their coworkers. Over time, these problems can be solved with ongoing, patient communication from leaders and peer groups.

Also, employees should carefully consider how to get the most out of their mental health leave benefits. It's better to use days for preventative self-care than just for full breaks. Employees could look at trends of emotional exhaustion and plan to take time off during tough times. Setting goals for your leave, like going to therapy or relaxing, can help you get the most out of it. Witnesses from coworkers about the benefits of taking time off give you confidence to use your time off wisely.

At the societal level, it is very important to work for fair access to mental health leave and other support services. A small group of fortunate knowledge economy business workers currently getting paid time off for mental health issues shows how unfair things are for many socioeconomically disadvantaged groups. It is very important for fair societies to give more paid leave and health and wellness tools to public sector, hourly, and gig workers.

Policymakers can help by giving people incentives to adopt on their own and getting rid of hurdles that make it hard to get mental health leave. Tax breaks, rules about hiring, and efforts to honor employers who are thinking ahead could all help bring about change. Improving public employee aid programs that aren't getting enough money also gives people help where private sector policies don't reach. To fix the problems that cause inequality, politicians, businesses, and the community will need to work together.

It is also still very important for society as a whole to stop stigmatizing mental health care. Cultural change that makes mental health leave policies possible can only happen if social taboos are broken down through education and openness from public figures. People who use mental health leave in the right way should be praised, not punished. With many different kinds of work, mental health leave can help more people accept and understand each other.

To sum up, improving mental health leave policies needs managers, workers, and social systems to work together in a more nuanced way to deal with issues like communication, readiness, fairness, and stigma. Adopting mental health leave can really lead to good changes in the way people work together and set new standards for putting people's needs ahead of productivity and profits if it is used in a whole-person way. In the 21st century, this change in ethics is necessary.

6.3 Recommendations for Companies and Future Research

For companies contemplating implementing mental health leave or optimizing existing policies, research synthesis suggests several key recommendations:

Firstly, genuine culture change must accompany policy rollouts. Training managers to support leave-taking, clearly communicating intentions, and leading by example are foundational. Policies lacking cultural groundwork risk low utilization. Celebrating mental health leave utilization in internal communications counters stigma.

Secondly, mental health leave should supplement, not replace, other mental health and wellbeing programs. While beneficial, leave alone is insufficient for engendering holistic, lasting improvements. Combining leave with manager training, counseling benefits, resilience initiatives, workload adjustments and burnout prevention better enables comprehensive support.

Additionally, careful planning to minimize disruptions is prudent. Cross-training employees and establishing float pools helps backfill workflows. Staggering leave usage across teams prevents excessive simultaneous absences. Being transparent that temporary workload increases may occur prevents frustration.

Furthermore, examining policy details with nuance is important. While unlimited leave sounds ideal, reasonable caps can reduce misuse risks. Requirements like manager approval, medical documentation, or concurrent use of personal leave provide additional guardrails depending on a company's needs and maturity level with mental health leave.

Tracking mental health leave utilization using anonymous aggregate data also allows for improvement. Monitoring demographic differences, leave durations, seasonality and reasons can inform supportive adjustments. Employees are more likely to provide honest feedback knowing data is secure and used constructively, not punitively.

Finally, evaluating mental health leave's impacts across indicators like stress, burnout, absenteeism and performance provides accountability. Both quantitative data like retention metrics and qualitative feedback from surveys and interviews offer insights. Adjust policies based on effectiveness data, employee input, and competitive benchmarking.

For researchers, priorities include conducting more longitudinal studies on mental health leave's long-term impacts and efficacy compared to standard leave. Larger sample comparative studies across diverse

industries would build generalizability. Exploring supplements to maximize mental health leave's benefits also warrants focus, such as coupling leave with therapy access.

Additionally, further investigation into mental health leave policy structures and nuances is needed to identify best practices. Examples include optimizing day allotments, maximal consecutive day durations, and approval processes. Research illuminating leading cultural change strategies alongside leave would similarly advance practice.

From a critical lens, rigorous inquiry into mental health leave limitations is essential. Analysing access barriers for marginalized groups, stigma trends across demographics, and risks of disclosure backlash would strengthen equity. Cost-benefit analyses and concerns around leave as a superficial quick fix also demand examination and problem-solving.

In summary, for mental health leave to fulfill its potential as a workplace wellbeing support mechanism, concerted efforts in policy design, cultural integration, critical analysis, and evidence-based improvement are foundational. With innovative thinking and compassionate intent, this emerging form of leave can positively impact employee mental health across diverse organizations in the years ahead.

