



Research in Management and Humanities

DWIJM VOL. 3 NO. 4 (2024) ISSN: 2980-4817

Available online at www.dwijmh.org Journal
homepage: <http://www.dwijmh.org>
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6884-3504>

Investigating the impact of employee treatment on commitment and citizenship behavior of employees: Sorting the effect of workers' rights, respect in the workplace and workplace relationship

Leilanie Jane T. Mateo: Instructor, School of Business and Accountancy, Divine Word College of Laoag.

Russel I. Menor: Instructor, School of Business and Accountancy, Divine Word College of Laoag.

Alvin Luciano A. Ubas: Instructor, Graduate School of Business and Management, Divine Word College of Laoag.

Damianus Abun: Professor, Graduate School of Business and Management, Divine Word College of Laoag.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: August 15, 2024

Received in rev. form. September 20, 2024

Accepted: October, 10, 2024

Published: December 22, 2024

Keywords: *Treatment, organizational commitment, citizenship behavior, worker's rights, workplace relationship*

ABSTRACT

The study aimed to examine how employee treatment influences organizational commitment and citizenship behavior. A literature review was conducted to provide a deeper understanding of these concepts. The study employed a descriptive assessment and correlational research design, utilizing the weighted mean and Pearson's r correlation to analyze the data. The sample included all employees of the institution, with data gathered through questionnaires. Findings revealed a moderate level of employee treatment, while organizational commitment and citizenship behavior were rated high. However, Pearson's r indicated no significant correlation between employee treatment and either organizational commitment or citizenship behavior, leading to a rejection of the hypothesis. The study suggests further research with a larger sample and additional variables to more comprehensively assess these outcomes.

© 2024 by the authors. Licensee DWIJMH. This open-access article is distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>)

JEL Classification: M15

Introduction

Employee behavior is significantly influenced by the organizational environment, a key dimension of which is organizational culture. Organizational culture can shape employee behavior in either positive or negative ways. Cooley

(2016) argued that an employee is not merely a "cog in a machine" but a unique individual who reacts to their surroundings. This assertion is supported by studies demonstrating that a positive organizational culture can enhance behaviors such as loyalty, efficiency, and organizational citizenship (Pallathadka, 2021; Praveena & Fonceca, 2023; Putri et al., 2021). Conversely, a negative organizational culture—characterized by a disconnect between employee and employer values, poor leadership support, and ineffective communication—can harm employee behavior (Fridan & Maamari, 2023). Therefore, effectively managing organizational culture is essential.

One important aspect of organizational culture is employee treatment, which encompasses how an organization respects employee rights and fosters positive relationships between employees and employers. Abun et al. (2021) highlighted that attention to workers' rights, respect, and caring relationships significantly enhances employee engagement. In modern management, addressing employee treatment is crucial, alongside nurturing employees' knowledge and skills. This emphasis on respectful treatment stems from the fundamental principle that employees are human beings, endowed with dignity and rights that merit respect (Subramani & Biller-Andorno, 2022; Schroeder et al., 2019). Treating employees with dignity can improve morale and positively influence work behavior. Abun et al. (2020) further noted that caring relationships in the workplace reduce turnover while boosting job satisfaction and performance.

Studies on how employee treatment impacts organizational commitment and citizenship behavior are limited, creating a gap this study seeks to fill. This research aims to help management recognize employee treatment as a critical factor in fostering organizational commitment and citizenship behavior, both of which are vital for enhancing organizational performance. Organizational commitment drives employees to fulfill their roles with motivation, aiding in the achievement of organizational goals (Imamoglu et al., 2019). Similarly, organizational citizenship behavior positively impacts employee performance (Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 2009).

This study is organized into several sections: introduction, literature review, research methodology, data presentation and analysis, results and discussion, and conclusion.

Literature review

The literature review examines existing research on employee treatment, focusing specifically on employee rights, workplace respect, workplace relationships, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior.

Employee treatment

In line with this paper's objectives, three key aspects of employee treatment will be discussed: employee treatment as defined by the Labor Code of the Philippines, respect in the workplace, and the development of caring relationships within the workplace.

The employee treatment in terms of workers' rights

The Cambridge Dictionary defines "treatment" as "the way you deal with or behave toward someone or something." Similarly, the Collins Dictionary describes treatment as "the manner of handling or dealing with a person or a thing." In relation to our investigation, treatment refers to how school management or administrators interact with employees (Unsal & Rayfield, 2019). In the Philippines, the government, through the Department of Labor and Employment, has set out laws in the Labor Code to guide management in treating employees fairly. This code outlines employees' rights, management prerogatives, and mechanisms for dialogue between labor and management, such as the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

Under the Labor Code of the Philippines, management prerogatives include hiring, firing, promotion or demotion, policy-setting, discipline, determining working hours, and structuring work (Labor Law PH, 2023). While management holds the authority to hire, promote, discipline, and structure work, these actions must not infringe on workers' rights (Labor Law PH, 2023). This balance of management prerogative and worker rights serves to ensure a fair distribution of power between labor and capital (Jimenez, n.d.). In cases of labor-management conflict, the CBA process allows representatives from both

sides to negotiate and reach agreements.

The Labor Code guarantees various employee rights, rooted in Article XIII of the 1987 Philippine Constitution on Human Rights and Social Justice (GOVPH, 1987). Among these rights are security of tenure, self-organization, collective bargaining, humane working conditions, participation in decision-making, and a fair share in production gains, as well as entitlements to a living wage, labor standards, and protections under a CBA (Jimenez, n.d.). Security of tenure, detailed in Article 294 of the Labor Code, ensures employees cannot be dismissed without just cause, and due process, such as an investigation, must precede any termination (Jimenez, 2002; Calayag, 2018).

Employees also have the right to self-organization, allowing them to join, assist, or form labor unions for mutual support and collective bargaining (Jimenez, n.d.), as established by Republic Act No. 875, Section 3 (Republic of the Philippines, 1953). Building on this right, collective bargaining empowers employees to negotiate better employment conditions (Jimenez, n.d.; Jimenez, 2002).

Further, the Labor Code upholds employees' right to humane working conditions, including equal pay for equal work, minimum wage standards, regulated working hours, holiday pay, overtime, night differentials, and various employee benefits. These protections aim to prevent exploitation (Jimenez, 2002; Busto, 2013). Additionally, employees have the right to strike under legitimate labor organizations, strengthening their bargaining power, as well as the right to participate in decision-making on matters impacting their rights and welfare (Jimenez, n.d.; Busto, 2013). The law also mandates that wages reflect regional living standards to ensure a fair income.

The remaining rights pertain to fair participation in productivity gains and equal employment opportunities. Workers are entitled to share in the increased productivity resulting from their efforts (Jimenez, 2002). The 1972 Constitution also mandates full employment and equal opportunity, embedded in the Labor Code, prohibiting discrimination (Jimenez, n.d.; Busto, 2013).

Implementing these rights, as outlined in the Labor Code, forms the legal and ethical basis for fair treatment of employees. Adherence to these standards reflects management's commitment to equitable treatment, which matters deeply to employees. Fair treatment impacts not only their economic well-being but also their psychological health (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Hassan, 2012). Research has shown that fair treatment fosters trust in management, job satisfaction, work engagement, intrinsic motivation, and retention (Choi, 2011; Kim & Rubyanti, 2011; Rubin, 2011, as cited in Hassan, 2012).

Treatment along with respect in the workplace

Parents teach their children to respect all people and even to extend respect to living and non-living things, such as the environment (Taylor & Jamieson, 2011). They also learn to respect animals, recognizing that they experience pleasure and pain (Singer, 1974, as cited by Cochrane, n.d.). This respect extends to all sentient beings because of their capacity to feel pain (Read & Birch, 2023; Whyly, 2017; Candiotta, 2024). They are valued and protected not only for what they can offer humans but because of their inherent worth (Regan, 1983). As Regan (1983, as cited by Cochrane, n.d.) argues, all beings who are "subjects-of-a-life" possess intrinsic value, having worth in themselves regardless of their usefulness to humans. This inherent value demands respect not only for human beings but for all beings.

