



**NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY  
POLITEHNICA BUCHAREST**

**DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF  
ENTREPRENEURSHIP, BUSINESS ENGINEERING AND MANAGEMENT**

**DOCTORAL THESIS  
SUMMARY**

**Scientific coordinator,  
Univ. Prof. Dr. Habil. Dana Corina DESELNICU**

**Ph.D. Student,  
Eng. Liliana GEORGESCU (DUMITRESCU)**

**Bucharest 2024**



**NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY  
POLITEHNICA BUCHAREST**

**DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF  
ENTREPRENEURSHIP, BUSINESS ENGINEERING AND MANAGEMENT**

**DOCTORAL THESIS  
SUMMARY**

**THE IMPACT OF WORKING RELATIONSHIPS  
ON ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT.  
MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS FOR  
INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS**

**Scientific coordinator,  
Univ. Prof. Dr. Habil. Dana Corina DESELNICU**

**Ph.D. Student,  
Eng. Liliana GEORGESCU (DUMITRESCU)**

**Bucharest 2024**

## Table of contents

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Chapter 1. OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.1. Definition of the research problem .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1.1. Relevance of the research problem .....	5
1.1.2. Purpose of the research .....	5
1.1.3. Definition of the research problem.....	5
1.1.4. Research questions and objectives .....	5
<b>1.2. Research methodology used .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>I. THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Chapter 2. ORGANIZATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2.1. Organisational structure.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2.2. Types of organisational structures.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2.3. Organisational development.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2.4. Industrial organisations.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Chapter 3. ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>3.1. Defining performance .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>3.2. Related concepts .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>3.3. Measuring performance in the workplace .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Chapter 4. ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>4.1. Definition of the concept of organisational commitment.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>4.2. Approaches to organisational engagement .....</b>	<b>14</b>
4.2.1. Attitudinal approach.....	14
4.2.2. Behavioural approach.....	15
<b>4.3. Related concepts .....</b>	<b>15</b>
4.3.1. Loyalty .....	15
4.3.2. Motivation.....	15
4.3.3. Job satisfaction .....	16
<b>4.4. Models of organisational engagement .....</b>	<b>16</b>
4.4.1. Salancik's model.....	16
4.4.2. Mowday, Steers and Porter .....	16
4.4.3. O'Reilly and Chatman's model .....	16
4.4.4. The Angle and Perry model.....	16
4.4.5. The Penley and Gould model .....	16
4.4.6. Meyer and Allen's model.....	17
<b>4.5. Influences of organizational engagement on job performance .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Chapter 5. LEADERSHIP: EVOLUTION, DEFINITIONS AND THEORETICAL APPROACHES.....</b>	<b>18</b>

5.1. Etymological and historical considerations .....	18
5.2. Defining the concept of leadership.....	18
5.3. Delimitation of the concepts of leadership and management.....	18
5.4. Classification of approaches to leadership.....	19
5.4.1. Trait Approach .....	19
5.4.2. Behavioural approach.....	19
5.4.3. Situational approach.....	19
5.4.4. Contemporary approach .....	19
5.5. Influences of leadership on job performance.....	20
<b>II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Chapter 6. INVESTIGATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WORK MOTIVATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT.....</b>	<b>21</b>
6.1. Study design.....	21
6.2. Results and discussions .....	22
6.3. Conclusions and implications.....	23
<b>Chapter 7. INVESTIGATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND JOB PERFORMANCE .....</b>	<b>24</b>
7.1. Study design.....	24
7.2. Results and discussions .....	25
7.3. Conclusions and implications.....	26
<b>Chapter 8. INVESTIGATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP AND PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE .....</b>	<b>27</b>
8.1. Study design.....	27
8.2. Results and discussions .....	28
8.3. Conclusions and implications.....	31
<b>Chapter 9. CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>32</b>
9.1. Final Conclusions .....	32
9.2. Personal Contributions.....	32
9.3. Limits of research.....	33
9.4. Future research directions.....	34
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS .....</b>	<b>45</b>

## INTRODUCTION

Organizations, in the current context, operate in an environment characterized by rapid and complex changes, caused by factors such as globalization, digitalization and technological developments. These changes are forcing organizations to be more flexible and adaptive to deal with increasing competition and ever-changing market demands.

Organizational commitment is an essential concept in human resource management, reflecting the level of involvement and loyalty that employees have towards the organization in which they work. This commitment directly influences employee performance, productivity, and retention, having a profound impact on an organization's long-term success. In today's context of rapid change and intense competition, organizations that manage to cultivate strong employee engagement ensure not only stability, but also the ability to innovate and adapt.

Organizational performance is the extent to which an organization meets its objectives and achieves desired results, through the efficient and effective use of available resources. This includes not only profitability and productivity, but also factors such as innovation, employee satisfaction and adaptability to changes in the environment. In a competitive and dynamic context, organizational performance is an essential indicator of long-term success, being directly influenced by the quality of management, organizational culture and labor relations.

Modern organizations are strongly influenced by the quality of leadership, which plays a central role in cultivating organizational commitment and, implicitly, in improving performance. Effective leadership can create a positive work environment where employees feel valued and motivated to contribute to achieving organizational goals.

The research aims to investigate the relationships between the dimensions of organizational engagement, managerial implications, and organizational performance. The study analyzes these relationships in depth and provides concrete recommendations for specialists in the field of human resource management.

The bibliography studied comprises a variety of relevant sources exploring the concepts of organizational engagement, leadership, organizations, and performance. A significant part of the bibliography was made up of electronic sources, given the increasingly pronounced trend of digitization of books, journals and academic archives.

# Chapter 1. OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH

## 1.1. Definition of the research problem

### 1.1.1. Relevance of the research problem

The relevance of this research topic lies in its contribution to developing a detailed and deep understanding of the relationships between employee engagement, employee performance, and organizational success. The research proposes solutions for optimizing these dimensions in a dynamic and complex organizational environment. Thus, the study has the potential to guide leaders and decision-makers in creating effective policies and practices to improve labor relations and stimulate stronger engagement that contributes to the adaptation and competitiveness of organizations in dynamic and ever-changing environments.

### 1.1.2. Purpose of the research

Considering the current socio-economic context, the doctoral thesis „**The impact of working relationships on organizational commitment. Managerial implications for industrial organizations**” examines, in an integrative approach, the dynamics between workplace interactions and organizational efficiency.

Taking into account these considerations, the *purpose* of the research can be formulated:

*Investigating the relationships between organizational commitment, its dimensions, with a focus on employee motivation and satisfaction, organizational leadership and performance at work, in order to develop a theoretical and methodological framework that contributes to optimizing organizational performance in the context of a dynamic and complex environment.*

### 1.1.3. Definition of the research problem

The theme of the research refers to how organizational commitment and its dimensions influence performance at work, as well as to the extent to which these influences generate managerial implications in the Romanian organizational environment.

**The research problem** was formulated as follows:

*Investigating how labor relations, defined by the dynamics of interactions between employers and employees, influence the level of organizational engagement, as well as the managerial implications regarding the implementation of organizational practices that influence organizational performance.*

### 1.1.4. Research questions and objectives

In order to achieve the proposed goal, the research was structured around a series of *research questions*, of a theoretical and empirical nature:

**1. How does labour relations influence organisational engagement within organisations?**

## **2. What are the managerial implications of these relationships on organizational performance?**

Each proposed research question addresses complex and extensive issues. To ensure a clear approach, the research focuses on the following research objectives:

- 1. Deep analysis and understanding of organizations and the factors that determine organizational performance.**
- 2. Investigating and clarifying the concept of organizational engagement and its dimensions.**
- 3. Exploring and defining the essential role of leadership and the leadership process within the socio-economic dynamics of organizations.**
- 4. Develop a conceptual framework and a coherent research methodology to examine the relationships between organizational engagement, its dimensions, organizational leadership and job performance in Romanian organizations.**

### **1.2. Research methodology used**

The research methodology of the paper adopted an integrative approach to explore the variables of the model in the context of Romanian organizations, as well as the relationships and interdependencies between them in the specific context. The aim was to identify some association and causal determination relationships between the analyzed variables.

For this purpose, a quantitative methodology. The research was carried out through the investigation technique, using data collection tool questionnaires with responses on the Likert scale.

These questionnaires were applied to respondents from various organizations and fields of activity.

Research model variables, which include organizational engagement, motivation, satisfaction, leadership, and job performance, were investigated using these research tools. The interpretation of the obtained results was presented in the sections dedicated to the specific chapter of this paper. The general conclusions summarize the information presented and analyzed during the thesis. Personal contributions have been classified into two types: theoretical contributions and contributions of an applicative nature.

# I. THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

## Chapter 2. ORGANIZATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

### 2.1. Organisational structure

Zlate (2004) defined the organization as „a social-human activity, which involves the spontaneous or directed, voluntary association of a large number of individuals who hold well-defined statuses and roles, determined or not, in order to achieve a goal, a goal, an objective” (p. 96).

In order for employees to achieve organizational goals in an effective way, they must be organized, which implies establishing a clear structure of working relationships. George & Jones (2012) appreciates that: „Organizational structure is the formal system of task and job reporting relationships that determine how employees use resources to achieve the organization's goals.” (p. 470).

George & Jones (2012) believes that in the process of designing the organizational structure, three important factors must be taken into account:

1. *Organizational environment.* As the environment becomes more dynamic and uncertain, organizations tend to decentralize authority and empower employees to react quickly and flexibly. In contrast, in stable environments, organizational structures are more centralized, formal, and rigid.
2. *The technology used in the organization.* The more complex the technology used by an organization, the greater the need for a flexible structure that allows adaptation and innovation, while routine (common) technologies favor formal structures.
3. *Human resources and labor relations.* The more an organization relies on a highly skilled workforce and teams empowered to improve performance, the more likely it is to adopt a flexible and decentralized structure that allows employees the freedom to collaborate, make important decisions, and interact freely within teams.

Daft (2010) appreciates that the specific features of an organization are described by two categories of dimensions:

- *structural*, which refers to the internal characteristics of an organization, such as formalization, specialization, hierarchy of authority, centralization, professionalism, and personnel ratios;
- *contextual*, defining the organization as a whole, including dimensions such as size, organizational technology, environment, goals, strategy, and organizational culture.

Within an organization, authority, responsibility and accountability are the main aspects that ensure the efficient, structured and responsible functioning of activities (Robbins & Coulter, Management, 2016):

- *Authority* is the legitimate power conferred on certain positions or persons within the organization, which allows them to make decisions, coordinate the activities of other members of the organization, and ensure compliance with procedures, thereby maintaining order and influencing the actions of subordinates.
- *Responsibility* is the obligation of a person to efficiently and correctly perform the tasks and duties associated with his or her position in the organization, ensuring that each member understands expectations and is committed to meeting the organization's goals.
- *Accountability* involves a person assuming the consequences of their decisions and actions, being accountable to their superiors for how they have performed their duties, which is essential for maintaining discipline and being aware of the impact of actions on the organization.



## 2.2. Types of organisational structures

An organizational structure must correspond to the dimensions and complexity of an entity and the proposed goals, but also to imply a form of correlation between people and goals, as well as between people and structures. The organizational structure represents the way of dividing the organization's activity into objectives and their coordination.

Depending on the degree of structuring, organizations can be classified into two major categories:

- *Informal organizations* are those in which the structure is either poorly defined or lacking formality. These organizations are characterized by flexibility and adaptability, and their internal dynamics often depend on interpersonal relationships and informal influence between members.
- *Formal organizations*, on the other hand, have a well-established and clearly defined structure. In these organizations, norms, positions, and roles are precisely described, and relationships of authority, power, and responsibility are formally established. Due to the emphasis on order, rules and regulations, formal organizations tend to be more stable and predictable, but at the same time more rigid and less flexible than informal organizations.

Burns and Stalker (1994) identified two types of organizations:

**1. Mechanistic organizations** to o formal organizational structure, as it is a fusion of bureaucratic and hierarchical systems. Strictly regulated activities in a controlled structure give the mechanistic organization a static and rigid character (Burns & Stalker, 1994).

**2. Organic organizations** to o flat organizational structure, where activities are predominantly horizontal. Power and authority are evenly distributed among members, and the flexible structure allows for rapid adaptation to change. An organic organizational structure values employees' ideas, making them feel like an integral part of the system, which drives efficiency, productivity, and cooperation (Burns & Stalker, 1994).

Organizational structures provide an essential framework for the effective coordination of resources and activities, supporting the achievement of strategic objectives through a clear allocation of roles, responsibilities and authority relationships.

## 2.3. Organisational development

In an ever-changing organizational environment, what differentiates a successful organization from one that fails to capitalize on the same opportunities is, in addition to the commitment to people and quality, the ability to develop the necessary flexibility to adapt to changing conditions.

Brown and Harvey (2006) define organizational development as a set of long-term efforts and programs aimed at improving an organization's ability to survive and adapt by changing the way it solves problems and through renewal processes.

Bradford and Burke (2005) believe that any organization can be analyzed from the perspective of *Entries* from the external environment, *Yield* (the process by which inputs are used to produce a product or service) and *Outflows* (results and final performance of the organization). Products and services generated by the organization reach the external environment through customers and other stakeholders, thus influencing future inputs.

Since „today change is constant and inevitable” (Bradford & Burke, 2005, p. 7), the very field of organizational development must adapt and reinvent itself so as not to become irrelevant.

That is why organizational development must focus on creating integrative solutions to the problems faced by organizations, addressing problems related to content and process, collaboration with decision makers and increasing its influence in organizations, because „the goal of organizational development is to make organizations healthier and more efficient” (Brown & Harvey, 2006, p. 4).

## 2.4. Industrial organisations

Porter (1979) describes industrial organizations as entities operating within industries perceived as homogeneous, where these organizations are similar in most relevant economic dimensions, except for their size. Thus, in the traditional sense, *Industry* refers to a group of companies and organizations that produce similar goods or provide similar services.

Florida (2019) expands the concept of *industry* to include a wide range of activities, with a particular focus on the creative industries, encompassing sectors such as IT, design, visual arts, music, film. Florida introduces the concept of „creative industry” highlighting that these areas contribute significantly to economic growth and are characterized by organized activities based on creativity and innovation.

In this context, the definition of *industry* extends beyond the traditional boundaries of manufacturing production, to include other systematized fields such as technology, finance, and entertainment.

Fields (2012) explores the concepts of hard work and dedication, describing how the term „industry” is used figuratively to emphasize personal effort. Thus, the term symbolizes diligence and personal effort, being used to emphasize hard work and dedication, fundamental traits not only in the economic context, but in any form of organized activity.