REFERENCES

[1] MSN. (n.d.). https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/us/portland-schools-hit-with-civil-rights-complaint-for-factoring-race-and-gender-into-school-discipline/ar-BB1iE2Bd

[2] Schiavo, A. (2021, February 4). New Lyra Health partnership aims to expand mental health benefits. Employee Benefit News. https://www.benefitnews.com/news/new-lyra-health-partnership-aims-to-expand-mental-health-benefits

[3] Schiavo, A. (2021, February 4). New Lyra Health partnership aims to expand mental health benefits. Employee Benefit News. https://www.benefitnews.com/news/new-lyra-health-partnership-aims-to-expand-mental-health-benefits

[4] Survey Finds 70% of Burnt Out Employees Would Leave Job | Visier. (n.d.). https://www.visier.com/blog/new-survey-70-percent-burnt-out-employees-would-leave-current-job/

[5] 2023 Work in America Survey. (n.d.). https://www.apa.org. https://www.apa.org/pubs/reports/work-in-america/2023-workplace-health-well-being

[6] Mental well-being: resources for the public (2021, September 24). https://www.who.int/news-room/feature-stories/mental-well-being-resources-for-the-public

[7] Cameron, R. (2024, March 26). Is a Mental Health Leave of Absence the Answer? Lyra Health. https://www.lyrahealth.com/blog/mental-health-leave-of-absence/

[8] R. (2024, April 16). What is "Sad Leave", will it help in your work-life balance? Know more. Asianet News Network Pvt Ltd. https://newsable.asianetnews.com/lifestyle/what-is-sad-leave-will-it-help-in-your-work-life-balance-know-more-rba-sc117d

[9] Novotney, A. (2023, April 21). Why mental health needs to be a top priority in the workplace. https://www.apa.org. https://www.apa.org/news/apa/2022/surgeon-general-workplace-well-being

[10] Vanacker, A. (2020, May 11). Why Your Employees' Mental Health Should Be Top Priority. Forbes. https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbesbusinesscouncil/2020/05/11/why-your-employees-mental-health-should-be-top-priority/?sh=e1e119d36009

[11] Marmillod, V. (2023, September 13). Reducing Absenteeismn Prioritizing Employee Mental Health. HUMANOO. https://www.humanoo.com/en/magazin/reducing-absenteeism-mental-health/

[12] Pereira, K. (2023, July 11). Mental Health Days For Employees: Benefits For Your Team And Business. https://www.completepayrollsolutions.com/blog/mental-health-days-for-employees

[13] M. (2021, October 7). The stigma surrounding mental health issues at work. MHR. https://mhrglobal.com/uk/en/knowledge-hub/hr/stigma-surrounding-mental-health-issues-work

[14] George, A. S. (2024, February 25). The Rest Deficit: Why Sleep Alone Cannot Cure Our Fatigue. puirp.com. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10691450

[15] The Rise of Mental Health Days in Corporate Policies. (n.d.). Corporate Wellness | Employee Well-Being. https://www.corporatewellnessmagazine.com/article/the-rise-of-mental-health-days-in-corporate-policies

[16] Naik, A. (2024, January 19). Burnout Report: one in five needed to take time off work due to stress in the past year. Mental Health UK. https://mentalhealth-uk.org/blog/burnout-report-one-in-five-needed-to-take-time-off-work-due-to-stress-in-the-past-year/

[17] George, A. S., George, A. H., & Baskar, T. (2023, December 25). Neuro-Gaming: How Video Games Shape the Brain's Cognitive Landscape. puirj.com. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10427117

[18] Chodavadia, P., Teo, I., Poremski, D., Fung, D., & Finkelstein, E. A. (2023, February 14). Prevalence and economic burden of depression and anxiety symptoms among Singaporean adults: results from a 2022 web panel. BMC Psychiatry. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-023-04581-7

[19] Kupcová, I., Danišovič, U., Klein, M., & Harsanyi, S. (2023, April 11). Effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on mental health, anxiety, and depression. BMC Psychology. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-023-01130-5

[20] George, A. S. (2024, March 25). Exam Season Stress and Student Mental Health: An International Epidemic. puirj.com. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10826032

[21] Simon, S. (2021, November 16). It's OK to Take a Mental Health Day. Verywell Health. https://www.verywellhealth.com/mental-health-day-5209222

[22] Abramson, A. (2023, March 6). Does Your Workplace Have to Offer Mental Health Days? The Paper Gown. https://www.zocdoc.com/blog/does-your-workplace-have-to-offer-mental-health-days/