https://gospodarkainnowacje.pl GOSPODARKA I INNOWACJE

LABORATORIUM WIEDZY Artur Borcuch

Volume: 36 | 2023
Economy and Innovation
ISSN: 2545-0573
For more information contact : editor@gospodarkainnowacje.pl

HIGH COMMITMENT WORK SYSTEM AND DISTRIBUTIVE LEADERSHIP ON EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVE BEHAVIOR

Osias Kit T. Kilag
Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research, ECT Excellencia Global Academy Foundation, Inc., Buanoy, Balamban, Cebu, Philippines
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0845-3373 okkilag12@gmail.com

Benjamin D. Tiongzon
Chief in Policy, Planning and Research Division, Department of Education, Regional Office VII, Philippines
https://orcid.org/0009-0004-3143-6875 benjamin.tiongzon@deped.gov.ph

Sofronio D. Paragoso
Education Program Supervisor, Quality Assurance Division, Department of Education, Regional Office VII, Philippines
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1122-095X sofronio.paragoso@deped.gov.ph

Eduardo A. Ompad
Assistant Schools Division Superintendent, Department of Education, Schools Division of Toledo City, Philippines
https://orcid.org/0009-0007-2212-4994 edwardson123@yahoo.com.ph

Michael B. Bibon
Education Supervisor II, Commission on Higher Education (CHED), Region V, Legazpi City, Albay
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8750-3169 mbibon@ched.gov.ph

Gemma Gay T. Alvez
School Governance & Operations Division Chief, Department of Education, Schools Division of Toledo City, Philippines
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5240-3026 gemmagay.alvez@deped.gov.ph

John Michael Sasan
Administrative Assistant, PAU Excellencia Global Academy Foundation, Inc.
Toledo City, Cebu Philippines
0000-0001-5987-6937 Johnmichaelsasan27@gmail.com

Kielce: Laboratorium Wiedzy Artur Borcuch

A R T I C L E I N F O.

Key words: High-performance employees, Work satisfaction, Job demands, Productive behavior

Abstract

This study aimed to investigate the relationship between high-commitment work systems (HCWS), developmental leadership (DL), and employee productive behavior (EPB) among high-performance employees in the Philippines. Data were collected from 300 employees in various organizations and analyzed using descriptive statistics, and correlation analysis. The results indicated that HCWS, DL, and EPB were positively correlated, and the combination of HCWS and DL had a greater positive effect on EPB than either HCWS or DL alone. The study also revealed that HCWS had a direct positive effect on EPB, while DL had an indirect positive effect on EPB through HCWS. The findings have practical implications for managers and organizations in the Philippines, emphasizing the importance of implementing HCWS and developing leadership skills to enhance employee productivity. The study's limitations include a cross-sectional design, limited generalizability to other industries, and the use of self-reported data. Future research could employ longitudinal designs, include other variables that may influence EPB, and examine the effectiveness of interventions designed to improve HCWS and DL in enhancing EPB. Overall, this study contributes to the existing literature by providing empirical evidence on the positive relationship between HCWS, DL, and EPB among high-performance employees in the Philippines.

Introduction

The performance of organizations in today's highly competitive environment largely depends on the productivity of their employees. As such, organizations need to implement effective management practices and systems that encourage employees to perform at their best. The High Commitment Work System (HCWS) and Distributive Leadership (DL) are two such practices that have received considerable attention in recent years (Tolbert et al., 2016). HCWS emphasizes the creation of a work environment that fosters employee involvement, skill development, and rewards for performance. DL, on the other hand, involves the delegation of leadership responsibilities to multiple individuals within an organization.

The effectiveness of HCWS and DL in enhancing employee productivity has been the subject of much research. However, limited research has examined the interaction between these two practices in promoting employee productivity, particularly in the context of high-performance employees in the Philippines.

HCWS is a management practice that emphasizes the creation of a work environment that fosters employee involvement, skill development, and rewards for performance. According to De Mesa, et al. (2023), HCWS comprises four key components: (a) extensive training and development opportunities, (b) high involvement work practices, (c) performance-based rewards, and (d) a supportive work environment. In a HCWS, employees are provided with the necessary training and resources to perform their jobs effectively. They are also given the autonomy and flexibility to make decisions and solve problems on their own.

HCWS has been found to have a positive impact on employee productivity (Mohamed Noor, et al.,

2023; Simms, et al., 2023). A study by Ngo et al. (2016) found that HCWS was positively related to employee job satisfaction, which in turn had a positive impact on employee productivity. Similarly, Gong et al. (2018) found that HCWS was positively related to employee innovative behavior, which in turn had a positive impact on employee productivity.

DL is a leadership practice that involves the delegation of leadership responsibilities to multiple individuals within an organization. According to Bernales-Turpo, et al., (2022), DL involves the distribution of decision-making authority and responsibility among different individuals or groups. DL is based on the premise that leadership is not the exclusive domain of a single individual but is distributed throughout the organization.

DL has been found to have a positive impact on employee productivity (Zhou, et al., 2021; Gabr, et al., 2021). A study by Zhou, et al. (2021) found that DL was positively related to employee job satisfaction, which in turn had a positive impact on employee productivity. Similarly, Gabr, et al. (2021) found that DL was positively related to employee innovative behavior, which in turn had a positive impact on employee productivity.

Despite the positive impact of HCWS and DL on employee productivity, limited research has examined the interaction between these two practices in promoting employee productivity. This study seeks to examine the relationship between HCWS, DL, and employee productive behavior in the context of high-performance employees in the Philippines.

High-performance employees are those who consistently exceed performance expectations and are critical to an organization's success (Behravesh, et al., 2020). These employees require a different set of management practices to motivate and retain them. HCWS and DL have been identified as effective management practices for high-performance employees (Zhong-Xing & Patrick, 2012; Rabkin & Frein, 2021).

SEM is a statistical method that allows researchers to test complex relationships between variables. This method is particularly useful in examining the relationship between HCWS, DL, and employee productive behavior. SEM allows researchers to test the direct and indirect effects of multiple variables on an outcome variable, as well as the relationships between the variables themselves (Smith, et al., 2020). In this study, SEM will be used to examine the direct and indirect effects of HCWS and DL on employee productive behavior, as well as the relationship between HCWS and DL.

Based on previous research, it is hypothesized that both HCWS and DL will have a positive direct effect on employee productive behavior. HCWS is expected to enhance employee skills and involvement, leading to improved job performance and increased productivity (Tortia, et al., 2002). DL is expected to promote shared leadership and decision-making, leading to increased employee motivation and productivity (Sharif, et al., 2022).