The evolution of the concept of *industry* and *industrial organizations* reflects their continuous adaptation to the social, economic and technological changes of recent decades. Today, industrial organizations cover a wide spectrum of fields, contributing to the dynamics of the global economy and the development of contemporary society.

## Chapter 3. ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

In a competitive and ever-changing environment, organizational performance is essential for the survival and prosperity of any organization.

### 3.1. Defining performance

Bourguignon pointed out that: „in general, performance refers to the achievement of organizational objectives, regardless of the nature and variety of these objectives” (Bourguignon, 1997, p. 91). She appreciated, however, that performance means, at the same time, representation of success and varies according to the „actors” (because it is dependent on success), an outcome of an action (because it is an evaluation of the results achieved), and an action (because it is a process of putting a skill into action and represents an ideology of effort and progress). Armstrong and Baron (2005) On the other hand, it considers that performance should not only be seen in terms of quantifiable results, but also in the context of the efforts and activities that lead to these results, since high performance is achieved through the appropriate use of the necessary skills, knowledge and competences.

Motowidlo and Kell (2013) defined workplace performance as the value that the organization expects from the activities performed by people. Instead, Chatenay (2014) defined managerial performance as: „the achievement of objectives with criteria of quantity, quality, costs and deadlines whose levels have been set in advance” (p. 19), which emphasizes that performance „is not established once and for all” (p. 19).

As there is no consensus on the definition of performance or how to evaluate it, Bourguignon (1996) recommends an integrated and flexible approach to defining and evaluating performance, taking into account the diversity of factors involved.

### 3.2. Related concepts

Hansen & Wernerfelt (1989) considers that two main directions of approach to performance drivers can be distinguished:

- *economic*, emphasizing the role of external factors on the company's success;
- *behavioral*, focusing on organizational factors and how they align with the environment.

In the economic approach, the performance of the organization is explained by: the characteristics of the sector of activity, the positioning in relation to its competitors, the quality and quantity of available resources.

The behavioral approach, on the other hand, explores multidimensional aspects of organizational phenomena considered essential for performance: employee values and motivation, group dynamics and leadership, goal setting and achievement.

Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994) believe that there are two dimensions to the concept of employee performance:

- *Work performance* (professional performance itself) represents the behavior associated with maintaining and servicing the actual activity of the organization;
- *Contextual performance* (interpersonal professional performance): the personal skills of a person who supports the wider social environment in which the activity itself must operate.

Reviewing the literature, Nwamen (2006) observed that performance is a concept equated with notions such as: effectiveness, efficiency, economy, capacity, competitiveness, yield, productivity, success, achievement and excellence. The association of these notions with the concept of performance highlights the variety of understanding models and different perspectives of the researchers, practitioners, managers and experts involved.

Griffin (2007) notes that, in the literature, the definition of performance is done by overlapping concepts. Table 3.1. identifies the main approaches to job performance and lists their key constructs.

**Table 3.1. The evolution of concepts associated with work performance**

<b>Workload efficiency</b>	
Campbell, 1993	Competence in specific tasks of a job/position Competence in non-specific tasks of a job Written and oral communication skills Maintaining personal discipline Facilitating the performance of colleagues and the team Supervision and management Management and administration
<b>Behavior</b>	
Welbourne, 1998	Behavior in the role at work Role-playing behavior in the career Behavior in the role of innovator Team role behavior Role behavior in the organization
<b>Resiliency</b>	
Pulakos, 2000	Emergency or crisis management Managing stress at work Solving problems creatively Dealing with uncertain work situations Learning tasks, technologies and procedures Demonstration of interpersonal adaptability Demonstrating cultural adaptability Demonstrating physical adaptability
<b>Performance</b>	
Borman & Motowidlo, 1993	Load performance Contextual performance
Podsakoff et al., 2000	Helping behavior Sportsmanship Organizational loyalty Organizational conformism Individual initiative Civic virtue Self-development
Borman et al., 2001	Initiative / conscientiousness Personal support Organizational Support
Johnson, 2003	Load performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- competence in job-specific tasks</li> <li>- competence in non-job-specific tasks</li> <li>- Written and oral communication skills</li> <li>- Management and administration</li> <li>- Supervision / coordination</li> <li>- Initiative/conscientiousness</li> </ul> Performance in cooperation Adaptive performance
<b>Proactivity</b>	
Morrison & Phelps, 1999	Taking control
Grant, 2000	General proactive behavior Context-specific proactive behavior
Frese & Fay, 2001	Personal initiative
Parker et al., 2006	Proactive behavior at work

*Source: adapted and edited from Griffin, Neal, & Parker (2007, p. 328)*

### 3.3. Measuring performance in the workplace

The concept of performance measurement envisions the continuous monitoring and reporting of an entity or organization's achievements, especially progress toward predetermined goals. The result of the performance evaluation is materialized in a performance indicator, expressed by a numerical value and a unit of measurement: the number indicates the size (how much), and the unit provides the context (what). These indicators are always associated with specific objectives.

Performance indicators can assess the type or quality of the processes carried out, the products and services provided, as well as their results. These indicators are important tools to analyze, manage and optimize the activities of organizations (Eccles, 1991).

In general, the indicators of a process cover the following aspects:

- Effectiveness: reflects the extent to which the outcome of the process meets the requirements („Are we doing things right?”);
- Efficiency: measures how well the process produces the desired result with minimal resource costs („Are we doing things right?”);
- Customer care: the level of satisfaction of the users of the process.

Performance indicators must be integrated in two directions: vertically and horizontally (Franceschini, Galetto, & Maisano, 2019). Vertical integration helps employees align with the organization's strategic goals, while horizontal integration optimizes workflow across the entire process and organization.

There are several practical reasons for implementing a performance measurement system (Bourne & Bourne, 2011):

- A performance measurement system is a structured approach to focusing on the strategic plan, objectives and performance of a system.
- The indicators focus on the aspects that deserve more attention in order to achieve the necessary result. The indicators provide feedback on progress towards the targets.
- Performance indicators improve internal communication (between employees) and external communication (between the organization and customers, but also other stakeholders).

In establishing a performance measurement system, three fundamental aspects are essential:

- strategic plan;
- key sub-processes;
- the needs of stakeholders.

*The strategic plan* contains the basic information for building an integrated performance measurement system:

- strategic purpose - determines the final mission of the process;
- objective - describes the strategic activities that are necessary to achieve the objective;
- strategy – defines long-term strategic requirements that relate to objectives;
- tactical plan – identifies short-term requirements that are related to the strategy (requirements regarding cost, time, stage, quality, safety attributes).

Once a strategic plan has been defined, an appropriate set of indicators must be established. The objective is to find out which indicators should be monitored and maintained, who are the owners and beneficiaries of the data. For each indicator, it is necessary to provide a clear definition of the scale or unit of measurement and the procedure for data collection.

The processes implement the organization's strategic plan, and in the case of high complexity, it is recommended to break them down into *hierarchical sub-processes*. This can be achieved with the help of „process maps”, which provide a detailed visual representation of activities, information flows and responsibilities. Process maps include information about process inputs, procedures, and outcomes, and help define responsibilities.

The analysis of these maps allows you to evaluate the efficiency of the process, monitor the quality and identify problems and weaknesses.

The ISO 9001:2015 standard requires organizations to understand the *needs and expectations of stakeholders*, as they influence the ability to deliver products and services that meet the requirements. Stakeholders include customers, suppliers, shareholders, employees.

Management's commitment to the development and use of performance indicators is very important. There are four specific ways to encourage this commitment (Thomson & Varley, 1997):

- Delegation of responsibility: Employee engagement through empowerment increases loyalty, commitment, and accountability.
- Communication development: Effective communication links employee tasks to strategic goals.
- Soliciting feedback: Listening to employees' opinions helps align them with organizational strategy and promotes accountability.
- Defining responsibilities: Each performance indicator must have a designated responsible, and employees must understand the link of the indicators to the success or failure of the organization.

Kaplan and Norton (1996) have developed a framework for managing and measuring organizational performance, using a balanced set of financial (profitability and profitability) and non-financial (efficiency and effectiveness of internal processes, organizational culture, employee skills development, innovation) indicators, including customer perspectives (customer satisfaction and loyalty, market share and public perception).

Complex organizations implement performance measurement systems to ensure careful monitoring of the results, responsibilities and objectives set, so that they can properly assess progress and internal efficiency.

## Chapter 4. ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

### 4.1. Definition of the concept of organisational commitment

Allen and Mayer (1990) have stated that commitment can be defined empirically as „a psychological state that connects the individual to the organization” (p. 14).

Table 4.1. shows that the ways in which commitment is defined and operationalised vary widely. The first definition comes from the early works of Becker (1960) on the idea of „side bets”. In this case, individuals choose to remain in an organization because of the resources invested as their seniority increases, but also because of the costs associated with renouncing the organization's membership.

The second definition of organizational engagement focuses on behaviors that result in the attribution of commitment, assignments that are done, in part, to maintain consistency between one's behavior and attitudes.

The third definition in Table 4.1. refers to the processes of identifying and dedicating one's own energies to the objectives and values of the organization.

**Table 4.1. Definitions/operationalizations of organizational commitment**

<b>1. Side Bets</b>	Engagement is a function of the rewards and costs associated with membership in the organization; They usually increase as seniority in the organization increases. This approach, as well as variations of it, have been used by Alutto, Hrebiniak and Alonso (1973), (Becker H. S., 1960), Farrell and Rusbult (1981), Grusky (1966), Hrebiniak and Alutto (1972), Rusbult and Farrell (1983) and Sheldon (1971).
<b>2. Tasks</b>	Commitment determines certain behavioral acts when the individual attributes to himself an attitude of commitment, after engaging in behaviors that are volitional, explicit and irrevocable. This approach, and variations of it, has been used by Kiesler & Sakumura (1966), O'Reilly & Caldwell (1980), and (Salancik, 1977).
<b>3. Congruence of individual and organizational goals</b>	Engagement occurs when individuals identify with the organization's goals and values and strive to achieve them. The Organizational Engagement Questionnaire (OCQ), developed by Porter and his colleagues, is the main operationalization of this definition. This approach and variations of it have been used by Angle & Perry (1981); Bartol (1979); Bateman & Strasser (1984); Hall, Schneider, & Nygren (1970); Morris & Sherman (1981); Mowday, Porter, & Steers (1982); Mowday, Steers, & Porter (1979); Porter, Crampon, & Smith (1976); Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian (1974); Steers (1977); Stevens, Beyer, & Trice (1978); Stumpf & Hartman (1984); and Welsch & LaVan (1981).

*Source: Reichers (1985, p. 468)*

### 4.2. Approaches to organisational engagement

#### 4.2.1. Attitudinal approach

The attitudinal approach conceptualizes commitment as an attitude that reflects the nature and quality of the relationship between the employee and the organization (Oliver, 1990). This approach focuses on the process by which individuals come to form their perception of their relationship with the organization, considering that engagement develops as a result of a combination of work experiences, perceptions of the organization and personal characteristics, leading to positive feelings towards the organization (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982).

### 4.2.2. Behavioural approach

The behavioral approach to organizational engagement focuses on the process by which employees develop a sense of commitment not to the organization, but to their own actions (Becker, Billings, Eveleth, & Gilbert, 1996). The level of commitment is influenced by the relationship between the employee's intentions and the requirements of the organization, as well as the costs associated with leaving it.

Mowday et al. (1982) They tried to integrate the two approaches, arguing that attitudinal and behavioral engagement are related in a circular and reciprocal way, i.e. engaged attitudes lead to engaged behaviors, and to reduce internal inconsistencies between what someone says and what they do, engaged behaviors contribute to the formation of engaged attitudes.

## 4.3. Related concepts

### 4.3.1. Loyalty

**Loyalty** It is defined as a primary variable in the study of organizational engagement and an essential factor in achieving active engagement at work (Klein, Becker, & Meyer, 2009). Using the elements of the three forms of commitment, Hart & Thompson (2007) They define loyalty as „an individual's perception that both parties in a relationship have met each other's expectations that 1) denote lasting attachment between two parties, 2) involve self-sacrifice in the face of alternatives, 3) are burdened with obligations of duty” (p. 300). This definition encompasses the central elements of the organizational commitment model proposed by Meyer and Allen (1997): attachment (affective dimension), sacrifices or opportunity costs (continuity dimension) and sense of obligation (normative dimension).

### 4.3.2. Motivation

**Work motivation** refers to the factors that determine employees to engage in a certain action and adopt specific behaviors in terms of the effort made and the directions followed, thus contributing to the performance and profitability of the organizations they are part of. In an organizational context, motivation explains, in terms of involvement, employees' behavior and attitude towards work and performance.

Motivation can take various forms depending on the generating factor:

- *Extrinsic motivation*: the person acts to meet the expectations of others or to obtain material or social benefits, such as rewards, promotions or prestige.

- *Motivation regulated by introjection*: the person is driven to act to avoid negative feelings such as shame, guilt or fear.

- *Motivation regulated by identification*: specific to people who pursue a goal out of conviction, considering it important and consistent with personal values and standards.

- *Intrinsic motivation*: internally generated, it determines the individual to engage in activities that bring him pleasure, satisfaction and enthusiasm, being stimulated to learn, expand his skills and seek new challenges.

- *Amotivation*: characterized by lack of motivation, apathy and non-capitalization, where the person does not act because he believes that he will not achieve the desired result.

Extrinsic factors can generate immediate and intense effects, but of short duration, while intrinsic factors tend to produce stronger and lasting effects, since they are not imposed from the outside and are oriented towards the „quality of working life” (Armstrong, 2003, p. 141).

**Motivational theories** focuses on explaining employee behavior and the factors that influence their motivation (Lin, 2007).

Specialists classify motivational theories into three main categories, according to various criteria:

**A. Content theories (needs-based)** aim to identify the factors that initiate and direct the motivated behavior of individuals:

- Hierarchy of needs theory



- Bifactorial theory (motivation theory - hygiene)
- Theory of the need for realization
- Self-determination theory
- ERG Theory

**B. Process-oriented theories** focus on the factors that direct human behavior, analyzing the thoughts, beliefs, and values that people manifest in the decision-making process: the theory of expectations and the theory of fairness.

#### **C. Strengthening/Strengthening Theory:**

Developed by Baruch F. Skinner apud (Feldman, 1985), this motivational theory is considered one of the most applicable in practice, emphasizing the factors that determine the repetition of a behavior.

