

BAM 2023 CONFERENCE



BUSINESS
SCHOOL

UNCOVERING THE EFFECTS OF SELF-MANAGEMENT TEAM ON WELL-BEING: THE MODERATING ROLE OF TEAM ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING CAPABILITY

Zina Barghouti Abrini

Jaume I University

Clarke Ronald

Rennes School of business

Ricardo Chiva

Jaume I University

Jacob Guinot

UNCOVERING THE EFFECTS OF SELF-MANAGEMENT TEAM ON WELL-BEING: THE MODERATING ROLE OF TEAM ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING CAPABILITY

Zina Barghouti

Dept: Business Administration and

Marketing

Jaime I University

Castellon (Spain)

barghout@uji.es

Ronad Clarke

Department of Management & Organization

Rennes School of Business

Rennes (France)

ronald.clarke@rennes-sb.com

Ricardo Chiva

Dept: Business Administration and

Marketing

Jaime I University

Castellon (Spain)

rchiva@uji.es

Jacob Guinot

Dept: Business Administration and

Marketing

Jaime I University

Castellon (Spain)

guinotj@uji.es

1. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, organizations work using increasingly decentralized organizational structures. The current organizational trend is to give more power and responsibility to the employee (Martela, 2019). Thus, delegation in decision-making and assumption of risks are becoming more common elements in many positions. We are experiencing a shift from centralized organizations with hierarchical and vertically organized systems to work structures that decentralize power (Laloux, 2014; Lee and Edmondson, 2017; Michael et al., 2017). Decentralized organizational designs offer greater flexibility and agility in adapting to environmental changes, as well as greater autonomy in resource management and decision-making by teams (Banner, 2016; Chiva and Guinot, 2022; Mallén-Broch et al., 2023). In this sense, the literature acknowledges that team-oriented horizontal structures may be best suited to the current scenario of continuous change and challenges (Laloux, 2014; Lee and Edmonson, 2017).

These new models of organizational structure often rely on the use of self-managed teams (Lee and Edmonson, 2017; Magpili and Pazos, 2018). Self-managed teams are those in which decision-making, resource management, and task allocation are done collaboratively and participatively among all team members, without the presence of a leader with direct authority over the group (Yang and Guy, 2011; Michael et al., 2017). In this type of team, all members of the organization have a high degree of autonomy and responsibility in their work, which enables them to make agile decisions and efficiently adapt to environmental changes (Rousseau and Aubé, 2010).

Self-management teams have the potential to have a positive impact on employees' psychological well-being and the work climate. With more autonomy and control over their work, employees can experience a greater sense of purpose, achievement, and satisfaction, as well as foster the quality of interpersonal relationships in their workplace (Rousseau and Aubé, 2010). This can lead to a reduction in stress and tension in the work environment, promoting a peaceful, healthy, and positive psychological state (Schaufeli and Salanova, 2014). Therefore, self-managed teams seem to have the potential to improve employees' well-being.

The current work environment is characterized by competition, speed, and agility in task execution and immediate decision-making to adapt to turbulent environmental changes and remain competitive in the market. However, competition and speed should not be seen as excuses to overlook the well-being of workers. As suggested by Warr and Nielsen (2018), workers' well-being should not be sacrificed for the sake of productivity. Therefore, workers' well-being can be affected by various factors related to the work environment, such as stress, overload, burnout, lack of control over work, and lack of support (Schaufeli and Salanova, 2014). Additionally, authors like Maslach (2011) and Bakker and Oerlemans (2011) reveal that workers' well-being can have a significant impact on a company's productivity. A worker in a stress- and burnout-based work environment may have reduced capacity to work effectively and efficiently (Lee et al., 2013). For this reason, it is important to find a balance between speed and quality of work and workers' well-being.

Based on the arguments explained, our objective is to conduct research aimed at discovering whether an alternative management model based on self-managed teams influences the well-being of workers. To do this, a multilevel study has been proposed, encompassing two models. On one hand, we analyze how a work environment based on self-management teams promotes the peace of mind of all team members, and on the other hand, we reveal how this same environment reduces stress or burnout. Our literature review reveals limited attention to these concepts, despite proposals indicating their positive effects on organizational functioning (Warr and Nielsen, 2018; Schaufeli and Salanova, 2014). Consequently, we propose a research model that takes management literature one step further by revealing how self-managed teams influence workers' well-being. Additionally, it reveals how the variable of team learning capability positively moderates the relationship between self-managed teams and job satisfaction. To validate the proposed model, we conducted a multilevel analysis of a sample that collected data from 120 conscious and profitable companies, resulting in a total of 480 cases.