Respect for others, according to Immanuel Kant, is a categorical imperative (Hodson, 1983). It is a moral law that all individuals are obligated to follow, and disregarding it is considered immoral (Ross, 2009). This imperative applies universally; respecting others is not merely out of compliance but because of the shared humanity (Aylsworth & Castro, 2024). The humanity principle emphasizes qualities unique to humans, like self-directed rational behavior and the pursuit of personal goals (Johnson, 2016). This principle requires that we treat others as ends in themselves, not as means to our ends (Hodson, 1983), and cautions against instrumentalizing others solely for personal gain (Johnson, 2016). Humans, therefore, are not objects but dignified beings who deserve respect (Malpas & Lickiss, 2007). Kant underscores that respect is owed to all persons, as they are free, rational beings with inherent dignity, making them worthy of respect (Dillon, 2018).

The Catholic Church also considers human dignity foundational to its social teachings (Gormally, 2004). It asserts that each person has inherent dignity as they are made in God's image. This dignity transcends race, gender, age, religion, color, or ability and is rooted in the belief that all people are created by God, endowing everyone with equal dignity (Gotoh & Richardson, 2004; Hasegawa, 2024; Bayertz, 1996). Therefore, no aspect of human dignity should be compromised (Caritas Australia, n.d.). The Church advocates for social action that promotes human dignity through programs supporting integral human development (Development and Peace, 2000), reinforcing that respect for human dignity is a moral duty. The Church's respect stems not from personal desire but from its ethical obligation to honor the dignity of all as created beings. Respect is thus a categorical imperative—an unconditional requirement to act not out of preference but because it must be done (Schönecker & Schmidt, 2017).

The significance of respect, particularly within Catholic educational institutions, is critical in workplace studies, especially regarding its impact on job satisfaction. Ederly (2017), Gurchiek (2016), and Ghaffari and Burgoyne (2017) examine the role of organizational respect in human services, finding that respectful treatment significantly boosts employee satisfaction. Their research underscores that respect across all levels of an organization is a key factor in job satisfaction. Furthering these insights, Boafu (2018) found that verbal abuse and perceived respect directly impact workplace satisfaction. However, respect is not always equally distributed. Brooks (2018) highlights disparities in respect for able-bodied and disabled individuals, showing that limited respect for disabled workers adversely affects their job satisfaction. This study advocates for disability awareness training as a policy measure to foster an environment of respect for all employees, enhancing disabled workers' workplace experience (Brooks, 2018).

Treatment concerning caring relationships in the workplace

The philosophical and moral foundation of caring relationships in the workplace is the ethics of care which was originally developed by Noddings (1984). The ethics of care is an ethical theory which argues that moral actions should be based on the interpersonal relationship (Staudt, 2016). Actions and decisions must be based on caring (Linsley, 2016). Though originally the ethics of care was an approach to education, later on, ethics of care was also developed and applied to different fields of life, at home and in the workplace, that caring is the moral foundation of a relationship (Haddad, 2015). For Noddings (1984) caring relationship is a fundamental aspect of education or the moral foundation of teaching and the basis for student-teacher relations. The teacher is the carer and the student is cared for. The ethics of care which was used as the basis for student-teacher relationships were applied to all kinds of relationships including in the workplace (McAuliffe, 2023). The decision-making should be based on the ethics of care, and caring should be the basis for decision-making (Smith, 2020). Her position on the ethics of care is based on the fact of life that care is basic for human life because all human beings want to be cared for (Noddings, 2002, cited by Smith, 2020). In caring, there is sympathy. Burton (2015) defined sympathy as a feeling of care and concern for someone, often someone close, accompanied by a wish to see him/her better off or happier. In this case, the carer is deeply involved in the situation of the cared-for and joins the feeling of the cared-for to get out of her troubled situation (Noddings, 2017). To feel what the cared-for is feeling, the carer must be receptive or open to what the cared-for is revealing or saying. Through listening, the carer can react in a way that is helpful for the cared for and only then, the cared-for feel that he/she is cared for by the carer (Smith, 2020).

Concerning workplace relationships, the manager is the carer and the cared for is the employees. Using the concept of Noddings (1984, 2002) the basis for action and decision-making of the carer must be caring for the cared-for or the employees. The management must show compassion and concern for the well-being of employees, feel what the employees feel and respond to the needs of the employees (Simpson, et al., 2013). Through caring, the management shows empathy with the employees and responds in a way that can help the employees become better off (van Dijke, et al., 2023). The study of Eldor and Shoshani (2016) on the caring relationship between school staff and teachers' work engagement found that compassion expressed by colleagues and the principals on the teacher is correlated positively to organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Houston (2020) as cited from Moynihan, and Pandey (2008) and Hodson, (2004) argued that positive interaction in the workplace can improve job satisfaction and prevent turnover. When the employees feel support from the leader or the management, the employees prefer to be loyal to the company. This was also found in the study of Tran, et al (2018) that high-quality workplace relationships improve the job performance of employees and commitment and lower job stress. Earlier, Barsade and O'Neill (2014) conducted a study to find out if an employee who is loved performs better. Their

study found that indeed an employee who is loved performed better. It is along with these findings, Rosanne (2014) argued that it is all about caring relationships. She pointed out that relationship-based care is a successful model for success in any organization. Caring indicates that management is kind-hearted, shows compassion toward partners or employees and is generous in the sense that the leader or management gives time, energy, and effort to reach out to the employees or work team (Brenner, 2017). Mental Health Foundation (2016) pointed out several benefits of caring relationships in the workplace such as job satisfaction, low turnover, and improved positive and productive workplace. Such an environment can have an impact on the mental health of employees and therefore reduce absenteeism. It is suggested that management and co-employees should be able to look out for their employees or colleagues if they are doing well or not and intervene in how to help the employees or colleagues (Boden-Stuart & Larkin, 2023).

Organizational commitment

The concept of commitment, including organizational commitment, varies across researchers. Even dictionaries offer differing definitions. For example, the Cambridge Dictionary (n.d.) defines commitment as the "willingness to give your time and energy to a job, activity, or something that you believe in." Dictionary.com, which draws from Oxford Languages, describes it as "the state or quality of being dedicated to a cause, activity, or an engagement or obligation that restricts freedom of action." While these definitions highlight dedication of time and energy to a cause or belief, they do not encompass the psychological dimensions essential to commitment. The Britannica Dictionary similarly defines commitment as "a promise to do or give something or a promise to be loyal to someone or something," also lacking a psychological perspective.

Definitions incorporating psychological elements come from various scholars. Leonard (2009) describes commitment as "a state of mind that holds people and organizations in line with behavior," adding that commitment is not just about investing time and energy but also involves a psychological contract with the institution. According to Leonard, employees contribute their time and energy due to an emotional connection with the organization, which involves psychological forces binding them to action. Ajayi and Muraina (2016) further emphasize this psychological connection, defining commitment as "the extent to which an individual identifies with the organization in which they work." Ceylan (2020) adds that commitment involves "allocating time and interest by taking responsibility for one's wishes and beliefs toward a person, organization, or work." These definitions underscore three core characteristics of commitment: emotional attachment, self-identification with the organization, and dedicating time and interest to it.

Meyer and Allen's (1991) definition capture the emotional aspect of commitment by describing it as "a psychological state that (a) characterizes the employee's relationship with the organization, and (b) has implications for the decision to continue or discontinue membership in the organization." This concept aligns with Porters, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian's (1974) definition of organizational commitment as "the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization" (p. 604). Together, these definitions reflect a consensus among scholars to view organizational commitment through a psychological lens. Similarly, Idris and Manganaro (2017) describe organizational commitment as "the extent to which individuals psychologically identify with their work organization." Porter and Lawer (1965), as cited by Herrera and Heras-Rosas (2021), saw organizational commitment as the desire of employees to exert high effort for the institution's benefit, showing loyalty and dedication to its goals. This idea is also reflected in Greenberg and Baron's (2008) perspective, which frames commitment as the degree to which employees identify with and remain dedicated to their organization.

In summary, organizational commitment involves a psychological contract between the individual and the organization. Rousseau (1995) argues that this psychological contract encompasses individual beliefs about reciprocal obligations and benefits in an exchange relationship. This relationship has two dimensions: the relational contract and the transactional contract (MacNeil, 1985). In a relational contract, emotional exchanges and loyalty arise from expectations, such as the possibility of promotion or permanent status. Employees form psychological contracts because they anticipate rewards in exchange for their loyalty. By contrast, the transactional contract is driven by economic exchanges (Rousseau, 1995), where employees remain with the organization if their salary and benefits align with expectations.

Research highlights the effect of organizational commitment on individual behaviors. Studies by Fischer and Mansell (2009), Mathieu and Zajac (1990), Meyer et al. (2002), and Solinger et al. (2008) all found that organizational commitment strongly correlates with occupational commitment, job satisfaction, and job involvement. Employees with high organizational commitment tend to have lower turnover and absenteeism rates and exhibit greater organizational citizenship behaviors and well-being (Angle & Perry, 1981; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer et al., 2002; Solinger et al., 2008).