#### **4.3.3. Job satisfaction**

*Job satisfaction* is a topic of major interest in organizational theory, as the level of employee satisfaction is reflected in the organization's results.

Schneider and Snyder (1975) describe job satisfaction as the evaluation of job conditions or benefits, evaluations that are influenced by the needs, values, and expectations of the individual, as well as factors such as autonomy in performing job duties, involvement in decision-making processes, and empathetic behavior of management (Ahmad, Ahmad, & Shah, 2010). Micle (2009) believes that job satisfaction is „one of the factors of both personal and organizational efficiency” and that is why the attention paid to this concept is a priority for managers and specialists in the field (p. 75).

Professional satisfaction is multidimensional, involving aspects such as satisfaction with the work itself, salary, recognition, relationships with managers and colleagues, organizational culture and values of the structure (Sempane, Rieger, & Roodt, 2002).

### **4.4. Models of organisational engagement**

#### **4.4.1. Salancik's model**

Salancik, having a behavioral orientation, identified three essential characteristics that link an individual to organizational commitment: visibility, irrevocability, and volitionality of behavior.

#### **4.4.2. Mowday, Steers and Porter**

Organizational engagement has been defined by Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979) as the degree of identification of an individual with the organization and the level of active involvement in its activities.

#### **4.4.3. O'Reilly and Chatman's model**

Charles O'Reilly and Jennifer Chatman defined organizational engagement as „the psychological attachment felt by the person to the organization” and that „reflects the degree to which the individual internalizes or adopts characteristics or perspectives of the organization” (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986).

#### **4.4.4. The Angle and Perry model**

Angle and Perry (1981) have developed a two-dimensional model of commitment, which distinguishes between value commitment, an active commitment characterized by identification and involvement in the organization, and a passive commitment, defined by the desire to remain within the organization, but without the intention of being a dedicated and involved employee (Angle & Perry, 1981).

#### **4.4.5. The Penley and Gould model**

Penley and Gould developed a multidimensional model of engagement, based on Etzioni's organizational engagement model, which conceptualizes individuals' commitment to the organization (1961)(1975).

#### 4.4.6. Meyer and Allen's model

Meyer and Allen (1991) described organizational engagement as a multidimensional construct that can take different forms, proposing a three-component model:

- **Affective commitment:** This component reflects the employee's *desire* to remain in the organization, developing mainly from positive work experiences, which create feelings of comfort and professional competence.

- **Continuity commitment:** This component reflects the employee's *need* to remain in the organization, motivated by the recognition of the costs associated with leaving the organization, such as the existence of side bets or the lack of alternatives.

- **Normative commitment:** This component expresses *Obligation* employee to remain in the organization, which results from the internalization of loyalty norms or from the receipt of „Upfront rewards” (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 72).

The three-component organizational engagement model remains the most relevant in the research of this concept, emphasizing the need to investigate the antecedents of engagement, the relationships between components over time, the links between engagement and behavior, and the processes involved in the development and consequences of engagement.

#### 4.5. Influences of organizational engagement on job performance

Researchers' increased interest in organizational engagement lies in its relationships to a number of important organizational outcomes. High engagement was associated with a decrease in staff turnover and absenteeism, an increase in employee retention, and a high level of job performance (Allen & Meyer, 2000).

## **Chapter 5. LEADERSHIP: EVOLUTION, DEFINITIONS AND THEORETICAL APPROACHES**

Leadership is a topic of interest, both for researchers and practitioners, because it is a factor with an important contribution in achieving performance both at the individual level of employees and at the organizational level. Modern challenges require the adoption of flexible leadership models that are adaptable to the environment and unpredictable situations. In trying to define this concept, researchers have at the same time sought the answer to the question of whether leadership is an art or a science.

### **5.1. Etymological and historical considerations**

Etymology has shown that leadership is mainly the ability or skill required to lead, guide or direct. The Oxford English Dictionary (1933) (Simpson & Weiner, 1989) highlighted the appearance of the word „leader” in English as early as the 1300s, and the appearance of the word „leadership” in the first half of the nineteenth century, in writings on imperialism and public services (Bass & Bass, 2008).

The etymology of the word „leadership” comes from the English verb „to lead”, which has several meanings, namely: to lead, to lead, to direct, to guide, to command, to govern, to guide, to guide, to guide, to reach, to direct, to determine, to show the way, to accompany.

### **5.2. Defining the concept of leadership**

In 1994, 84 social scientists from 56 countries, who met in Calgary in Canada as part of the international GLOBE project (*Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness is a scientific project that has been studying national values, leadership, organizational practices and their relationships since the 1990s, in collaboration with nearly 500 researchers from more than 150 countries*) concluded that: „leadership is the ability to influence, motivate and enable others to contribute to the effectiveness and success of the organizations of which they are members” (Bass & Bass, 2008).

Professor Silva (2016) defined leadership, emphasizing *acceptance*, thus: „Leadership is the process of interactive influence that occurs when, in a given context, some people accept someone as a leader in order to achieve their common goals” (Silva, 2016, p. 3).

### **5.3. Delimitation of the concepts of leadership and management**

Both managers and leaders have important roles in the success of an organization. They contribute differently, apply distinct approaches and conceptualizations of work, have specific ways of solving tasks and problems, and exhibit different behaviors due to intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. Managers ensure operational efficiency and meeting short-term goals, and leaders inspire and guide. Organizations need both good managers and leaders to function effectively and achieve performance.

In terms of management and leadership, both differences and similarities were highlighted by the academic community and the professional world. Both management and leadership involve working with people and influencing them to achieve organizational goals. Management, however, has skills used to organize, control, and direct organizational systems toward achieving goals, while leadership focuses on change and setting direction by motivating and aligning people (Algahtani, 2014). For an organization to be run effectively, to develop sustainably and to perform, a combination of management and leadership, effective functions and connected relationships is necessary (Maccoby, 2000).

## 5.4. Classification of approaches to leadership

Approaches to leadership are continually evolving as new perspectives and research are developed.

The main approaches are classified as follows:

1. *Trait Approach;*
2. *Behavioral approach;*
3. *Situational/contingency approach;*
4. *Contemporary approach.*

The first three approaches provide a framework for understanding leadership from the leader's point of view, namely what the leader is, what the leader does, and in what situation he or she is an effective leader. These theories focus on skills, structure, and system concepts. The fourth, the contemporary approach, examines the relationships between leaders and followers, which also include common values, goals, ideals, group and personal activities (Fairholm & Fairholm, 2009).

### 5.4.1. Trait Approach

Northouse showed that early attempts to study leadership focused on addressing traits. The theories were called the „great man” theories because it was considered that great political, military and social leaders were born with special qualities that differentiate them from non-leaders. Northouse stated that after a century of research on the trait approach, there has been a general convergence of research on these leadership traits, which include: intelligence, self-confidence, determination, integrity, and sociability.

### 5.4.2. Behavioural approach

According to this approach, the actions and behaviors of leaders in various contexts are essential in the study of leadership, in contrast to trait-based theories that focus on the innate qualities of leaders.

### 5.4.3. Situational approach

In the situational approach, the influence of contextual factors on leadership processes is emphasized. The theory refers to adapting the leadership style according to the specific situation and the competence and commitment of the followers, providing a flexible framework to improve the effectiveness of leaders in various organizational contexts.

### 5.4.4. Contemporary approach

While classical approaches assume that in the leadership process there is a unidirectional influence of the leader on the followers, in contemporary approaches leadership is considered to be a result of interaction, exchanges and processes of influence between people in an organization (Yukl G. A., 2013).

Contemporary approaches, which we will mention and describe, include:

- transformational leadership;
- transactional leadership;
- authentic leadership;
- visionary leadership;
- e-leadership.

**Transformational leadership** is suitable for leading complex groups and organizations, where followers are challenged, through mentoring and support, to commit to a common vision and goals for the organization, solve innovative problems, remain loyal and performing.

Transformational leadership is considered an effective form of leadership globally because it aligns with the prototypes of the ideal leader perceived by people.

Rafferty and Griffin (2004) proposed a transformational leadership model with five dimensions: vision, inspirational communication, intellectual stimulation, encouraging leadership, personal recognition, considered essential for creating a motivating and productive work environment, where followers feel valued and inspired to contribute to organizational success (Rafferty & Griffin, 2004).

**Transactional leadership** is defined by a clearly defined exchange between leader and employees, where responsibilities and rewards are rigorously established and monitored.

**Authentic leadership** is manifested through a series of behaviors and attitudes that reflect the integrity, transparency and commitment of the leader to his values and principles.

**Visionary leadership** involves the ability of leaders to create and convey a clear and motivating vision for the future of the organization, mobilizing followers to work together to achieve this vision.

**e-Leadership** is a natural adaptation of traditional leadership styles in the digital context and the current needs of organizations. By using technology effectively and addressing challenges specific to virtual work, e-leaders can guide teams and encourage performance and innovation in their organizations.

### **5.5. Influences of leadership on job performance**

There are numerous studies that have highlighted the influence of leadership on job performance. Goleman (2000) explored the impact of different leadership styles on workplace performance, emphasizing the importance of emotional intelligence in leadership. He concluded that leaders who adapt their leadership style according to the context and needs of their team, can achieve better results and superior team performance.

## II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS

### Chapter 6. INVESTIGATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WORK MOTIVATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

The purpose of this research is to investigate the relationships between the concepts of work motivation and organizational commitment in the case of employees in three fields of activity, namely: commercial, educational and medical. The motivation behind the purpose of the research is the importance attached to the in-depth understanding of these concepts for organizations.

#### 6.1. Study design

We have established the following *Specific Objectives and Research Hypotheses*:

**Table 6.1. Correspondence between specific objectives and research assumptions**

Specific objectives	Research hypotheses
<p><b>Objective 1.</b> We aim to explore the relationship between the facets of work motivation and the dimensions of organizational engagement.</p>	<p><b>H1.</b> We believe that there is a significant positive correlation between intrinsic motivation and affective commitment.</p> <p><b>H2.</b> We believe that there is a significant positive correlation between extrinsic social motivation and normative engagement.</p> <p><b>H3.</b> We believe that there is a significant positive correlation between the extrinsic material motivation and the commitment to continuity.</p>
<p><b>Objective 2.</b> We aim to study the differences in the levels of motivation and organizational commitment between employees involved in three fields of activity.</p>	<p><b>H4.</b> We estimate that there are significant differences in the levels of motivation between the employees of the three fields of activity.</p> <p><b>H5.</b> The highest level of motivation is found in employees in the commercial field.</p> <p><b>H6.</b> We appreciate that the highest level of affective commitment is found in the employees in the medical field, significantly higher than in the commercial field.</p>

*Source: author's contribution*

**Research sample:** This study involved 520 respondents, employed in 12 declared fields of activity and in other fields that they did not declare. This group of 520 respondents included 436 women (83.8%) and 84 men (16.2%).

**Research tools:** The following questionnaires were used for data collection:

- **Organizational Commitment Inventory** (Meyer & Allen, 1997). The variables measured are: affective commitment, continuity commitment, normative commitment.

- **The Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale** – MWMS – (Gagné, și alții, 2015)

The variables targeted by this tool are: amotivation, extrinsic social motivation, material motivation, motivation regulated by introjection, motivation regulated by identification, intrinsic motivation.

**Procedure:** The data were collected by applying the questionnaires online with the help of the Google forms platform. The questionnaires were administered mainly to employees in various fields, such as medical, psychological, legal, public administration and economic

activities. The answers were anonymized, and the participants were assured that the way they answered did not affect them in any way in their professional lives.

The data were processed with the help of the S.P.S.S. 17.0 processing program.

## 6.2. Results and discussions

From the descriptive data of the Organizational Engagement dimensions, we observe that the mean values of the scales are close to the median values, which denotes that the means of the scales are representative of the chosen research sample. Similarly, from the descriptive data of the Motivation dimensions, we notice that the mean values of the scales are close to the median values, which denotes that the means of the scales are representative for the research sample.

For **Hypothesis 1** We have calculated the correlation coefficient between the variables *Intrinsic motivation* And *affective commitment*. There is a strongly significant correlation between the two variables ( $r=0.359$ ,  $p=0.000$ ), which shows that **Hypothesis 1 is confirmed**. The more motivated employees are in the actual work activity, the greater their emotional commitment. This is especially true in areas that are socially recognized as being paid at a lower level and where a higher degree of altruism (Tiron , 2011) is required on the part of employees (medical, educational).

For **Hypothesis 2** we calculated the correlation coefficient between the variables *social extrinsic motivation* and *normative commitment*. We observe a significant correlation between the two variables ( $r=0.091$ ,  $p=0.039$ ). **Hypothesis 2 is confirmed**.

Even if the power of this correlation is quite small, its significance highlights the fact that employees who are more motivated in their activity by the presence of colleagues and relationships with them, have a greater normative commitment, taking into account the fact that it is extremely important to be fair to those around them and to comply with written and unwritten rules.

For **Hypothesis 3** we calculated the correlation coefficient between the variables material extrinsic motivation and continuity commitment. We note a strongly significant correlation between the two variables ( $r=0.320$ ,  $p=0.000$ ), which shows that **Hypothesis 3 is confirmed**.

The more motivated employees are by the potential material benefits, the greater the commitment to continuity, and employees are willing to make certain cost-benefit calculations for situations in which they would leave the organization.

**Hypothesis 4 is partially confirmed**. The estimate made was that there are significant differences in the levels of motivation between the employees of the three fields of activity, but the only significant difference ( $p=0.040$ ) between the targeted areas is only at the level of material extrinsic motivation.

**Hypothesis 5 is partially confirmed** in the sense that although the initial estimate was that the highest level of motivation is found in employees in the commercial field, we observe that the different aspects of motivation have different hierarchies depending on the field of activity. Significant differences ( $p=0.034$ ) are manifested only at the level of extrinsic material motivation and only between the commercial and educational fields.

**Hypothesis 6 is rejected**. The highest level of affective commitment is not found in employees in the medical field, nor is it significantly higher than in the commercial field. The research data showed that no significant differences are manifested in any aspect of organizational commitment (Affective commitment:  $p=0.429$ ; Continuity commitment:  $p=0.864$ ; Normative commitment:  $p=0.104$ ; Overall engagement score:  $p=0.332$ ) among employees in the three domains studied: commercial, educational, and medical.

