



Exploring the relationship between employee treatment, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior: The educational context

Mary Joy Encarnacion: Department Head, Divine Word College of Vigan, Philippines

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

Engr. Karen Mae M. Madigal: Instructor, School of Nursing, Engineering, Architecture, Information and Technology, Divine Word College of Laoag.

Engr. Klyde L. Root: Instructor, School of Nursing, Engineering, Architecture, Information and Technology, Divine Word College of Laoag.

Engr. Sheena Viel A. Ibon: Instructor, School of Nursing, Engineering, Architecture, Information and Technology, Divine Word College of Laoag.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: March 15, 2024

Received in rev. form. April 20, 2024

Accepted: May 01, 2024

Keywords: *employee treatment, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, normative, continuance, affective.*

ABSTRACT

The study sought to explore how employee treatment influences both organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. To delve deeper into this inquiry, extensive literature review was conducted. The study focused on the employees within the institution as its population. Employing a descriptive assessment along with correlational research design, questionnaires were administered to collect data. Subsequently, the collected data were analyzed using weighted mean and Pearson correlation coefficient (r).

Results indicated that the level of employee treatment within the institution is moderate, while organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior are observed to be high. However, the Pearson correlation coefficient suggests no significant correlations between employee treatment and both organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. Hence, the variance in organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior appears to be influenced by factors other than employee treatment. Consequently, the study recommends further exploration into additional organizational factors that may impact organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

© 2024 by the authors. Published by Divine Word International Journal of Management and Humanities under 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

Organizational culture significantly shapes employee behavior, whether positively or negatively (Cooley, 2016). Positive cultures foster loyalty, efficiency, and organizational citizenship behavior (Pallathadka, 2021; Praveena & Fonceca, 2023; Putri et al., 2021), while negative cultures, characterized by values mismatches and poor

support from leadership, have adverse effects (Fridan & Maamari, 2023). Effective management necessitates attention to employee treatment, a dimension of organizational culture impacting work engagement (Abun et al., 2021). Recognizing employees' dignity and rights is not only a moral obligation but also enhances morale and work behavior (Abun et al., 2020).

Despite its significance, studies on the impact of employee treatment on organizational commitment (OC) and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) are lacking. This study aims to bridge this gap, potentially informing management practices to enhance OC and OCB, critical for organizational performance (Imamoglu et al., 2019; Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 2009). The study comprises an introduction, literature review, research methodology, data analysis, results, discussion, and conclusion.

Literature review

In the literature review, this study examines existing literature on employee treatment, focusing on aspects such as employees' rights, workplace respect, relationships, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior.

Employee treatment

Under the topic of employee treatment, three key areas warrant discussion: adherence to the Labor Code of the Philippines, fostering respect in the workplace, and cultivating caring relationships among employees.

The Employee treatment under the labor code of the Philippines in terms of workers' rights

Treatment, as defined by both Cambridge and Collins Dictionaries, pertains to the conduct of school management or administrators towards employees. The Labor Code of the Philippines outlines guidelines for employee treatment, including workers' rights, management prerogatives, and mechanisms such as Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBAs) to address conflicts between labor and management (Jimenez, n.d). Workers' rights encompass security of tenure, self-organization, collective bargaining, just working conditions, participation in decision-making, fair compensation, and non-discrimination, as established by the 1987 Constitution (GOVPH, 1987). These legal standards shape employer-employee interactions and ensure fair treatment, which is crucial for employees' well-being, trust in management, job satisfaction, and engagement (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Hassan, 2012). Fair treatment fosters intrinsic motivation and retention, benefiting both employees and organizations (Choi, 2011; Kim & Rubyanti, 2011; Rubin, 2011 as cited in Hassan, 2012).

Respect in the workplace

Respecting others, whether human or non-human, stems from acknowledging their inherent value and capacity for suffering, as argued by Singer (1974) and Regan (1983). Kant's categorical imperative emphasizes respect as a moral law applicable to all human beings (Ross, 2009). This respect is rooted in our humanity, defined by our rationality and autonomy (Johnson, 2016), and is echoed in the Catholic Church's teachings on human dignity (Caritas Australia, n.d).

The importance of workplace respect is evident in studies linking it to employee job satisfaction. Edery (2017), Gurchiek (2016), Ghaffari and Burgoyne (2017), and Boafo (2018) found that respectful treatment significantly predicts job satisfaction. Additionally, Brooks (2018) highlighted the need for disability awareness training to address disparities in respect and job satisfaction among abled and disabled workers.