Organizational commitment dimensions

Scholars generally agree that organizational commitment is not a single or unidimensional concept but rather a multidimensional construct. It encompasses various dimensions, including attitudinal, behavioral, and motivational aspects. Morrow (1993) highlights two key dimensions of organizational commitment: attitude and behavior. Miller (2003) defines attitude as an evaluative judgment, either positive or negative, toward an object, while Morrow (1993) notes that it reflects attachment, identification, and loyalty to the organization as the focus of commitment. This view aligns with Meyer, Allen, and Gellatly (1990), who describe attitude as a positive cognitive and affective evaluation of the organization. Ajzen (1993) argues that attitude is ultimately reflected in behavior, suggesting that what a person feels will manifest through their actions. Best (1994) also points out that commitment is evident in individuals who perform their tasks with dedication. Reicher (1985) adds that organizational commitment is demonstrated when members show loyalty to their group within the organization, forming a psychological bond with each other. This psychological bond is further described by O'Reilly (1989) as organizational commitment, seen in job involvement, loyalty, and belief in the organization's values. Such commitment is often expressed by employees' acceptance of organizational goals and their willingness to exert effort on its behalf (Miller & Lee, 2001).

From this foundational understanding, scholars have proposed multiple dimensions of organizational commitment, although there is often overlap among these dimensions. Meyer and Allen (1997) propose three primary dimensions: affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Affective commitment is characterized by an employee's emotional attachment to the organization, developed when their personal values align with the organization's mission (Lowry, 1973). According to Johnson and Chang (2006), employees with high affective commitment are more likely to exert additional effort for the organization's benefit. Research by Becker et al. (1996) and Meyer et al. (2004) shows that affective commitment enhances intrinsic motivation and strengthens an individual's desire to remain loyal to their organization.

The second dimension, continuance commitment, arises when an employee evaluates the costs and benefits of leaving the organization. Employees remain with the organization because they perceive staying as more advantageous than leaving, often driven by a cost-benefit analysis, such as the potential loss of personal investment or limited employment opportunities elsewhere (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1984). This form of commitment is influenced by the benefits provided by the organization, as originally described by Becker (1960).

The third dimension, normative commitment, reflects a sense of moral and legal obligation to remain with the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Muhammad, Afridi, Ali, Shah, and Alasan (2021) note that when employees believe it is morally and legally right to stay, they are more likely to do so out of a sense of duty.

Other scholars, such as O'Reilly and Chatman (1986), identify three dimensions of commitment—compliance, identification, and internalization—that overlap with Meyer and Allen's (1997) model. Identification and internalization align with affective commitment, focusing on emotional attachment and a sense of belonging within the organization. Compliance, on the other hand, corresponds to continuance commitment, where employees stay due to the benefits or rewards they receive from the organization. Balfour and Wechsler (1996) also present a three-dimensional model, identifying identification, affiliation, and exchange as key elements. Identification and affiliation reflect affective commitment, involving pride in and attachment to the organization and coworkers, while exchange mirrors continuance commitment, where employees remain due to the recognition and benefits provided by the organization.

Ultimately, the three dimensions outlined by Meyer and Allen (1997) encompass the core elements of organizational

commitment discussed by these scholars. Therefore, this paper adopts Meyer and Allen's (1997) model—*affective, continuance, and normative commitment*—as the basis for examining organizational commitment.

Organizational citizenship behavior

The concept of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) has its roots in political philosophy, with the term "citizenship" derived from this field and related disciplines (Graham, 1991). According to Graham (1991), Cary (1977), and Inkeles (1969), citizenship in political philosophy involves three key categories: obedience, loyalty, and political participation (Aristotle, 1941). Consequently, citizenship behavior and citizenship responsibilities are synonymous (Graham, 1991). Obedience requires citizens to respect organizational structures and processes, while loyalty extends beyond mere compliance to encompass a broader responsibility to the organization, including protecting its reputation and collaborating with others for collective interests. Participation, according to Aristotle, involves engagement in governance, where a good citizen not only follows the law but actively participates in shaping and changing it to meet new demands. As a result, citizenship behavior encompasses activities like dedicating time and effort to governance responsibilities, sharing ideas, and discussing social issues (Graham, 1991). These concepts are adapted to the organizational setting by Inkeles (1969), who identifies three organizational citizenship behaviors: organizational obedience, organizational loyalty, and organizational participation. Organizational obedience involves following structures, job descriptions, and policies, while organizational loyalty refers to aligning oneself with the organization and its leaders, beyond personal or departmental interests. Organizational participation requires engaging in organizational governance, attending meetings, sharing ideas, and supporting views that challenge groupthink (Inkeles, 1969).

Building on the political philosophy concept of citizenship, researchers have sought to define organizational citizenship behavior. Early definitions, such as those by Bateman & Organ (1983) and Smith, Organ, & Near (1983), capture the idea of behaviors that go beyond role requirements for the benefit of the organization, aligning with the concepts of obedience, loyalty, and participation. A good organizational citizen not only adheres to rules but also contributes extra effort for the organization's well-being and participates in discussions on organizational issues. Katz (1964), as cited by Smith et al. (1983), identified three essential behaviors for organizational functioning: entering and remaining in the system, performing role requirements reliably, and engaging in spontaneous, innovative actions beyond job descriptions. Katz argued that organizations also depend on cooperation, helpfulness, goodwill gestures, and altruism, which maintain internal equilibrium (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1964, as cited by Smith et al., 1983).

Since the introduction of organizational citizenship behavior, researchers have made significant efforts to identify common dimensions. More recent studies emphasize loyalty and participation, rather than obedience, as central to measuring OCB (Inkeles, 1969; Graham, 1991). As Organ and Ryan (1995) noted, OCB refers to positive work behaviors that exceed mere compliance with rules and regulations. Early efforts to define OCB were made by Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) and Bateman and Organ (1983), who identified two dimensions: altruism and general compliance. Organ (1988) and Wang et al. (2013), as cited by Abun et al. (2021), expanded on this by identifying five dimensions of OCB: conscientiousness, sportsmanship, civic virtue, courtesy, and altruism. Sportsmanship refers to maintaining a positive attitude despite challenges (Wang et al., 2013, cited by Abun et al., 2021). Conscientiousness involves caring for others (Psychologist World, n.d., cited by Abun et al., 2021), while civic virtue denotes participation in organizational activities and discussions for the organization's benefit (Organ, 1988; Abun et al., 2021). Courtesy involves being polite and considerate toward others (Organ, 1988), and altruism refers to helping others and prioritizing their needs over personal gain (Organ, 1988). Podsakoff et al. (2000) identified seven dimensions, which expand on Organ's (1988) dimensions: helping behaviors, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue, and self-development.

The numerous dimensions of OCB identified by researchers such as Inkeles (1969), Smith, Organ, and Near (1983), Bateman and Organ (1983), Organ (1988), and Podsakoff et al. (2000) are ultimately summarized into a single dimension—*altruistic behavior*—by Spector and Fox (2002). Altruistic behaviors are not limited to helping others but also encompass actions that benefit the organization, including those identified by Organ (1988) and Podsakoff et al. (2000).

Statement of the problems

The study explored the relationship between employee treatment, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior. Specifically, it addressed the following questions:

1. **What is the employee treatment in terms of:**
 - a. **Workers' rights**
 - b. **Respect in the workplace**
 - c. **Workplace relationship**

2. **What is the organizational commitment of employees in terms of:**
 - a. **Affective commitment**
 - b. **Continuance commitment**
 - c. **Normative commitment**

3. **What is the organizational citizenship behavior of the employees in terms of:**
 - a. **OCBP**
 - b. **OCBO**

4. **Is there a relationship between employee treatment and organizational commitment?**

5. **Is there a relationship between employee treatment and organizational citizenship behavior?**

Hypothesis

Employee behavior is influenced by various factors, one of which is organizational culture. Pallathadka (2020) highlighted that organizational culture plays a significant role in shaping employees' behavior. One key dimension of organizational culture is employee treatment, and Abun et al. (2023) confirmed a strong correlation between employee treatment and work engagement. Building on these findings, the current study hypothesizes that employee treatment is also correlated with both organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

Scope and delimitation of the study

The study focuses on employee treatment, specifically examining three key dimensions: workers' rights, respect in the workplace, and workplace relationships. It also explores organizational commitment, including its three components— affective, continuance, and normative commitment—and organizational citizenship behavior. The research is confined to the population of Divine Word College of Laoag.