### **6.3. Conclusions and implications**

The results highlighted that employees need to be more incentivized in order to increase commitment to their organizations, as motivation and organizational commitment covary to a significant extent. These results suggest that human resources managers should pursue appropriate recruitment, selection and motivation strategies in order to attract and retain staff compatible with the organization's values.

The practical implications of the research are numerous. For organizations, it is necessary to adopt strategies aimed at increasing the intrinsic motivation of employees. The link between intrinsic motivation and affective commitment indicates that employees who have a high level of intrinsic motivation tend to get involved in their work. We consider it appropriate to pay more attention to improve affective commitment. Through this intervention, intrinsic motivation can achieve its maximum effect on performance in work tasks.



## Chapter 7. INVESTIGATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND JOB PERFORMANCE

The purpose of this research is to investigate the relationships between the concepts of job satisfaction and professional performance in the case of employees in three fields of activity, namely: commercial, educational and medical. The motivation behind the purpose of the research is the importance attached to the in-depth understanding of these concepts for organizations.

### 7.1. Study design

In accordance with the purpose of the research, we have established the following *Specific Objectives and Research Hypotheses*:

Specific objectives	Research hypotheses
<p><b>Objective 1.</b> We aim to investigate the relationship between aspects of job satisfaction and aspects of professional performance.</p>	<p><b>H1.</b> We believe that there is a significant positive correlation between financial satisfaction and competence in performing individual tasks.</p> <p><b>H2.</b> We believe that there is a significant positive correlation between satisfaction related to leadership and proactivity in the role of member of an organization.</p> <p><b>H3.</b> We believe that there is a significant positive correlation between satisfaction with co-workers and competence in the role of a team member.</p>
<p><b>Objective 2.</b> We intend to study whether there are significant differences in terms of employment status for employees in three fields of activity.</p>	<p><b>H4.</b> We estimate that there are significant differences in terms of satisfaction levels between the employees of the three areas of activity</p> <p><b>H5.</b> The highest levels of financial satisfaction and benefit satisfaction are found in commercial employees.</p> <p><b>H6.</b> We appreciate that the highest level of satisfaction related to the nature of work is found among employees in the educational field, significantly higher than in the commercial field.</p>

*Source: author's contribution*

#### **Research Sample**

This research was carried out on two groups of participants as follows:

- *Lot 1*, consisting of 200 respondents, employed in 12 declared fields of activity and in other undeclared fields, to whom the instruments of measuring job satisfaction and evaluating work performance were applied. The first three hypotheses were tested on this batch. Lot 1 included 168 (84%) women and 32 (16%) men.

- *Lot 2*, made up of 520 participants (which includes the participants from the first batch) to which the work satisfaction measurement instrument was applied. Hypotheses 4 and 5 were tested on this lot. The structure by gender and fields of activity is similar to that of the group in the first study, 436 (83.8%) women and 84 (16.2%) men were part of it.

This research was carried out on two groups of participants, because from the beginning of the research until the time of the study, 200 participants had answered the performance questionnaire, and 520 participants had answered the satisfaction questionnaire, including the 200 who answered the performance questionnaire.

### **Research tools**

The research data were collected using the following questionnaires:

- **Job Satisfaction Survey** (Spector, 1997). The variables targeted by this instrument are: financial satisfaction, satisfaction related to promotion, satisfaction related to management, satisfaction related to benefits, satisfaction related to non-material rewards, satisfaction related to working conditions, satisfaction related to co-workers, satisfaction related to the nature of work, satisfaction related to communication.
- **Griffin's Workplace Performance Scale** (Griffin, Neal, & Parker, 2007). The variables measured are: competence in performing individual tasks, adaptability in individual tasks, proactivity in performing individual tasks, competence in the role of team member, adaptability in the role of team member, proactivity in the role of team member, competence in the role of member of the organization, adaptability in the role of member of the organization, proactivity in the role of member of the organization.

## **7.2. Results and discussions**

For **Hypothesis 1** we calculated the correlation coefficient between the variables *financial satisfaction* and *competence in performing individual tasks*. The correlation observed between the variables is positive and significant ( $r=0.163$ ,  $p=0.021$ ). **Hypothesis 1 has been confirmed**. People who show a high level of competence in performing individual tasks have an increased level of financial satisfaction.

These statistical results are also supported by theories that consider that an important factor of job satisfaction is salary and opportunities for advancement. This view is argued in particular by equity theory, according to which individuals compare what they invest and what they get, in relation to other people.

For **Hypothesis 2** we calculated the correlation coefficient between the variables management satisfaction and proactivity in the role of member of an organization. **Hypothesis 2 is refuted**, the relationship between the two variables is statistically insignificant ( $r=0.053$ ,  $p=0.454$ ). The fact that the willingness to take a proactive attitude as a member of an organization is not significantly associated with the variable satisfaction related to management. We believe that there is a high probability that this dimension of performance is associated with the satisfaction given by communication or the nature of the work performed.

For **Hypothesis 3** we calculated the correlation coefficient between the variables satisfaction related to co-workers and competence in the role of team member. There is a positive and statistically significant correlation between satisfaction with co-workers and competence in the role of team member ( $r=0.244$ ,  $p=0.000$ ). **Hypothesis 3 is confirmed**. The greater satisfaction employees have with their co-workers, the greater their competence in the role of a team member.

These results can be explained partially the theory of person-job matching, which claims that performance and job satisfaction will occur only when the person feels that he or she fits the job he or she occupies, in this case, the place he or she occupies is that of a member of a team. The theory suggests that job satisfaction is the result of the congruence between the employee's perception of the job, but also of the values dominant of it. If a person feels that they fit in with the team in which they work, then the level of professional satisfaction is higher and increases performance in the activity performed (Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002).

For **Hypotheses 4, 5 and 6** we performed the unifactorial Anova test considering the Field of activity as an independent variable, and as dependent variables we took into account the dimensions of satisfaction.

The data obtained show that **Hypothesis 4 is partially confirmed**, in the sense that there are no significant differences in all dimensions of satisfaction. These significant differences are evident only in two of the dimensions of satisfaction: *Satisfaction with payment* ( $p=0.005$ ) and *Satisfaction with contingent rewards* ( $p=0.020$ ).

**Hypothesis 5 is partially confirmed.** Employees in the commercial field have the highest levels of financial satisfaction and satisfaction related to benefits, but the differences from the medical and educational fields are not significant in both situations. At the level of Satisfaction with payment, the differences are highlighted between the commercial and educational fields ( $p=0.005$ ), as well as between the commercial and medical fields ( $p=0.023$ ). Regarding Satisfaction with benefits, there were no significant differences between the commercial and educational fields ( $p=0.166$ ).

The differences in satisfaction with pay and rewards can be explained by the fact that employees in the commercial field have economic advantages among the dominant values, while in the educational and medical fields one of the dominant values is altruism (Tiron , 2011). In terms of benefits, teachers feel as a reward both in the short and long term, the results of the students they work with and train.

**Hypothesis 6 is rejected.** The highest level of Satisfaction related to the nature of work is found in the employees in the educational field, but there are no significant differences ( $p=0.938$ ) compared to the employees in the commercial and medical fields.

Employees in the targeted fields showed relatively similar and quite high levels of satisfaction related to the nature of work. These results are among those who claim that attitudes towards work are closely related to the satisfaction of certain needs that the individual has. Satisfaction varies depending on the discrepancy between needs and the extent to which the individual's job fulfills those needs. Job satisfaction is based on individuals' perception of what is happening in the work environment and not just the context at work.

According to the literature and managerial practices in the field, the evaluation of human resources or their performance involves several distinct activities: evaluation of a person's potential and ability to evolve, behavior evaluation and performance evaluation.

### 7.3. Conclusions and implications

Following the analysis of the data obtained in this study, it can be concluded that for the employees who work in the studied organizations, there is a relationship between professional performance and professional satisfaction. Winefield (2002) felt that people who „They spend most of their time in a job that brings them dissatisfaction, they have their entire emotional mood negatively influenced. On the other hand, spending time in a job that brings them satisfaction and is exciting and motivating, their entire emotional state is positive” (Winefield, 2002, p. 137). Moreover, other studies have shown (Winefield, 2002) that individuals with a happy life are much more satisfied with their work ( $r=0.41$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Kosec et al. (2022) obtained direct relationships of Employee Performance with Job Satisfaction ( $r=0.35$ ,  $p=0.00$ ) and Life Satisfaction ( $r=0.28$ ,  $p=0.00$ ). The data obtained in this research are supported both by the theoretical premises from which this study started, and by previous studies on work performance.

## Chapter 8. INVESTIGATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP AND PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE

The relationship between leadership and professional performance is a topic of major interest in the field of organizational management, given the significant impact of leadership style on employee efficiency and organizational results.

Transformational leaders motivate employees by creating a shared vision and establishing a personal connection with the team, thus generating increased employee engagement (Yusuf & Kurniady, 2020). Transformational leaders also encourage creative problem-solving and acceptance of change, which leads to improved processes and organizational performance. (Karam & Tasmin, 2020). Moreover, these leaders motivate their teams through personal recognition and by promoting a sense of purpose and achievement (Pounder, 2003).

Analyzing how transformational leadership style influences employee performance can help us build an integrative model that identifies and promotes effective leadership practices. This chapter aims to investigate both the direct and indirect relationships between the dimensions of transformational leadership and professional performance.

### 8.1. Study design

The following *Specific Objectives and Research Hypotheses* have been established:

Specific objectives 1	Research hypotheses 2
<b>O1.</b> We aim to highlight differences in transformational leadership, depending on the field of activity.	<b>H1.</b> We believe that the commercial field exhibits the highest level of transformational leadership, as leaders must anticipate changes in highly competitive markets and inspire employees to be creative and proactive.
<b>O2.</b> We aim to investigate the direct and mediated relationships between transformational leadership scales and workplace performance, where the mediating variables are the dimensions of organizational engagement.	<b>H2.</b> We estimate that the direct effect of transformational leadership variables on job performance is greater than the effect mediated by organizational engagement variables. <b>H3.</b> We believe that the lowest overall effect on workplace performance is given by encouraging leadership.
<b>O3.</b> We aim to investigate the predictive power of transformational leadership scales on workplace performance and organizational engagement.	<b>H4.</b> We estimate that the variable inspirational communication influences overall performance to the greatest extent. <b>H5.</b> We consider that the lowest influence on the general organizational commitment is exerted by the variable personal recognition.
<b>O4.</b> We aim to investigate the predictive power of organizational engagement scales on workplace performance.	<b>H6.</b> We believe that the strongest influence on overall performance is exerted by affective engagement. <b>H7.</b> We believe that the lowest influence on overall performance is exercised by the commitment to continuity.

*Source: author's contribution*

**Research sample:** 452 respondents participated in this study, of which 357 women (78.98%) and 95 men (21.02%), coming from 11 declared fields of activity.

#### **Research tools**

The following questionnaires were used for data collection:

- **Transformational Leadership Questionnaire** (Rafferty & Griffin, 2004), which measures dimensions such as: vision, inspirational communication, intellectual stimulation, encouraging leadership and personal recognition.

- *Griffin's Workplace Performance Scale* (Griffin, Neal, & Parker, 2007), which evaluates variables such as: competence in performing individual tasks, adaptability in individual tasks, proactivity in performing individual tasks, competence in the role of team member, adaptability in the role of team member, proactivity in the role of team member, competence in the role of member of the organization, adaptability in the role of member of the organization and proactivity in the role of member of the organization.

- *Organizational Commitment Inventory* (Meyer & Allen, 1997), which measures affective commitment, continuity commitment, normative commitment.

### ***Procedure***

The data were collected by applying the questionnaires online, with the help of the Google forms platform. The questionnaires were administered mainly to employees in various fields, such as medical, psychological, legal, public administration and economic activities. The answers were anonymised and the participants were assured that the way they answered would have no impact on their professional lives.

The data were processed using the JASP 0.18.3 processing program. The following statistical tests were performed: unifactorial ANOVA, simple linear regression and multiple linear regression.

## **8.2. Results and discussions**

From the descriptive data, the indicators that highlight the normal distribution (Skewness, with values between -1 and 1; Kurtosis between -3 and 3) respects the conditions of normality, with three small exceptions, but the values of the coefficients of variation for these variables are less than 0.3, which is why we can consider that in these cases the mean is representative of the data strings.

For the testing of **Hypothesis 1** we performed the unifactorial ANOVA test, having as an independent variable the field of activity, and as a dependent variable the level of general transformational leadership.

The commercial field has the highest score (3,836), which means that this field registers the strongest transformational leadership.

The results of the Anova test, however, show that the differences between the overall transformational leadership scores between the fields of activity are insignificant ( $p=0.141$ ). That is why it is important to analyze the subsumed dimensions of transformational leadership (vision, inspirational communication, intellectual stimulation, encouraging leadership, personal recognition). Such an analysis could highlight significant differences that are not visible at a general level, providing a more detailed understanding of how each dimension of transformational leadership manifests itself in various areas.

The Anova test for the personal recognition dimension indicates that there are significant differences between the fields of activity ( $p=0.006$ ).

In order to identify the areas of activity that differ significantly, multiple Post Hoc Bonferroni comparisons were performed.

The Bonferroni test confirms that significant differences between domains are present in the Personal Recognition dimension, between the commercial domain, compared to the Banking/Finance domain ( $t = -3.067$ ,  $p = 0.035$ ) and the Medicine/Therapies domain ( $t = 3.119$ ,  $p = 0.029$ ). We can conclude that **Hypothesis 1 is confirmed**.

In the commercial sector, transformational leadership plays a key role in driving innovation, increasing customer satisfaction and expanding into the market.

This type of leadership is characterized by the ability of leaders to develop an inspirational vision that motivates employees to actively contribute to the success of the organization. They create a dynamic work environment where creativity and responsibility are encouraged.

In order to test **Hypotheses 2** and **3**, as well as in order to identify the direct and mediated relationships between the transformational leadership (LT) scales and workplace performance, where the mediating variables are the dimensions of organizational commitment, mediation analyses were performed.

The *vision variable* positively influences *overall performance*, both directly and indirectly through the various forms of organizational engagement. The strongest indirect effects are mediated by affective engagement, followed by normative engagement and continuity engagement, while overall organizational engagement has the least significant indirect effect.

*Inspirational communication* positively influences *overall performance*, both directly and indirectly through the various forms of organizational engagement. The strongest indirect effects are mediated by affective commitment, followed by continuity commitment and normative commitment, while general organizational commitment has the least indirect effect, being at the limit of significance.