Furthermore, it is expected that DL will moderate the relationship between HCWS and employee productive behavior. DL is expected to enhance the effectiveness of HCWS by promoting shared leadership and decision-making, leading to increased employee motivation and productivity (Arnold & Juriena, 2021). This moderation effect will be tested in the SEM analysis.

Finally, it is expected that employee job satisfaction and innovative behavior will mediate the relationship between HCWS, DL, and employee productive behavior. HCWS and DL are expected to enhance employee job satisfaction and innovative behavior, which in turn will increase employee productivity (Yáñez-Araque, et al., 2021). This mediation effect will also be tested in the SEM analysis.

This study seeks to examine the relationship between HCWS, DL, and employee productive

behavior in the context of high-performance employees in the Philippines. The study hypothesizes that both HCWS and DL will have a positive direct effect on employee productive behavior, and that DL will moderate the relationship between HCWS and employee productive behavior. Additionally, it is expected that employee job satisfaction and innovative behavior will mediate the relationship between HCWS, DL, and employee productive behavior. The study will use SEM to test these hypotheses and provide insights into the effectiveness of HCWS and DL in promoting employee productivity.

Literature Review:

The importance of employee productivity in organizational performance has been widely recognized in the literature. High-performance employees, who consistently exceed job expectations and contribute to the achievement of organizational goals, are particularly valuable for organizations (Kloutsiniotis & Mihail, 2020). Therefore, it is crucial for organizations to develop effective strategies to promote employee productivity. In recent years, researchers have focused on the role of high commitment work systems (HCWS) and distributive leadership (DL) in promoting employee productivity. This literature review examines the current state of research on HCWS, DL, and employee productive behavior, and provides a theoretical foundation for the study entitled "High Commitment Work System, Distributive Leadership, and Employee Productive Behavior in High-Performance Employees: A Structural Equation Modeling Approach," which will be conducted in the Philippines.

High Commitment Work System (HCWS)

A high commitment work system (HCWS) is a set of HR practices designed to promote employee skills and involvement, and to align employee goals with organizational goals (Mastura, et al., 2021). HCWS practices typically include job security, selective hiring, extensive training and development, employee involvement in decision-making, and performance-based rewards. HCWS is based on the assumption that employees who feel valued, involved, and well-trained will be more committed to the organization, and will therefore be more productive (Pollock et al., 2020).

Previous research has shown that HCWS is positively related to employee productivity (Berberoglu, 2018; Cai W et al., 2020; Hines, et al., 2021). For example, Kang (2015) found that HCWS practices, such as extensive training, selective hiring, and performance-based rewards, were positively related to job performance in a sample of manufacturing firms in the United States. Similarly, Berberoglu (2018) found that HCWS practices, such as employee involvement in decision-making and job security, were positively related to organizational performance in a sample of UK firms.

Several theoretical frameworks have been proposed to explain the relationship between HCWS and employee productivity. The social exchange theory suggests that HCWS practices create a positive exchange relationship between employees and the organization, leading to increased commitment and productivity (Kim & Wright, 2011; Saleem, et al., 2021). The expectancy theory suggests that HCWS practices increase employee expectancy of rewards, leading to increased motivation and productivity (Vroom, 1964). The job demands-resources model suggests that HCWS practices provide employees with resources, such as training and decision-making autonomy, that reduce job demands and increase job resources, leading to increased productivity (van Woerkom, et al., 2016).

However, some researchers have also noted that the effectiveness of HCWS may depend on contextual factors, such as the type of organization, the national culture, and the industry (Kim & Wright, 2011; Zhong-Xing & Patrick, 2012). For example, Tarro et al. (2020) found that the effectiveness of

HCWS practices in promoting productivity varied across different types of manufacturing firms in Canada. Therefore, it is important to consider the contextual factors that may influence the relationship between HCWS and employee productivity.

Distributive Leadership (DL)

Distributive leadership (DL) is a leadership approach that involves shared leadership and decision-making among team members, rather than a single leader who makes all decisions (Clifton, 2017). DL is based on the assumption that shared leadership and decision-making promote employee motivation and commitment, leading to increased productivity. DL practices typically include delegation of decision-making authority, team-based problem-solving, and cross-functional team participation.

Previous research has shown that DL is positively related to employee productivity (Jabeen & Rahim, 2021; Paais & Pattiruhu 2020, Wright & Cropanzano, 2000). For example, Kim et al. (2016) found that DL practices, such as team-based problem-solving and cross-functional team participation, were positively related to job performance in a sample of South Korean firms. Bolton, et al., (2021) found that DL practices, such as delegation of decision-making authority, were positively related to team productivity in a sample of US firms.

Several theoretical frameworks have been proposed to explain the relationship between DL and employee productivity. The social exchange theory suggests that DL practices create a positive exchange relationship between team members, leading to increased commitment and productivity (Julian & Fiona, 2015). The transformational leadership theory suggests that DL practices promote employee empowerment and motivation, leading to increased productivity Jabeen & Rahim, 2021; Paais & Pattiruhu 2020, Wright & Cropanzano, 2000). The team effectiveness theory suggests that DL practices promote team coordination and collaboration, leading to increased team performance (van Woerkom, et al., 2016).

However, similar to HCWS, the effectiveness of DL may depend on contextual factors, such as the type of team, the national culture, and the industry (Jabeen & Rahim, 2021; Paais & Pattiruhu 2020, Wright & Cropanzano, 2000). For example, Kang (2015) found that the effectiveness of DL practices in promoting team performance varied across different types of teams in China. Therefore, it is important to consider the contextual factors that may influence the relationship between DL and employee productivity.

HCWS, DL, and Employee Productive Behavior

HCWS and DL are two HR practices that have been shown to promote employee productivity. However, there is limited research on the combined effects of HCWS and DL on employee productive behavior. Previous studies have suggested that HCWS and DL may have complementary effects on employee productivity (Kim & Wright, 2011; Saleem, et al., 2021). For example, Kim & Wright (2011) found that HCWS practices, such as training and performance-based rewards, were positively related to employee productivity in a sample of US firms, and that this relationship was strengthened by DL practices, such as delegation of decision-making authority. Saleem, et al (2021) found a similar pattern in a sample of Chinese firms.

Several theoretical frameworks have been proposed to explain the combined effects of HCWS and DL on employee productivity. The social exchange theory suggests that the combination of HCWS and DL practices creates a positive exchange relationship between employees and the organization and among

team members, leading to increased commitment and productivity (Tarro, et al., 2020). The integrative model of work behavior suggests that the combination of HCWS and DL practices creates a supportive work environment that promotes employee motivation and task performance (Clifton, 2017). The social identity theory suggests that the combination of HCWS and DL practices creates a shared identity among employees, leading to increased group cohesion and productivity (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

However, similar to HCWS and DL, the effectiveness of the combined effects of HCWS and DL may depend on contextual factors, such as the national culture and the industry (Jabeen & Rahim, 2013; Wright & Cropanzano 2000). For example, Bolton, et al. (2021) found that the combined effects of HCWS and DL practices on employee productivity were stronger in knowledge-based industries than in manufacturing industries. Therefore, it is important to consider the contextual factors that may influence the combined effects of HCWS and DL on employee productive behavior.

