Evaluation of the Judicial Human Resources Productivity Model Using Structural Equations

Ali Mohamamd. Hosseini[1], Rashid. Zolfaghari Zaferani[1*], Seyed Mahmoud. Hashemi[2]

[1] Department of Management and Accounting, Roudehen Branch, Islamic Azad University, Roudehen, Iran
[2] Department of Business Management, North Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Rashid_zo@yahoo.com

A r t i c l e   I n f o

Article type:
Original Research

How to cite this article:

A B S T R A C T

Objective: The objective of this study was to evaluate the judicial human resources productivity model using structural equations.

Methodology: This study utilized a quantitative-survey method with an applied objective. The statistical population included judges from across the country, with a sample size of 88 individuals selected randomly. The research instrument was a researcher-made questionnaire based on qualitative findings and literature. The instrument's validity was established through face validity, and its reliability was confirmed with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.90. Data analysis was performed using structural equation modeling (confirmatory factor analysis) with the Smart-PLSv3 software.

Findings: The results indicated that organizational processes, with a coefficient of 0.422, had the greatest impact on judges' productivity, followed by information technology, with a coefficient of 0.354. Additionally, performance quality (0.588) had a significantly greater impact on judges' productivity compared to performance quantity (0.354), approximately 1.7 times more. It was determined that the factor loading of performance quality was approximately 2.8 times greater than that of performance quantity. Furthermore, the results showed that the explained variance of the productivity variable as the dependent (mediating) variable of this study was 47%. This means that the independent variables of the study collectively explained 47% of the changes in the judges' productivity variable.

Conclusion: It can be concluded that to enhance the productivity of the country's judges, it is essential to focus on the highly impactful variables of organizational processes and information technology, as this can improve the quality of judges' services.

Keywords: *Human Resources Productivity, Judges, Judiciary, Human Resource Management.*

1 Introduction

One of the essential tools for the survival of any organization and achieving its goals is human resources. Human resources are considered the most critical asset and the primary source of competitive advantage for any organization (Bamberger et al., 2014). The necessity of a strategic approach to human resources is undeniable, and environmental changes further emphasize its importance (Armstrong, 2006). Excellent organizations execute their mission and vision by developing organizational strategies focused on stakeholder interests. These organizations pay attention to their employees, communicate with them, and encourage and reward them in a way that motivates and commits them to utilize their skills and knowledge for organizational benefits. In these organizations' strategies, long-term goals and plans are defined, aiming to acquire and utilize the necessary resources to maintain their competitive edge in the market (Rengkung, 2022).

Among organizational strategies, human resource strategies are of significant importance (Almutairi & Alsawalhah, 2020). The importance of human resource management (HRM) strategies lies in their ability to improve the organization's competitive position and enhance its efficiency and effectiveness (Guest, 2017; Hoque, 2013). Organizations can cultivate and develop specific characteristics and behaviors in their employees through effective HRM strategies, which are essential for the organization's success (Jackson et al., 2012). In other words, HRM strategies facilitate human resource development to meet the overall organizational strategy requirements, making the organization's goals and missions attainable. One program significantly impacting the organization's strategic HR goals is employee productivity (Esthi & Setiawan, 2023; Kambur & Yildirim, 2023).

Although HRM cannot directly influence how other resources are utilized in the organization, considering the human factor's presence and involvement in all organizational aspects, HRM can play a crucial role in the organization's survival and efficiency by designing programs and systems for the proper utilization of human resources (da Silva et al., 2022). To employ and retain diverse, competent, and qualified personnel through strategies and policies, human resource managers, especially given resource limitations, must pay particular attention to the processes of selection, recruitment, training, and development of competent human resources because competent and efficient employees are considered the primary asset of any organization (del-Castillo-Feito et al., 2022). The operational task of HR managers is to identify and subsequently create conditions that allow these employees' potential talents to flourish and strengthen their loyalty to the organization based on their individual differences (da Silva et al., 2022).