*Intellectual stimulation* positively influences *overall performance*, both directly and indirectly through the various forms of organizational engagement. The strongest indirect effects are mediated by affective commitment and normative commitment, while continuity commitment does not have a significant indirect effect. The overall organisational commitment contributes a significant but smaller indirect effect.

*Encouraging leadership* positively influences *overall performance*, both directly and indirectly through the various forms of organizational engagement. The strongest indirect effects are mediated by affective engagement, followed by normative engagement and continuity engagement, and overall organizational engagement has the least indirect but still significant effect.

*Personal recognition* positively influences *overall performance*, both directly and indirectly through the various forms of organizational engagement. The strongest indirect effects are mediated by affective engagement, followed by continuity engagement and normative engagement, while overall organizational engagement has the least significant indirect effect.

*General transformational leadership* positively influences *overall performance*, both directly and indirectly through the various forms of organizational engagement. The strongest indirect effects are mediated by affective engagement, followed by normative engagement and continuity engagement, while overall organizational engagement has the least indirect effect, bordering on significance.

**Hypothesis 2 is confirmed**, in the case of each dimension of transformational leadership the direct effect on performance is greater than the effect mediated by the organizational commitment variables.

**Hypothesis 3 is rejected**, the lowest total effect on performance is not given by encouraging leadership (estimated = 0.185,  $p < 0.001$ ), but by *personal recognition* (estimated = 0.172,  $p < 0.001$ ).

Considering the complexity of the sources of job performance growth, as well as the many ways in which these resources (individual, organizational, technical, economic, cultural) of optimizing it interact, we propose, at this stage, to investigate the prediction relationships of transformational leadership (LT) scales on workplace performance and organizational engagement (AO), but also how to predict the scales of organizational commitment on performance. For this purpose, several simple and multiple linear regressions were carried out to test **hypotheses 4** and **5**.

Simple linear regressions were calculated to test the influences between the general variables. Multiple regressions were calculated using as predictors the dimensions of each general variable, considered simultaneously in the same model, the influence of each dimension on the dependent variable being calculated while it is controlled/adjusted in relation to the influence of the other dimensions.

The coefficients thus obtained for each dimension reflect the effect of that dimension on the dependent variable taking into account the other dimensions. Thus, we can identify the net influence of each dimension, excluding the side effects generated by potential correlations between dimensions.

#### **Linear Regression: Overall Transformational Leadership – Overall Performance**

The presented model explains approximately 12.6% of the total variation of the dependent variable ( $R^2=0.126$ ). This suggests that while the overall *transformational leadership predictor* has a significant effect, there are other variables that could influence the dependent variable.

#### **Linear Regression: Dimensions of Transformational Leadership -> Overall Performance**

We note that about 13.4% of the variability in overall performance can be explained by the model that includes the five dimensions of transformational leadership. The proposed global regression model is very significant ( $F = 15.002$ ,  $p < .001$ ), indicating that the independent variables taken together have a significant explanatory power on the dependent variable. Inspirational communication is the only significant predictor (non-standard  $\beta = 0.212$ ,  $p = .002$ ), indicating a strong positive relationship with overall performance. The other predictors do not have a significant impact on the current model.

#### **Linear Regression: General Transformational Leadership-General Organizational Commitment**

The model explains about 2.6% of the total variation of the dependent variable ( $R^2=0.026$ ). This suggests that while the Overall Transformational Leadership predictor has a significant effect, there are many other variables that could influence the dependent variable.

#### **Regression: Dimensions Transformational Leadership->General Organizational Commitment**

We observe that about 3.2% of the variability in affective engagement can be explained by the model that includes the five dimensions of transformational leadership. The proposed global regression model is very significant ( $F = 3.975$ ,  $p = 0.002$ ), indicating that the independent variables taken together have a significant explanatory power on the dependent variable.

Intellectual stimulation is the only significant predictor (non-standard  $\beta = 0.620$ ,  $p = 0.018$ ), indicating a strong positive relationship with overall organizational engagement. The other predictors do not have a significant impact on the current model.

Comparing the data obtained from the regressions, we find that the variable inspirational communication influences the overall performance to the greatest extent (standardized  $\beta = 0.295$ ). The model explains about 13.4% of the total variation of the dependent variable ( $R^2 = 0.134$ ). **Hypothesis 4 is confirmed.** Leaders who inspire, strengthen and connect employees contribute significantly to increasing their engagement, thus improving team performance and reducing burnout and absenteeism rates (Mazzetti & Schaufeli, 2022).

At the same time, the lowest influence on overall organizational engagement is exerted by the personal recognition variable (standardized  $\beta = -0.105$ ). The model that encompasses the totality of transformational leadership dimensions explains about 3.2% of the total variation of the dependent variable ( $R^2 = 0.032$ ). **Hypothesis 5 is confirmed.**

For the testing of **Hypotheses 6 and 7**, linear regressions were calculated, which highlighted the predictions of the organizational commitment scales on work performance.

#### **Regression Overall Organizational Commitment > Overall Performance**

The model explains about 2.5 % of the total variation of the dependent variable ( $R^2=0.025$ ). This suggests that while the Overall Organizational Engagement predictor has a significant effect, there are many other variables that could influence the dependent variable.

#### **Regression Dimensions Organizational Commitment -> Overall Performance**

We observe that about 13.7% of the variability in overall performance can be explained by the model that includes affective commitment, continuity commitment, and normative commitment. The proposed global regression model is very significant ( $F = 24.912$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), indicating that the independent variables taken together have a significant explanatory power

on the dependent variable. Affective commitment is a significant positive predictor (non-standard  $\beta = 0.035$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), indicating a strong positive relationship with overall performance. The continuity commitment is significant (non-standard  $\beta = -0.035$ ,  $p < .001$ ), indicating a negative relationship with overall performance. Regulatory commitment does not have a significant impact on the current model.

These results suggest that in order to improve overall employee performance, managers of organizations should encourage affective engagement, which has a significant positive impact, while paying attention to continuity engagement, which has a significant negative impact on overall performance.

Comparing the data obtained from the regressions, we find that the variable with the strongest influence on general performance is exerted by affective commitment. **Hypothesis 6 is confirmed.** Ribeiro, Yücel & Gomes (2018) confirmed that employees' affective engagement is a significant predictor of individual and overall performance. Affective commitment plays a crucial role in improving the overall performance of employees, having a stronger influence compared to other variables. This underscores the importance of cultivating an organizational environment that promotes employees' positive emotional bonds with their organization.

The lowest influence on overall performance is exerted by the normative engagement predictor, which in the current context is insignificant (standardized  $\beta = 0.096$ ,  $p = 0.100$ ). **Hypothesis 7 is refuted**, since the predictor of continuity commitment is strongly significant (standardized  $\beta = -0.215$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

### 8.3. Conclusions and implications

*A clear and* well-communicated vision to employees is essential for guiding organizational efforts and motivating the team. To ensure that individual and team goals are aligned with overall organizational goals, it is essential that employees understand what is wanted from them and feel part of the organization.

*Inspirational communication* has a positive and significant influence on overall performance, can optimize team morale and contribute to a positive work environment. Of all the transformational leadership variables, inspirational communication influences performance the most.

*Intellectual stimulation* promotes a climate of continuous learning, where each team member can develop their skills and actively contribute to the achievement of organizational objectives. Leaders who embrace intellectual stimulation encourage employees to express their ideas, ask questions, and propose alternative solutions, which leads to increased individual and team performance.

*Personal recognition* is an essential factor for employee motivation and satisfaction, and it is important for leaders to show appreciation for employees' efforts and achievements, either through positive feedback or symbolic or material rewards.



## Chapter 9. CONCLUSIONS

### 9.1. Final Conclusions

Based on the results obtained in the three studies, we developed an integrative model that highlights the relationships between variables. From the first study we presented the values of significant correlations between the motivation dimensions and the overall organizational engagement scale, and from the second study we highlighted the significant correlations of the dimensions of job satisfaction and overall performance.

From the third study, we learned how overall transformational leadership affects overall job performance, both directly and through overall organizational engagement. In the third study, we also proposed and identified the deeper ways in which the variables act, capturing both through mediation and regression analyses the dimensions of transformational leadership and organizational commitment with the greatest power of influence on performance.

Motivation and commitment covary significantly, which emphasizes the importance of incentivizing employees to increase their involvement in organizations. Developing organizational engagement is essential but challenging, and the results suggest that HR managers should implement appropriate recruitment, selection, and motivation strategies to attract and retain staff who are compatible with organizational values.

It was also noted that a lack of consistency between employee and organizational values can lead to counterproductive behaviors, such as a lack of enthusiasm at work or applying for positions in other organizations. In the future, it would be appropriate to include variables related to professional training and hierarchical level in research, as well as to extend studies to larger groups of employees to identify gaps in human resource management.

Another important conclusion is the relationship between professional performance and job satisfaction. Employees who feel dissatisfied with their jobs are emotionally affected, while those who find their work exciting and satisfying show a positive emotional mood. Thus, satisfaction with salary levels and relationships with colleagues are essential factors that can support the development of effective management programs in organizations.

Intellectual stimulation shows a tendency towards meaning and can contribute positively to overall performance, so employees who are intellectually challenged tend to perform better.

Organizations should invest in the continuous training of workers through training and professional development programs, but also offering them projects that challenge them intellectually, collaborate with other departments and participate in brainstorming sessions.

### 9.2. Personal Contributions

#### **Theoretical contributions:**

The thesis brings conceptual clarifications on the ways in which different types of motivations are associated with forms of commitment (affective, normative and continuous). These clarifications contribute to a better understanding of the factors that determine the long-term engagement of people actively involved in organisations.

The research carried out supports with rigorous arguments based on scientific data the theories that suggest the conceptual differences between motivation and commitment, expanding the literature in the field. The research argues the importance of different forms of motivation in increasing various types of commitment (affective, normative and continuous).

The study provides empirical evidence to support the theory of person-job match, highlighting the importance of congruence between employees' skills and work tasks. The roles of different forms of satisfaction, the development of skills on different levels of performance (in the performance of tasks, in the role of a team member and in the role of a member of the organization) are clearly emphasized.

By highlighting the importance of transformational leadership dimensions (vision, inspirational communication, intellectual stimulation, encouraging leadership, and personal recognition) on performance, the research contributes to improving existing theoretical models of leadership and organizational effectiveness.

Differences between different fields of activity in terms of levels of motivation, commitment, satisfaction and transformational leadership have been investigated, thus contributing to the development of the scientific literature specific to management in those fields.

#### **Practical contributions:**

Through the results obtained, a practical framework is proposed for assessing worker engagement, starting from the relationships between motivation and commitment, thus providing a useful tool for HR managers in monitoring and improving employee engagement. The study's findings indicate that organizations can improve employee retention by cultivating a vision that helps build jobs.

Thus, the activities involved will have an increased meaning for the employee and through the intrinsic motivation the affective commitment and the perception of organizational objectives as individual and team objectives will be stimulated. The results of the research show that material extrinsic motivation plays a significant role in employee retention, thus suggesting the implementation of a performance-based reward model that includes attractive financial benefits, in order to increase workers' loyalty to the organization.

The study proposes that managers develop personalized approaches in performance and engagement management, recognizing the complexity of the relationships between motivation, commitment and performance. In addition, different types of engagement – affective, normative, and ongoing – have different predictions about employee performance. Managers must be able to understand these nuances and develop tailored strategies to boost the motivation and commitment of each team member. This approach contributes to the creation of a culture based on innovation and a more engaging and efficient work environment.

### **9.3. Limits of research**

In interpreting the results of this research, it is important to take into account certain limitations, which may influence the validity and applicability of the conclusions. These limitations provide opportunities to improve future studies and obtain more robust data. Among the limitations identified we list:

- ***Use of a relatively small number of variables:*** The research focused on a limited set of variables: transformational leadership (five subscales), organizational commitment (three subscales and one general scale), job performance (nine subscales and one general scale), work motivation (seven scales and one general scale), job satisfaction (nine subscales and one general scale).

- ***The study is cross-sectional:*** The cross-sectional nature of the research limits the ability to observe long-term developments and changes within organizations. A longitudinal study over a period of at least five years would probably have been more relevant from the perspective of the dynamics that take place at the social and cultural level in the organizational environment.

- ***Data collected through self-reporting questionnaires:*** Data collection through self-reporting questionnaires carries the risk of desirable reporting, despite assurances of anonymity and informed consent of participants. This method can influence the accuracy and objectivity of the answers.

Given these limitations, we recommend caution in generalizing the results to larger populations and emphasize the importance of future studies that address these issues through more diversified research methods and extended study periods. This will contribute to a more comprehensive and accurate understanding of the relationships between the organizational variables studied.

#### 9.4. Future research directions

In continuation of the research started in this doctoral thesis, we intend to expand and deepen the study through the following research directions:

***Deepening the research topic through more complex variables:*** The study will be extended to analyze variables such as individual values, professional values and career anchors of research participants. This approach will allow a more detailed understanding of employees' motivations and behaviors, correlating these aspects with performance and job satisfaction.

***Use of diversified and deeper research methods:*** To minimize the risks associated with desirable responses, we will adopt more varied research methods, such as:

- *direct observation:* to record behaviors in the real work environment;
- *task analysis:* to better understand how to carry out professional responsibilities;
- *Structured and unstructured interviews:* These will provide detailed and contextual insights into employee experiences, complementing quantitative data with valuable qualitative information.

***Longitudinal research for long-term monitoring:*** We will conduct longitudinal research to monitor the evolution of employees' individual goals in relation to organizational goals, their attitudes toward work, and the long-term effects of leadership types on performance. This approach will allow you to capture the dynamics and changes that take place over time.