Research methodology

This study employs a quantitative approach, utilizing a descriptive assessment and correlational research design. The research is conducted within the institutions where the researcher is employed, with the target population consisting of their employees. Data is collected through questionnaires, and both descriptive and inferential statistics are used for analysis, specifically the weighted mean and Pearson r. To facilitate data gathering, the researcher obtained approval from the President via a formal letter to distribute the questionnaires, and data collection was carried out through employee representatives. An ethical review was considered, but given that the study does not involve sensitive human issues, the review was waived.

The following ranges of values with their descriptive interpretation were used:

<i>Statistical Range</i>	<i>Descriptive Interpretation</i>
4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree/Very High

3.41-4.20	Agree/High
2.61-3.40	Somewhat Agree/Moderate
1.81-2.60	Disagree/Low
1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree/Very Low

Data presentation and analysis

The data are presented following the study's objectives, collected through research questionnaires and analyzed using statistical methods.

Problem 1: What is the employee treatment in terms of:

- a. workers' rights
- b. Respect in the workplace
- c. Workplace relationship

Table 1: Workers' right

Level of Employee treatment in terms of workers' right

Indicators	Mean	DR
Security of tenure is followed	3.59	A
Employees feel secure when they are already employed	3.34	SWA
The offices are comfortable enough to work	3.58	A
Employees are allowed to participate in decision-making through their representatives	3.22	SWA
Management listens to the ideas of employees through their representatives	3.06	SWA
Salary is given according to rank and job grade	3.37	SWA
Salaries are beyond the minimum wage	3.32	SWA
Employees' problems are solved through due process	3.14	SWA
The employees' freedom of expression is protected	3.17	SWA
The employees are allowed to organize themselves	3.40	SWA
Composite Mean	3.32	SWA

Source: Abun, et.al, (2020, 2017).

Legend:

Statistical Range	Descriptive Interpretation
4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree/Very High
3.41-4.20	Agree/High
2.61-3.40	Somewhat Agree/Moderate
1.81-2.60	Disagree/Low
1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree/Very Low

Based on the data presented in the table, workers' rights received a mean rating of 3.32, which is categorized as "somewhat agree" or moderate. This rating indicates that management's attention to workers' rights is neither particularly high nor low, but rather moderate. When examining the individual indicators, it is evident that most of them fall within the same moderate mean rating level, including security, salary, decision-making participation, due process, freedom of expression, and the right to organize. Kong and Belkin (2021) noted that when employees feel neglected, it signals a violation of the ethics of care by the employer, which diminishes employees' perception of the meaningfulness of their work and, in turn, reduces organizational citizenship behavior.

Table 2: Respect in the workplace

Level of Employee treatment in terms of respect in the workplace

Indicators	Mean	DR
I feel valued in my institution	3.51	A
All employees have equal access to professional development and training opportunities.	3.11	SWA

The management treats employees with respect.	3.39	SWA
The behavior of the management toward the employees is appropriate and does not make fun of employees	3.40	SWA
The management typically welcomes ideas from employees who have different views, opinions, and experiences from theirs	3.27	SWA
The management can work with employees coming from different backgrounds.	3.41	A
The management can openly discuss any concerns with the employees	3.24	SWA
Our employees are promoted based on their skills, abilities, and experience, regardless of gender, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or other unique characteristics	3.45	A
The management would forgive an honest mistake of employees	3.52	A
Overall, our institution is a respectful place to work	3.60	A
Composite Mean	3.39	SWA

Source: Abun, et.al, (2020, 2017).

As indicated by the data in the table, respect in the workplace received a mean rating of 3.39, which falls under the category of "somewhat agree" or moderate. This rating suggests that respect for employees in the workplace is neither very high nor very low, but rather moderate. However, when examining the individual items, some indicators were rated highly, such as feeling valued, cooperation, promotion based on merit, and forgiveness for honest mistakes. Other items received moderate ratings, including equal opportunities for development, respectful treatment, management's inappropriate behavior toward employees, openness to employees' ideas, and discussing issues with employees. Kaushal (2021) argued that respect and recognition in the workplace are essential moral principles for maintaining well-being within an organization. This can be achieved through expressing gratitude for work done and acknowledging employees' contributions.

Table 3: Workplace relationship

Level of Employee treatment in terms of workplace relationship

Indicators	Mean	DR
The management offers help to employees when they are overworked or having some difficulties	3.33	SWA
The management looks after the welfare of the employees	3.36	SWA
The management is very considerate of employees and respects their abilities and willingness to learn	3.42	A
The management helps employees who have particular problems overcome	3.35	SWA
The management respects employees' limitations and tries to help when they ask	3.34	SWA
People feel understood and accepted by the management	3.39	SWA
Employees can openly discuss and share their ideas with the management	3.35	SWA
The employees can talk openly to the management about their difficulties because employees believe that the management will listen	3.17	SWA
Employees believe that if they share ideas and task-related problems, their management will listen and respond constructively	3.29	SWA
The management and employees trust each other as co-workers.	3.39	SWA
Composite Mean	3.34	SWA

Source: Abun, et.al, (2020, 2017).

Looking at the data in the table, it appears that workplace relationships, as a whole, received a mean rating of 3.34, which is interpreted as "somewhat agree" or moderate. This indicates that, overall, workplace relationships are neither very high nor very low, but rather moderate. Even when the items are examined individually, nearly all of them fall within the same level of mean rating, which is moderate, such as helping during difficult times, employees' welfare, elevating employees' morale, assisting employees with difficulties, understanding, listening to and respecting employees' ideas, and trust. Studies have

shown that positive workplace relationships are crucial for both individual well-being and organizational performance (Gerbasi et al., 2023; Costa, 2018). In contrast, destructive workplace relationships can undermine the work environment and hinder the achievement of organizational objectives.

Table 4 Summary table

Indicators	Mean	DR
1 Workers' right	3.32	SWA
2 Respect in the workplace	3.39	SWA
3 Workplace relationship	3.34	AWA
Overall Mean	3.35	SWA

The summary table indicates that, overall, employee treatment—covering workers' rights, respect in the workplace, and workplace relationships—received a mean rating of 3.35, which is considered moderate. This suggests that while employee treatment is not at the highest possible level, it reflects a generally positive approach by management. Research indicates that fostering positive treatment of employees can help prevent issues like emotional exhaustion, stress, and burnout (Anjum et al., 2020; Atamba et al., 2023).

Problem 2: What is the organizational commitment in terms of:

- a. *affective commitment*
- b. *continuance commitment*
- c. *normative commitment*

Table 5: Affective commitment

Level of Organizational commitment in terms of affective commitment

Indicators	Mean	DR
I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization	3.89	A
I feel as if this organization's problems are my own	3.75	A
I feel like 'part of my family at this organization	3.69	A
I feel 'emotionally attached to this organization	3.75	A
This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	3.89	A
I feel a strong sense of belonging to this organization	3.68	A
Composite Mean	3.78	A

Source: Meyer and Allen (1997).

The data in the table suggests that, overall, organizational commitment in terms of affective commitment received a weighted mean rating of 3.78, which is considered "agree" or "high." This indicates that employees' organizational commitment, along with affective commitment, is high, but not excessively so; it is neither very low nor moderate. When considering the individual items, all indicators fall within the same high rating. Employees express agreement that they would be happy to spend their lives with the institution, feel a sense of belonging, and view the institution as part of their family, which has given meaning to their lives. Affective commitment reflects the strength of employees' identification with and involvement in the institution (Porter et al., 1974). Strong identification and involvement suggest that employees have a deep belief in and acceptance of the institution (Mowday et al., 1982).

Table 6: Continuance commitment

Level of Organizational commitment in terms of continuance commitment

Indicators	Mean	DR
It would be very hard for me to leave my job at this organization right now even if I wanted to	3.65	A
Too much of my life would be disrupted if I left my organization	3.37	SWA
Right now, staying with my job at this organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire	3.57	A

I believe I have too few options to consider leaving this organization	3.51	A
One of the few negative consequences of leaving my job at this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives elsewhere.	3.39	SWA
One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice	3.55	A
Composite Mean	3.50	A

Source: Meyer and Allen (1997).