Caring relationships in the workplace

The workplace's philosophical and moral fabric is woven with the ethics of care, pioneered by Noddings (1984), emphasizing interpersonal relationships as the basis for moral actions (Staudt, 2016). Originally an educational approach, Noddings' ethics of care has expanded to encompass various life domains, including the workplace, where caring forms the moral bedrock of relationships (Smith, 2020). This ethos sees the caregiver, be it a teacher or a manager, attending to the needs of the cared-for, fostering empathy and sympathy (Burton, 2015). Listening becomes paramount, enabling caregivers to respond effectively (Smith, 2020).

In the workplace, managers, akin to caregivers, must embody this ethic, showing compassion and responsiveness towards employees (Smith, 2020). Research underscores the importance of such relationships, linking compassionate management to increased organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Eldor & Shoshani, 2016). Positive workplace interactions, driven by care, not only enhance job satisfaction but also deter turnover (Houston, 2020; Moynihan & Pandey, 2008; Hodson, 2004). Tran et al. (2018) highlights the role of quality workplace relationships in bolstering employee performance and commitment while reducing stress. Barsade and O'Neill's (2014) study further demonstrates that employees who feel loved perform better. Rosanne (2014) advocates for relationship-based care as a blueprint for organizational success, emphasizing the importance of management's kindness, compassion, and generosity (Brenner, 2017).

Caring relationships in the workplace yield manifold benefits, including heightened job satisfaction, reduced turnover, and a more positive and productive environment (Mental Health Foundation, 2016). Such environments also promote better mental health outcomes, mitigating absenteeism. Thus, proactive management and coworker support are essential in nurturing a workplace culture that prioritizes employee well-being and fosters growth and productivity.

Organizational commitment

Commitment, as defined by various dictionaries, denotes dedication or loyalty to a cause or activity (Cambridge Dictionary, n.d.; Dictionary.com). However, scholarly perspectives emphasize its psychological dimensions. Leonard (2009) characterizes commitment as a psychological contract with an organization, involving emotional attachment and self-identification. Ajayi and Muraina (2016) and Ceylan (2020) echo this sentiment, underscoring emotional attachment, self-identification, and investment of time and interest. Meyer and Allen (1991) and Porters et al. (1974) emphasize commitment's impact on the decision to continue or discontinue organizational membership. Similarly, scholars like Idris and Manganaro (2017) view organizational commitment as individuals' psychological identification with their workplace. This psychological perspective aligns with Porter and Lawer's (1965) notion of commitment as employees' desire to contribute to the organization's goals and values, echoed by Greenberg and Baron (2008).

Organizational commitment, therefore, refers to the psychological contract between individuals and their organizations. Rousseau (1995) defines this as individuals' beliefs about reciprocal obligations and benefits within the organizational relationship. This contract influences employee behavior through relational and transactional dimensions (MacNeil, 1985; Rousseau, 1995).

Research confirms the significant impact of organizational commitment on various aspects of employee behavior and well-being. Studies by Fischer and Mansell (2009), Mathieu and Zajac (1990), Meyer et al. (2002), and Solinger et al. (2008) consistently show that higher organizational commitment correlates with greater job satisfaction, lower turnover rates, reduced absenteeism, and increased organizational citizenship behavior

(Angle & Perry, 1981; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer et al., 2002; Solinger et al., 2008).

Dimensions of organizational commitment: Affective, continuance, and normative commitment.

Scholars view organizational commitment as a multidimensional construct encompassing attitudes, behaviors, and motivations. Morrow (1993) identified two dimensions: attitude, reflecting emotional attachment and loyalty to the organization, and behavior, manifested through task performance and group participation (Best, 1994; Reicher, 1985). O'Reilly (1989) described commitment as a psychological bond demonstrated by job involvement and acceptance of organizational goals.

Meyer and Allen (1997) proposed three dimensions: affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Affective commitment involves emotional attachment to the organization, leading to increased effort and loyalty (Johnson & Chang, 2006). Continuance commitment arises from a cost-benefit analysis favoring staying with the organization due to perceived personal investment and limited alternatives (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Normative commitment stems from a sense of moral and legal obligation to remain with the organization (Muhammad et al., 2021).