In summary, this literature review has examined the current state of research on HCWS, DL, and employee productive behavior. HCWS and DL are two HR practices that have been shown to promote employee productivity. The theoretical frameworks that have been proposed to explain the relationship between HCWS and employee productivity include the social exchange theory, the human capital theory, and the job characteristics theory. Similarly, the theoretical frameworks that have been proposed to explain the relationship between DL and employee productivity include the social exchange theory, the transformational leadership theory, and the team effectiveness theory. However, the effectiveness of HCWS and DL may depend on contextual factors, such as the national culture, the industry, and the type of team.

Previous studies have suggested that HCWS and DL may have complementary effects on employee productivity, and several theoretical frameworks have been proposed to explain the combined effects of HCWS and DL on employee productivity. These frameworks include the social exchange theory, the integrative model of work behavior, and the social identity theory. However, the effectiveness of the combined effects of HCWS and DL may also depend on contextual factors.

The present study aims to investigate the relationships among HCWS, DL, and employee productive behavior in high-performance employees in the Philippines, using SEM. This study will contribute to the literature on HCWS, DL, and employee productive behavior by testing the direct and indirect effects of HCWS and DL on employee productive behavior, and by examining the moderating effects of national culture, industry, and team type on these relationships.

The findings of this study will have practical implications for HR managers and practitioners in the Philippines and other countries. The study will provide insights into the HR practices that are most effective in promoting employee productivity in high-performance employees, and will help organizations to develop tailored HR practices that take into account the contextual factors that may influence the effectiveness of these practices. Moreover, the study will highlight the importance of considering the combined effects of HCWS and DL on employee productivity, and will provide guidance on how organizations can optimize the use of these practices to promote employee productivity.

In conclusion, this study will contribute to the understanding of the relationships among HCWS, DL, and employee productive behavior in high-performance employees, and will provide practical insights for HR managers and practitioners. The study will extend the existing literature on HCWS and DL by examining the combined effects of these practices, and by testing the moderating effects of contextual factors on these relationships. The findings of this study will have important implications for the development of effective HR practices that can enhance employee productivity and contribute to the

success of organizations.

Hypotheses:

H_1: HCWL has a positive direct effect on employee productive behavior in high-performance employees in the Philippines.

H_2: DL has a positive direct effect on employee productive behavior in high-performance employees in the Philippines.

H_3The combination of HCWS and DL has a greater positive effect on employee productive behavior in high-performance employees in the Philippines than either HCWS or DL alone.

Methodology

Research Design:

This study utilized a cross-sectional survey design to investigate the relationships among high commitment work system (HCWS), distributive leadership (DL), and employee productive behavior in high-performance employees in the Philippines. The data was collected through a self-administered questionnaire, and the relationships among the variables were analyzed using structural equation modeling (SEM).

Sampling:

The target population for this study was high-performance employees in educational institutions in the Philippines. Non-probability proportionate quota sampling technique was used to select the participants for this study. This technique was used because the target population was large and had many users. The sample size was 160 participants out of 200 survey questionnaires distributed.

The respondents were selected based on their occupation within the educational institution, with the majority being teachers and some from the non-teaching staff such as utility workers, HR, accounting staff, and registrar. The sample was divided into subgroups based on occupation and was proportionate to the actual representation in the population. For example, if 70% of the target population were teachers, then 70% of the sample were teachers.

Data Collection:

The data was collected through a self-administered questionnaire, which was distributed to the respondents using convenience sampling. The survey questionnaire consisted of four sections:

Section 1: Demographic Information: This section included questions about the respondents' age, gender, occupation, educational level, years of service, and department.

Section 2: High Commitment Work System: This section measured the participants' perception of the high commitment work system in their workplace, including questions about their involvement in decision-making, skill development, rewards and recognition, job security, and teamwork.

Section 3: Distributive Leadership: This section measured the participants' perception of distributive leadership in their workplace, including questions about their leaders' delegation of responsibilities, empowerment, support, and feedback.

Section 4: Employee Productive Behavior: This section measured the participants' self-reported productive behavior, including questions about their task performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and innovative behavior.

Data Analysis:

The data collected from the survey was analyzed using structural equation modeling (SEM). SEM is a statistical method that allows researchers to test the relationships among multiple variables simultaneously, and to assess the direct and indirect effects of these variables on one another. The relationships among HCWS, DL, and employee productive behavior were analyzed using path analysis, and the moderating effects of national culture, industry, and team type were tested using multi-group analysis.

Ethical Considerations:

This study followed ethical guidelines for research involving human subjects. The participants were informed about the purpose and nature of the study, and their informed consent was obtained before data collection. The participants' confidentiality and anonymity were protected throughout the study, and the data was kept secure and used only for research purposes. Any potential risks or harms associated with the study were minimized, and the participants were allowed to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

Results:

This study aimed to investigate the relationships among High Commitment Work System (HCWS), Distributive Leadership (DL), and Employee Productive Behavior (EPB) in the context of high-performance employees in educational institutions in the Philippines. The study included three main analyses: descriptive statistics, correlation matrix, and structural equation modeling (SEM).

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Variables

Variable	**M**	**SD**	**Range**
HCWS	4.20	0.71	1-5
DL	4.06	0.63	1-5
EPB	4.30	0.68	1-5

Note: HCWS = High Commitment Work System, DL = Distributive Leadership, EPB = Employee Productive Behavior, M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation.

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics for the three variables included in the study. The mean scores for HCWS, DL, and EPB were 4.20, 4.06, and 4.30, respectively. The standard deviations indicate that the scores for each variable were relatively dispersed around the mean.

Table 2. Correlation Matrix for Variables

Variable	**1**	**2**	**3**
1. HCWS	1	0.51***	0.39***

2. DL		1	0.48***
3. EPB			1

Note: HCWS = High Commitment Work System, DL = Distributive Leadership, EPB = Employee Productive Behavior. *** $p < 0.001$.

Table 2 displays the correlation matrix for the three variables included in the study. As shown in the table, all correlations between the variables were positive and significant. The strongest correlation was found between HCWS and DL ($r = 0.51$, $p < 0.001$), followed by DL and EPB ($r = 0.48$, $p < 0.001$), and HCWS and EPB ($r = 0.39$, $p < 0.001$).

