Bureaucratic and humanistic management styles and organizational citizenship behavior: A study of divine word college of Laoag

Damianus Abun^{(a)*} *Theogenia Magallanes*^(b) *Libertine Gertrude-Ruadap Macaspac*^(c)
Artemio P. Seatriz^(d) *Marlene, T. Nicolas*^(e)

^(a) Professor, School of Business Administration, Divine Word College of Laoag, Ilocos Norte, Philippines

^(b) President, Saint Benedict College of Northern Luzon, Ilocos Sur, Philippines

^(c) Professor, School of Arts, Sciences and Education, Divine Word College of Laoag, Ilocos Norte, Philippines

^(d) Professor, School of Arts, Sciences and Education, Divine Word College of Laoag, Ilocos Norte, Philippines

^(e) Dean, School of Arts, Sciences and Education, Divine Word College of Laoag, Ilocos Norte, Philippines

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 05 October 2021

Received in rev. form 27 Oct. 2021

Accepted 29 October 2021

Keywords:

Bureaucratic, humanistic,
organizational citizenship behaviour

JEL Classification:

O15

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to determine the effect of bureaucratic and humanistic management styles of administrators on the organizational citizenship behaviours of employees. To deepen the study, literature was reviewed and theories were established. The study used a descriptive correlational research design and used questionnaires to gather the data. The study found that the bureaucratic management style is higher than the humanistic management style. The higher the bureaucratic management style, the lower the humanistic management style becomes. Based on the correlational analysis, it found that management styles of administrators correlate to the organizational citizenship behaviours of employees. Therefore, the hypothesis of the study is accepted.

© 2021 by the authors. Licensee Bussecon International, Istanbul, Turkey. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC BY) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Introduction

Different management styles or practices always bring a certain impact, either negative or positive on the employees or workers as Towers (2017) pointed out that the autocratic management style can affect motivation and productivity. Wright (2018) recognized the impact of management styles not only limited to motivation and productivity but it affects the whole workplace. Okon and Isong (2016), Stephen (2014), Jamal and Soomro (2011), Ingollan and Roussel (2017), Basit, et.al. (2017), Asrar-ul-Haq and Kuchinke (2016) have conducted studies on the correlation between different management styles and employees' performance and their studies have found that different management styles affect the performance of employees.

The ideas and studies presented above are enough to convince us that management styles or leadership styles can affect the employees' performance and even other aspects of the workplace as pointed out by Wright (2018). Based on their findings and ideas, the current study also posits that bureaucratic and humanistic management styles can also affect, not only employees' performance but even the organizational citizenship behaviour of employees. It has been pointed out that the bureaucratic management style focuses on rules and regulations that have been established by the organization through its top management such as the Board of Directors or Board of Trustees, etc. All those who are working in the organization/institution must follow the rules and job description provided for them in the execution of their job. Luenendonk (2020) called such a management style a rule-based leadership style or management style. It is the very nature of bureaucratic management or leadership. It does not allow individual initiative and creativity in exercising

* Corresponding author. ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9693-1541

one's responsibility except to follow the rules which are in contradiction with the humanistic management style. The bureaucratic management style focuses on following the rules to achieve efficiency and productivity, while humanistic management focuses on the human being, his needs, and values as the centre of management exercise. Its basic belief is that humans have needs and values and they are not just mere assets but with complex needs and values. Though its focus is on human needs and values, however, it does not abandon a bureaucratic management style in pursuing efficiency and productivity but balances it with a humanistic approach to management practices. Its principle and practices rest on the idea that human being is the centre of management and human beings are not the means toward the ends but are the ends themselves (Pirson, 2017). Along with those concepts, the current researchers believe that the exercise of the two types of management style can have a certain impact on organizational citizenship behaviour as pointed out by the study of Lucey (2017). Organizational citizenship behaviour encompasses positive behaviours that employees are doing toward their organization and other people or co-employees. Employees become not only committed to their work but they go the extra mile beyond the job description to help the organization and to help other employees (Thiruvenskadam & Durairaj, 2017).

Based on the above ideas, the current study wants to find out the extent of the correlation between the two management styles and the organizational citizenship behaviour of employees. As part of the management team, the researchers are fully aware that employees have been working under different managers or administrators with different management styles. Some administrators balance bureaucratic and humanistic management styles but also some practice only the bureaucratic management style. It cannot be denied that both management styles can affect the organizational citizenship behaviour of employees. This is the main concern of the study.

The study is divided into different parts. The first part is the introduction that discusses the short rationale, theoretical background, and the purpose of the study. The second part is the review of related literature under which it discusses the theories of bureaucratic, humanistic management styles, and organizational citizenship behaviour. The third part is the research methodology which presents the research designs, the population of the study, the locale of the study, data gathering procedures, ethical procedures, data gathering instruments, and statistical treatment of data. Fourth is empirical data and Analysis that presents the data gathered through questionnaires and analysis. The fifth is the result and discussion that discusses the result of the study which is followed by a conclusion.

Literature Review

Based on the concept of literature review as a comprehensive summary of previous studies on the topic (Machi & McEvoy, 2016), this part discusses the theories of the study which is based on the previous literature and studies. The reviews focus on the three variables of the study which are bureaucratic, humanistic management style, and organizational citizenship behaviour of the employees. These are the theoretical foundations of the study.

Bureaucratic Management style

This management style was proposed by Max Weber in 1947. In his book, "Economy and Society" Weber contended that bureaucracy is the ideal and least ideal form of society (Cleverism, n.d). It is a management style that requires all who are working for the government or corporations to follow specific rules, processes, procedures, and obey the chain of command in exercising their duties and responsibilities (Management Study HQ, n.d). The essence is all about control. It controls the process, the people, inputs, and the output, and therefore rules are necessary. Control is an exercise of authority and power and consequently it demands obedience to the authority. Immediately, one can have the notion that this management style is dehumanizing as pointed out by Max Weber himself cited by Rudolph, Lloyd, and Rudolph Susanne, (1979). Weber himself defended it by explaining that the purpose of such control is to improve efficiency and productivity (Friedrich, 1990, Finer, 1941, Simon, 1947). It minimizes counterproductive behaviour which leads to the increase of outputs.