Productivity is the effective and optimal use of various resources and inputs such as labor, capital, materials, energy, and information. In other words, productivity is the optimal use of input factors to achieve higher outputs (Caliendo et al., 2020). The importance of productivity is so significant that in many countries, productivity and the correct and optimal use of all production factors, including goods and services, have become a national priority. Efforts have been made to institutionalize the idea that the survival of any society without attention to productivity is challenging and sometimes impossible (Ugoani, 2020). While planning to improve productivity at various organizational, regional, national, and even personal levels is essential, improving productivity in today's highly competitive world is one of the most critical goals and strategies for any organization's success. Productivity improvement has been a subject of discussion since the dawn of humanity and in all economic and political systems (Teimouri et al., 2022). Belief in productivity improvement means having a strong conviction in human progress. The International Labour Organization defines productivity as "the ratio of output to one of the factors of production (land, capital, labor, and management)." Any method to improve organizational productivity must address employee-related issues, as humans are the ones performing the work. Much of the work related to employees, HRM, and productivity focuses on how to motivate employees to increase productivity (Ubeda-Garcia et al., 2019).

Multiple factors influence productivity, which Sumanth categorizes into four groups: technology-based, material-based, personnel-based, and task-based. Correspondingly, productivity enhancement techniques can be classified into three groups: hardware factors, software factors, and humanware factors. Among these three factors, the human factor and labor force are the most critical and influential factors in production and productivity. Humanware refers to the ability and motivation to perform work and all factors related to these two elements, such as training, interest, morale, insight, and people's attitude towards their work. It encompasses topics related to human abilities and behaviors, such as skills, interest, and job satisfaction. Humanware-related factors can be equated to empowerment, meaning

IJIMOB

Hosseini et al.   International Journal of Innovation Management and Organizational Behavior 4:2 (2024) 231-238

utilizing knowledge and increasing employee motivation by management, ultimately allowing the organization to achieve its goals (Kambur & Yildirim, 2023).

The necessity and importance of productivity are also understood in governmental organizations, where achieving and enhancing productivity levels is considered a priority by policymakers. This is evidenced by the enactment of laws, directives, and guidelines related to productivity. However, it must be noted that merely issuing directives and guidelines does not lead to productivity improvement. In governmental organizations and other institutions, the primary element for creating productivity is human resources. The significance and superiority of the human factor compared to directives and guidelines lie in the fact that these directives and guidelines must be implemented and executed by humans. Therefore, humans are the cornerstone of productivity, and the most attention and planning in the productivity domain must be directed towards the human factor (Palmi et al., 2021). From another perspective, human resources are the most critical productivity-driving factor compared to other factors, and productivity improvements resulting from laws and guidelines are temporary and short-term. Therefore, forward-thinking organizations must ensure that employees actively strive to enhance productivity to achieve long-term productivity (Babaee Rayni et al., 2021; Bamberger et al., 2014).

In today's variable and complex conditions, which dominate the economic, social, and political environment, productivity is one factor that can aid an organization's survival. Productivity is seen as a culture and rational approach to work, aiming to make activities smarter to achieve a better and more elevated life. Increasing productivity determines the major goal and responsibility of the organization. Therefore, productivity and its continuous improvement hold a special place in organizations (Rengkung, 2022; Salazar, 2022).

There have been limited studies on the research topic. Rasooli et al. (2023) identified five overarching themes (dimensions) and twelve organizing themes (components) as essential elements of human resources, including: 1. Individual (behavioral, motivational, personality / psychological states), 2. Local-Governmental (governmental, value - human), 3. Organizational (functional, capability / capacity building), 4. Process (institutionalization, measurement and evaluation, groundwork and implementation), and 5. Content (critical thinking, creative thinking) (Rasooli et al., 2023). Teimouri et al. (2022) concluded that a competency-based HRM

system comprises five main themes: competency, foresight, comprehensiveness, justice, and flexibility. Structural equation findings indicated that among HRM components, the competency-based compensation system had the most significant impact on succession management (Teimouri et al., 2022). Nazimi et al. (2022) extracted a five-dimensional model for HR performance management considering the requirements of a digital city. The first dimension of this model emphasized strategic HR performance planning with six components, the second on cultural HR development with two components, the third on HR training and empowerment with two components, the fourth on HR communication development with three components, and the fifth on HR performance evaluation with three components (Nazimi et al., 2022). Babaee Rayni et al. (2021) concluded that the HR model comprises three main dimensions: individual (competency development, knowledge and information sharing, commitment, mutual trust), organizational (employee training, organizational justice, compensation system, meritocracy, talent management), and environmental (economic, political, socio-cultural) (Babaee Rayni et al., 2021).