The study consists of a theoretical review of the central concepts of the model. Furthermore, the four hypotheses proposed will be presented for validation. Subsequently, a general discussion of the obtained results will be conducted, and finally, the conclusions, limitations, and suggestions for future research will be presented.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. *Self Management Teams*

Self-management teams function in some organisational models and structures, such as sociocracy, polyarchy, holocracy, responsive model and Teal organisations (Laloux, 2014 Magpili and Pazos, 2018). The term self-management is based on the premise that in order to manage others, it is necessary to learn to manage oneself. That is, it is the use of any method, skill or strategy by which the participants in a job can achieve their goals with autonomy (Lee and Edmondson, 2017; Arzola, 2018). This emerging model in management is classified by Laloux (2014) as Teal organisations or self-management organisations. These are organisations that are based on the creation of value for all the actors or parties involved (e.g. employers, employees, consultants, trusted workers, among others). They are organisations with a strong ethical, moral, social and legal sense (Robertson, 2015).

Authors such as Michael et al (2017) define the concept of self-managed organisations as companies that are characterised by decentralisation of hierarchical authority and control power. Self-managed organisations are characterised by a flexible structure that facilitates the process of knowledge creation, participatory decision-making, multidirectional information flow, and an authority based on teamwork and tolerance of mistakes (Magpili and Pazos, 2018 Robertson, 2015). Also, these organisations stand out for their participative form of management, where all members of the organisation acquire higher levels of authority and responsibility over their daily activities (Lee and Edmondson, 2017). Self-managed organisations are characterised by a structure based on autonomous or self-managed teams, where people acquire a greater degree of freedom in their workplace.

Michael et al. (2017) suggest that self-management organisations function on the basis of creating self-managed teams, where employees have decision-making rights, autonomy, commitment to common purpose, shared responsibility, shared leadership and peer evaluation (Druskat and Wheeler, 2004; Milikin et al., 2010; Nina et al., 2018). These self-managed teams are based on a management model based on wholeness, collaboration and a management policy based on transparency. More specifically, Magpili and Pazos (2018) define self-managed teams as "a group of people with diverse skills and knowledge, with collective autonomy, and the responsibility to plan, manage and execute tasks interdependently to achieve a common goal". Cooney (2004) states that self-managed teams operate on the basis of a culture based on equality, where power is distributed among all team members, and everyone has responsibility for the outcome of the project and tasks (Hackman, 2002; Yang and Guy, 2011).

2.2. Team Learning Capability

The concept of organisational learning capability refers to organisational and management characteristics that facilitate organisational learning (Goh and Richard, 1997; Chiva and Alegre, 2009). Organisational learning capability is seen as a multidimensional concept, i.e. it is characterised by essential dimensions that seem to explain an organisation's propensity to learn (Alegre and Chiva, 2007). Chiva and Alegre (2009) identified the following dimensions of OLC: experimentation, risk acceptance, interaction with the environment, dialogue and participatory decision-making. These five dimensions facilitate the process of organisational learning in a given company.

Experimentation can be defined as the degree to which new ideas and suggestions are listened to and stipulated with empathy (Nevis et al., 1995; Pedler et al., 1997; Chiva and Alegre, 2013). According to Nevis et al, (1995) experimentation leads to curiosity, trying new ideas, making changes in work management, and involves the constant search for innovative solutions to problems.

Risk-taking involves tolerance of ambiguity, uncertainty and mistakes. Kouzes and Posner (1987) consider that learning from the successes and mistakes that come from risk-taking leads to the opening up of new business opportunities. In the same vein, Sitkin (1996) points out that failure or error is an essential prerequisite for effective organisational learning.

The dimension of interaction with the external environment is defined as the degree of existing relationships with the external environment. The external environment is understood as those factors that are beyond the direct control of the organisation (Chiva and Alegro, 2008). For example, effects of the economic, political/legal system, competitors, among others.

Dialogue is an essential dimension of the organisational learning process (Oswick et al., 2000). Authors such as Brown and Duguid (1992) emphasise that dialogue generates both individual and organisational learning, as it enables the hidden meanings of words to be seen and leads to a common understanding. Oswick et al. (2000) claim that dialogue fosters organisational learning because it is a phenomenon that creates a community based on the interaction and communication of individuals.