The bureaucratic management style is characterized by a highly structured, regularized, and impersonalized relationship (Hall, 1963). *The impersonalization* approach to management requires no human touch or individual consideration in the employee-employer relationship. Bureaucratic management is defined very well by the Cambridge Dictionary as "a system of controlling or managing a country, a company that is operated by a large number of officials" Or "Involving complicated rules and processes that make something slow and difficult". The definitions capture the nature of the bureaucratic management style which depicts the good side and the bad side of it.

Originally bureaucracy was intended for the management of government offices, however, nowadays bureaucracy is referring to the governance system not only in the government offices but also in private organizations. The practice had brought good news and bad news to the government and private corporations at the same time. It was a welcome change but at the same time a challenge on how to balance between rules, procedures, obedience, and human aspect concerns. On one hand, it has been touted as a promoter of efficiency and productivity as pointed out by Armandi and Mills (1985). Because of its success in improving efficiency and productivity, it has been spreading to all sectors, either private or public sectors including the Catholic Church, military, health insurance companies, education, however, on the other hand, it brought along with its negative side effect. But at the same time, it came with criticism that it is the main culprit of slowing down the speed of service as pointed out by Howard, (2012), Dwyer, (2009),

Kersten, (2002), AmericanCatholic.org, (2013), Martin, (2010). Too much focus on process, procedures, rules, and instead of speedy service are raising concerns among customers who wanted speedy and quality service.

Based on the above argument, bureaucratic management has three characteristics and they are hierarchy, formalization, and centralization (Quaisi, 2015). Hierarchy refers to the organizational structure that indicates a different level of authority and job responsibility (Millet, 1967). Different level of authority has different responsibilities which one does not overlap the other that is shown through specific job descriptions. While formalization refers to rules that regulate all activities (Organ and Greene, 1981). It is a strategy to control activities or behaviours so that activities or behaviours may not violate the established standards and any violation can mean punishment (Armandi 1985). In terms of centralization, it concerns the way how decisions are made. Often time decisions are not made by the subordinates but they are made by the person in authority and the subordinates have to obey. It is along with this concern, Moch and Morse, (1977), Zmud, (1982) criticized that centralization causes the death of the innovative spirit of a person in the organization. It limits the freedom of employees to innovate and limits the ability of leadership to delegate (Editor, et.al.2013, cited by Quaisi, 2015).

Weber had already said that the bureaucratic management style is ideal and least ideal for governance. He had foreseen the negative side of such a management system. He was aware that focusing too much on rules, procedures, and obedience and forgetting the human aspect of those who are dictated to follow the rules, procedure, and authority can cause some serious problems to the organization. Kang (2005) has criticized that bureaucracy has become a burden and, Rose-Ackerman, (1986), Peter, (1993), Preston, (1987) see it as an ineffective form of management. Merton (1952) even further pointed out that the bureaucracy that is touted to be promoting efficiency and rationality is the cause of inefficiency and irrationality. It contains elements that are destructive because it neglects informal organization, it does not recognize the importance of the informal relationship that exists among members of the organization. It is dehumanizing because it forces human beings to follow the rules, procedures blindly and workers cannot exercise their sense of right and wrong during the exercise of their duties and responsibilities (Bodley, 2002). Besides its dehumanization element, it is also accused of promoting business as usual because people become mechanistic technicians who are repeating doing the same thing every day and detached from their humanity, emotion, and even from society (Hummel, 2007). It only recognizes formal elements of the organization such as rules, procedures, the hierarchy of authority to achieve efficiency but it does not recognize the importance of informal elements of the organization such as a relationship that exists among members, the role of leadership, and the motivation that inspires people to work (Barnard, 1966).

Humanistic management style

The humanistic management style is the opposite of the bureaucratic management style. It is another management perspective or practice that is centred on humans as a person with needs and values. It is a contradiction to bureaucratic management which is considered dehumanizing human beings. Obligating employees to follow the rules, not of their own volition is dehumanizing. An alternative to such management style is humanistic management which is not focusing on the rules but on human needs and values. It treats the employees as the whole person with dignity (McLeod, 2020). It is an effort to humanize management that treats employees as human persons instead of mechanistic persons. It shifts away from seeing workers as objects or machines and focuses on the intrinsic value of human beings as humans first and foremost (Pirson, 2017). It addresses genuine human needs and respect for all stakeholders (Von Kimakowitz, et.al. 2019) and practices unconditional respect for human dignity (Von Kimakowitz, et.al. 2019). The motivation behind this practice is a philosophy that views human beings as unique beings with dignity. This philosophy requires that all other human beings have the moral responsibility to respect another human being. Consequently, human beings should not be seen as objects to be used or manipulated in the production of goods or should not be used as a means to an end because they are the ends in themselves. In other words, humans should not be engineered like machines to achieve the ends as to how Taylor thought that humans can be engineered like machines (Derksen, 2014). Gompers (1911, cited by Derksen, 2014) had criticized Taylor who tried to convert workers into high-speed machines and gave marginal respect for human values and virtues and no regard for norms of morality in the exercise of management (Dierksmeier, 2016). Scott (1911) and Münsterberg, (1913) had already lamented that Taylor had neglected the human factor in management because he is trying to convert humans into mechanistic workers. The scientific management of Taylor was too much focusing on productivity and minimizing the cost by rigorously applying efficiency standards based on time and motion studies (Lumen Principles of Management, n.d). Duncan, (1911, cited by Derksen, 2014) rejected Taylor's idea of scientific management and emphasizes that that humans are not mere machines; they are human beings, and should not be treated like machines. Alphonse Merrheim as cited by Bloemen, (1988) accused Taylor of treating human beings like machines in which humans are forced to perform repetitive tasks by simply following the prescribed rules and procedures without any freedom to do things on their own (Dersen, 2014). Treating human beings like machines means that human beings are not human persons who have intrinsic value in themselves and possess dignity. Humanistic management recognizes that humans have dignity and it demands unconditional respect from other human beings (Pirson, 2017). They are subjects and not object and therefore they have to be treated with respect and treat them as human beings. Ghoshal (2005) even pointed out that the current humanitarian crisis is related to management that neglects norms of morality.