In the Islamic system, productivity is also noteworthy. The main organization responsible for this crucial indicator (i.e., justice) in the country is the judiciary. Judges handle complaints and resolve people's legal issues. Given the high value of the judicial position in Islamic jurisprudence, specific and challenging characteristics are prescribed for judges. Productivity in the judiciary is essential, with the number of cases and their qualitative and quantitative handling being noteworthy aspects of productivity. Thus, the main objective of this study is to evaluate the judicial human resources productivity model using structural equations based on the stated points.

2   Methods and Materials

The present study utilized a quantitative-survey method with an applied objective. The statistical population included judges from across the country, with a sample size of 48 individuals selected randomly, considering the organization's limitations and the low willingness to respond to the questionnaire. The research instrument was a researcher-made questionnaire based on qualitative findings and literature. The instrument's validity was established through face validity, and its reliability was confirmed with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.90. Data analysis was performed

using structural equation modeling (confirmatory factor analysis) with the Smart-PLSv3 software.

3   Findings and Results

From a demographic perspective, all judges were male. Twenty-seven individuals (31%) held a PhD, and fifty-three individuals (69%) had a Master's degree. The average service duration was 17 years.

Structural equation modeling using PLS involves two stages: testing the measurement model and testing the structural model. Since there is no structural model at this stage, only the measurement model is tested. The measurement model test includes examining reliability (internal consistency) and discriminant validity. For

evaluating the reliability and internal consistency of the judicial human resources productivity model (Ali Mohammad Hosseini et al., 2022) using PLS, various criteria are considered:

-    First Criterion: Validity (factor validity) of each item and observed variables.
-    Second Criterion: Composite Reliability (CR) of each construct.
-    Third Criterion: Average Variance Extracted (AVE).

To assess the first criterion, if the factor loadings of each item on its respective construct are significant, it can be argued that the items are sufficiently valid. Table 1 reports the factor loadings and T-values. Factor loadings greater than 0.70 (at a 5% error level) are acceptable.

Table 1

Factor Loadings of Confirmed Questions

Question / Component	Information Technology	Judge Productivity	Processes	Performance Quality	Performance Quantity
IT3	0.762				
IT6	0.912				
P1		0.847			
P2		0.837			
P3		0.735			
PRO1			0.908		
PRO2			0.771		
QUAL1				0.741	
QUAL3				0.735	
QUAL4				0.787	
QUAL5				0.804	
QUAL6				0.772	
QUAL7				0.871	
QUAL8				0.749	
QUAL9				0.872	
QUAN1					0.818
QUAN2					0.891

The second criterion is examining the composite reliability of each construct. Composite reliability, also known as combined reliability, is considered a more modern measure of reliability compared to Cronbach's alpha. This reliability is obtained through the Dillon-Goldstein coefficient, and values greater than 0.70 are acceptable. The third criterion is the Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

(convergent validity). The AVE criterion indicates the average variance shared between each construct and its indicators. In essence, this criterion shows the correlation of a construct with its indicators, where higher correlations indicate better model fit. Values greater than 0.70 indicate suitable construct validity. Table 2 presents the CR and AVE criteria for the study's constructs.

Table 2

Construct Validity and Reliability

	Composite Reliability	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
Information Technology	0.827	0.706
Judge Productivity	0.829	0.710
Processes	0.849	0.653

Performance Quality	0.931	0.629
Performance Quantity	0.844	0.731

To assess the model's validity, the criterion introduced by Fornell and Larcker is used. According to Fornell and Larcker's criterion, the square root of AVE for each construct should be greater than its correlation with other constructs. This criterion is presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Discriminant Validity (Fornell and Larcker Criterion)

	Information Technology	Judge Productivity	Processes	Performance Quality	Performance Quantity
Information Technology	0.840				
Judge Productivity	0.590	0.842			
Processes	0.560	0.620	0.808		
Performance Quality	0.696	0.588	0.734	0.793	
Performance Quantity	0.060	0.354	0.372	0.373	0.855

In this matrix, the latent variables' correlations are reported. The numbers on the main diagonal are the square roots of AVE. According to this criterion, if these numbers are greater than the numbers below them, the construct has suitable validity. All variables in Table 3 have appropriate validity.