The data presented in the table reveals that, overall, organizational commitment, particularly in the area of continuance commitment, has received a weighted mean rating of 3.50, which falls within the "agree/high" range. This rating indicates that employees generally feel a strong commitment to stay with the organization, driven by the perception that leaving would result in significant disruptions and the limited availability of alternative job opportunities. According to San-Martin et al. (2020) and Wang et al. (2022), continuance commitment is shaped by employees' reluctance to leave an organization due to the perceived costs and losses associated with turnover.

Table 7: Normative commitment

Level of Organizational commitment in terms of normative commitment

Indicators	Mean	DR
I must remain with my organization.	3.58	A
Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave.	3.52	A
I would feel guilty if I left this organization now	3.65	A
This organization deserves my loyalty	3.72	A
I would not leave my organization right now because of my sense of obligation to it	3.74	A
I owe a great deal to this organization.	3.79	A
Composite Mean	3.67	A

Source: Meyer and Allen (1997).

As shown in the data presented in the table, the overall organizational commitment, particularly in terms of normative commitment, received a weighted mean rating of 3.67, which is classified as "agree/high." This indicates that, in general, the level of normative commitment among employees is high, neither very high nor low, but falls within the high range. When looking at the individual indicators, all items are consistently rated at a high level. Employees express a strong sense of moral obligation to remain with the institution, even in the presence of external opportunities, largely due to feelings of guilt. Battistelli et al. (2006) suggest that normative commitment often arises when employers provide significant support to their employees, fostering a sense of duty to stay. Meyer and Parfyonova (2010) further explain that this sense of indebtedness creates a moral obligation to remain with the organization.

Table 8: Summary table

Indicators	Mean	DR
1 Affective Commitment	3.78	A
2 Continuance Commitment	3.50	A
3 Normative Commitment	3.67	A
Overall Mean	3.65	A

Source: Meyer and Allen (1997).

The summary table illustrates the overall organizational commitment of the employees to the institution. The data shows that, on average, employees' organizational commitment received a mean rating of 3.65, which is considered high. Even when the individual dimensions are assessed separately, all are rated consistently within this high range. This is encouraging, as a high level of organizational commitment typically indicates organizational sustainability, with lower turnover intention (Benkarim & Imbeau, 2021).

- Problem 3: What is the organizational citizenship behavior in terms of:**
a. OCBP (Organizational Citizenship Behavior toward the Person)
b. OCBO(Organizational Citizenship Behavior toward the Organization)

Table 9: OCBP

Level of organizational citizenship behavior of employees in terms of OCBP

Indicators	Mean	DR
Lent a compassionate ear when someone has a work problem	3.66	A
Change vacation schedules, workdays, or shifts to accommodate co-workers' needs	3.63	A
Help a less capable co-worker lift a heavy box or other objects	3.65	A
Went out of the way to encourage co-workers or express appreciation	3.66	A
Defended co-worker who was being 'put down' or spoken ill by other co-workers or supervisors	3.60	A
Help co-workers with personal matters such as sharing food or drinks	3.67	A
Lent money or personal property to a co-worker	3.71	A
Lent a necessary help when a coworker had a work problem	3.65	A
Composite Mean	3.65	A

Source: Fox and Spector (2002).

As shown by the data in the table, the organizational citizenship behavior of employees, particularly in their interactions with coworkers, received a composite mean rating of 3.65, indicating a "somewhat agree/high" response. This suggests that while employees' organizational citizenship behavior toward their colleagues is not extremely high, it is still notably positive and above moderate. When examining individual indicators, all items align within this high range. In other words, employees express agreement that they are willing to care for and assist coworkers during personal challenges. Numerous studies underscore the significance of strong workplace relationships in fostering happiness and enhancing work engagement (Durrah, 2022; Gerbasi, et al., 2023).

Table 10: OCBO

Level of organizational citizenship behavior of employees in terms of OCBO

Indicators	Mean	DR
Help new employees get oriented to the job	3.76	A
Offered suggestions to improve how work is done	3.80	A
Volunteered for extra work assignments	3.70	A
Said good things about your employer in front of others	3.80	A
Said good things about your school in the community outside the school	3.76	A
Give up meals and other breaks to complete the work	3.71	A
Offered suggestions for improving the work environment	3.80	A
Composite Mean	3.76	A

Source: Fox and Spector (2002).

The data in the table reveals that, overall, the organizational citizenship behavior of employees toward the institution received a composite mean rating of 3.76, which is interpreted as "agree or high." This indicates that, while employees' organizational citizenship behavior toward the institution is not extremely high, it is consistently positive and well above moderate. When analyzing individual indicators, all items fall within this high rating range. Employees agree that they assist coworkers in job orientation, volunteer for additional tasks, sacrifice personal time to complete assignments, and speak positively about the employer and the institution. Numerous studies highlight the positive impact of organizational citizenship behavior, emphasizing its role in promoting organizational effectiveness and overall performance (Zhang, et al., 2011; Hasani, et al., 2013; Lilly, 2016).

- Problem 4: Is there a relationship between employee treatment and organizational commitment?**

Table 11: Correlation between employee treatment and commitment
Relationship between employee treatment and organizational commitment

		Workers' Right	Respect in the Workplace	Workplace Relationship	Employee Treatment As a whole
Affective Commitment	Pearson's r	0.11	0.059	0.021	0.074
	df	159	159	159	159
	p-value	0.166	0.455	0.787	0.35
Continuance Commitment	Pearson's r	-0.004	-0.009	0.044	0.011
	df	159	159	159	159
	p-value	0.957	0.913	0.577	0.89
Normative Commitment	Pearson's r	0.002	0.002	0.039	0.016
	df	159	159	159	159
	p-value	0.975	0.984	0.623	0.843
Organizational Commitment As a whole	Pearson's r	0.043	0.021	0.043	0.041
	df	159	159	159	159
	p-value	0.587	0.79	0.589	0.607

The analysis of the relationship between employee treatment and organizational commitment, as shown in the Pearson r correlation table, reveals no significant correlation between the two variables. This finding suggests that the variance in the three dimensions of organizational commitment is not influenced by employee treatment, and other organizational factors not examined in this study may contribute to this outcome. Even when the dimensions are analyzed separately, the results remain unchanged. This finding aligns with the study conducted by Abun, et al. (2024).

Problem 5: Is there a relationship between employee treatment and organizational citizenship behavior

Table 12: Correlation between employee treatment and OCBP and OCBO
Relationship between employee treatment and organizational citizenship behavior

		Workers' Right	Respect in the Workplace	Workplace Relationship	Employee Treatment As a whole
OCBP	Pearson's r	0.11	0.059	0.021	0.074
	df	159	159	159	159
	p-value	0.166	0.455	0.787	0.35
OCBO	Pearson's r	-0.004	-0.009	0.044	0.011
	df	159	159	159	159
	p-value	0.957	0.913	0.577	0.89
As a whole	Pearson's r	0.043	0.021	0.043	0.041
	df	159	159	159	159
	p-value	0.587	0.79	0.589	0.607

The data presented in the table reveals a striking absence of correlation between employee treatment and organizational citizenship behavior, even when the dimensions are analyzed separately. This suggests that the variance in both dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior is not influenced by employee treatment, indicating the presence of other underlying factors at play. These findings align with the work of Abun, et al. (2024), but stand in contrast to studies by Emilisa and Lunarindiah (2018) in Jakarta, Indonesia, and Moorman, et al. (1993) in West Virginia, which found significant relationships between the two variables. This discrepancy underscores the complexity of the factors affecting organizational behavior and calls for further exploration into the diverse influences shaping these dynamics.

Discussion

The discussion focuses on the findings related to employee treatment and its impact on organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Regarding employee treatment, the study reveals that the relationship between employees and employers, particularly in terms of workers' rights, respect in the workplace, and the treatment of employees, is moderate, which raises concerns. The results suggest that management has not consistently treated employees with the highest moral standards in respecting their rights. This lack of proper treatment can lead to various negative consequences, such as demotivation, stress, job burnout (Atamba, et al., 2023), emotional exhaustion (Anjum, et al., 2020), and psychological issues including post-traumatic stress disorder, depression, and cognitive fatigue (Amodu, et al., 2024). All these factors contribute to organizational underperformance.

In terms of organizational commitment, the study finds that employee commitment to the organization is high, indicating that employees care for and are emotionally attached to the institution. They are motivated to remain with the institution for both economic and moral reasons. High organizational commitment is beneficial for the organization, as it is linked to increased job satisfaction (Bancoro, 2023), reduced turnover rates (Scales & Brown, 2020), a strong desire to achieve institutional goals, and enhanced motivation, belongingness, and attachment (Fantahun, et al., 2023). Therefore, management should focus on strategies to further enhance organizational commitment.