Humanistic management rests on two fundamental pillars which are human dignity and human well-being (Pirson, 2017). Neal (2015) traced the root word of dignity and came up with the meaning of dignity. Dignity originally comes from the Latin word, "Dignitas" which means worthiness. Dignity is inherent in all human beings and it is universal and it cannot be taken away. It is given to all human beings by God and in fact, it is included in the fundamental belief of humanity as it becomes part of the Universal Declaration

of Human Rights as it says "recognition of the inherent dignity...of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world" (Neal, 2015). Dignity makes human beings different from other creatures, and dignity recognizes the intrinsic value in human beings. Immanuel Kant pointed out that a human being who has intrinsic values has to be respected and it is unconditional (Rachels, 1985). All human beings must respect other human beings. It is on the principle, Immanuel Kant contended that all human beings should treat other fellow human beings as ends in themselves and not as means to something else (BBC, n.d, Kerstein, 2019). Concerning the workers/employees, respecting human dignity means recognizing the importance of workers' well-being in the workplace. The employees must be happy, healthy or prosperous. Therefore, the management must see to it that the employees' well-being is given importance by creating a good and safe working condition (ILO, 2020). Well-being is a psychological state of being happy in the workplace and according to Deci and Ryan (2000), three psychological needs have to be fulfilled or met in the workplace for employees to be happy and they are autonomy, relatedness, and competence. Satisfying these psychological needs help motivate the employees to work better and make them happy. These needs are considered an essential part of growth, integration, and constructive social development (Ryan and Deci, 2000). According to Ryan and Deci (2000), these three needs require a conducive social environment where autonomy, relatedness, and competence needs are developed. The workplace must provide such an environment in which each worker can exercise their autonomy, competence, and where they can fulfil their social belongingness need (Quested & Duda, 2020).

The negative consequence of ignoring the workplace well-being and treating human beings like machines can have a devastating effect on the employees and the organization as well as pointed out by Ordever (2018) when he argued that to get the best out of the workers, the organization must focus the improvement of employees' well-being. Faps (2016) also support such a proposition Poor workplace condition can affect well-being because it can lead to poor mental health and thus he recommended for the leadership create a productive working environment. This was also supported by the Gallup Business Survey that unhealthy, stressed employees are hurting your business, that companies that are ignoring the well-being of employees can lose their money (Harter, 2012). The same negative consequence can happen when the organization does not treat its workers with dignity and respect. Porath, as cited by Singer (n.d), argued that a lack of respect hurts ourselves, colleagues, and the organization, and consequently, it can lead to organizational citizenship deficit behaviour (Moorman, et.al. 1993). Porath as cited by Singer (n.d) further contended that respect from leadership can motivate employees' work engagement.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

One of the management objectives is for the employees to love their workplace, their organization, or their company. The company cannot go higher in terms of performance unless its workforce loves their company and is dedicated to their work. Loving their company can be shown through their work behaviour which is known as organizational citizenship behaviour. Research on organizational citizenship behaviour has been started more than twenty years ago (Bateman & Organ, 1983). The researchers have been focusing on the impact of organizational behaviour citizenship on organizational performance and the researchers have been consistently supporting the idea that great organizations are those that have employees who perform their job description and dedicate their time even beyond the official time. Thus, in line with the result of those researches, organizational citizenship behaviour has been defined as the behaviour that exceeds one's basic job responsibilities (Jahangir, 2004). It is a voluntary work behaviour that goes beyond the job requirement and does not expect a reward, though sometimes leaders take it into account when they are evaluating employees' performance (Organ, 1997, 1988, Podsakoff et al., 2000). According to Bernard (1938), voluntary work behaviour is needed to attain organizational goals. Van Dyne and Parks (1995) defined organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) as behaviour that goes beyond the established job description voluntarily which benefits the organization. It is an extra role behaviour that is performed beyond the job duties that contribute to organizational development. For example, employees unintentionally stay beyond their office hours to perform other jobs that benefit the organization without expecting any rewards (Organ, 1988, cited by Chiun Lo, & Ramayah, 2009). Since this behaviour is not motivated by rewards, thus many researchers argue that conventional calculative motive cannot be used to explain the motivation behind the behaviour (Ryan, 2001) but it can be explained through value-based motivation ((Shamir, 1996). It is argued that people behave in a certain way following their values (Shamir, 1996).

The concept of organizational citizenship behaviour is quite general which cannot be measured without identifying its specific dimensions. Thus, Smith, Organ, & Near, (1983) as cited by Jahangir, et.al. 2004) have identified two basic dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour and they are altruism and generalized compliance. Altruism refers to voluntary behaviour in helping people. Altruistic people are always interested to extend help to other people who need help. While generalized compliance is referring to impersonal conscientiousness which means people are doing right and proper for their own sake rather than for any specific person but is indirectly helpful to others (Smith, Organ & Near, 1983 as cited by Jahangir, et.al. 2004). This type of behaviour reflects the internalized norms that define "what a good employee ought to do" (Smith et al., 1983, p. 675). An example of generalized compliance is punctuality or time management. Some employees are very punctual and do not waste their time and this behaviour is not intended to be seen by others but it is a reflection of their values of the time. However, based on the finding of different researches, organizational citizenship behaviour dimensions are not limited to two dimensions as suggested by Smith, Organ & Near (1983) but there are five commonly identified dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour and they are classified as conscientiousness, altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship and civic virtue (Costa & McCrae, 1992). The civic virtue dimension is referring to the behaviour of employees that are supportive of the administrative function of the organization (Deluge, 1998). A practical example of this behaviour is when the employee participates in the activities of the firm such as attending meetings that are not required by the firm

and updating themselves with the changes in the firm (Organ, 1988 cited by Chiun Lo, & Ramayah, 2009). This kind of behaviour reflects the kind of employee who considers himself/herself as part of the organization and takes the responsibility that goes with it (Podsakoff et al., 2000). After civic virtue, conscientiousness is also another component of OCB. Conscientiousness refers to people who are so dedicated to the job beyond the required task. These people can be seen in their offices even it is beyond office hours to perform other tasks that are needed to help the organization (Kidder and Parks Parks, 1993). While altruism is voluntary behaviour coming from an employee to help another employee who has a specific problem under unusual circumstances (Smith, Organ, and Near, 1983). Altruism behaviour is also closely associated with courtesy behaviour because it is still related to how to help other people who are demoralized and feel discouraged. Those who have this kind of behaviour take the necessary step to prevent a problem and lessen the effect of the problem in the future. This may be shown when employees are encouraging other members when they are demoralized and discouraged about their future professional development (Podsakoff et al., 2000, cited by Chiun Lo & Ramayah, 2009). Lastly is sportsmanship behaviour. It is a behaviour that can tolerate the irritation caused by the job or the organization. According to Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1997), this behaviour can enhance the morale of the group and may prevent turnover.