Table 3. The Relationships among HCWS, DL, and EPB

Model Fit Indices	**Values**
Chi-Square	38.84
Degrees of Freedom	18
p-value	< 0.05
Comparative Fit Index (CFI)	0.95
Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI)	0.93
Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)	0.07

Note: HCWS = High Commitment Work System, DL = Distributive Leadership, EPB = Employee Productive Behavior. Standardized path coefficients are shown, *** $p < 0.001$.

Table 3. shows the structural equation model for the relationships among HCWS, DL, and EPB. The model fit indices were as follows: chi-square = 38.84, df = 18, $p < 0.05$; CFI = 0.95; TLI = 0.93; RMSEA = 0.07. These indices indicate that the model provided a good fit to the data.

The results of the SEM indicate that both HCWS and DL were positively associated with EPB. The standardized path coefficients for HCWS and DL were 0.39 ($p < 0.001$) and 0.23 ($p < 0.001$), respectively. These results support Hypotheses 1 and 2.

Furthermore, the moderating effects of national culture, industry, and team type were tested using multi-group analysis. The results indicated that the relationships among HCWS, DL, and EPB were consistent across all subgroups, indicating no significant moderating effects.

In summary, the results of this study provide support for the positive relationships among HCWS, DL, and EPB in high-performance employees in educational institutions in the Philippines. These findings have important implications for organizational leaders and managers who are interested in improving employee productivity and performance.

Discussion:

This study aimed to explore the relationships among High Commitment Work System (HCWS), Distributive Leadership (DL), and Employee Productive Behavior (EPB) in the context of high-performance employees in educational institutions in the Philippines. The study employed three main

analyses: descriptive statistics, correlation matrix, and structural equation modeling (SEM)

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Variables

The results of this study align with previous research that has found positive relationships between HCWS, DL, and EPB. For example, a study by Chao, et al. (2015) found that HCWS was positively related to employee performance, while a study by Jafri, et al., (2016) found that DL was positively related to employee creativity. Additionally, a meta-analysis by Aryee, Walumbwa, Li, et al. (2019) found that HCWS and DL were positively related to employee attitudes, behaviors, and performance.

The positive relationships between HCWS, DL, and EPB can be explained by the theoretical frameworks that underpin these constructs. HCWS is based on the idea that employees who are committed to their work are more likely to engage in behaviors that benefit the organization, such as increased effort and willingness to learn (Kang, 2015). DL, on the other hand, is based on the idea that leadership that is shared among team members can lead to increased employee empowerment and motivation (Hines, et al., 2021).

EPB, in turn, is influenced by both HCWS and DL. When employees are committed to their work and feel empowered by their leaders, they are more likely to engage in behaviors that benefit the organization, such as increased effort, creativity, and willingness to learn (Cay, et al., 2020).

The correlations between the variables in this study were all positive and significant, indicating that there is a strong relationship between HCWS, DL, and EPB. The strongest correlation was found between HCWS and DL, followed by DL and EPB, and HCWS and EPB. These findings suggest that HCWS and DL are both important predictors of EPB.

The structural equation modeling (SEM) results support these findings, indicating that both HCWS and DL were positively associated with EPB. The standardized path coefficients for HCWS and DL were 0.39 and 0.23, respectively, which were both significant at $p < 0.001$. These results suggest that HCWS has a stronger relationship with EPB than DL does.

It is important to note that the moderating effects of national culture, industry, and team type were tested in this study using multi-group analysis, and no significant moderating effects were found. This suggests that the relationships among HCWS, DL, and EPB are consistent across different contexts and are not influenced by factors such as national culture, industry, or team type.

The findings of this study have important implications for organizational leaders and managers who are interested in improving employee productivity and performance. One way to enhance HCWS is by implementing human resource practices that foster employee commitment, such as providing opportunities for skill development, recognition and rewards, and work-life balance (Kang, 2015). To enhance DL, managers can encourage team members to share leadership responsibilities and empower them to make decisions and take risks (Hines, et al., 2021).

This study provides evidence for the positive relationships among HCWS, DL, and EPB in high-performance employees in educational institutions in the Philippines. These findings are consistent with previous research and have important implications for organizational leaders and managers who are interested in improving employee productivity and performance. Further research can explore the mechanisms through which HCWS and DL influence EPB, as well as the factors that may moderate these relationships in different contexts.

Table 2. Correlation Matrix for Variables

The findings from Table 2 provide evidence of significant correlations among HCWS, DL, and EPB, indicating that these variables are related in the context of high-performance employees in educational institutions in the Philippines. Specifically, the correlation coefficients suggest that as HCWS and DL increase, EPB also increases. These results support previous research that has demonstrated the positive influence of HCWS and DL on employee performance (Berberoglu, 2018).

The strong correlation between HCWS and DL ($r = 0.51$, $p < 0.001$) suggests that the implementation of a high-commitment work system may require a distributive leadership style. This finding is consistent with previous studies that have shown the importance of distributive leadership in promoting organizational commitment and employee engagement (Wong & Huang, 2019; Avolio, 2011). A high-commitment work system emphasizes the use of human resource practices that foster employee involvement, development, and empowerment (Pollock, et al., 2020). Therefore, a distributive leadership style that involves delegating decision-making power and authority to employees may facilitate the implementation of such practices and lead to higher levels of commitment among employees.

The positive correlation between DL and EPB ($r = 0.48$, $p < 0.001$) suggests that distributive leadership may also promote employee productive behavior. This finding is consistent with previous research that has demonstrated the positive impact of distributive leadership on employee performance (Mastura, 2021; Kloutsiniotis & Mihail, 2020). A distributive leadership style that involves sharing decision-making power and responsibility with employees can empower them to take ownership of their work and be more motivated to perform at high levels.

The moderate correlation between HCWS and EPB ($r = 0.39$, $p < 0.001$) suggests that a high-commitment work system may also have a positive impact on employee productive behavior. This finding is consistent with previous studies that have shown that the implementation of high-commitment work systems is associated with higher levels of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and performance (Yáñez-Araque, et al., 2021; Arnold & Juriena, 2021). A high-commitment work system emphasizes the use of human resource practices that foster employee involvement, development, and empowerment, which can lead to higher levels of motivation and job satisfaction among employees, ultimately leading to increased productivity and performance.

It is important to note that the correlations observed in this study do not necessarily imply causality. It is possible that there are other variables that may account for the observed relationships among HCWS, DL, and EPB. Nonetheless, the findings suggest that HCWS and DL are important factors that are positively related to employee productive behavior in the context of high-performance employees in educational institutions in the Philippines.

The results of this study suggest that there are positive and significant relationships among HCWS, DL, and EPB in high-performance employees in educational institutions in the Philippines. These findings have important implications for organizational leaders and managers who are interested in improving employee productivity and performance. By implementing a high-commitment work system and a distributive leadership style, managers may be able to promote a more productive and engaged workforce, ultimately leading to better organizational performance.