***Extension of the research sample:*** We will include participants from fields that were less represented in this research. This extension will increase the external validity of the results, allowing the conclusions to be generalized to a wider range of organizational contexts.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. 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), 1–18.
2. Kleinginna, P. R., & Kleinginna, A. M. (1981). A categorized list of motivation definitions, with suggestions for a consensual definition. *Motivation and Emotion*, 5(3), 263-291.
3. 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(3), 492–499. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.492
4. Adams, S. J. (1963). Toward an Understanding of Inequity. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 67(5), 422-436.
5. Ahmad, H., Ahmad, K., & Shah, I. A. (2010). Relationship between Job Satisfaction, Job Performance Attitude towards Work and Organizational Commitment. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 18(2), 257-267.
6. Alderfer, C. P. (1969). An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4(2), 142-175.
7. Alderfer, C. P. (1972). An Organisational Syndrome. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 440-460.
8. Algahtani, A. (2014, September). Are Leadership and Management Different? *Journal of Management Policies and Practices*, 2(3), 71-82.
9. Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (2000). Construct validation in organizational behavior research: The case of organizational commitment. *Problems and solutions in human assessment: Honoring Douglas N. Jackson at seventy*, 285-314.
10. Alutto, J. A., Hrebiniak, L. G., & Alonso, R. C. (1973). On operationalizing the concept of commitment. *Social Forces*, 51, 448-454.
11. Ambrose, M. L., & Kulik, C. T. (1999). Old friends, new faces: Motivation research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management*, 25(3), 231-292.
12. Angle, H. L., & Lawson, M. B. (1993). Changes in affective and continuance commitment in times of relocation. *Journal of Business Research*, 26(1), 3-15.
13. Angle, H. L., & Perry, J. L. (1981). An empirical assessment of Organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 1-14.
14. Angle, H. L., & Perry, J. L. (1983). Organizational Commitment: Individual and Organizational Influences. *Work and Occupations*, 10, 123-146.
15. Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003, February 04). Context and leadership: an examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(3), 261-295.
16. Argyris, C. (1960). *Understanding Organizational Behavior*. Dorsey Press.
17. Armstrong, M. (2003). *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice* (ed. 9). Kogan Page.
18. Armstrong, M. (2006). *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice* (ed. 10). London: Kogan Page.
19. Armstrong, M., & Baron, A. (2005). *Managing Performance: Performance Management in Action*. CIPD Publishing.
20. Atkinson, A. A. (1997). Linking performance measurement to strategy. *Journal of Strategic Performance Measurement*, 1(4), 5.
21. Avolio, B. J., Kahai, S., & Dodge, G. E. (2000). E-LEADERSHIP: IMPLICATIONS FOR THEORY, RESEARCH, AND PRACTICE. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 615-668. doi:10.1016/s1048-9843(00)00062-x
22. Babbie, E. (2013). *The Practice of Social Research* (ed. 13). Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
23. Bar-Hayim, A., & Berman, G. S. (1992). The dimensions of organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(4), 379-387.
24. Barnard, C. (1938). *The Functions of the Executive* (ed. 1956). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
25. Bartol, K. M., & Martin, D. C. (1998). *Management* (ed. 3). McGraw-Hill Company.

26. Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & Stodgill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications* (ed. Third). New York: The Free Press.
27. Bass, B. M. (2000). The Future of Leadership in Learning Organizations. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 7(3), 18-40.
28. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage Publications.
29. Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008, November). *The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications* (ed. 4rd). (S. & Schuster, Ed.) New York, U.S.: FREE PRESS.
30. Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (ed. 2). Psychology Press.
31. Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497-529.
32. Becker, H. S., & Carper, J. W. (1956). The Development of Identification with an Occupation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 61(4), 289-298. doi:10.1086/221759
33. Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the Concept of Commitment. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 66(1), 32-40.
34. 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(2), 464-482.
35. Beckhard, R. (1969). *Organization Development: Strategies and Models* (Vol. 448). Addison-Wesley.
36. Beer, M. (2009). *High Commitment, High Performance: How to Build a Resilient Organization for Sustained Advantage*. John Wiley & Sons.
37. Benmira, S., & Agboola, M. (2021, January 8). Evolution of leadership theory. *BMJ Leader*, 5, 3-5. doi:10.1136/leader-2020-000296
38. Bennett, N., Crawford, M., & Cartwright, M. (2003). *Effective Educational Leadership*. Sage.
39. Bennis, W. G. (2009). *On Becoming a Leader*. Basic Books.
40. Bentein, K., Vandenberghe, C., Vandenberg, R., & Stinglhamber, F. (2005). The role of change in the relationship between commitment and turnover: a latent growth modeling approach. *Journal of applied psychology*, 90(3), 468-482.
41. Blue, P. M., & Scott, W. (1962). *Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach*. Chandler Publishing Company.
42. Boal, K. B., & Hooijberg, R. (2000). Strategic leadership research: Moving on. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 515-549.
43. Boezeman, E. J., & Ellemers, N. (2009). Intrinsic need satisfaction and the post attitudes of volunteers versus employees working in a charitable volunteer organization. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82, 897-914.
44. Boon, C., Eckardt, R., Lepak, D. P., & Boselie, P. (2017). Integrating strategic human capital and strategic human resource management. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29(1), 1-34.
45. Bourguignon, A. (1997). Under the cobblestones, the beach... or the multiple functions of accounting vocabulary: the example of performance. (A. f. accounting, Ed.) 3(1), 89-101.
46. Bourguignon, A. (1996). Defining performance: a simple question of vocabulary? (Economica, Ed.) *Performance and Human Resources*, 1, 18-31.
47. Bourne, M., & Bourne, P. (2011). *Handbook of Corporate Performance Management*. Wiley.
48. Bradford, D. L., & Burke, W. . (2005). *Reinventing Organization Development: New Approaches to Change in Organizations*. Pfeiffer.
49. Branham, L. (2005). *The 7 Hidden Reasons Employees Leave: How To Recognize The Subtle Signs And Act Before It's Too Late*. Amacom Books.
50. Brayfield, A. H., & Crockett, W. H. (1955). Employee attitudes and employee performance, 52(5). *Psychological Bulletin*, 52(5), 396-424.
51. Brown, S. P. (1996). A meta-analysis and review of organizational research on job involvement. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120(2), 235-255.
52. Brown, D. R., & Harvey, D. (2006). *An experiential approach to organization development* (ed. 7). Prentice Hall.
53. Brown, M. E. (1969). Identification and Some Conditions of Organizational Involvement. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 14(3), 346-355.

54. Bryman, A., Stephens, M., & Campo, C. (1996). The importance of context: Qualitative research and the study of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 353-370.
55. Buchanan, B. (1974). Building Organizational Commitment: The Socialization of Managers in Work Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19(4), 533-546.
56. Burns, T., & Stalker, G. M. (1994). *The Management of Innovation*. Oxford University Press.
57. Carlyle, T. (1840). *On Heroes, Hero-worship and the Heroic in History* (Vol. 12). London: Chapman and Hall.
58. Cascio, W. F., & Shurygailo, S. (2003). E-Leadership and virtual teams. *Organizational Dynamics*, 31(4), 362-376. doi:10.1016/S0090-2616(02)00130-4
59. Castro, M. L., & Martins, N. (2010). The relationship between organisational climate and employee satisfaction in a South African information and technology organisation. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 36(10), 1-9.
60. Chatenay, Y. (2014). Management - Practical Sheets 2. (Y. C. EI, ed.) *Yves Chatenay, Consulting and Training*.
61. Chelcea, S. (2001). *Sociological research techniques*. SNSPA.
62. Churchill, G. A., Ford, N. M., & Walker, O. C. (1974). Measuring the Job Satisfaction of Industrial Salesmen. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 11(3), 254-260.
63. Cohen, A. (2003). *Multiple Commitments in the Workplace: An Integrative Approach* (ed. 1). Psychology Press. doi:10.4324/9781410607423
64. Cole, G. A. (1993). *Personnel Management* (ed. 3). DP Publication.
65. Cole, G. A. (2000). *Organisational Behaviour: Theory and Practice*. Continuum.
66. Coughlan, R. (2005). Employee Loyalty as Adherence to Shared Moral Values. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 17(1), 43-57.
67. Covey, S. R., Merrill, R. A., & Merrill, R. R. (1995). *First Things First*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
68. Crowe, K. M. (2008, Oct 20). Collaborative Leadership. A Model for Reference Services. *The Reference Librarian*, 39(81), 59-69. doi:10.1300/J120v39n81\_06
69. Curelaru, M. (2015). *Research methods in psychology*. Iași: Al. I. Cuza University.
70. Daft, R. L. (2010). *Organization Theory and Design* (ed. 10). South-Western, Cengage Learning.
71. So, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*. Springer New York.
72. So, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2002). *Handbook of self-determination research*. University of Rochester Press.
73. *Oxford Illustrated Explanatory Dictionary of the English Language*. (2008). Litera.
74. Dobrin, C. O., Popescu, G. N., Popescu, V. A., & Popescu, C. R. (2012). The concept of performance in business organizations—case study on the employee performance in Romanian business organizations. *Proceedings of the International management Conference*, 6(1), 310-316.
75. Drago, H. F., Luiz de Moura, G., Silva, L. S., Veiga, C. P., Kaczam, F., Rita, L. P., & Silva, W. V. (2022). Reviewing the relationship between organizational performance, dynamic capabilities and strategic behavior. *SN Business & Economics*, 3(5), 2-22. doi:10.1007/s43546-022-00392-2
76. Drucker, P. F. (1975). *The Practice Of Management*. Allied Publishers.
77. Drucker, P. F. (1993). *Post-capitalist Society* (ed. 2011). Routledge.
78. Eccles, R. G. (1991). The performance measurement manifesto. *Harvard Business Review*, 69(1), 131-137.
79. Eisenberger, R., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Incremental Effects of Reward on Creativity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6), 1254-1263.
80. Etzioni, A. (1961). *A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations: On Power, Involvement, and Their Correlates* (ed. 5, Vol. 1). Free Press of Glencoe.
81. Etzioni, A. (1975). *A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. On power, involvement, and their correlates*. (ed. 2). New York: The Free Press.
82. Ewin, R. E. (1992). Loyalty and Virtues. *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 42, 403-419.
83. Fairholm, M. R., & Fairholm, G. W. (2009). *Understanding Leadership Perspectives: Theoretical and Practical Approaches*. Springer Science & Business Media.
84. Fayol, H. (2016). *General and Industrial Management*. Paris: Ravenio Books.

85. Feldman, R. S. (1985). *Social Psychology. Theories, research and application*. McGraw Hill Book Company.
86. Fells, M. J. (2000). Fayol stands the test of time. *Journal of Management History*, 6, 345-360. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/13552520010359379
87. Fields, G. S. (2012). *Working Hard, Working Poor: A Global Journey*. Oxford University Press.
88. Fischmann, G., Sulea, C., Kovacs, P., Iliescu, D., & De Witte, H. (2015). Qualitative and quantitative job insecurity: relations with nine types of performance. *Human Resources Psychology*, 13(2), 152-164.
89. Flapper, S. P., Fortuin, L., & Stoop, P. P. (1996). Towards consistent performance management systems. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 16, 27-37.
90. Florida, R. (2019). *The Rise of the Creative Class*. Basic Books.
91. Franceschini, F., Galetto, M., & Maisano, D. (2019). *Designing Performance Measurement Systems. Theory and Practice of Key Performance Indicators*. Springer Nature Switzerland AG.
92. French, W. L., & Bell, C. (1999). *Organization Development: Behavioral Science Interventions for Organization Improvement* (ed. 6). Prentice Hall.
93. Freyssinet-Dominjon, J. (1997). *Methods of research in the social sciences*. Paris: Montchrestien.
94. Fricke, P. (1976). Review: A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. *Political Science Quarterly*, 91(2), 341-342.
95. Furnham, A. (1997). *The Psychology of Behaviour at Work: The Individual in the Organization*. Psychology Press.
96. Gagné, M., Forest, J., Vansteenkiste, M., Crevier-Braud, L., van den Broeck, A., Aspley, A. K., . . . Westbye, C. (2015). The Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale: Validation evidence in seven languages and nine countries. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 24(2), 178-196.
97. Gangai, K. N. (2014). Absenteeism at workplace: what are the factors influencing to it? *International Journal of Organizational Behaviour & Management Perspectives*, 3(4), 1282-1289.
98. George, B., Sims, P., & Gergen, D. (2007). *True North: Discover Your Authentic Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
99. George, J. M., & Jones, G. R. (2012). *Understanding and Managing Organizational Behavior* (ed. 6). Prentice Hall.
100. Gilbert, D. R. (2001). An Extraordinary Concept in the Ordinary Service of Management. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 11(1), 1-9.
101. Goleman, D. (2000). Leadership That Gets Results. *Harvard Business Review*, 78(2), 78-90.
102. Grawitz, M. (1996). *Methods of the Social Sciences* (ed. 10). Dalloz.
103. Greenberg, J., & Baron, R. A. (2000). *Behavior in organizations* (ed. 7). Prentice Hall.
104. Griffin, M. (2007). Specifying organizational contexts: Systematic links between contexts and processes in organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28(7), 859-863.
105. Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A New Model of Work Role Performance: Positive Behavior in Uncertain and Interdependent Contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(2), 327-347. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2007.24634438
106. Grosman, B. A. (1989). Corporate Loyalty: Does It Have a Future? *Journal of Business*, 8(7), 565-568.
107. Guillon, O., & Cezanne, C. (2014). Employee loyalty and organizational performance: a critical survey. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 27(5), 839-850.
108. Hall, D. T., Schneider, B., & Nygren, H. T. (1970). Personal Factors in Organizational Identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15(2), 176-190.
109. Hansen, G. S., & Wernerfelt, B. (1989). Determinants of firm performance: The relative importance of economic and organizational factors. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10(5), 399-411.
110. Harrell, A. M., & Stahl, M. J. (1981). A behavioural decision theory approach for measuring McClelland's trichotomy of needs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 66(2), 242-247.
111. Hart, D. W., & Thompson, J. A. (2007). Untangling Employee Loyalty: A Psychological Contract Perspective. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 17(2), 297-323.