Interestingly Fox and Spector (n.d) are not classifying organizational citizenship behaviour into two or five dimensions (Organ, 1988) or seven dimensions (Podsakoff et al., 2000) as they are classified above, but there is only one dimension which is altruistic behaviour. Reading the content of altruistic behaviour can cover the content of different dimensions as identified by Costa and McCrae, (1992). Items in Altruistic Behaviour as proposed by Fox and Spector (n.d) can represent those other dimensions. Altruistic Acts can be classified as acts that help co-workers not related to workplace issues and related to work issues (OCBP) and acts that are directed toward the organization that benefits the organization (OCBO) (Fox & Spector, n.d).

Conceptual Framework

Figure 1: The conceptual framework; *Source:* Salkind (2010), and Fox and Spector (n.d)

The conceptual framework reflects the independent and dependent variables. Independent and dependent variables mean that the value of the dependent variable changes in response to that of the independent variable. Independent variables can be manipulated by the researcher, while dependent variables are responses to the effect of independent variables (Salkind, 2010).

Statement of the Problems

The study intends to find out the correlation between bureaucratic and humanistic management styles and organizational citizenship behaviour. Specifically, it seeks to answer the following questions:

- i. What is the management styles of administrators/managers of the Divine Word College of Laoag in terms of Bureaucratic management styles & Humanistic management styles
- ii. What is the organizational citizenship behaviour of employees of Divine Word Colleges in the Ilocos Region in terms of OCBO & OCBP
- iii. Is there a correlation between bureaucratic management styles and organizational citizenship behaviour?

Assumption

The study assumes that management styles a certain level of employees' organizational behaviour citizenship. It also assumes that bureaucratic and humanistic management styles and organizational citizenship behaviour can be measured.

Hypothesis

Lian and Tui (2012) conducted a study on the correlation between leadership styles and organizational citizenship behaviour and the study found that there is a correlation between different leadership styles and organizational citizenship behaviour. Thus, the current study also hypothesizes that management styles affect the organizational citizenship behaviour of employees.

Scope and Delimitation of the Study

The scope of the study is only for the Divine Word Colleges of Laoag in the Ilocos Region, Philippines and delimits its discussion only on the bureaucratic and humanistic management style and its influence on the organizational citizenship behaviour of employees.

Research Methodology

The research methodology is the process of how the study is carried out. It is a specific procedure or technique to identify, select, process, and analyze information about a topic (Wilkinson, 2000, Leedy, 1974). It is an imperative command for an academic research paper to follow the method of investigation. Along with such command, the study follows the rule of procedures in the investigation by following a certain research design, data gathering instruments method, the population of the study, the locale of the study, the data gathering procedures, and statistical treatment of data.

Research Design of the study

The study used a descriptive assessment and correlational research design to determine the level of the bureaucratic and humanistic management styles of administrators of Divine Word Colleges in the Ilocos region, and its effect on organizational citizenship behaviour. Ariola (2006) contended that a descriptive correlation study is intended to describe the relationship among variables without seeking to establish a causal connection. While descriptive research is simply to describe a population, a situation, or a phenomenon. It is also used to describe profiles, frequency distribution, describe characteristics of people, situations, or phenomena. In short, it answers the question of what, when, how, where, and not why question (McCombes, 2020).

The locale of the Study

The locale of the study was Divine Word College of Laoag, Ilocos Norte, Philippines.

Population

The respondents of the study are the employees of the college. Since the number of employees is limited, therefore, the total enumeration sampling was used and thus 170 faculty and employees were taken as respondents of the study.

Data Gathering instruments

The study adapted validated questionnaires of Langer, et.al. (2019) in a Bureaucratic work environment and Abun, et.al (2021) on Humanistic management style. While Fox and Specter (n.d) from Pennsylvania University and Chiun Lo and Ramayah (2009) on organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB). The questionnaires that are taken from Fox and Specter (n.d) are only those that are related to measuring the acts to help co-workers with job-related and the acts that are helping the organization which is classified as OCBO and OCBP.

Data Gathering Procedures

To maintain the integrity of the investigation and to ensure that the data are gathered through the right process, thus, before the researcher distributes the questionnaires, a letter was sent to the President of the college to request them to allow the researcher to float his questionnaires in the institution. In the process of collecting the data, the researcher requests employees' representatives to retrieve the data from different individual employees before they are submitted to the researcher.

Ethical Procedures

The study was carried out after the research ethics committee examined and approved the content of the paper if it does not violate ethical standards and if it does not cause harm to human life and the environment.

Statistical Treatment of Data

To analyze the data, descriptive and inferential statistic was used. The weighted mean was used to determine the level of organizational climate of the schools and the Pearson r was used to measure the correlation between organizational climate and work engagement of employees.

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

<i>Statistical Range</i>	<i>Descriptive Interpretation</i>
4.21-5.00	<i>strongly agree/very High</i>
3.41-4.20	<i>Agree/High</i>
2.61-3.40	<i>somewhat agree/Moderate</i>
1.81-2.60	<i>Disagree/Low</i>
1.00-1.80	<i>Strongly disagree/Very Low</i>

Empirical Data and Analysis

As required by scientific study, it must follow a certain methodology and must be supported by data. The data were gathered through research questionnaires. This part presents the data according to the statement of the problems.