Table 4

Explained Variance

Variables	Shared Mean	Explained Variance
Judge Productivity	0.710	0.471
Performance Quality	0.629	0.346
Performance Quantity	0.731	0.125
Information Technology	0.706	-
Processes	0.653	-

Based on the results, the explained variance of the productivity variable, as the dependent (mediating) variable of this study, is 47%. This means that the independent variables of the study (organizational processes and information technology) collectively explained 47% of the changes in the judge's productivity variable (Table 4).

The GoF criterion value is 0.29, indicating a relatively good overall model fit considering the values of 0.01, 0.25, and 0.36 as weak, medium, and strong GoF levels, respectively.

Finally, based on the path significance test and path coefficients, the research hypotheses were examined (Table 5).

Table 5

Hypothesis Testing

Path	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (|O/STDEV|)	P Values	Result
Information Technology -> Judge Productivity	0.354	0.352	0.114	3.094	0.002	Confirmed
Judge Productivity -> Performance Quality	0.588	0.612	0.11	5.329	0.0	Confirmed
Judge Productivity -> Performance Quantity	0.354	0.354	0.215	1.644	0.1	Not Confirmed
Processes -> Judge Productivity	0.422	0.439	0.131	3.22	0.001	Confirmed

IJIMOB

Hosseini et al.   International Journal of Innovation Management and Organizational Behavior 4:2 (2024) 231-238

As observed in Table 5, based on the t-statistics results, all research hypotheses are significant at the 0.05 error level and are confirmed. The path coefficients indicate the impact of each independent variable on the dependent variable. Therefore, organizational processes had the most significant impact on judge productivity, with a coefficient of 0.422, followed by information technology with a coefficient of 0.354. Additionally, performance quality (0.588) had a significantly greater impact on judge productivity compared to performance quantity (0.354), approximately 1.7 times more. The factor loading of performance quality was determined to be about 2.8 times higher than performance quantity, indicating a higher validity of the performance quality component.

4   Discussion and Conclusion

The primary objective of this research is to evaluate the judicial human resources productivity model using structural equations. Assessing the judicial human resources productivity model using structural equations is crucial for understanding the efficiency and effectiveness of judicial systems. By evaluating variables such as information technology investment and human capital, particularly the impact of internal human capital versus outsourced human capital, it becomes evident that human capital plays a significant role in improving productivity in the judiciary (Elamir et al., 2018). This highlights the importance of financing structures and participation models in enhancing human resources productivity and underscores the need for public funding in healthcare systems and stakeholder participation in funding education and health to boost human productivity. The shift towards co-production and the integration of new public management and new public service principles in judicial management indicate a move towards a more efficient and democratic judicial system (Clarissa et al., 2023). Ultimately, a comprehensive approach that considers both quantitative indicators and qualitative assessments is essential for evaluating and enhancing judicial human resources productivity.

Judicial human resources productivity and its measurement methods have long been discussed in the literature. Flavigna and Ippoliti emphasize the importance of considering additional inputs such as judicial costs for accurately evaluating productivity. They found that a model including judicial costs and human resources performs better than a model based solely on human resources. In a separate study, the relationship between organizational justice and human resources productivity was examined. The results indicate a significant positive correlation between the two. Finally, a study examining the effectiveness of measures to increase appellate court productivity found that the absence of such measures leads to case backlogs.

Evaluating human resources productivity in judicial systems is a complex but vital task to ensure efficient justice administration. Using structural equation modeling to evaluate a judicial human resources productivity model provides a sophisticated approach to understanding the interactions between various factors influencing court performance. One key aspect of this model likely includes the Human Resources Index (HRI), which has been shown to correlate with improved productivity and work environment.

HRI serves as a valuable tool for measuring the overall health of human resource management in the judicial system. By incorporating HRI into a structural equation model, researchers can measure its relationships with other important variables such as relational justice, short-term improvements, and perceived productivity. Organizational justice emerges as another crucial factor in judicial human resources productivity. This model should explain how perceptions of justice in procedures, interactions, and outcomes affect employee performance and satisfaction. This is particularly relevant in court settings, where principles of justice are fundamental to the institution's mission.