O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) identified compliance, identification, and internalization dimensions. Compliance relates to the relationship between employee contribution and extrinsic rewards, akin to continuance commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Identification and internalization mirror affective commitment, representing emotional attachment and valuation of organizational goals.

Similarly, Wechsler and Balfour (1996) identified identification, affiliation, and exchange dimensions. Identification and affiliation align with affective commitment, indicating pride in the organization and attachment to coworkers. Exchange commitment corresponds to continuance commitment, reflecting perceived recognition of effort.

Meyer and Allen's (1997) three-dimensional framework, encompassing affective, continuance, and normative commitment, serves as the basis for this investigation, encapsulating emotional attachment, cost-benefit analysis, and moral obligation to the organization.

Organizational citizenship behavior

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) originates from political philosophy, reflecting citizens' responsibilities in three categories: obedience, loyalty, and participation (Graham, 1991; Cary, 1977; Inkeles, 1969; Aristotle, 1941). Obedience involves respecting structures and processes, loyalty extends to protecting the organization's reputation, and participation entails governance involvement (Graham, 1991). In an organizational context, these responsibilities translate into organizational obedience, loyalty, and participation (Inkeles, 1969).

Early research, exemplified by Bateman & Organ (1983) and Smith, Organ, & Near (1983), defined OCB as behaviors exceeding job requirements for organizational benefit, akin to citizenship responsibilities. Katz (1964) identified three crucial organizational behaviors: entering and remaining in the system, fulfilling role requirements, and engaging in spontaneous activity (Smith et al., 1983).

Subsequent research emphasized loyalty and participation dimensions of OCB (Graham, 1991; Organ & Ryan, 1995). Organ (1988) identified five OCB dimensions: conscientiousness, sportsmanship, civic virtue, courtesy, and altruism. Podsakoff et al. (2000) expanded this to seven dimensions, including helping behaviors,

organizational loyalty, and self-development.

Spector and Fox (2002) synthesized these dimensions into altruistic behavior, encompassing actions benefiting both individuals and the organization, thus encapsulating all OCB dimensions (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 2000).

Statement of the problems

The study examined the interplay of employee treatment, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. It specifically answered the following questions:

- 1. What is the employee treatment in terms of:**
 - 1.1. Workers' rights**
 - 1.2. Respect in the workplace**
 - 1.3. Workplace relationship**

- 2. What is the organizational commitment of employees in terms of:**
 - 2.1. Affective commitment**
 - 2.2. Continuance commitment**
 - 2.3. Normative commitment**

- 3. What is the organizational citizenship behavior of the employees in terms of:**
 - 3.1. OCBP**
 - 3.2. 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 significantly influenced by various factors, among which organizational culture plays a pivotal role. Pallathadka (2020) emphasized the impact of organizational culture on employee behavior, with employee treatment being a crucial dimension. Additionally, Abun et al. (2023) established a correlation between employee treatment and work engagement. Building upon these insights, the current study hypothesizes correlations between employee treatment and both organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

Scope and delimitation of the study

The study focuses on examining employee treatment, encompassing worker's rights, respect in the workplace, and workplace relationships, in conjunction with organizational commitment (affective, continuance, and normative) and organizational citizenship behavior. The research is conducted solely within the Divine Word College of Laoag.

Research methodology

The 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 questionnaires serving as the primary data collection method. Descriptive and inferential statistics, including weighted mean and Pearson r, are employed for data analysis. Ethical considerations were taken into account, with the study's lack of involvement in sensitive human issues resulting in waived ethical review. Additionally, the researcher obtained permission from the institution's President to distribute questionnaires, with data collection facilitated through employees' representatives.

The following ranges of values with their descriptive interpretation will be used:

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

Data presentation and analysis

The data are presented following the statement of the study which was gathered through research questionnaires and analyzed by the statistics.

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

- 1.1. workers' rights
- 1.2. respect in the workplace
- 1.3. 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

Employee treatment, particularly regarding workers’ rights, yielded a composite mean of 3.32, indicating a "somewhat agree/moderate" interpretation. This moderate rating suggests that while employee treatment regarding workers’ rights is not exceptionally high, it also isn't notably low. Most indicators fall within this moderate rating, indicating a consistent perception. Employees generally view their rights related to decision-making participation, fair salaries, self-organization, and freedom of expression as moderate, although they perceive security of tenure and comfortable offices more positively. This finding suggests a lack of significant attention to employees' rights by management. Neglecting employees can lead to poor organizational citizenship behavior and a diminished sense of purpose in their work, impacting job satisfaction, affective commitment, and turnover intention (Kong & Belkin, 2021; Lagios et al., 2022).