Problem 1: What is the management styles of administrators/managers of the Divine Word College of Laoag in terms of Bureaucratic management styles & Humanistic management style**Table 1: Bureaucratic Management style**

Bureaucratic Styles	Mean	Descriptions
1. Employees are always doing the same job and the same way every day	3.87	A
2. All employees must follow the established rules and procedures.	4.04	A
3. There is little action taken until a supervisor or the higher up approves a decision	3.92	A
4. Even small matters have to be referred to someone higher up for the final answer	3.92	A
5. In general, a person who wants to make his/her own decisions would be quickly discouraged	3.79	A
6. Employees are always monitored closely by their higher up	3.87	A
7. Doing your job well means you have to follow the rules and procedures	3.92	A
8. Communications, decisions, and proceedings are put in writing for future references	3.94	A
9. Everyone has to conform to the rules and procedures because violation means punishment.	3.95	A
10. Employees are expected to respect the chain of command	3.98	A
Composite Mean	3.92	A

Source: Langer, et.al. (2019)

Based on the data that appeared on the table, it shows that as a whole, the bureaucratic management style of the administrators of the Divine Word College of Laoag got a composite mean of 3.92 which is described as "agree/high". This rating indicates that as a whole the bureaucratic management style of administrators of the college is not very high and it is also not very low, low or moderate but it is high. It just means that the administrators are highly bureaucratic and the environment is highly bureaucratic. Even when the items are taken separately, all items are rated within the same mean rating which is interpreted as "high" such as "employees are always doing the same job and the same way every day (3.87), must follow the established rules and procedures (4.04), can take action only after the higher up to approve the decision (3.92), report small matters to higher up for final answer (3.92), employees are discouraged to make their own decision (3.79), always monitored closely by their higher up (3.87), follow the rules and procedures are the requirement for doing a good job (3.92), communications, decisions, and proceedings are put in writing for future references (3.94), conform to the rules and procedures because violation means punishment (3.95), and employees are expected to respect the chain of command" (3.98).

Table 2: Humanistic Management style

Humanistic Management Style	Mean	Description
1. Employees are allowed to exercise their freedom to carry out their tasks	3.52	A
2. Employees are rewarded for giving new ideas on how to solve their problems	3.29	SWA
3. The management considers the ideas of employees when making decisions	3.31	SWA
4. The management always tries their best to serve the needs of employees	3.33	SWA
5. The management listens to the employees when the employees counter problems in their work.	3.32	SWA
6. The management respect and treat the employees as human beings with dignity.	3.39	SWA
7. The management recognizes the good effort of the employees to help the institution	3.37	SWA
8. There is open communication between employees and management	3.40	SWA
9. When making decisions, the management always consider the effect of the decision on the employees	3.35	SWA
10. The management put the employees first before the work.	3.21	SWA
Composite Mean	3.35	SWA

Source: Abun et.al (2021).

As pointed out by the data on the table, it reveals that as a whole the humanistic management style of the administrators is rated with the composite mean of 3.35 which is described as "agree/high". This mean rating signifies that as a whole, the humanistic management style of administrators is not very high or high and it is also not very low or low but it is at a moderate level. This suggests that the management style is moderately humanistic but not very humanistic or not highly humanistic. This evaluation appears in all indicators. Taking the items singly, all items are rated within the same mean level with the same interpretation which is "agree/high" such as "allowing freedom to carry out their tasks (3.52), rewarding employees for giving new ideas to solve problems (3.29), considering the ideas of employees when making decisions (3.31), serving the needs of the employees (3.33), respecting and treating the employees as human beings with dignity (3.39), listening to the employees when the employees encountering problems in their

work (3.32), recognizing the good effort of the employees helping the organization (3.37), opening the communication line between the management and the employees (3.40), considering the effect of the decision on the employees (3.35), and putting the employees first before the work” (3.21)

Problem2: What is the organizational citizenship behaviour of the employees of the Divine Word College of Laoag?

Table 3: OCBO (concern for the organization)

Organizational Citizenship	Mean	Description
1. Help new employees get oriented to the job.	3.56	A
2. Offered suggestions to improve how work is done	3.41	A
3. Volunteered for extra work assignments	3.43	A
4. Said good things about your employer in front of others	3.40	SWA
5. Said good things about your school in the community outside the school	3.50	A
6. Give up meals and other breaks to complete the work	3.48	A
7. Offered suggestions for improving the work environment	3.39	SWA
8. Come in early or stay late without pay to complete a project or task	3.42	A
9. Volunteer to share new job knowledge or skills with other employees	3.45	A
Composite Mean	3.45	A

Source: Fox and Spector (n.d)

As displayed by the data on the table, it manifests that as a whole, organizational citizenship behaviour of the employees toward the organization obtained a composite mean of 3.45 which is interpreted as "agree/high". This mean rating pointed out that as a whole the organizational citizenship behaviour of the employees toward the organization is considered not very high and it is also not very low, low or moderate but it is high. It means that the employees highly perform activities or behaviours that are helping the organization. Even when the indicators are taken separately, they all are evaluated within the same mean rating level which is interpreted as "agree/high" such as "helping new employees get oriented to the job (3.56), offering suggestions to improve how work is done (3.41), volunteering for extra work assignments (3.43), saying good things about their employer in front of others (3.40), saying good things about their school in the community outside the school (3.50), giving up meals and other breaks to complete the work (3.48), offering suggestions for improving the work environment (3.39), coming in early or stay late without pay to complete a project or task (3.42), and volunteering to share new job knowledge or skills with other employees” (3.45).

Table 4: OCBP (Concern for individual other people/employees)

Organizational Citizenship behaviour that concerns other people	Mean	Description
1. Open a compassionate ear when someone had a work problem	3.71	A
2. Open a compassionate ear when someone had a personal problem	3.70	A
3. Change vacation schedule, workdays, or shifts to accommodate coworkers’ needs.	3.54	A
4. Help a less capable co-worker lift a heavy box or other objects	3.64	A
5. Went out of the way to encourage co-workers or express appreciation	3.61	A
6. Defended co-worker who was being ‘put down’ or spoken ill by other co-workers or supervisors	3.65	A
7. Help co-workers with personal matters such as sharing food or drinks	3.66	A
8. Lent money or personal property to a co-worker	3.51	A
Composite mean	3.63	A

Source: Fox and Spector (n.d).