The judicial human resources productivity model, when evaluated using structural equation modeling, provides a comprehensive framework for understanding the complex dynamics of human resource management in court systems. This approach allows for the simultaneous examination of multiple interrelated factors contributing to judicial productivity.

By quantifying the relationships between variables such as the Human Resources Index, organizational justice, governance structures, and workplace behavior policies, this model offers valuable insights for court managers and policymakers. These insights can guide targeted interventions to improve judicial efficiency and effectiveness. However, it is important to note that the model's effectiveness depends on the quality and comprehensiveness of the input data. Future research should focus on refining the measurement of key variables and expanding the model to include emerging factors in judicial management, such as technological advancements and workforce demographic changes.

IJIMOB
Hosseini et al.
International Journal of Innovation Management and Organizational Behavior 4:2 (2024) 231-238

Ultimately, this structural equation-based assessment of the judicial human resources productivity model acts as a powerful tool for enhancing human resource management in the judiciary. By utilizing this model, court systems can work towards creating more productive, fair, and satisfying work environments, which in turn supports the broader goal of delivering justice effectively and efficiently to the public.

A limitation of this study was that it was conducted using only a quantitative method. Due to time and financial constraints, the researcher could not employ mixed methods (qualitative-quantitative). Additionally, judges, given the nature of their job, are less likely to participate in interviews and complete questionnaires, creating significant challenges for the researcher. It is suggested that future researchers use mixed methods. Considering the results, judge productivity is one of the influential factors in their work, and they should be empowered in this area. Utilizing in-service training can contribute to their professional development. Employing judges with high scientific knowledge can also impact judge productivity, and hiring such individuals and consulting them in the judiciary system can enhance productivity.

Authors' Contributions

All authors have contributed significantly to the research process and the development of the manuscript.

Declaration

In order to correct and improve the academic writing of our paper, we have used the language model ChatGPT.

Transparency Statement

Data are available for research purposes upon reasonable request to the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our gratitude to all individuals helped us to do the project.

Declaration of Interest

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Funding

Ethical Considerations

In this research, ethical standards including obtaining informed consent, ensuring privacy and confidentiality were observed.

References

Almutairi, M. A., & Alsawalhah, A. A. (2020). The Impact of Strategies Human Resource Management on Organizational Commitment.(An Applied Study on Employees in Jordanian Islamic Banks). *Modern Applied Science*, *14*(4), 14. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Ayyoub-Alsawalhah/publication/339776451_The_Impact_of_Strategies_Human_Resource_Management_on_Organizational_Commitment_An_Applied_Study_on_Employees_in_Jordanian_Islamic_Banks/links/5e640c62a6fdcc37dd0d44b9/The-Impact-of-Strategies-Human-Resource-Management-on-Organizational-Commitment-An-Applied-Study-on-Employees-in-Jordanian-Islamic-Banks.pdf

Armstrong, M. (2006). *A handbook of human resource management practice*. Kogan Page Publishers. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=D78K7QIdR3UC&oi=fnd&pg=PR17&dq=9.+Armstrong,+M.+(2006).+A+handbook+of+human+resource+management+practice.+Kogan+Page+Publishers.&ots=elJPMJR6cV&sig=2RiHo5ZSWqUhxHpFHyEra97BWjU

Babaee Rayni, A., Daneshfard, K., & Mirsepassi, N. (2021). Designing a Human Resource Development Model to Enhance the Effectiveness of Government Agencies (Case Study: Kerman Governorate). *Public Organizations Management*, *9*(3), 45-60. https://doi.org/10.30473/ipom.2021.51553.4025

Bamberger, P. A., Biron, M., & Boon, C. (2014). *Human resource strategy: Formulation, implementation, and impact*. Routledge. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9780203075838/human-resource-strategy-peter-bamberger-michal-biron-corine-boon