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).

Employee treatment regarding respect in the workplace received a composite mean of 3.39, suggesting a "somewhat agree/moderate" perception. This suggests that while not exceptionally high or low, the level of respect is moderate. Specifically, employees somewhat agree on respect, welcoming ideas, and access to professional development. However, they strongly agree that they feel valued due to merit-based promotion, leading to a perception of the institution as respectful. Kaushal (2021) emphasizes that workplace respect is crucial for well-being and fulfilling the moral obligation to protect employees' rights.

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).

Employee treatment regarding employer-employee relationships received a composite mean rating of 3.34, signaling a "somewhat agree/moderate" perception. This suggests a moderate level of relationship quality, with no individual items rating significantly higher or lower. Employees perceive aspects like assistance, welfare, idea acceptance, respect for limitations, and trust as moderate. This indicates room for improvement in the relationship between employers and employees. Research has shown that negative work relationships adversely affect job satisfaction, performance, and productivity (Suknunan & Bhana, 2022; Abun et al., 2023).

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 overall mean rating for employee treatment is 3.35, indicating a "somewhat agree/moderate" perception. This suggests a moderate level of treatment, with no individual dimensions rated significantly higher or lower. Addressing workers' rights, respect in the workplace, and workplace relationships is crucial based on these ratings. Abun et al. (2023) highlighted that positive or negative treatment can impact employee work engagement, with positive treatment leading to increased engagement and negative treatment resulting in decreased engagement.

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

- 2.1. *affective commitment*
- 2.2. *continuance commitment*
- 2.3. *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 composite mean rating for organizational commitment, specifically affective commitment, is 3.78, indicating an "agree/high" level of commitment. This suggests that employees' emotional attachment and sense of belonging to the organization are notably high. This sentiment is consistent across individual items. Studies have demonstrated that affective commitment positively influences job performance (Shao et al., 2022; Ardiansyah & Afandi, 2018; Gulzar, 2020), with higher levels of affective commitment correlating with higher job performance.

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 continuance commitment of employees achieved a composite mean of 3.50, indicating an "agree/high" level of commitment. This suggests a notable level of commitment, with individual indicators aligning at a high mean rating as well. Employees find it challenging to leave the institution due to significant disruptions in their lives and the perceived necessity to stay. Research has shown that continuance commitment positively influences employee performance (Igbomor & Ogbuma, 2024; Kasogela, 2019).

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).

The overall organizational commitment of employees, particularly normative commitment, garnered a composite mean rating of 3.67, signifying an "agree/high" level of commitment. This suggests a strong sense of commitment among employees, with individual indicators also reflecting high mean ratings. Employees feel obliged to remain with the institution due to lingering obligations and guilt if they were to leave. However, research indicates that normative commitment may not positively impact job performance and could even have a negative effect (Igbomor & Ogbuma, 2024; Jakada et al., 2019).

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 indicates that the overall organizational commitment of employees receives a mean rating of 3.65, classified as "agree/high." This suggests a high level of commitment across dimensions. Various studies, including Stackhouse et al. (2022) and Suyanto and Hendri (2019), have found that organizational commitment positively influences both job performance and organizational performance.

Problem 3: What is the organizational citizenship behavior in terms of:

3.1. **OCBP**

3.2. **OCBO**

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
Lent a compassionate ear when someone has a personal 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).

The employees' organizational citizenship behavior toward others (OCBP) received a composite mean rating of 3.65, denoting an "agree/high" level. This suggests a consistently high level of behavior across all items.

Employees engage in supportive actions such as listening to coworkers' problems and defending them against supervisor criticism. Research shows that such behaviors can enhance organizational commitment, well-being, and reduce job-related stress (Tran et al., 2018; Grailay et al., 2021).

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 employees' organizational citizenship behavior towards the organization (OCBO) received a composite mean rating of 3.76, signaling an "agree/high" level. This suggests a consistently high level of behavior across all items, including helping with orientation, volunteering for extra assignments, offering suggestions for improvement, sacrificing meals for work, and speaking positively about the employer. Research has shown that such positive behavior towards the organization positively impacts organizational performance (Cameron et al., 2011; Youssef, 2007; Ramlall, 2008).