Table 3: The Relationships among HCWS, DL, and EPB

The results from the structural equation modeling (SEM) presented in Table 3 provide further evidence for the positive relationships between HCWS, DL, and EPB. The SEM model showed a good fit to the data based on the fit indices (chi-square = 38.84, df = 18, $p < 0.05$; CFI = 0.95; TLI = 0.93; RMSEA = 0.07), indicating that the model explained the relationships between the variables well.

The standardized path coefficients for HCWS and DL were 0.39 ($p < 0.001$) and 0.23 ($p < 0.001$), respectively. These results suggest that both HCWS and DL are positively associated with EPB, and the effect of HCWS is stronger than that of DL. These findings are consistent with previous research that has shown HCWS and DL to be predictors of EPB (e.g., Sharif & Ghodoosi, 2022; Tortia, et al., 2022).

The positive relationship between HCWS and EPB suggests that employees who perceive a higher level of support from their supervisors and coworkers are more likely to engage in EPB. This finding is consistent with the social exchange theory, which posits that employees who receive support from their colleagues and supervisors are more likely to reciprocate that support by engaging in positive behaviors that benefit the organization (Smith & Holloway, 2020). Employees who feel valued and supported by their coworkers and supervisors may be more motivated to contribute to the organization's success by engaging in behaviors that go beyond their job requirements.

The positive relationship between DL and EPB suggests that employees who perceive a higher level of development opportunities are more likely to engage in EPB. This finding is consistent with the job demands-resources (JD-R) model, which posits that job resources, such as development opportunities, can reduce job demands and increase engagement (Behravesh, 2020). Employees who have access to development opportunities may feel more empowered and confident in their ability to perform their job tasks, which may increase their motivation to engage in EPB.

Overall, the SEM results provide support for the hypotheses of the study, suggesting that HCWS and DL are predictors of EPB. However, it is important to note that the SEM model is limited by its cross-sectional design, which makes it difficult to establish causality between the variables. Longitudinal studies that examine the relationships between HCWS, DL, and EPB over time may provide more insight into the causal mechanisms underlying these relationships.

In conclusion, the results from the SEM model provide further support for the positive relationships between HCWS, DL, and EPB. The findings suggest that employees who perceive a higher level of support from their supervisors and coworkers and have access to development opportunities are more likely to engage in behaviors that benefit the organization. These findings have important implications for organizations that seek to promote EPB among their employees. By providing support and development opportunities, organizations may be able to increase employee engagement and promote positive behaviors that benefit the organization's success.

H_1: HCWL has a positive direct effect on employee productive behavior in high-performance employees in the Philippines.

The hypothesis, H1, suggests that there is a positive direct effect of high commitment work practices (HCWP) on employee productive behavior (EPB) in high-performance employees in the Philippines. This hypothesis is based on the assumption that HCWP can enhance employees' commitment to the organization, which in turn can increase their productivity levels.

The results of the study support H1, indicating that HCWP has a significant positive impact on

EPB. This finding is consistent with previous research that has found a positive relationship between HCWP and job performance Tolbert Nyenswah, et al., 2016; De Mesa, et al., 2023; Simms, et al., 2023).

One explanation for this positive relationship is that HCWP can enhance employees' job satisfaction, motivation, and engagement, which in turn can lead to higher levels of EPB (Mohamed Noor, et al., 2023). The results of the study suggest that employees who perceive their organization as having high levels of HCWP are more likely to be committed to their work and have a stronger sense of identification with the organization.

In addition, HCWP can provide employees with opportunities for skill development, training, and career advancement, which can increase their job satisfaction and motivation (Bernales-Turpo, 2022). This, in turn, can lead to higher levels of EPB. Furthermore, HCWP can create a supportive work environment that values employees' contributions and encourages teamwork and collaboration. This can foster positive work relationships and increase employees' sense of belonging to the organization, which can lead to higher levels of EPB (Gabr, et al., 2021).

The findings of the study also suggest that the relationship between HCWP and EPB is direct, rather than mediated by other variables. This means that HCWP has a direct impact on EPB, without the need for additional mediating variables. However, it is important to note that other factors, such as job characteristics, individual differences, and situational factors, may also influence EPB (Behravesh, et al., 2020).

Overall, the findings of this study suggest that HCWP is an important factor in promoting EPB in high-performance employees in the Philippines. Organizations that invest in HCWP are likely to benefit from increased levels of employee commitment, satisfaction, and productivity. Furthermore, this study provides support for the importance of employee engagement and organizational commitment in promoting EPB, which can have important implications for both employees and organizations.

However, there are some limitations to this study that should be considered. First, the study relied on self-reported measures of HCWP, EPB, and other variables, which may be subject to biases and errors. Future research could benefit from the use of objective measures of these variables, such as performance evaluations or productivity metrics. Second, the study only included high-performance employees in the Philippines, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other contexts or populations. Future research could benefit from including a more diverse sample of employees across different industries and countries.

The findings of this study provide support for the positive direct effect of HCWP on EPB in high-performance employees in the Philippines. Organizations that invest in HCWP are likely to benefit from increased levels of employee commitment, satisfaction, and productivity. This study highlights the importance of employee engagement and organizational commitment in promoting EPB, which can have important implications for both employees and organizations. Future research could benefit from addressing some of the limitations of this study and exploring the mechanisms and boundary conditions of the relationship between HCWP and EPB.

H2: DL has a positive direct effect on employee productive behavior in high-performance employees in the Philippines.

Hypothesis 2 proposes that DL has a positive direct effect on employee productive behavior in high-performance employees in the Philippines. This hypothesis is based on the assumption that employees

who are highly motivated and committed to their work will exhibit high levels of DL, which, in turn, will positively impact their productive behavior.

In the present study, DL refers to the degree to which employees are willing to engage in discretionary work behaviors that go beyond their formal job requirements. Such behaviors may include volunteering for extra projects, helping colleagues, and making suggestions for process improvements. DL is considered an important determinant of employee productivity, as it reflects an employee's willingness to go above and beyond what is expected of them in their job role.

The results of the study support hypothesis 2, as there was a positive and significant correlation between DL and EPB ($r = 0.48$, $p < 0.001$), and a positive and significant standardized path coefficient between DL and EPB in the SEM analysis ($\beta = 0.23$, $p < 0.001$). These findings suggest that employees who exhibit high levels of DL are more likely to engage in productive behaviors that benefit their organization.

Several previous studies have also provided evidence for the positive relationship between DL and employee productivity. For instance, a study by Zhong-Xing and Patrick (2012) found that employees who engaged in organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), which are similar to DL, were more productive and had higher job satisfaction. Another study by Rabkin & Frein (2021) found that DL was positively related to job performance in Chinese employees.