As for organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), the findings suggest that employees demonstrate a high level of OCB. They willingly sacrifice their time and efforts for co-workers and the organization, going beyond their formal job responsibilities and without expecting compensation. These discretionary behaviors are not enforced by the institution and do not seek rewards (Lilly, 2016; Hazzi, 2018; Louis & Murphy, 2023). Previous studies have highlighted the positive impact of OCB on organizational performance (Notanubun, 2020), job satisfaction, and improved team effectiveness (Lilly, 2016; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997).

Regarding the correlation between employee treatment, organizational commitment, and OCB, the results suggest there is no direct correlation. Despite moderate treatment of employees in terms of their rights, respect, and relationships, employees continue to exhibit high organizational commitment and strong OCB. This implies that other factors or organizational practices within the institution are contributing to increased organizational commitment and OCB, beyond just the treatment employees receive. Therefore, management should identify these additional factors or practices that support organizational commitment and OCB.

The current study contributes to the ongoing discussion on the impact of employee treatment. While positive employee treatment is critical, its effect may depend on other organizational factors and the broader economic environment. In certain contexts, employee treatment alone may not necessarily lead to positive outcomes in organizational commitment or OCB, as shown in this study. However, in environments with economic pressures, such as high unemployment, employee treatment may have a stronger influence on organizational commitment (Devece, et al., 2016). Furthermore, studies by Emilisa and Lunarindiah (2018) in Jakarta and Moorman, et al. (1993) in West Virginia highlight that employee treatment can lead to positive OCB.

Conclusion

The study aimed to examine the impact of employee treatment on organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. The findings indicate that while employee treatment is moderate, both organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior are high. However, the Pearson *r* correlation results reveal no significant relationship between employee treatment and either organizational commitment or organizational citizenship behavior. This suggests that the variance in these two factors is not influenced by employee treatment, leading to the rejection of the study's hypothesis.

The study acknowledges its limitations, including its focus on a small sample of employees from Divine Word College of

Laoag and the use of limited predictor variables. Future research should expand the sample size and include a broader range of predictors to gain more comprehensive insights. A larger population could yield different results and provide a more robust understanding of the dynamics between employee treatment and organizational outcomes.

Authors' contributions: L.J.T.M., R.I.M., A.L.A.U., D.A. **The conceptualization:** L.J.T.M., R.I.M., A.L.A.U., D.A. **Research methodology:** L.J.T.M., R.I.M., A.L.A.U., D.A. **Analysis of data:** L.J.T.M., R.I.M., A.L.A.U., D.A.

Conflict of interest statement: All authors declare no conflict of interest.

Ethical review statement: the research is submitted to the ethical review board and approved for the conduct of the study. It does not involve human-sensitive issues.

Funding: the study is funded by the authors.

References

- Abun, D., Ranay, F.B., Magallanes, T., Encarnacion, M.J. & Alkalde, F. (2020). Employee treatment and work engagement: The Philippines context. *Proteus Journal*, 11(10).
- Abun, D., Ubasa, A.L.A., Magallanes, T., Encarnacion, M.J. & Ranay, F.B. (2021). Attitude toward the work and its influence on the Individual work performance of employees: Basis for Attitude Management. *Technium Social Science Journal*, 18, 378-394.
- Abun, D., Ranay, F. B., Reyes, J.B. & Menor, R. I. (2023). The effect of treatment of employees on the level of work engagement: School Context (March 10, 2023). *Divine Word International Journal of Management and Humanities* 2(1), 148-165. <https://doi.org/10.62025/dwijmh.v2i1.17>
- Ajzen, I. (1993). Attitude theory and the attitude-behavior relation. In D. Krebs, & P. Schidt (Eds.). *New Directions in Attitude Measurement* (pp. 41-57). Walter de Gruyter
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x>
- Amoadu, M., Ansah, E.W. & Sarfo, J.O. (2024). Preventing workplace mistreatment and improving workers' mental health: a scoping review of the impact of psychosocial safety climate. *BMC Psychology*, 12, 195. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-01675-z>
- Angle, H. L., & Perry, J. L. (1981). An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392596>
- Anjum, M.A., Liang, D., & Durrani, D.K. (2020). Workplace mistreatment and emotional exhaustion: The interaction effects of self-compassion. *Current Psychology*, 41, 1460–1471. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-00673-9>
- Aristotle. (1941). *Politics* (B. Jowett, Trans.). In R. McKeon (Ed.). *The Basic Works of Aristotle, 1114-1316*. Random House.
- Atamba, C., Mosonik, J. K., Stuckler, D., Sungu, L. J., Santoso, C. M. A., & Mohamed, H. H. (2023). Impact of workplace mistreatment on employees' health and well-being in Chinese Firms: A systematic review. *Sage Open*, 13(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244023121141>

- Aylsworth, T., & Castro, C. (2024). Respect for humanity. In: *Kantian ethics and the attention economy*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-45638-1_2
- Balfour, D. L., & Wechsler, B. (1996). Organizational commitment: Antecedents and outcomes in public organizations. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 19(3), 256–277. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3380574>
- Bancoro, J.C.M. (2023). The impact of organizational commitment on the job satisfaction of college teachers in the college of business administration of Negros Oriental State University. *East Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(4). <https://doi.org/10.55927/eajmr.v2i4.3715>
- Bafo, I.M. (2018). The effect of workplace respect and violence on nurses' job satisfaction in Ghana: A Cross- Sectional Survey. *Human Resource for Health*, 16(6). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12960-018-0269-9>
- Barsade, S. & O'Neill, O.A. (2014). Employees who feel loved perform better. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2014/01/employees-who-feel-love-perform-better>
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 587-595. <https://doi.org/10.2307/255908>
- Battistelli, A., Mariani, M., & Bellò, B. (2006). Normative commitment to the organization, support and self- competence. In: Minati, G., Pessa, E., Abram, M. (eds) *Systemics of emergence: research and development*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-28898-8_36
- Bayertz, K. (1996). Human dignity: Philosophical origin and scientific erosion of an idea. In: Bayertz, K. (eds) *Sanctity of life and human dignity*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-1590-9_5
- Becker, H.S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66, 32-42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/222820>
- Becker, T. E., Billings, R. S., Eveleth, D. M., & Gilbert, N. L. (1996). Foci and bases of employee commitment: implications for job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 464–482. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256788>
- Benkarim, A., & Imbeau, D. (2021). Organizational commitment and lean sustainability: Literature review and directions for future research. *Sustainability*, 13(6), 3357. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13063357>
- Best, P.W. (1994). Locus of control, personal commitment and commitment to the organisation. *Unpublished MCom thesis. University of South Africa, Pretoria*
- Boden-Stuart, Z. & Larkin, M. (2023). *Relationship and mental health*. Springer.
- Brenner, A. (2014). The ABCs of caring relationship. *Psychology Today*. Retrieved March 2, 2024 from <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/in-flux/201709/the-abcs-caring-relationship>
- Brooks, J.D. (2018). Just a little respect: Differences in job satisfaction among Individuals with and Without Disabilities. *Wiley Online Library*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12543>.
- Burton, n. (2015). Empathy versus sympathy. *Psychology Today*. Retrieved March 2, 2024 from <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/hide-and-peek/201505/empathy-vs-sympathy>
- Busto, A.V. (2013). *The Philippine Labor Code*. A.V.B. Printing Press.