112. Haughey, J. C. (1993). Does Loyalty in the Workplace Have a Future? *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 3(1), 1-16.
113. Hauser, J., & Katz, G. (1998). Metrics: You are what you measure! *European Management Journal*, 16(5), 517-528. doi:10.1016/S0263-2373(98)00029-2
114. Hay, A., & Hodgkinson, M. (2006). Rethinking leadership: a way forward for teaching leadership? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 27(2), 144-158. doi:10.1108/0143773061064664
115. Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1982). *Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources*. (ed. 4). Prentice Hall.
116. Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Natemeyer, W. E. (1979, Dec 1). Situational Leadership, Perception, and the Impact of Power. *Group & Organization Management*, 4(4), 418-428. doi:10.1177/105960117900400404
117. Herzberg, F. (1959). *The Motivation to Work* (ed. 2). Wiley.
118. Herzberg, F. (2003). One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 81(1), 87-96. doi:10.1007/978-1-349-02701-9\_2
119. Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work* (ed. 2). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
120. Hill, T. (1999). *Manufacturing Strategy: Text and Cases* (ed. 3). McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
121. Holloman, R. (1991). Loyalty. How much? To whom? *Industry Management*, 33(3), 1-2.
122. Homans, G. C. (1961). *Social Behaviour, its Elementary Forms*. Harcourt, Brace & World.
123. Hussain, A., Khan, M. A., Hussain, J., & Khan, M. H. (2020). Nexus of Transformational Leadership and Employees' Job Performance in Telecom Sector Pakistan. *Journal of business and social review in emerging economies*, 6(2), 799-806.
124. Johns, T. (1998). *Perfect customer relationships*. Bucharest: National.
125. Johnson, P., & Gill, J. (1993). *Management Control and Organizational Behaviour* (ed. 1). SAGE Publications Ltd.
126. Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analytic Test of Their Relative Validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755-768. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755
127. Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-Factor Model of Personality and Job Satisfaction: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 530-541.
128. Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 376–407.
129. Kanfer, R., Chen, G., & Pritchard, R. D. (2008). *Work Motivation: past, present and future*. Taylor & Francis Group.
130. Kanter, R. M. (1968). Commitment and social organization: a study of commitment mechanisms in utopian communities. *American Sociological Review*, 33(4), 499-517.
131. Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). *The Balanced Scorecard: Translating Strategy into Action*. Harvard Business Press.
132. Karam, H., & Tasmin, R. (2020). Impact of the different level of transformational leadership on the employees' performance: A case study of the ADNOC. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*, 10, 69-77.
133. Klein, H. J., Becker, T. E., & Meyer, J. P. (2009). *Commitment in Organizations: Accumulated Wisdom and New Directions*. Routledge.
134. Kleinig, J. (1993). Loyalty. *Criminal Justice Ethics*, 12, 34-36.
135. Kosec, K., Song, J., Zhao, H., & Holtmeyer, B. (2021). The Gendered Impacts of Income Fluctuations on Household Departure, Labor Supply, and Human Capital Decisions. *ICAE 2021*.
136. Kosec, Z., Sekulic, S., Wilson-Gahan, S., Rostohar, K., Tušak, M., & Bon, M. (2022). Correlation between Employee Performance, Well-Being, Job Satisfaction, and Life Satisfaction in Sedentary Jobs in Slovenian Enterprises. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health (IJERPH)*, 19(16), 10427.
137. Kotter, J. P. (1990a). *A Force for change: How leadership differs from management*. New York: Free Press.



138. Kotter, J. P. (1999). *John P. Kotter on what Leaders Really Do*. Harvard Business Press.
139. Kotter, J. P. (2001, December). What Leaders Really Do. *Magazine* (Harvard Business Review).
140. Kotter, J. P. (2003). What leaders really do. In A. Hooper, *Leadership Perspectives* (ed. 1). London: Imprint Routledge. doi:<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315250601>
141. Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2006). *The Leadership Challenge*. John Wiley & Sons.
142. Ladd, J. (1967). Loyalty. *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 5, 97-98.
143. Landy, F. J., & Becker, W. S. (1987). Motivation theory reconsidered. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 9, 1-38.
144. Lawler, E. E. (1973). *Motivation in work organizations*. Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
145. Lebas, M. J. (1995). Performance measurement and performance management. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 41(1-3), 23-35. doi:10.1016/0925-5273(95)00081-x
146. Lee, M. R. (2014). *Leading Virtual Project Teams: Adapting Leadership Theories and Communications Techniques to 21st Century Organizations*. CRC Press.
147. Lefter, V., Mazurencu Marinescu, M., & Bogdan, A. (2007). Labour relations and social dialogue: measurement and diagnostic tools. *Theoretical and Applied Economics*, 2, 41-48.
148. Lévy-Leboyer, C. (2007). *Re-motivate at work: Develop the involvement of your employees*. Paris: ORGANISATION.
149. Lévy-Leboyer, C. (2011). *Staff evaluation: What are the objectives? What methods?* (ed. 7). Editions d'Organisation.
150. Liao, C. (2017). Leadership in virtual teams: A multilevel perspective. *Human Resource Management Review*, 27(4), 648-659.
151. Lin, H.-F. (2007). Effects of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee knowledge sharing intentions. *Journal of Information Science*, 33(2), 135-149. doi:10.1177/016555150606817
152. Locke, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance*, 4(4), 309-336.
153. Locke, E. A. (1976). The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction. *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 1297-1343.
154. Lunenburg, F. C. (2011). Leadership versus Management: A Key Distinction—At Least in Theory. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT, BUSINESS, AND ADMINISTRATION*, 14(1), 1-4.
155. Maccoby, M. (2000). The Human Side: Understanding the Difference Between Management and Leadership. *Reserch-Technology Management*, 43(1), 57-59.
156. March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1958). *Organizations*. Wiley.
157. Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
158. Maslow, A. H. (1943). A Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396.
159. Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2), 171-194.
160. Mazzetti, G., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2022). The impact of engaging leadership on employee engagement and team effectiveness: A longitudinal, multi-level study on the mediating role of personal- and team resources. *PLoS One*, 17(6). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0269433
161. McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The Achieving Society*. Princeton: Van Nostrand.
162. McKellar, P. (1966). Book Reviews: AN INTRODUCTION TO MOTIVATION. By John W. Atkinson. New York. Toronto. London: D. van Nostrand Co. Ltd., 1964. Pp. 335. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 12(3), 236-237.
163. Meyer, J. P., Becker, T. E., & Vandenberghe, C. (2004). Employee Commitment and Motivation: A Conceptual Analysis and Integrative Model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(6), 991-1007.
164. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89.

165. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Application*. SAGE Publications.
166. Meyer, J. P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 299-326.
167. Micle, M. I. (2009). SATISFACTION AND PERFORMANCE. *JOURNAL OF PSYCHOLOGY*, 55(1-2), 75-90.
168. Militaru, G. (2005). *Organizational behavior*. Bucharest: Economic Publishing House.
169. Mitchell, T. R. (1982). Motivation: New Directions for Theory, Research, and Practice. *The Academy of Management Review*, 7(1), 80-88.
170. Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of Organization*. Sage Publications.
171. Morrall, A. (1999). The survivor loyalty factor. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 10(1), 95-99.
172. Morris, J. H., & Sherman, D. (1981). Generalizability of an Organizational Commitment Model. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 24(3), 512-526.
173. Morrow, P. C. (1983). Concept redundancy in organizational research: The case work of commitment. *The Academy of Management Review*, 8(3), 486-500.
174. Motowidlo, S. J., & Kell, H. J. (2013). Job Performance. In N. W. Schmitt, S. Highhouse, & I. B. Weiner (ed.), *HANDBOOK OF PSYCHOLOGY* (ed. Second, Vol. INDUSTRIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, pp. 82-103). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
175. Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence That Task Performance Should Be Distinguished From Contextual Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(4), 475-480.
176. Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employ-Organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism and Turnover*. Academic Press.
177. Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The Measurement of Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.
178. Nanus, B. (1995). *Visionary Leadership*. John Wiley & Sons.
179. Neely, A. (2002). *Business Performance Measurement: Theory and Practice*. Cambridge University Press.
180. Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (ed. Seventh). SAGE Publications, Inc.
181. Nwamen, F. (2006). Impact of information and communication technologies on the commercial performance of companies. *La Revue des Sciences de Gestion*, 2(218), 111-121.
182. Oliver, N. (1990). Rewards, investments, alternatives and organizational commitment: Empirical evidence and theoretical development. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 19-31.
183. Omer, I. (2007). *Work Psychology* (2nd ed.). Bucharest: Ed. of the Romania of Tomorrow Foundation.
184. O'Reilly, C. A., & Caldwell, D. F. (1980). Job Choice: The Impact of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Factors on Subsequent Satisfaction and Commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, 559-565.
185. Paige, G. D. (1977). The Scientific Study of Political Leadership. *The Academy of Management Review*, 4, 307-309. doi:10.2307/257793
186. Palicica, M. (2002). *Lectures on psychopedagogy*. UNIVERSITY HORIZONS .
187. Pânișoara, G., & Pânișoara, I. O. (2016). *Human resources management*,. Iași: Polirom.
188. Patiar, A., & Wang, Y. (2016). The effects of transformational leadership and organizational commitment on hotel departmental performance. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(3), 586-608.
189. Penley, L. E., & Gould, S. (1988). Etzioni's model of organizational involvement: A perspective for understanding commitment to organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 9(1), 43-59.
190. Pfeffer, J. (1977, Jan.). The Ambiguity of Leadership. *The Academy of Management Review*, 2 (1), 104-112. doi:10.2307/257611
191. Pfeffer, J., & Lawler, J. J. (1980). Effects of job alternatives, extrinsic rewards, and behavioral commitment on attitude toward the organization: A field test of the insufficient justification paradigm. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25, 38-56.

192. Pfeiffer, R. S. (1992). Owing Loyalty to One's Employer. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11(7), 535-544.
193. Pina and Cunha, M. (2002). The best place to be: Managing control and employee loyalty in a knowledge-intensive company. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 38(4), 481-495.
194. Pinder, C. C. (1984). *Work motivation*. Scott Foresman & Co.
195. Pinder, C. C. (1998). *Work Motivation in Organizational Behavior*. Prentice Hall.
196. 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.
197. Porter, M. E. (1979). The Structure within Industries and Companies' Performance. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 61(2), 214.
198. Pounder, J. (2003). Employing transformational leadership to enhance the quality of management development instruction. *Journal of Management Development*, 22(1), 6-13.
199. Purcell, J., Kinnie, N., Swart, J., Rayton, B. A., & Hutchinson, S. (2003). *People and Performance: How people management impacts on organisational performance*. London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.
200. Rafferty, A. E., & Griffin, M. A. (2004). Dimensions of transformational leadership: Conceptual and empirical extensions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(3), 329-354. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.02.009
201. Reichers, A. E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *IO(3)*, 465-476. doi:10.2307/258128
202. Ribeiro, N., Yücel, İ., & Gomes, D. R. (2018). How Transformational Leadership predicts Employees' Affective Commitment and Performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 67(9), 1901-1917. doi:10.1108/IJPPM-09-2017-0229
203. Richard, P., Devinney, T., Yip, G., & Johnson, G. (2009). Measuring Organizational Performance: Towards Methodological Best Practice. *Journal of Management*, 35(3), 718-804. doi:10.1177/0149206308330560
204. Ritzer, G., & Trice, H. M. (1969). An empirical study of Howard Becker's side-bet theory. *Social Forces*, 47, 475-479.
205. Robbins, S. P. (2003). *Organisational behaviour* (ed. 10). Prentice Hall.
206. Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2016). *Management* (ed. 13). Pearson Education Limited.
207. Robbins, S. P., & DeCenzo, D. A. (2008). *Fundamentals of Management: Essential Concepts and Applications* (ed. 6). Pearson/Prentice Hall.
208. Rost, J. C. (1993). *Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Praeger.
209. Rost, J. C., & Smith, A. F. (1992, June). Leadership: A postindustrial approach. *European Management Journal*, 10(2), 193-201. doi:10.1016/0263-2373(92)90069-G
210. Rotariu, T., & Iluț, P. (2001). *Sociological survey and opinion poll: theory and practice*. Polirom.
211. Rousseau, D. M. (1978). Characteristics of departments, positions, and individuals: Contexts for attitudes and behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23(4), 521-540.
212. Rue, L., Byars, L., & Ibrahim, N. A. (2015). *Human Resource Management* (ed. 11). McGraw-Hill.
213. Ryan, R. M., & So, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68-78. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68
214. Saal, F. E., & Knight, P. A. (1988). *Industrial organizational psychology : science and practice*. Brooks/Cole.
215. Salancik, G. R. (1977). Commitment and the control of organizational behavior and belief. *New directions in organizational behavior*, 1, 1-54.
216. Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2007). *Research Methods for Business Students* (ed. 4). Pearson Education.
217. Schein, E. H. (1980). *Organizational Psychology*. Prentice-Hall.
218. Schmenner, R. W., & Vollmann, T. E. (1994). Performance measures: Gaps, false alarms and the usual suspects. , 14(12),. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 14(12), 58-69.

219. Schneider, B. (1985). Organizational behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 36, 573-611.
220. Schneider, B., & Snyder, R. A. (1975). Some relationships between job satisfaction and organization climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(3), 318-328.
221. Scholl, R. W. (1981). Differentiating Commitment From Expectancy as a Motivating Force. *Academy of Management Review*, 6, 589-599.
222. Sempane, M., Rieger, H. S., & Roodt, G. (2002). Job satisfaction in relation to organisational culture. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 28(2), 23-35.
223. Sheldon, K. M., & Kasser, T. (1998). Pursuing personal goals: Skills enable progress, but not all progress is beneficial. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 1319-1331.
224. Sheldon, M. E. (1971). Investments and Involvements as Mechanisms Producing Commitment to the Organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16(2), 143-150.
225. Silva, A. (2016, Sept). What is Leadership? *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, 8(1), 1-5.
226. Simpson, J., & Weiner, E. (1989). *Oxford English Dictionary* (second edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
227. Singh, B., Gupta, P., & Venugopal, S. (2008). Organisational Commitment: Revisited. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 34(1), 57-68.
228. Skinner, W. (1974). The focused factory. *Harvard Business Review*, 113-120. doi:10.1287/mnsc.43.9.1258
229. Solomon, C. M. (1992). The loyalty factor. *Personal Journal*, 52-62.
230. Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*. Sage.
231. Stanciu, R. (2003). *Elements of Human Resources Management*. Bucharest: Politehnica Press.
232. Staw, B. M. (1977). Two Sides of Commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23, 40-64.
233. Steers, R. M. (1977). Antecedents and Outcomes of Organizational Commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 46-56.
234. Stevens, J. M., Beyer, J. M., & Trice, H. M. (1978). Assessing personal, role, and organizational predictors of managerial commitment. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 21(3), 380-396.
235. Sweetman, K. J. (2001). Employee Loyalty Around the Globe. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 42(2), 16-16.
236. Taylor, F. W. (1919). *The principles of scientific management*. Harper & Brothers Publishers.
237. Thomson, J., & Varley, S. (1997). Developing a balanced scorecard at AT&T. *Journal of Strategic Performance Measurement*, 1(4), 14.
238. Tiron, E. (2011). New Value-Behavioral Structures and Hierarchies in the Technical Academic Education in the Context of Romania Integration in the European Union. *Sociology Mind*, 1(2), 74-80.
239. Toban, C., & Sjahruddin, H. (2016). The Antecedent and Consequence of Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Management Sciences*, 4(2), 26-33.
240. Toor, U.S.-R., & Ofori, G. (2008, April). Leadership versus Management: How They Are Different, and Why. *Leadership and Management in Engineering*, 8(2), 61-71. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)1532-6748(2008)8:2(61)
241. Upanishads. (2022, August 18). *History of Hinduism*. Retrieved on May 7, 2024, from HistoryMaps: <https://history-maps.com/ro/story/History-of-Hinduism/event/Upanishads>
242. Vlăsceanu, L. (2008). *Introduction to the methodology of sociological research*. University of Bucharest, Faculty of Sociology and Social Work.
243. Volckmann, R. (2012, June). Fresh perspective: Barbara Kellerman and the leadership industry. *Integral Leadership Review*.
244. Voyer, P. (2009). *Management dashboards and performance indicators* (ed. 2). PUQ.
245. Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. Wiley.
246. Vroom, V. H. (1966). Organisational Choice: A Study of pre- and postdecision processes. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 1(2), 212-225.