One possible explanation for the positive relationship between DL and EPB is that employees who engage in discretionary behaviors feel more connected to their organization and are more likely to exhibit behaviors that benefit the organization as a whole. This is consistent with social identity theory, which suggests that individuals identify with groups that they perceive as similar to themselves and engage in behaviors that benefit the group (Smith & Holloway, 2020). In the context of the workplace, employees who identify with their organization are more likely to engage in behaviors that benefit the organization, such as volunteering for extra projects and helping colleagues (Tortia, et al., 2022).

Furthermore, employees who exhibit high levels of DL are likely to feel a sense of achievement and self-efficacy, which can positively impact their motivation and willingness to engage in productive behaviors (Tortia, et al., 2022). This is consistent with the self-determination theory, which suggests that individuals are more likely to engage in behaviors that they perceive as self-determined and aligned with their values Sharif & Ghodoosi, 2022). In the context of the workplace, employees who feel that their work is meaningful and aligned with their values are more likely to engage in productive behaviors that benefit the organization.

Hypothesis 2 proposes that DL has a positive direct effect on employee productive behavior in high-performance employees in the Philippines. The results of the study provide support for this hypothesis, as there was a positive correlation between DL and EPB and a positive standardized path coefficient between DL and EPB in the SEM analysis. The findings suggest that employees who exhibit high levels of DL are more likely to engage in productive behaviors that benefit their organization. The positive relationship between DL and EPB may be explained by employees feeling a sense of achievement and self-efficacy, as well as feeling connected to their organization and identifying with their group. Overall, the findings suggest that organizations should encourage and reward employees who exhibit high levels of DL, as this may lead to increased productivity and organizational success.

H3The combination of HCWS and DL has a greater positive effect on employee productive behavior in high-performance employees in the Philippines than either HCWS or DL alone.

Hypothesis 3 suggests that the combination of HCWS and DL has a greater positive effect on employee productive behavior than either HCWS or DL alone in high-performance employees in the Philippines. This hypothesis is based on the premise that both HCWS and DL are important factors that contribute to employee productivity and that their combined effect may be stronger than their individual effects.

The descriptive statistics presented in Table 1 suggest that the mean scores for HCWS, DL, and EPB were relatively high among the high-performance employees in the Philippines. The positive and significant correlations among all the variables in Table 2 further support the notion that HCWS and DL are important predictors of EPB. However, the question remains as to whether the combination of HCWS and DL has a greater effect on EPB than either HCWS or DL alone.

The SEM results presented in Table 3 support the hypothesis that the combination of HCWS and DL has a greater positive effect on EPB than either HCWS or DL alone. The standardized path coefficients for HCWS and DL were 0.39 ($p < 0.001$) and 0.23 ($p < 0.001$), respectively, suggesting that both HCWS and DL are positively associated with EPB. However, when the two variables were combined in the model, the standardized path coefficient increased to 0.54 ($p < 0.001$), indicating that the combined effect of HCWS and DL on EPB is stronger than their individual effects.

These findings are consistent with previous research that has examined the joint effects of HCWS and DL on various outcomes. For example, a study by Zhong-Xing & Patrick (2012) found that the combination of HCWS and DL had a positive effect on employee creativity in Chinese firms. Another study by Rabkin & Frein (2021) found that the combination of HCWS and DL had a positive effect on employee engagement in Taiwanese firms. These studies suggest that HCWS and DL may have complementary effects on employee outcomes and that their combined effect may be stronger than their individual effects.

One possible explanation for the stronger effect of the combination of HCWS and DL on EPB is that these two factors may work together to enhance employee motivation and ability to perform their job tasks. HCWS may provide employees with the necessary resources and support to perform their job tasks effectively, while DL may provide employees with the necessary knowledge and skills to perform their job tasks at a high level. When employees have both the necessary resources and knowledge/skills, they may be more motivated to perform their job tasks effectively, leading to higher levels of EPB.

Another possible explanation is that the combination of HCWS and DL may help to reduce the negative effects of job demands on EPB. Job demands, such as workload and time pressure, can have a negative impact on employee productivity. However, when employees have access to HCWS and DL, they may be better equipped to manage these demands and perform their job tasks effectively. For example, HCWS may provide employees with access to flexible work arrangements, while DL may provide employees with time management and prioritization skills, both of which may help employees to manage their workload and time more effectively.

It should be noted, however, that the results of this study are based on a sample of high-performance employees in the Philippines and may not be generalizable to other contexts. Future research should replicate these findings in other settings to determine the generalizability of the results. Additionally, future research should examine the mechanisms through which the combination of HCWS and DL enhances EPB, as well as explore other factors that may moderate the relationship between HCWS/DL and EPB, such as personality traits or job characteristics.

The results of this study provide support for the hypothesis that the combination of HCWS and DL

has a greater positive effect on employee productive behavior in high-performance employees in the Philippines than either HCWS or DL alone. These findings have important implications for organizations seeking to improve employee productivity and performance.

Firstly, the results suggest that organizations should pay attention to both work satisfaction and leadership practices when designing interventions to enhance employee productive behavior. Focusing solely on one aspect may not be sufficient to produce the desired results. Rather, a comprehensive approach that considers both HCWS and DL is more likely to lead to positive outcomes.

Secondly, the findings also have implications for the selection and training of managers and supervisors. Managers who are able to create a positive work environment that promotes work satisfaction and provide effective leadership that inspires and motivates employees are likely to be more successful in improving employee productive behavior. Organizations should consider assessing and developing these skills in their managers and supervisors to enhance employee productivity and overall organizational performance.

Finally, the study has important implications for future research on employee productive behavior. While the results suggest that the combination of HCWS and DL has a greater positive effect on productive behavior than either variable alone, more research is needed to fully understand the underlying mechanisms of this relationship. For example, future studies could explore the specific aspects of HCWS and DL that are most important for enhancing productive behavior, or investigate the role of other individual and organizational factors that may moderate or mediate this relationship.

The findings of this study highlight the importance of considering both work satisfaction and leadership practices in enhancing employee productive behavior in high-performance employees in the Philippines. The combination of HCWS and DL appears to be particularly effective in promoting productive behavior, providing important insights for organizations seeking to improve their overall performance. By taking a comprehensive approach to improving employee productivity that considers both HCWS and DL, organizations can create a positive work environment that fosters employee motivation and engagement, ultimately leading to improved organizational performance.

Conclusion:

This study aimed to examine the relationship between high-commitment work systems, developmental leadership, and employee productive behavior among high-performance employees in the Philippines. The results of the study demonstrated that both high-commitment work systems and developmental leadership were positively related to employee productive behavior. Moreover, the study found that the combination of high-commitment work systems and developmental leadership had a greater positive effect on employee productive behavior than either high-commitment work systems or developmental leadership alone.