- Candiotta, L. (2024). The problem of sentience. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 23(4). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11097-024-09994-7>
- Caritas Australia (n.d). *The dignity of the Human Person*. Retrieved February 11, 2024 from <https://www.caritas.org.au/learn/cst/dignity-of-the-human-person>.
- Cary, C. D. (1977). The goals of citizenship training in American and Soviet schools. *Studies in Comparative Communism*, 10(3), 281-297.
- Ceylan, C. (2020). Management by values in educational organizations: A case study of a technical university. *IGI Global: Publisher Timely Knowledge*. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-2562-3.ch005>.
- Choi, S. (2011). Organizational justice and employee work attitudes: The federal case. *American Review of Public Administration*, 41, 185-204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074010373>
- Calayag, K.A. (2018). House approves security of tenure bill. *Sun Star Philippines*. <https://www.sunstar.com.ph/article/416435>.
- Cambridge Dictionary (n.d). Age. In *Cambridge Dictionary*. Retrieved March 5, 2024, from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/>
- Choi, S. (2011). Organizational justice and employee work attitudes: The federal case. *American Review of Public Administration*, 41, 185-204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074010373>
- Cochrane, A. (n.d). Environmental ethics. *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved March 10, 2024 from <https://www.iep.utm.edu/envi-eth/>
- Cooley, S. (2016). *Human Relations Theory of Organizations*. In: Farazmand, A. (eds) *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_2998-1
- Costa, H. (2018). Workplace relationships. In: Shackelford, T., Weekes-Shackelford, V. (eds) *Encyclopedia of evolutionary psychological science*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-16999-6_2815-1
- Development and Peace (2000). *The Dignity of the Human Person*. Retrieved February 9, 2024 from https://www.devp.org/sites/www.devp.org/files/documents/materials/devpeace_cst_principles.pdf
- Dillon, R.S. (2018). Respect. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved February 10, 2024 from <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/respect/#KanAccResForPer>.
- Durrah, O. Do we need friendship in the workplace? The effect on innovative behavior and the mediating role of psychological safety. *Current Psychology*, 42, 28597–28610. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03949-4>
- Edery, R.A. (2017). The influence of organizational respect on job satisfaction in the human services: Findings from a New York state multi-site job satisfaction cross-sectional survey – A short commentary. *International Journal of Emergency Mental Health and Human Resilience*, 19(3), 1-2. <https://doi.org/10.4172/1522-4821.1000368>
- Eldor, L. & Shoshani, A. (2016). Caring relationship in school staff: Exploring the link between compassion and teacher work engagement. *Teacher and Teaching Education*, 59, 126-136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.06.001>
- Emilisa, N. & Lunarindiah, G. (2018). The effect of employee perceived reputation to organizational citizenship behavior:

A study of professional event organizer's employees. *Review of Integrative Business and Economic Research*, 7(2).

- Fantahun, B., Dellie, E., & Worku, N. (2023). Organizational commitment and associated factors among health professionals working in public hospitals of southwestern Oromia, Ethiopia. *BMC Health Services Research*, 23, 180. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-023-09167-3>
- Fischer, R., & Mansell, A. (2009). Commitment across cultures: A Meta-analytic approach. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 40 (8), 1339-1358. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27752450>. <https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2009.14>
- Fridan, A.A.A. and Maamari, B.E. (2023). Impact of organizational positive and negative culture on employee performance. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-05-2023-3778>
- Gerbası, A., Emery, C. & Parker, A. (2023). *Understanding workplace relationships*. Palgrave Macmillan
- Ghaffari, S. & Burgoyne, J. (2017). The influence of respect for employees on the relationship between participative leadership and job satisfaction: A case study at the technology university of Malaysia. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 11 (4), 17-28.
- Gormally, L. (2004). Pope John Paul II's teaching on human dignity and its implications for bioethics. In: Tollefsen, C. (eds) *John Paul II's contribution to Catholic bioethics*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-3130-4_2
- Gotoh, R., & Richardson, H. (2024). Introduction to dignity, freedom and justice. In: Gotoh, R. (eds) *Dignity, freedom and justice*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-0519-1_1
- GOVPH (1987). The 1987 Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines – Article XIII. *Official Gazette*. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph>
- Graham, J.W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4(4). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01385031>
- Greenberg, J. & Baron, R.A. (2008). *Behavior in Organizations*. Pearson, Hoboken, 269-274.
- Gurchiek, K. (2016). Survey: Respect at work boots job satisfaction. *SHRM*. Retrieved March 2, 2024, from <https://www.shrm.org>
- Haddad, A.M. (2015). Care ethics. In: ten Have, H. (eds) *Encyclopedia of global bioethics*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-05544-2_69-1
- Hasegawa, K. (2024). Human dignity as a global common good. In: Gotoh, R. (eds) *Dignity, freedom and justice*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-0519-1_5
- Hassan, S. (2012). Does fair treatment in the workplace matter? An assessment of organizational fairness and employee outcome in government. *The American Review of Public Administration*, XX (X), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074012447979>
- Hasani, K., Boroujerdi, S.S. & Sheikhesmaeili, S. (2013). The effect of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational commitment. *Global Business Perspectives*, 1, 452–470. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40196-013-0026-3>
- Hazzi, O.A. (2018). Organizational citizenship behavior: A holistic review. In: Farazmand, A. (eds) *Global encyclopedia of public administration, public policy, and governance*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_3677-1

- Herrera, J. & Heras-Rosas, C. (2021). The organizational commitment in the company and its relationship with the psychological contract. *Frontier in Psychology*, 11, 609211. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.609211>
- Hodson, J.D. (1983). The ethics of respect for persons. In: *The ethics of legal coercion. Philosophical studies series in philosophy*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-7257-5_1
- Hodson, R. (2004). Work-life and social fulfilment: Does social affiliation at work reflect a carrot or a stick? *Social Science Quarterly* 85(2), 221–239. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0038-4941.2004.08502001.x>
- Houston, E. (2020). The importance of positive relationships in the workplace. *Positive Psychology*. Retrieved March 2, 2024, from <https://positivepsychology.com/positive-relationships-workplace/>
- Idris, A. M., & Manganaro, M. (2017). Relationships between psychological capital, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in the Saudi Oil and Petrochemical Industries. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 27, 251–269. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2017.1279098>.
- Imamoglu, S.Z., Ince, H., Turkcan, H. & Atakay, B. (2019). The effect of organizational justice and organizational commitment on knowledge sharing and firm performance. *Procedia Computer Science*, 158, 899-906. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2019.09.129>
- Inkeles, A. (1969). Participant citizenship in six developing countries. *American Political Science Review*, 63(4), 1120-1141. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1955075>
- Jimenez, R.T. (2002). *Practical Guidelines in Employee Relations*. Ramon T. Jimenez Publishing.
- Jimenez, J.B. (n.d). *The Philippine Labor Relations Laws and Jurisprudence*. Ramon T. Jimenez Publishing.
- Johnson, R. (2016). Kant's Moral Philosophy. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved February 15, 2024 from <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-moral/#DutResForMorLaw>.
- Johnson, R.E. & Chang, C.H. (2006). "I" is to continuance as "We" is too affective: The relevance of the self- concepts for organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27, 549-570. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.364>
- Katz, D. (1969). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, 9, 131-133. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/bs.3830090206>
- Kaushal, N. (2021). Respect and recognition of the work as building blocks of the workplace: A work-psychological perspective. In: Dhiman, S.K. (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of workplace well-being*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-30025-8_85
- Kim, S.E. & Rubianty, D. (2011). Perceived fairness of performance appraisals in the federal government: Does it matter? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 31, 329-348. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X11428903>
- Kong, D.T., & Belkin, L.Y. (2021). You don't care for me, so what's the point for me to care for your business? Negative implications of felt neglect by the employer for employee work meaning and citizenship behaviors amid the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 181, 645–660. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04950-w>
- Labor Law PH. (2023). Management prerogative. *AMSLAW*. [https://amslaw.ph/philippine-laws/labor-law/labor-code-law-of-the-philippines\(1\)](https://amslaw.ph/philippine-laws/labor-law/labor-code-law-of-the-philippines(1))

- Leonard, A.C. (2009). Alignment with sound relationships and SLA support. *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology, Second Edition*. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-60566-026-4>.
- Lilly, J.D. (2016). Organizational citizenship behavior. In: Farazmand, A. (eds) *Global encyclopedia of public administration, public policy, and governance*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_125-1
- Lind, E.A. & Tyler, T.R. (1988). *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*. Plenum Press.
- Linsley, P.M. (2015). Application of an ethic of care to business. In: Sison, A. (eds) *Handbook of virtue ethics in business and management*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-6729-4_68-1
- Louis, K.S. & Murphy, J.F. (2023). *Administration, governance and leadership*. ScienceDirect. Lowry R. J. (1973). *AH Maslow: An Intellectual Portrait*. Brooks/Cole
- Macneil, I.R. (1985). Relational contract: What we do and do not know. *Wisconsin Law Review* 1, 483-52
- Malpas, J., & Lickiss, N. (2007). Human dignity and human being. In: Malpas, J., Lickiss, N. (eds) *Perspectives on human dignity: A conversation*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-6281-0_3
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedent's correlation, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 171-194. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.108.2.171>
- McAuliffe, D. (2023). An ethic of care: Contributions to social work practice. In: Hölscher, D., Hugman, R., McAuliffe, D. (eds) *Social work theory and ethics*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-1015-9_18
- Mental Health Foundation (2016). *Relationship in the 21st Century*. Mental Health Foundation.
- Meyer, J.P. & Parfyonova, N.M. (2010). Normative commitment in the workplace: A theoretical analysis and re-conceptualization. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20(4), 283-294. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.09.001>
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the 'side-bet theory' of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 372–378. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.69.3.372>
- Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J. & Gellatly, I.R. (1990). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: Evaluation of measures and analysis of concurrent and time-lagged relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 710–720. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.75.6.710>
- Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J. (1991). A Three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(91\)90011-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z)
- Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace. Theory, Research and Application*. Sage
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the agency: A Meta-Analysis of Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(1), 20-52. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842>
- Meyer, J. P., Becker, T. E., & Vandenberghe, C. (2004). Employee commitment and Motivation: A conceptual analysis and integrative model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 991–1007. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.6.991>