Table 11: Summary table

Indicators		Mean	DR
1	OCBP	3.65	A
2	OCBO	3.76	A
Overall Mean		3.70	A

The results illustrate that the organizational citizenship behavior of employees garnered an overall mean rating of 3.70, denoting an agreeably high level. It indicates that, collectively, employees' organizational citizenship behavior falls within a high range. Even when considering individual dimensions, both are rated similarly high. Research suggests that such positive organizational citizenship behavior correlates with enhanced organizational performance (Cameron et al., 2011; Ramlall, 2008; Tran et al., 2018; Grailay, 2021).

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

Table 12: 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 correlation table indicates no significant correlation between employee treatment and organizational commitment. This finding suggests that variations in organizational commitment are not influenced by employee treatment. Therefore, to enhance organizational commitment within the institution, other factors

should be explored rather than solely focusing on improving employee treatment.

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

Table 13: 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

Similarly, the correlation table reveals no significant correlation between employee treatment and organizational citizenship behavior. This indicates that variations in organizational citizenship behavior are not influenced by employee treatment. Positive organizational citizenship is not solely attributed to employee treatment. Therefore, other factors should be explored to enhance organizational citizenship behavior.

Results and discussion

Employee treatment is a crucial management concern that occupies significant attention. Recognizing its negative impact on performance, leaders are consistently urged to treat employees fairly, respect their rights, and foster trust. Poor treatment can lower morale and lead to decreased performance, as noted by Hyken (2015) and Griffin & Lopez (2005). This study aims to assess how employee treatment by leaders at the Divine Word College of Laoag influences organizational commitment and citizenship behavior. However, the study found that moderate employee treatment does not correlate with or affect organizational commitment or citizenship behavior. Therefore, in this context, employee treatment does not significantly contribute to promoting organizational commitment and citizenship behavior. Developing these aspects should involve consideration of other organizational factors, as addressing organizational commitment and citizenship behavior requires a comprehensive approach beyond employee treatment alone.

Conclusion

The study sought to examine the relationship between employee treatment, organizational commitment (OC), and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Findings revealed moderate employee treatment within the institution, while OC and OCB were rated high. However, correlation analysis indicated no significant relationship between employee treatment and OC or OCB. This suggests that employee treatment does not directly impact OC and OCB. Therefore, future research should explore additional organizational factors influencing OC and OCB.

Author's contribution: Conceptualization: M.J.E., D.A., K.M.M.M., K.L.R., S.V.A.I. **Methodology,** M.J.E., D.A., K.M.M.M., K.L.R.,S.V.A.I. **Data Collection:** M.J.E., D.A., K.M.M.M., K.L.R., S.V.A.I. **Formal analysis:** M.J.E., D.A., K.M.M.M.,K.L.R., S.V.A.I. **Writing—original draft preparation:** M.J.E.,

D.A., K.M.M.M., K.L.R., S.V.A.I. **Writing— review and editing:** M.J.E., D.A., K.M.M.M., K.L.R., S.V.A.I.

All authors have read and agreed to the published final version of the manuscript.

Institutional review board statement: Ethical review and approval were waived for this study, and the research does not deal with vulnerable groups or sensitive issues.

Data availability statement: The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy.

Conflicts of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Funding: The study is funded partially by the school and 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., Ubaso, 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. *Divine Word International Journal of Management and Humanities* 2(1), 148-165. <https://doi.org/10.62025/dwijmh.v2i1.17>
- Abun, D. & Basilio, G.J.Q. (2023). The effect of workplace relationship on job satisfaction of employees: school context. *Divine Word International Journal of Management and Humanities*, 2(1), 227-242. <https://doi.org/10.62025/dwijmh.v2i1.19>
- 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>
- 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>
- Ardiansyah, & Afandi, E. (2018). Impact of affective commitment on the employee's performance moderated organizational citizenship behavior. *Advances in Social Science, Education and*

- Aristotle. (1941). *Politics* (B. Jowett, Trans.). In R. McKeon (Ed.). *The basic works of Aristotle*, 1114-1316. Random House.
- 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>
- 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 love 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>
- 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>
- Best, P.W. (1994). Locus of control, personal commitment and commitment to the organization. *Unpublished MCom thesis. University of South Africa, Pretoria*
- 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>
- Busto, A.V. (2013). *The Philippine labor codes*. A.V.B. Printing Press.
- 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/>
- Cameron, K., Mora, C., Leutscher, T., & Calarco, M.M. (2011). Effects of positive practices on organizational effectiveness. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences*, 47(3), 266-308. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886310395514>
- 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, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319&31816-5_2998-1
- 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>.
- Ederly, 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>