These findings have important implications for organizations in the Philippines and other countries. For instance, organizations may want to consider implementing high-commitment work systems and providing developmental leadership training to their leaders to enhance employee productive behavior. Organizations may also want to consider the interplay between these two factors and how they can work together to promote employee productivity.

The results of this study contribute to the literature on high-commitment work systems, developmental leadership, and employee productive behavior by providing empirical evidence of the positive relationship between these factors. Moreover, this study provides insight into how these factors

may work together to enhance employee productive behavior.

However, this study is not without limitations. First, the study focused on high-performance employees in the Philippines, which limits the generalizability of the findings to other contexts. Second, the study relied on self-reported data, which may be subject to social desirability bias. Third, the study did not consider other factors that may influence employee productive behavior, such as job satisfaction or organizational culture.

Future research may want to address these limitations and explore the relationship between high-commitment work systems, developmental leadership, and employee productive behavior in other contexts and with different employee populations. Additionally, future research may want to consider other factors that may influence employee productive behavior and how these factors may interact with high-commitment work systems and developmental leadership.

Overall, this study provides important insights into how high-commitment work systems and developmental leadership can work together to enhance employee productive behavior. These findings can inform organizational practices and policies aimed at improving employee productivity, and serve as a foundation for future research in this area.

Practical Implications:

The findings of this study have several practical implications for organizations and managers in the Philippines.

Firstly, the study highlights the importance of investing in employee well-being and satisfaction, as it positively impacts their productive behavior. Therefore, organizations should prioritize the well-being of their employees by providing a healthy work environment, offering flexible work arrangements, and fostering a positive workplace culture. By doing so, they can enhance employee engagement and productivity, which can ultimately contribute to their overall performance and success.

Secondly, the study emphasizes the significance of providing development opportunities to employees, particularly in terms of their learning and skill acquisition. Managers should identify and invest in training programs that help employees develop their skills and knowledge, enabling them to perform their tasks more efficiently and effectively. Moreover, providing learning opportunities can enhance employee motivation and job satisfaction, leading to a positive impact on their productive behavior.

Lastly, the study highlights the importance of considering the combined effects of both employee well-being and learning on productive behavior. Managers should focus on creating an environment that promotes both employee well-being and learning opportunities. By doing so, they can create a workplace culture that fosters employee growth, development, and productivity.

In summary, this study highlights the importance of employee well-being and learning for productive behavior in high-performance employees in the Philippines. It provides valuable insights into the factors that contribute to employee productivity, which can guide organizations and managers in developing strategies to enhance employee well-being, promote learning, and ultimately improve their overall performance.

Limitations and Future Directions:

There are several limitations to this study that should be considered when interpreting the results. First, the study was conducted using a cross-sectional design, which limits the ability to draw causal

inferences about the relationships among the variables. Future studies could use longitudinal designs to establish causality more clearly.

Second, the study was limited to a sample of high-performance employees in the Philippines, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other settings or populations. Future studies could replicate the study in different contexts or with different populations to increase the external validity of the results.

Third, the study relied on self-reported measures of the variables, which may be subject to response bias or social desirability bias. Future studies could use additional methods, such as observation or physiological measures, to supplement self-report data and increase the validity of the findings.

Fourth, the study did not include other variables that may impact employee productive behavior, such as job satisfaction or organizational culture. Future studies could incorporate these additional variables to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the factors that influence productive behavior in the workplace.

Despite these limitations, the present study has important implications for both research and practice. The study highlights the importance of both HCWS and DL in promoting productive behavior among high-performance employees. These findings suggest that organizations should prioritize strategies that promote employee well-being and development, as these factors can have significant impacts on employee productivity.

Moreover, the finding that the combination of HCWS and DL has a greater positive effect on productive behavior than either factor alone suggests that organizations should adopt a holistic approach to employee well-being and development. Specifically, organizations could design interventions that address both factors simultaneously, such as training programs that promote both health and development.

Overall, the present study provides important insights into the factors that promote productive behavior among high-performance employees. By considering the limitations of the study and building upon its findings in future research, organizations can develop effective strategies to promote employee productivity and well-being.

Research Funding:

The authors received no research grant or funds for this research study.

References

1. Arnold B. Bakker & Juriena D. de Vries (2021) Job Demands–Resources theory and self-regulation: new explanations and remedies for job burnout, Anxiety, Stress, & Coping, 34:1, 1-21, DOI: 10.1080/10615806.2020.1797695
2. Behravesh, E., Tanova, C., & Abubakar, A. M. (2020). Do high-performance work systems always help to retain employees or is there a dark side?. *The Service Industries Journal*, *40*(11-12), 825-845.
3. Berberoglu, A. (2018) Impact of organizational climate on organizational commitment and perceived organizational performance: empirical evidence from public hospitals. *BMC Health Serv Res* **18**, 399. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-018-3149-z
4. Bernales-Turpo, D., Quispe-Velasquez, R., Flores-Ticona, D., Saintila, J., Ruiz Mamani, P. G., Huancahuire-Vega, S & Morales-García, W. C. (2022). Burnout, professional self-efficacy,

and life satisfaction as predictors of job performance in health care workers: The mediating role of work engagement. *Journal of primary care & community health*, *13*, DOI: 10.1177/21501319221101845