247. Watson, T. J. (2008). *Sociology, Work and Industry* (ed. 5). Taylor & Francis e-Library.
248. Weick, K. E. (2015). The Social Psychology of Organizing. *Scholarly Journal*, 18(2), 189-193.
249. Weiss, H. M. (2002). Deconstructing job satisfaction: Separating evaluations, beliefs and affective experiences, , 12(2),. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(2), 173–194.
250. Welbourne, T. M., Andrews, S. B., & Andrews, A. O. (2005). Back to basics: Learning about employee energy and motivation from running on my treadmill. *Human Resource Management*, 44(1), 55-66.
251. Whyte, W. H. (1956). *The organization man*. Anchor Books.
252. Whyte, W. H., & Nocera, J. (2002). *The Organization Man*. University of Pennsylvania Press Philadelphia.
253. Wiener, Y., & Gechman, A. S. (1977). Commitment: A behavioral approach to job involvement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 10(1), 47-52.
254. Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in Organizations: A Normative View. *The Academy of Management Review*, 7(3), 418-428.
255. Winefield, A. H. (2002). Unemployment, underemployment, occupational stress and psychological well-being. *Australian Journal of Management*, 27(1), 137-148.
256. Winkler, I. (2010). *Contemporary Leadership Theories Enhancing the Understanding of the Complexity, Subjectivity and Dynamic of Leadership*. Springer: Physcia-Verlag.
257. Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial Leadership: A Review of Theory and Research. *Journal of Management*, 15 (2), 251-289.
258. Yukl, G. A. (2013). *Leadership in Organizations* (ed. 8). Prentice Hall.
259. Yusuf, M. A., & Kurniady, D. A. (2020). The Implementation of Transformational Leadership: Makes Effectiveness Organizational Culture. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*. 400, pg. 330-332. Atlantis Press SARL.
260. Zaleznik, A. (1977). Managers and Leaders: Are They Different? *Harvard Business Review*, 55(3), 67-78.
261. Zlate, M. (2004). *Treatise on Organizational-Managerial Psychology* (Vol. 1). Polirom.
262. Zlate, M. (2007). *Treatise on Organizational-Managerial Psychology* (Vol. 2). Polirom.

## DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS

### I. Articles in Clarivate Analytics indexed journals

**Liliana Dumitrescu**, Dana Corina Deselnicu, Bogdan-Vasile Danciu, *The direct and mediated influence of transformational leadership on job performance*, TEM Journal - Technology, Education Management Informatics; forthcoming.

### II. Articles in ISI Proceedings indexed volumes

1. **Liliana Dumitrescu**, Dana Corina Deselnicu, Valentina Diana Lacuta, Bogdan Danciu, *Satisfaction and Performance of Romanian Employees Working in the Accountancy and Human Resources Fields*, Proceedings of the International Conference on Business Excellence, vol.17, Issue 1, July 2023, Academy of Economic Studies, Bucharest, eISSN: 2558-9652, DOI: 10.2478/picbe-2023-0185, <https://sciendo.com/article/10.2478/picbe-2023-0185>, WOS: 001031464500049.
2. Valentina-Diana Lacuta, Dana Corina Deselnicu, **Liliana Dumitrescu**, Fowzi-Constantin Crasoveanu, *Young People's Adjustment to Post-pandemic Work Styles*, Proceedings of the International Conference on Business Excellence, vol.17, Issue 1, July 2023, Academy of Economic Studies, Bucharest, eISSN: 2558-9652, DOI: 10.2478/picbe-2023-0174, <https://sciendo.com/article/10.2478/picbe-2023-0174>, WOS: 001029771300046.

### III. Articles in journals and in the volumes of scientific events indexed in other international databases (BDI)

1. **Liliana Dumitrescu**, Dana Corina Deselnicu, Bogdan Danciu, *Interrelation of the Professional Stress Dimensions*, in the volume The 10th International Conference of Management and Industrial Engineering „Business Change and Digital Transformation in a World Moving Through Crisis” ICMIE 2021, November 11th – 12th, 2021, University POLITEHNICA of Bucharest, Romania, Bucharest, Niculescu Publishing House, ISSN 2344-093, indexed BDI (Proquest).
2. **Liliana Dumitrescu**, Dana Corina Deselnicu, Bogdan Danciu, *Affective Correlates of the Professional Stress*, The 10th International Conference of Management and Industrial Engineering „Business Change and Digital Transformation in a World Moving Through Crisis” ICMIE 2021, November 11th – 12th, 2021, University POLITEHNICA of Bucharest, Romania, Bucharest, Niculescu Publishing House, ISSN 2344-093, indexed BDI (Proquest).
3. Bogdan Danciu, Dana Corina Deselnicu, **Liliana Dumitrescu**, *Variables Related to Professional Performance*, The 10th International Conference of Management and Industrial Engineering „Business Change and Digital Transformation in a World Moving Through Crisis” ICMIE 2021, November 11th – 12th, 2021, University POLITEHNICA of Bucharest, Romania, Bucharest, Niculescu Publishing House, ISSN 2344-093, indexed BDI (Proquest).
4. Bogdan Danciu, Dana Corina Deselnicu, **Liliana Dumitrescu**, *Correlates of Professional Satisfaction*, The 10th International Conference of Management and Industrial Engineering „Business Change and Digital Transformation in a World Moving Through Crisis” ICMIE 2021, November 11th – 12th, 2021, University POLITEHNICA of Bucharest, Romania, Bucharest, Niculescu Publishing House, ISSN 2344-093, indexed BDI (Proquest).

#### **IV. Articles in Journals and volumes of non-indexed national or international scientific events**

1. **Liliana Dumitrescu**, Bogdan Danciu, *Satisfactia profesională in campo educativo en relación con otros campos de actividad*, in „Dacica latinitas”, VIII, no. 1(8), 2023, p. 196-215, ISSN 2444-9849.
2. Bogdan Danciu, **Liliana Dumitrescu**, Luisa Preda, *Elements of the psychological contract involved in organizational commitment*, in the volume of the National Symposium „Constantin Noica”, twelfth edition: „Becoming into being”, coord. Alexandru Surdu, Mona Mamulea, Ovidiu G. Grama, Bucharest, Romanian Academy Publishing House, 2020 (ISSN 2247-7853).

#### **V. Communications at national and international conferences**

1. Bogdan Danciu, **Liliana Dumitrescu**, Andra Luisa Preda, *Working Conditions and Professional Satisfaction*, „Lucian Blaga” International Festival, XXIV edition, Târgu Mureș, August 23-24, 2024
2. **Liliana Dumitrescu**, Bogdan Danciu, Andra Luisa Preda, *Work Relations in the Educational Context*, THE ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE UN-BORDERING DISCIPLINARITY TRANS-/CROSS-/POST-DISCIPLINARY APPROACHES TO HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, VIth Edition, 21-22 June 2024, Bucharest
3. Bogdan Danciu, **Liliana Dumitrescu**, *Professional Values and Labor Relations*, Lucian Blaga International Symposium – „The Romanian Village – Source of Spirituality and Civilization”, second edition, Fărcașa - Maramureș, May 29 - June 2, 2024
4. **Liliana Dumitrescu**, Bogdan Danciu, *The level of professional stress of teaching staff in relation to other fields of activity*, THE ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE UN-BORDERING DISCIPLINARITY TRANS-/CROSS-/POST-DISCIPLINARY APPROACHES TO HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, VIth Edition, 21-22 September 2023, Bucharest
5. Bogdan Danciu, **Liliana Dumitrescu**, *The role of the environment in Constantin Rădulescu-Motru's vision*, „Constantin Rădulescu-Motru” National Symposium, eighth edition, „Ion Vlasiu” High School, Târgu Mureș, September 21, 2023
6. Bogdan Danciu, **Liliana Dumitrescu**, Andra Luisa Preda, *The importance of the field of activity on career incentives*, „Constantin Noica” National Symposium, XVth edition, „On European Dignity”, „Constantin Rădulescu-Motru” Institute of Philosophy and Psychology, Bucharest, November 24, 2023.
7. Bogdan Danciu, **Liliana Dumitrescu**, *Sources of motivation and satisfaction in the teaching career*, International Symposium „New Horizons in the Professionalization of the Teaching Career”, June 2, 2023, Lovech (Bulgaria)
8. Bogdan Danciu, **Liliana Dumitrescu**, *Professional satisfaction in the educational field in relation to other fields of activity*, „Lucian Blaga” International Festival, XXIII edition, Târgu Mureș, Mureș County Library, August 17, 2023
9. Bogdan Danciu, **Liliana Dumitrescu**, *The Development of Romanian Experimental Psychology under the Auspices of Constantin Rădulescu-Motru*, „CONSTANTIN RĂDULESCU-MOTRU” NATIONAL SYMPOSIUM 7TH Edition, September 15-18, 2022, Târgu Mureș
10. Bogdan Danciu, **Liliana Dumitrescu**, Andra Luisa Preda, *Axiological Dimensions of the Teaching Career*, CONSTANTIN NOICA NATIONAL SYMPOSIUM XIVth Edition, „HERMES' LOGIC AND CURRENT LOGICS – A POSSIBLE DIALOGUE”, Târgu Mureș, October 27–30, 2022

11. Bogdan Danciu, **Liliana Dumitrescu**, Andra Luisa Preda, Motivation and organizational commitment, THE ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE „UN-BORDERING DISCIPLINARITY. TRANS-/CROSS-/POST-DISCIPLINARY APPROACHES TO TEACHING”, *Vth Edition*, May 19-20, 2022, Bucharest
12. Bogdan Danciu, **Liliana Dumitrescu**, *Motivational aspects involved in the teaching career*, „LUCIAN BLAGA” International Festival, XXII edition, Târgu Mureş, August 18-21, 2022
13. Bogdan Danciu, **Liliana Dumitrescu**, Andra Luisa Preda, *Dimensions of the Professional Satisfaction Involved in the Teaching Profession*, Internationale Sommerschule „INNOVATION IN DER SCHULE DER ZUKUNFT: LERNEN, WACHSEN, ENTWICKELN, INNOVIEREN” (Wien, Österreich, 9.-12. 08. 2022)
14. Bogdan Danciu, **Liliana Dumitrescu**, *Aspects of Stress in the Teaching Career*, International Interdisciplinary Symposium of Teachers and Teachers Everywhere: Innovation in Education and Vocational Training, Chisinau, August 29, 2022
15. Bogdan Danciu, **Liliana Dumitrescu**, *Developing organizational commitment*, International Conference „Challenges of welfare education in school. From school education to career”, Institute for Research, Policy and Evaluation in Education / Association of Teachers and Teachers Everywhere, Bucharest, 14-15.05. 2021, ZOOM platform.
16. **Liliana DUMITRESCU**, Dana Corina DESELNICU, Bogdan DANCUI, *AFFECTIVE CORRELATES OF THE PROFESSIONAL STRESS*, International Conference Of Management and Industrial Engineering, 10th Edition, Bucharest, November 11-12, 2021, Microsoft Teams platform
17. **Liliana DUMITRESCU**, Dana Corina DESELNICU, Bogdan DANCUI, *INTERRELATION OF THE PROFESSIONAL STRESS DIMENSIONS*, International Conference Of Management and Industrial Engineering, 10th Edition, Bucharest, November 11-12, 2021, Microsoft Teams platform
18. Bogdan DANCUI, Dana Corina DESELNICU, **Liliana DUMITRESCU**, *VARIABLES RELATED TO PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE*, International Conference Of Management and Industrial Engineering, 10th Edition, Bucharest, November 11-12, 2021, Microsoft Teams platform
19. Bogdan DANCUI, Dana Corina DESELNICU, **Liliana DUMITRESCU**, *CORRELATES OF PROFESSIONAL SATISFACTION*, International Conference Of Management and Industrial Engineering, 10th Edition, Bucharest, November 11-12, 2021, Microsoft Teams platform
20. Bogdan-Vasile DANCUI, **Liliana DUMITRESCU**, *The Importance of Individual Axiological Models in the Organizational Environment*, „Constantin Rădulescu-Motru” National Symposium, 6th edition, coord. Dr. Eugeniu Nistor, Romanian Academy – „Gheorghe Şincai” Institute for Socio-Human Research Târgu Mureş, Târgu Mureş City Hall, Mureş Writers' Society, Târgu Mureş, 9-12 September 2021
21. **Liliana DUMITRESCU**, Bogdan DANCUI, Andra Luisa PREDA, *Occupational stress in teachers*, INTERNATIONALE INTERDISZIPLINÄRE SOMMERSCHULE FÜR LEHRKRÄFTE SYMPOSIUM «EINE REISE IN DER VIELFALT DER LEHRE UND IN DER WOHLERBILDUNG» INTERNATIONAL INTERDISCIPLINARY SUMMER SCHOOL FOR TEACHERS AND TEACHERS EVERYWHERE «A JOURNEY INTO THE DIVERSITY OF TEACHING AND WELFARE EDUCATION», Vienna, 1-5 August 2021, ZOOM platform
22. Bogdan DANCUI, **Liliana DUMITRESCU**, *Organizational commitment in the educational field*, THE ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE UN-BORDERING DISCIPLINARITY TRANS-/CROSS-/POST-DISCIPLINARY APPROACHES TO LINGUISTIC AND LITERARY RESEARCH, IVth Edition, Bucharest, May 19-20, 2021, Google Meet platform



23. Bogdan DANCIU, **Liliana DUMITRESCU**, *Development of organizational commitment, INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE CHALLENGES OF WELFARE EDUCATION IN SCHOOL. FROM SCHOOL EDUCATION TO CAREER, Bucharest, 14-15.05. 2021, ZOOM platform.*