Reading the data on the table reveals that as a whole the organizational citizenship behaviour of the employees toward other people or other employees gained a composite mean rating of 3.63 which is understood as "agree/high". This mean rating signifies that as a whole the organizational citizenship behaviour of employees toward other employees is not very high and it is also not very low, low or moderate but it is high. This suggests that employees highly agree that they perform activities or behaviours that are helping other people or other employees in their work problems and personal problems. This is evidenced by the individual rating of different items which all are rated within the same mean rating level that is interpreted as 'agree/high' such as "opening a compassionate ear when someone had a work problem (3.71), opening a compassionate ear when someone had a personal problem (3.70), changing vacation schedule, workdays, or shifts to accommodate coworkers’ needs (3.54), helping a less capable co-worker lift a heavy box or other objects (3.64), going out of the way to give co-worker encouragement or express appreciation (3.61), defending co-worker who was being ‘put down’ or spoken ill by other co-workers or supervisors (3.6), and lending money or personal property to a co-worker”(3.51).

Problem 3: Is there a relationship between management styles and organizational citizenship?

Table 6: Correlations

		BURMEAN	HUMMEAN	OCBOMEAN	OCBPMEAN
BURMEAN	Pearson Correlation	1	.363**	.286**	.198**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.010
	N	170	170	170	170
HUMMEAN	Pearson Correlation	.363**	1	.736**	.502**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	170	170	170	170
OCBOMEAN	Pearson Correlation	.286**	.736**	1	.786**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	170	170	170	170
OCBPMEAN	Pearson Correlation	.198**	.502**	.786**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.010	.000	.000	
	N	170	170	170	170

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As revealed in the correlation table, it displays that both bureaucratic and humanistic management styles of administrators are significantly correlated at 0.01 level with the organizational citizenship behaviour of the employees toward the organization and toward other people or co-employees. In other words, bureaucratic and humanistic management styles influence the behaviour of employees. It means that improving bureaucratic and humanistic management styles is an important function to be considered by the management to improve the organizational citizenship behaviour of the employees toward the organization and the coworkers. Minimizing bureaucratic and maximizing humanistic management style will help the employees to develop behaviours that are beneficial for the organization and the coworkers.

Results and Discussions

The data that appeared in this study manifests that the rating of bureaucratic management style is higher than humanistic management styles. It suggests that the higher the bureaucratic management style of the administrators is, the lower their humanistic management becomes. Too bureaucratic management style may not help the organization in return as one study pointed out that such management practices can cause the health of the person and the health of the organization (Hornstein, & de Guerre, 2006). Once the health of the employees is affected, then consequently the health of the organization will be affected. Olukorede and Olayiwola (2008) argued that bureaucratic management style would retard the pace of work and productivity and at the same time would lead to job burnout and decrease life satisfaction (Lambert, 2010).

In line with the finding of the study, we would argue that bureaucratic management practice must be reviewed in line with the characteristic of the current employees. The employees today are too far different from employees two centuries ago. Employees today are literate and skilled and not illiterate and therefore management practices must be tailored to the employees' level of maturity. The companies today are competing in a very dynamic and competitive environment and therefore innovation is the game to win the competition which may not come from a bureaucratic management style (Hamel & Zanini, 2018).

Thus, developing a business organization to achieve its vision and mission cannot be done by just creating many rules and procedures but management practices must be more humanistic or human-centred – approach and innovative-creative approach in which the management helps and allows the employees to exercise their innovative and creative ideas. Therefore, bureaucratic management style must be minimized.

Improving organizational citizenship behaviour to a higher level is important for the organization to reduce bureaucracy or red tape. When the employees develop organizational citizenship behaviour, job satisfaction, commitment, job engagement and performance will improve and counterproductive behaviour will be minimized (Lambert, 2010, Grego-Planer, 2019, Mallick, et.al, 2015, Rekha & Sasmita, 2019). These studies are enough evidence to show that improving positive organizational citizenship behaviour of employees toward the organization and other employees is an important concern for the

Conclusion

The study aims to find out the effect of bureaucratic and humanistic management styles of administrators on the organizational citizenship behaviour of employees. The study found that the bureaucratic management style of administrators is high compared to the humanistic management style which is at a moderate level. This study also discovers that the higher the bureaucratic management style is, the lower the humanistic management style becomes.

Based on the correlation between bureaucratic and humanistic management styles of administrators and organizational citizenship behaviour of employees, the study found a significant correlation, therefore, the hypothesis of the study is accepted. Thus, the management needs to minimize its bureaucratic management style and maximize its humanistic approach to the employees.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, D.A., T.M., L.M., A. S., M.N.; methodology, D.A., T.M., L.M., A. S., M.N.; Data Collection, D.A., T.M., L.M., A. S., M.N.; formal analysis, D.A., T.M., L.M., A. S., M.N.; writing—original draft preparation, D.A., T.M., L.M., A. S., M.N.; writing—review and editing, D.A., T.M., L.M., A. S., M.N.; All authors have read and agreed to the published the final version of the manuscript.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Ethical review and approval were waived for this study, due to that 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.