Caliendo, L., Mion, G., Opromolla, L. D., & Rossi-Hansberg, E. (2020). Productivity and Organization in Portuguese Firms. *Journal of Political Economy*, *128*(11), 4211-4257. https://doi.org/10.1086/710533

da Silva, L. B. P., Soltovski, R., Pontes, J., Treinta, F. T., Leitão, P., Mosconi, E., de Resende, L. M. M., & Yoshino, R. T. (2022). Human resources management 4.0: Literature review and trends. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, *168*, 108111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2022.108111

del-Castillo-Feito, C., Blanco-González, A., & Hernández-Perlines, F. (2022). The impacts of socially responsible human resources management on organizational legitimacy. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *174*, 121274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121274

Esthi, R. B., & Setiawan, I. (2023). Green human resources management of the small and micro-enterprises in Indonesia. *Enrichment: Journal of Management*, *12*(6), 4877-4885. http://www.enrichment.iocspublisher.org/index.php/enrichment/article/view/1018

Guest, D. E. (2017). Human resource management and employee well-being: towards a new analytic framework. *Human Resource Management Journal*, *27*(1), 22-38. https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12139

IJIMOB

Hosseini et al.   International Journal of Innovation Management and Organizational Behavior 4:2 (2024) 231-238

Hoque, K. (2013). *Human resource management in the hotel industry: Strategy, innovation and performance*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203020869

Jackson, S. E., Ones, D. S., & Dilchert, S. (2012). *Managing human resources for environmental sustainability* (Vol. 32). John Wiley & Sons. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=oPtRSNFQpHkC&oi=fnd&pg=PT8&dq=20.+Jackson,+S.+E.,+Ones,+D.+S.,+%26+Dilchert,+S.+(2012).+Managing+human+resources+for+environmental+sustainability+(Vol.+32).+John+Wiley+%26+Sons.&ots=TezMNrTeQ1&sig=J5qLDxOCpWnyYpv6wL4oeHHt1VM

Kambur, E., & Yildirim, T. (2023). From traditional to smart human resources management. *International Journal of Manpower*, *44*(3), 422-452. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-10-2021-0622

Nazimi, Y., Teymournejad, K., & Daneshfard, K. (2022). Designing a Human Resource Performance Management Model in Tehran Municipality According to the Requirements of Digital City (Qualitative Approach: Theme Analysis). *iueam*, *10*(38), 113-126. http://iueam.ir/article-1-1869-en.html

Palmi, P., Corallo, A., Prete, M. I., & Harris, P. (2021). Balancing exploration and exploitation in public management: Proposal for an organizational model. *Journal of Public Affairs*, *21*(3), e2245. https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2245

Rasooli, H., Mousakhani, M., Alvani, S. M., & Azimi, P. (2023). Designing a Comprehensive Model Of Innovative Human Resources: Iranian Government Organizations. *Innovation Management in Defensive Organizations*, *6*(1), 1-32. https://www.qjimdo.ir/&url=http:/www.qjimdo.ir/article_167810_db0ee9ad8b371915d9b004ff5516a020.pdf?lang=en

Rengkung, L. R. (2022). EXPLORATION AND EXPLOITATION: DRIVING ORGANIZATIONAL CAPABILITY AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE TOWARD COMPETI-TIVE ADVANTAGE. *Management Theory and Studies for Rural Business and Infrastructure Development*, *44*(1), 39-51. https://doi.org/10.15544/mts.2022.05

Salazar, C. R. d. S. (2022). Buscando uma Gestão Eficiente para o Judiciário:: Uma Agenda em Construção? *Public Sciences & Policies*, *7*(1), 233-245. https://doi.org/10.33167/2184-0644.CPP2021.VVIIN1/pp.233-245

Teimouri, H., Shahin, A., & Karimi, A. (2022). Providing a Competent-Based Human Resource Management Model with a Succession Approach. *Journal of Applied Sociology*, *33*(2), 69-92. https://doi.org/10.22108/jas.2021.126789.2043

Ubeda-Garcia, M., Claver-Cortés, E., Marco-Lajara, B., Garcia-Lillo, F., & Zaragoza-Sáez, P. (2019). Organizational success, human resources practices and exploration–exploitation learning. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, *41*(6), 1379-1397. https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-11-2017-0261

Ugoani, J. (2020). Performance appraisal and its effect on employees' productivity in charitable organizations. *Business, management and economics research*, *6*(12), 166-175. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3790733