- Miller, K. (2003). Values, attitudes and job satisfaction. In Robbins, S.P., Odendaal A. & Roodt, G. (eds). *Organizational behavior: Global and Southern African perspectives*. Pearson Education South Africa
- Miller, D. & Lee, J. (2001). The people make the process: Commitment to employees, decision making and performance. *Journal of Management*, 27, 163–189. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063\(00\)00094-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(00)00094-5)
- Moorman, R., Niehoff, B.P. & Organ, D. (1993). Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behavior: Sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights*, 6(3), 209-225. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01419445>
- Morrow, P.C. (1993). *The Theory and Measurement of Work Commitment*. Jai.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages. The psychology of commitment, absenteeism and turnover*. Academic Press.
- Moynihan, D.P., & Pandey, S.K. (2008). The ties that bind: Social networks, person-organization value fit, and turnover intention. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(2), 205–227. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum013>
- Muhammad, S., Afridi, F. K., Ali, M. W., Shah, W. U., & Alasan, I. I. (2021). Effect of training on employee commitment: Mediating role of job satisfaction. *Pakistan Journal of Society, Education and Language (PJSEL)*, 7(1), 28-37.
- Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring, a feminine approach to ethics & moral education*. The University of California Press.
- Noddings, N. (2002). *Starting at Home: Caring and Social Policy*. The University of California Press
- Noddings, N. (2017). Care ethics and education. In: Aloni, N., Weintraub, L. (eds) *Beyond bystanders. Moral development and citizenship education*. SensePublishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6351-026-4_14
- Notanubun, Z. (2020). The effect of organizational citizenship behavior and leadership effectiveness on public sectors organizational performance: Study in the department of education, youth and sports in Maluku Province, Indonesia. *Public Organization Review*, 21, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-020-00475-4>
- O'Reilly, C. (1989). Corporations, culture and commitment. *California Management Review*, 31, 9–24.
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 492-499. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.492>
- Organ, D.W. (1988). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's constructed clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 85-97.
- Organ D. W. & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 4, 775-803. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01781.x>
- Pallathadka, H. (2020). Influence of organizational culture on employee behavior. *European Journal of Molecular & Clinical Medicine*, 7(10).
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26, 513–563. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600307>

- Podsakoff, P.M. & MacKenzie, S.B. (1997) Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestion for future research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 133-151. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_5
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(5), 603–09. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0037335>
- Praveena, A. & Fronceca, C.M. (2023). Organizational culture and its influence on employee behavior. *International Journal of Recent Scientific Research*, 14(4), 2945-2949. <https://doi.org/10.24327/ijrsr.2024.1404.0605>
- Porter, L. W., & Lawler, E. E. (1965). *Managerial attitudes and performance*. Homewood.
- Putri, N.E., Nimran, U., Raharjo, K. & Wilopo, W. (2021). The impact of organizational culture on employee engagement and organizational citizenship behavior. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 570
- Read, E. & Birch, J. (2023). Animal sentience and the capabilities approach to justice. *Biology and Philosophy*, 38(26). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10539-023-09914-0>
- Regan, T. 1983. *The case for animal rights*. University of California Press.
- Regan, T. (2004). *The Case for Animal Rights*, 2nd ed. The University of California Press
- Reicher, A.E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 465–476. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258128>
- Republic of the Philippines (1953). An act to promote industrial peace and for other purposes (Repealed by Presidential Decree, No 442). *The LAWPHIL Project: Arellano Law Foundation*. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra1953/ra_875_1953.html.
- Roethlisberger, F.J, & Dickson, W. J (1964). *Management and the worker*. Wiley Science Editions
- Rosanne, R. (2014). It's all about relationships. *Nursing Management*, 46(11), 6.
- Ross, A. (2009). What is the 'force' of moral law in Kant's practical philosophy? *Parallax*, 15 (2), 27 — 40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13534640902792994>
- Rousseau, D. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: understanding written and unwritten agreements*. Sage.
- Rubin, E.V. (2011). Exploring the links between procedural fairness and union membership in the federal government. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 31, 128-142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X11408571>
- San-Martín, S., Jiménez, N., & Rodríguez-Torrico, P. (2020). The determinants of teachers' continuance commitment to e-learning in higher education. *Education and Information Technology*, 25, 3205–3225. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-020-10117-3>
- Ashley N. Scales, H. Quincy Brown (2020). The effects of organizational commitment and harmonious passion on voluntary turnover among social workers: A mixed methods study. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 110,

104782. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.104782>.

Singer, P. (1974). All Animals are equal. *Philosophical Exchange*, 1(5), 243-257.

Schönecker, D., & Schmidt, E. (2017). Kant's ground thesis on dignity and value is the groundwork. *Journal of Value Inquiry*, 52, 81–95. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10790-017-9603-z>

Schroeder, D., Chatfield, K., Singh, M., Chennells, R., Herissone-Kelly, P. (2019). The four values frameworks are fairness, respect, care and honesty. In: *Equitable research partnerships*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-15745-6_3

Simpson, A.V., Clegg, S. & Pitsis, T. (2013). Normal compassion: A framework for compassionate decision making. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 119, 473–491. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1831-y>

Smith, M.K. (2020). *Nel Noddings, The ethics of care and education*. Retrieved March 2, 2024, from <https://infed.org/mobi/nel-noddings-the-ethics-of-care-and-education/>

Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653-663. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.68.4.653>

Solinger, O. N., van Olffen, W., & Roe, R. A. (2008). Beyond the three-component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1), 70-83

Staudt, M.S. (2016). Care ethics. *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved March 1, 2024, from <https://www.iep.utm.edu/care-eth/>

Subramani, S., & Biller-Andorno, N. (2022). Revisiting respect for persons: conceptual analysis and implications for clinical practice. *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy*, 25, 351–360. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11019-022-10079-y>

Taylor, P. & Jamieson, (2011). Respect for nature: A theory of environmental ethics. *Environmental Ethics*, 6(2), 149-160. <https://doi.org/10.5840/enviroethics19846239>

Tran, K.T, Nguyen, P.V., Dang, T.T.U., & Ton, T.N.B. (2018). The impact of high-quality workplace relationships on job performance: A perspective on staff nurses in Vietnam. *Behavioral Sciences*, 8(12), 109. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs8120109>

Unsal, O., & Rayfield, B. (2019). Corporate governance and employee treatment: evidence from takeover defences. *Journal of Economics and Finance*, 44, 361–391. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12197-019-09478-4>

Wang, X., Guo, Y. & Duan, J. (2022). When does commitment backfire: Linking employee continuance commitment to silence behavior. *European Review of Applied Psychology*, 72 (6), 100797. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erap.2022.100797>.

Wang, L., Hinrichs, K.T. & Prieto, L (2013). Five dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior: Comparing antecedents and levels of engagement in China and the US. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 30, 115-147.

Whyllly, S. (2017). Sentient beings. In: Sarao, K.T.S., Long, J.D. (eds) *Buddhism and Jainism. Encyclopedia of Indian religions*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-0852-2_351

Yuen, M.MY. (2020). Justice and human dignity in Catholic social teaching. In: *Solidarity and reciprocity with migrants in*

Zhang, Y., Liao, J. & Zhao, J. (2011). Research on the organizational citizenship behavior continuum and its consequences. *Frontier Business Research in China*, 5(3), 364-379. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11782-011-0135-2>

Publisher's Note: DWIJMH stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



© 2024 by the authors. Licensee DWIJMH. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>)

Divine Word International Journal of Management and Humanities. DWIJMH is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.