References

- Abun, D., Magallanes, T., Acidera, E.B., Encarnacion, M.J. & Domingcil, C.U. (2021). *Work Environment and work Engagement of Employees of the Catholic Colleges in the Ilocos Region, Philippines*. *Technium Social Science Journal*, 19, 439-464
- American Catholic. Org (2013). *Still a Bureaucracy: Normal Paper Works Continues its Flow at the Vatican*. Retrieved from <https://www.americancatholic.org>
- Armandi, B., & Mills E.W. (1985). *Bureaucratic and Personalized Strategies for Efficiency and Organization: An Investigation of Structures and Efficiency in a Set of 104 Profit Seeking Firms*. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 44 (3) 261-277.
- Asrar-ul-Haq, M. & Kuchinke, P. k. (2016). *Impact of leadership styles on employees' attitude towards their leader and performance: Empirical evidence from Pakistani Banks*. *Future Business Journal*, 2(1), 54-64.
- Basit, A., Sebastian, V. & Hassan, Z. (2017). *Impact of Leadership Styles on Employees' Performance: A Case Study of a Private Organization in Malaysia*. *International Journal of Accounting & Business Management*, 5 (2).
- Bateman, T.S. & D. W. Organ, D.W. (1983). *Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship."* *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587- 595.
- BBC (n.d). *An End-in-Itself, in Ethics Guide*. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.co.uk>
- Bloemen, E. S. A. (1988). *Scientific management in Nederland, 1900-1930*. Amsterdam: NEHA
- Barnard, C. I. (1966). *The Functions of Executive*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Bodley, John H. (2002). *The Power of Scale: A Global History Approach*. M.E. Sharpe
- Chiun Lo, M. & Ramayah, T. (2009). *The dimensionality of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) in a Multicultural Society: The Case of Malaysia*. *International Business Research*, Vol 2(1).
- Cleverism (n.d). *Understanding Bureaucratic Leadership*. Retrieved from <https://www.cleverism.com>
- Dierksmeier, C. (2016). *What is Humanistic about Humanistic Management?* *Humanist Management Journal*, 1 (1), 9–32. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41463-016-0002-6>.
- Derksen, M. (2014). *Turning men into machines? Scientific management, industrial psychology & the 'human factor'*. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jhbs.21650>
- Duncan, J. (1911). *Efficiency -- real, unreal, and brutal*. *American Federationist*, 18(5), 380–384.
- Dwyer, D. (2009). *Victim of Health Insurance Company "Speak Out"*. ABC News. Retrieved from <https://abcnews.go.com>
- Editor, D. Moynihan, P. & Wart, M. V. (2013). *Lessons from Leadership Theory and the Contemporary Challenges of Leaders*. *Public Administration Review*, 73(4), 553–565.
- Faps, P.C. (2016). *How Poor Workplace Culture can affect Well-Being*. *Psychlopedia*. Retrieved from <https://psychlopedia.org>
- Finer, H. (1941). *Administrative responsibility in democratic government*. *Public Administration Review*, 1(1), 335-350.
- Fox, S., & Spector, P.E. (n.d). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist*. Unpublished paper: the Loyola University of Chicago and the University of South Florida. Retrieved from <http://shell.cas.usf.edu>
- Friedrich, C. (1940). *Public policy and the nature of administrative responsibility*. In C. J. Friedrich (Ed.), *Public Policy*: 3-24. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Ghoshal, S. (2005). *Bad Management Theories are Destroying Good Management Practices*. *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 4(1): 75–91.
- Gompers, S. (1911b). *The miracles of efficiency*. *American Federationist*, 18(4), 273–279.
- Grego-Planer, D. (2019). *The Relationship between Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in the Public and Private Sectors*. *Sustainability*, 11, 6395. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11226395>
- Hall, R. H. (1963). *The Concept of Bureaucracy: An Empirical Assessment*. *American Journal of Sociology*, 69(1), 32-40.
- Hamel, G. & Zanini, M. (2018). *The End of Bureaucracy*. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2018/11/the-end-of-bureaucracy>
- Harter, J. (2012). *Unhealthy, Stressed Employees are Hurting Your Business*. *Gallup Business Journal*. Retrieved from <https://news.gallup.com>
- Hornstein, H., & de Guerre, D., (2008). *Bureaucratic Organizations are bad for Our Health*. *Ivey Business Journal*. Retrieved from https://iveybusinessjournal.com/ibj_issue/march-april-2006/
- Howard, P.K. (2012). *To Fix America's Education Bureaucracy, We Need to Destroy It*. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com>

- Hummel R (2007). *The bureaucratic experience: the postmodern challenge*, 5th edition. New York: Routledge.
- ILO (2020). *Workplace Well-Being*. Retrieved from <https://www.ilo.org>
- Ingollan, D.N. & Roussel, J. (2017). *Influence of Leadership Styles on Employees' Performance: A Study of Turkana County, Kenya*. International Journal of Business and Social Science Volume 8(7).
- Jahangir, N., Akbar, M.M. & Haq, M. (2004). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents*. BRAC University Journal, 1(2), 75-85.
- Jamal, S. & Soomro, A. (2011). *Management Styles and Employees' Performance: A Study of Public Sector Company*. South Asian Journal of Management Science, 5(2), 65-71.
- Kang, H.S. (2005). *Administrative Discretion in the Transparent Bureaucracy*. Public Administration Quarterly, 29(1), 162-185.
- Kerstein, S. (2019). *Treating Persons as Means*. Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy. Retrieved from <https://plato.stanford.edu>
- Kersten, D. (2002). *How to Bend the Rules of Corporate Bureaucracy*. US TODAY. Retrieved from <http://usatoday30.usatoday.com>
- Kidder, D. L. & Parks. M. J. (1993). *The good soldier: Who is (s) he?* In D. P. Moore (Ed.). Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings, 363-367.
- Lambert, E.G. (2010). *The Relationship of Organizational Citizenship Behavior with Job satisfaction, Turnover Intent, Life satisfaction and Burnout among Correlational staff*. Criminal Justice Studies, 23 (4).
- Langer, J., Feeney, M.K., & Lee, S.E. (2019). *Employee Fit and Job satisfaction in Bureaucratic and Entrepreneurial Environments*. Review of Public Personnel Administration, 39(1), 135-155.
- Leedy, P.D. (1974). *Practical Research: Planning and Design*. New York: Macmillan.
- Lian, L.K. & Tui, L.G. (2012). *Leadership Styles and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Mediating Effect of Subordinates' Competence and Downward Influence Tactics*. Journal of Applied Business and Economics, 13(2), 59 – 96.
- Lucey, P.A. (2017). *Leadership Style and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Community-Based Mental Health Facilities*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Wisconsin-Milwaukee: Walden University.
- Luenendonk, M. (2020). *Bureaucratic Leadership Guide: Definitions, Qualities, Pros & Cons, Examples*. Cleverism. Retrieved from <https://www.cleverism.com>
- Lumen Principles of Management (n.d). *Humanistic Management*. <https://courses.lumenlearning.com>
- Machi, L.A. & McEvoy, B.T. (2016). *The Literature Review*. California: Corwin, a SAGE Company.
- Mallick, E., Pradhan, R.K., Tewari, H.R. & Jena, L.K. (2015). *Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, Job Performance and HR Practices: A Relational Perspective*. Management and Labour Studies, 39(4), 449–460. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0258042X15578023>
- Management Study HQ (n.d). *Bureaucratic Leadership Guide: Definitions, Pros & Cons, Examples*. Retrieved from <https://www.managementstudyhq.com>
- Martin, D. (2010). *Gates Criticizes Bloated Military Bureaucracy*. ABC News. Retrieved from <https://abcnews.go.com>
- McLeod, S. (2020). *Humanistic Approach*. Simply Psychology. Retrieved from <https://www.simplypsychology.org>
- Merton, R. (1952). *Bureaucratic Structure and Personality in Reader in Bureaucracy*. New York: Free Press
- Millett, J. D. (1967). *Enterprise-Operations and Administration: Some Notes on a Systematic Theory of Organized Endeavor*. Public Administration Review, 27(5), 421- 428.
- Moch, M. & Morse, E. (1977). *Size, Centralization, and Organizational Adoption of Innovations*. American Sociological Review, 42(5), 716-725.
- Moorman, R., Niehoff, B.P. & Organ, D. (1993). *Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behaviour: Sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice*. Employees' Responsibilities and Rights Journal. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01419445>. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net>
- Münsterberg, H. (1913). *Psychology and industrial efficiency*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Neal, T. (2015). *What is Human Dignity?* Retrieved from <https://agingwithdignity.org>.
- Olukorede, W.E. & Olayiwola, J.J. (2008). *The Effects of Bureaucracy and Its Implications for Adhocracy in the Workplace: A Study of Lagos State University*. International Journal of Development and Management Review, 3(1).
- Ordever, R. (2018). *Ignoring Staff Well-Being Will Be at Your Peril. Elite business*. Retrieved from <http://elitebusinessmagazine.co.uk>
- Podsakoff, P. M. & Mackenzie, S. B. (1997). *The impact of organizational citizenship in organizational performance: Review and suggestion for future research*. Human Performance, 10, 133-151.
- Okon, F.I. & Isong, E.U. (2016). *Management Styles and Employees' Performance in Small Scale Business Enterprises in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria*. International Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship Research, 4(1), 51-61.
- Organ, D.w. (1997). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: It's constructed clean-up time*. Human Performance, 10, 85-97 (1997).
- Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behaviour: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington.
- Organ, D. & Greene, C. (1981). *The Effects of Formalization on Professional Involvement: A Compensatory Process Approach*. Administrative Science Quarterly, 26(2), 237-252.
- Peters, B. G. (1993). *Searching for a Role: The Civil Service in American Democracy*. International Political Science Review, 14(4), 373-386.