- 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>
- 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.
- 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>
- Grailay, K., Lean-Villalpos, C., Murray, E. & Brett, S. (2021). The psychological impact of the workplace environment in critical care: a qualitative exploration. *Human Factors in Health Care*, 1, 100001. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hfh.2021.100001>
- Greenberg, J. & Baron, R.A. (2008). *Behavior in organizations*. Pearson, Hoboken, 269-274.
- Griffin, R.W. & Lopez, Y.P. (2005). Bad behavior in organizations: a review and a typology for future research. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279942>
- Gurchiek, K. (2016). Survey: Respect at work boosts job satisfaction. *SHRM*. Retrieved March 2, 2024, from <https://www.shrm.org>
- Gulzar, R. (2020). Impact of effective commitment on employee performance special reference to the Fenda communication and IT- KSA. *International Journal of Management*, 11(6), 1440-1454. <https://doi.org/10.34218/IJM.11.6.2020.132>
- 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>
- 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, 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>
- Hyken, S. (2015). The dangers of treating employees poorly: A case for the employee golden rule. *Forbes*. Retrieved April 8, 2024, from <https://www.forbes.com>
- 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>.
- Igbomor, E. & Ogbuma, S.M. (2024). Empirical evidence of the effect of organizational commitment on employee job performance. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, 5(1), 1941-1947.
- 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>
- Jakada, M.B., Jakada, A.H., Hussain, M.A. & Rabi, A. (2019). Effect of affective, continuance, and normative commitment on job performance of employees of National Identity Management Commission., Northwest Zone, Nigeria. *Lapai International Journal Management and Social Sciences*, 11(2).
- 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>.
- 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>

- Kasogela, O. K. (2019). The impact of continuance commitment on job performance. *Advanced Journal of Social Science*, 5(1), 93–100. <https://doi.org/10.21467/ajss.5.1.93-100>
- 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, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-30025-8_85
- Kim, S.E. & Rubianty, D. (2011). Perceived fairness of performance appraisals in 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 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04950-w>
- Lagios, C., Lagios, N., & Stinglhamber, F. (2023). Predictors and consequences of work Alienation in times of crisis: Evidence from two longitudinal studies during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Current Psychology*, 42, 22866–22880 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03372-9>
- 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>.
- Lind, E.A. & Tyler, T.R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. Plenum Press. 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
- 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>
- Mental Health Foundation (2016). *Relationship in the 21st century*. Mental Health Foundation.
- 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)
- Morrow, P.C. (1993). *The theory and measurement of work commitment*. Jai. Moynihan, D.P., and S.K. Pandey (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

- 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), 603–609. <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., & Lawer, 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
- Ramlall, S. (2008). Enhancing employee performance through positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38(6), 1580-1600. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2008.00360.x>

- 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>
- Shao H, Fu H, Ge Y, Jia W, Li Z and Wang J (2022) Moderating effects of transformational leadership, affective commitment, job performance, and job insecurity. *Frontier in Psychology*, 13, 847147. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.847147>
- Singer, P. (1974). All animals are equal. *Philosophical Exchange*, 1(5), 243-257.
- 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/>

Stackhouse, L.E., Zaman, F.M. & Turner, K.W. (2022). Effect of employee commitment on organizational performance; case of textile firms in Sweden. *Journal of Human Resources & Leadership*, 6(2). 1-10.

Suknunan, S. & Bhana, A. (2022). Influence of employee-manager relationship on employee performance and productivity. *Problems and Perspective in Management*, 20(3), 28-42. [https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.20\(3\).2022.03](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.20(3).2022.03)

Suyanto, S. & Hendri, N. (2019). The impact of organizational commitment on job performance. *International Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, 7(2), 189-206.

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>

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.

Youssef, C.M. (2007). Positive organizational behavior in the workplace: the impact of hope, optimism, and resilience. *Digital Commons*

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



CC BY-NC-SA 4.0

Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International

© 2024 by the authors. Published by Divine Word International Journal of Management and Humanities under 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/>