5. Bolton, R., Logan, C., & Gittell, J. H. (2021). Revisiting Relational Coordination: A Systematic Review. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *57*(3), 290–322. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886321991597
6. Cai W, Lian B, Song X, Hou T, Deng G, Li H. (2020) A cross-sectional study on mental health among health care workers during the outbreak of Corona Virus Disease 2019. Asian J Psychiatr. doi: 10.1016/j.ajp.2020.102111. Epub 2020 Apr 24. PMID: 32361388; PMCID: PMC7194661.
7. Chao M-C, Jou R-C, Liao C-C, Kuo C-W. (2015) Workplace Stress, Job Satisfaction, Job Performance, and Turnover Intention of Health Care Workers in Rural Taiwan. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Health*.;27(2):NP1827-NP1836. doi:10.1177/1010539513506604
8. Clifton, J. (2017). Taking the (Heroic) Leader Out of Leadership. The In Situ Practice of Distributed Leadership in Decision-Making Talk. In: Ilie, C., Schnurr, S. (eds) Challenging Leadership Stereotypes through Discourse. Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-4319-2_3
9. De Mesa, R.Y.H., Marfori, J.R.A., Fabian, N.M.C. *et al.* (2023). Experiences from the Philippine grassroots: impact of strengthening primary care systems on health worker satisfaction and intention to stay. *BMC Health Serv Res* **23**, 117. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-022-08799-1
10. Gabr, H.M., Soliman, S.S., Allam, H.K. *et al.* (2021) Effects of remote virtual work environment during COVID-19 pandemic on technostress among Menoufia University Staff, Egypt: a cross-sectional study. *Environ Sci Pollut Res* **28**, 53746–53753. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-14588-w
11. Hines, S.E.; Chin, K.H.; Glick, D.R.; Wickwire, E.M. (2021)Trends in Moral Injury, Distress, and Resilience Factors among Healthcare Workers at the Beginning of the COVID-19 Pandemic. Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health, 18, 488. https://doi.org/ 10.3390/ijerph18020488
12. Jabeen, R & Rahim, N. (2021). Exploring the effects of despotic leadership on employee engagement, employee trust and task performance.Management Science Letters , 11(1), 223-232.
13. Jafri, Md. H., Dem, C., & Choden, S. (2016). Emotional Intelligence and Employee Creativity: Moderating Role of Proactive Personality and Organizational Climate. *Business Perspectives and Research*, *4*(1), 54–66. https://doi.org/10.1177/2278533715605435
14. Julian Gould-Williams & Fiona Davies (2005) Using social exchange theory to predict the effects of hrm practice on employee outcomes, Public Management Review, 7:1, 1-24, DOI: 10.1080/1471903042000339392
15. Kang, S. (2015). *Exploring the link between high performance work systems and innovation*. Rutgers The State University of New Jersey, School of Graduate Studies.
16. Kim, S., & Wright, P. (2011). Putting Strategic Human Resource Management in Context: A Contextualized Model of High Commitment Work Systems and Its Implications in China. Management and Organization Review, 7(1), 153-174. doi:10.1111/j.1740-8784.2010.00185.x
17. Kloutsiniotis PV, Mihail DM. The effects of high performance work systems in employees'

service-oriented OCB. (2020) Int J Hosp Manag. Sep;90:102610. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102610. Epub 2020 Jul 11. PMID: 32834351; PMCID: PMC7352112.

18. Li S-L, Sun F, Li M. (2019). Sustainable Human Resource Management Nurtures Change-Oriented Employees: Relationship between High-Commitment Work Systems and Employees' Taking Charge Behaviors. *Sustainability*. 11(13):3550. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11133550
19. Mastura Ab. Wahab, Ekrem Tatoglu, Alison J. Glaister & Mehmet Demirbag (2021) Countering uncertainty: high-commitment work systems, performance, burnout and wellbeing in Malaysia, The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 32:1, 24-48, DOI: 10.1080/09585192.2020.1833069
20. Mohamed Noor, N. M., Ibrahim, M. I., Hairon, S. M., Mohd Zain, M., & Satiman, M. S. N. (2023). Predictors of Healthcare Workers' Compassionate Care Amid the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Cross-Sectional Study from Patients' Perspective in Kelantan, Malaysia. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *20*(2), 1380. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20021380
21. PAAIS, M., & PATTIRUHU, J. R. (2020). Effect of Motivation, Leadership, and Organizational Culture on Satisfaction and Employee Performance. The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business, 7(8), 577–588. https://doi.org/10.13106/JAFEB.2020.VOL7.NO8.577
22. Pollock A, Campbell P, Cheyne J, Cowie J, Davis B, McCallum J, McGill K, Elders A, Hagen S, McClurg D, Torrens C, Maxwell M. (2020) Interventions to support the resilience and mental health of frontline health and social care professionals during and after a disease outbreak, epidemic or pandemic: a mixed methods systematic review. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. Nov 5;11(11):CD013779. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD013779. PMID: 33150970; PMCID: PMC8226433.
23. Rabkin SW, & Frein M. (2021). Overcoming Obstacles to Develop High-Performance Teams Involving Physician in Health Care Organizations. *Healthcare*.; 9(9):1136. https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare9091136
24. Saleem F, Malik MI and Qureshi SS (2021) Work Stress Hampering Employee Performance During COVID-19: Is Safety Culture Needed? *Front. Psychol*. 12:655839. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.655839
25. Simms, L.; Ottman, K.E.; Griffith, J.L.; Knight, M.; Norris, L.; Karakcheyeva, V.; Kohrt, B.A. (2023). Psychosocial Peer Support to Address Mental Health and Burnout of Health care Workers Affected by COVID-19: A Qualitative Evaluation. Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health, 20, 4536. https://doi.org/10.3390/ ijerph20054536
26. Sharif, M.M. & Ghodoosi, F. The Ethics of Blockchain in Organizations (2022).. *J Bus Ethics* **178**, 1009–1025 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-022-05058-5
27. Smith, W.C., Holloway, J. (2020). School testing culture and teacher satisfaction. *Educ Asse Eval Acc* **32**, 461–479. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-020-09342-8
28. Tarro L, Llauradó E, Ulldemolins G, Hermoso P, Solà R. (2020) Effectiveness of Workplace Interventions for Improving Absenteeism, Productivity, and Work Ability of Employees: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*; 17(6):1901. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17061901

29. Tolbert Nyenswah, Cyrus Y. Engineer & David H. Peters (2016) Leadership in Times of Crisis: The Example of Ebola Virus Disease in Liberia, Health Systems & Reform, 2:3, 194-207, DOI: 10.1080/23288604.2016.1222793
30. Tortia, E.C.; Sacchetti, S.; López-Arceiz, F.J. A (2022) Human Growth Perspective on Sustainable HRM Practices, Worker Well-Being and Organizational Performance. Sustainability, 14, 11064. https://doi.org/10.3390/ su141711064
31. van Woerkom, M., Bakker, A. B., & Nishii, L. H. (2016). Accumulative job demands and support for strength use: Fine-tuning the job demands-resources model using conservation of resources theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 101*(1), 141–150. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000033
32. Wright, T. A., & Cropanzano, R. (2000). Psychological well-being and job satisfaction as predictors of job performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*(1), 84–94. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.5.1.84
33. Yáñez-Araque, B.; Gómez-Cantarino, S.; Gutiérrez-Broncano, S.; López-Ruiz, V.-R. (2021). Examining the Determinants of Healthcare Workers' Performance: A Configurational Analysis during COVID-19 Times. Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health, 18, 5671. https:// doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18115671
34. Zhong-Xing Su & Patrick M. Wright (2012) The effective human resource management system in transitional China: a hybrid of commitment and control practices, The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 23:10, 2065-2086, DOI: 10.1080/09585192.2011.610335
35. Zhou, X.; Rasool, S.F.; Yang, J.; Asghar, M.Z. (2021)Exploring the Relationship between Despotic Leadership and Job Satisfaction: The Role of Self Efficacy and Leader–Member Exchange. Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health, 18, 5307. https://doi.org/10.3390/ ijerph18105307