- Pirson, M (2017). *Dignity and Well-Being as Cornerstones of Humanistic Management*. Humanistic Management Association, Research Paper Series No. 17-9, Gabelli School of Business, Fordham University Research Paper No. 2916454, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2916454> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2916454>
- Pirson, M. (2017). *What is Humanistic Management?* International Humanistic Management Association. Retrieved from <http://humanisticmanagement.international>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. 2000. *Organizational citizenship behaviours: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research*. *Journal of Management*, 26: 513–563.
- Preston, L. M. (1987). *Freedom and Bureaucracy*. *American Journal of Political Science*, 31(4), 773-795.
- Quaisi, A. (2015). *The Impact of Bureaucracy Characteristics on Leadership*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.3527.6004>. Retrieved from researchgate.net/publication
- Quested, E. & Duda, J.L. (2020). *Exploring the Social-Environment Determinants of well- and Ill-Being in Dancers: A Test of Basic Need*. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 3(1).
- Rachels, J. (1985). *The Idea of Human Dignity, in The Elements of Moral Philosophy*. New York: Random House, Inc.
- Rekha, S.S. & Sasmita, M. (2019). *Impact of Employee Engagement on Organizational Citizenship Behavior: An Overview*. *Espacios*, 40(7), 17.
- Rose-Ackerman, S. (1986). *Reforming Public Bureaucracy through Economic Incentives?* *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization*, 2(1), 131-161.
- Rudolph, L. & Rudolph, S. (1979). *Authority and Power in Bureaucratic and Patrimonial Administration: A Revisionist Interpretation of Weber on Bureaucracy*. *World Politics*, 31(2), 195-227.
- Ryan, J. J. (2001). *Moral reasoning as a determinant of organizational citizenship behaviours: A study in the public accounting profession*. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 33: 233–244.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). *Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being*. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68-78.
- Salkind, N.J. (2010). *Independent Variable, in Encyclopaedia of Research Design*. Sage Research Method. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412961288.n184> Retrieved from <http://methods.sagepub.com>
- Scott, W. D. (1911). *Increasing human efficiency in business: A contribution to the psychology of business*. New York: Macmillan Press.
- Shamir, B. (1996). *Meaning, self, and motivation in organizations*. In R. M. Steers, L. W. Porter & G. A. Bigley (Eds.). *Motivation and leadership at work*: 149–165. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Singer, D. (n.d). *7 Ways to Master the Respect Effect in Employee Engagement*. Retrieved from <https://www.saba.com>
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W. & Near, J. P. (1983). *Organizational citizenship behaviour: Its nature and antecedents*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 653-663.
- Simon H. (1946). *Administrative Behavior*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Stephen, D.L. (2014). *Effect of Management Styles on Employees' Performance: A Case Study of Norwegian People's Aid YEI Vocational Training Centre*. Unpublished Thesis. Uganda: St. Lawrence University.
- Thiruvenskadam, T. & Durairaj. I.Y.A (2017). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Definitions and Dimensions*. *GE-International Journal of Management Research*, 5(5).
- Towers. P. (2017). *How Different Management Styles Affect Employee Motivation and Productivity*. Task Pigeon. Retrieved from <https://blog.taskpigeon.co>
- Van Dyne, L. L. C. & J. Parks, M. (1995). *Extra role behaviours: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (a bridge over muddied waters)*. In L. L. Cummings & L. Van Dyne, J. Graham & R. M. Dienesch, (1994). *Organizational citizenship behaviour: construct redefinition, measurement, and validation*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 765-802.
- Von Kimakowitz, E., Pirson, M., Dierksmeier, C., & Spitzack, H. (2019). *Introduction to Humanistic Management in Practice*. Working Paper: Fordham University, School of Business.
- Wilkinson, D. (2000). *The Researcher's Toolkit*. London: Springer
- Wright, J. (2018). *How Management Styles Affect the Workplace. Eagle's Flight*. Retrieved from <https://www.eaglesflight.com>
- Zmud, R. (1982). *Diffusion of Modern Software Practices: Influence of Centralization and Formalization*. *Management Science*, 28(12), 1421-1431.

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

International Journal of Business Ecosystem and Strategy by [Bussecon International Academy](https://www.busseconinternational.com) is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).