Finally, these authors suggest the need for organisations with a democratic and participatory system. Participation is understood as the level of influence that employees have in the decision-making process. Moreover, as some authors (e.g. Scott-Land and Chan, 2004) argue, participatory decision-making improves access to information, improves the quality of information and the ownership of decision outcomes. Therefore, participatory decision-making is defined as one of the enablers of organisational learning.

Following the same lines of research, organisational learning capacity is considered a vital component for the effectiveness and success of an organisation (Camps et al., 2016). Many studies on OLC explain it as a variable that leads to fostering an organisation's productivity and performance (Alegre and Chiva, 2013; Camps and Luna-Arocas, 2012; Guinot et al., 2013; Tippins and Sohi, 2003). Likewise, authors such as Jiménez-Jimenez et al. (2008) argue that organisational learning is a mechanism that helps companies to adapt to turbulent changes in the environment and to be more proactive.

In particular, in this study we will investigate the OLC phenomenon at the team level. We will talk about the learning capacity of the team.


2.3. well-being

In recent years, the concept of wellbeing has been defined as an individual's state of satisfaction and peace of mind due to good physical, mental and emotional conditions. Authors such as Warr and Nielsen (2018) suggest that wellbeing is achieved when the individual is satisfied in their job. And this is the result of a pleasant working environment and recognition, which has an impact on family and social well-being.

Well-being at work requires a balance between physical well-being and emotional or mental well-being. Physical well-being is understood as the creation of plans and activities that promote the safety and health of employees. In parallel, emotional well-being consists, on the one hand, of reducing stress or burnout and anxiety. On the other hand, it is about increasing peace of mind. Therefore, to achieve well-being requires a healthy working environment that is characterised by continuous improvement in promoting and protecting the health, safety and well-being of workers.

Based on the circumplex model of well-being, it is revealed that a high level of pleasure and low level of activation drives individuals to achieve peace of mind (Bakker & Oerlemans, 2011; Warr and Nielsen, 2018). To this end, states that define peace of mind are considered to be relaxation, calmness, serenity, among others (figure 1). However, a low level of pleasure and low level of arousal leads to a state of burnout (Russell, 1980; Warr and Nielsen, 2018). The main factors that drive the individual to a state of burnout are fatigue, stress, boredom, among others (figure 1).

Figure 1: Circumplex welfare model



Source: Adapted from Warr and Nielsen, 2018.

2.3.1 Burnout

The concept of burnout appeared in the 1970s by the author freudenberguer (1740) to explain the process of mental and physical deterioration of professionals in the workplace. Since then, the concept of burnout has been defined as a psychological response to chronic work-related stress, of an emotional nature, which appears in the members of organisations, where the response is characterised by a cognitive deterioration consisting of a loss of enthusiasm for work, professional disenchantment or low personal fulfilment at work. It is also defined as an affective impairment characterised by emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation (Maslach and Jackson, 1981). Emotional exhaustion is explained as the affective level at which the worker feels that he/she cannot give more of him/herself. In other words, it is a situation of depletion of one's energy or resources that limits one's ability to remain productive at work (Bakker and Oerlemans, 2016). Depersonalisation or dehumanisation is defined as the development of negative and

cynical feelings and attitudes towards co-workers (Gil-Monte, 2007; Gil-Monte, 2007). (Gil-Monte, 2007; Bakker and Oerlemans, 2016).

On the other hand, the literature reveals that the main cause of burnout lies in the work environment and company policies. Among the reasons highlighted were a negative work environment, extended working hours, lack of autonomy, lack of communication between employees and senior management, low pay, lack of rewards, among others (Álvarez, 2011; Schaufali and Salanova, 2014). These causes of burnout awaken in the employee depression, anxiety, low self-esteem, feelings of failure, lack of concentration and poor performance (Laschinger at al., 2003; Hatch et al., 2011; Maslach, 2011).

Burnout has become an important and socially recognised phenomenon, being linked to work and work activities. The term burnout has been analysed from the perspective of two effects: the demands-control effect and the effort-reward effect. From the demands-control interaction model it is pointed out that burnout arises when the demands of work are high, but the ability to control them is low. And the effort-reward effect explains burnout from the perspective of an imbalance between high effort and low reward. That is, the employee is confronted with obligations, excessive tasks and demands but does not receive favourable monetary and non-monetary rewards

Burnout is characterised by three key dimensions: the exhaustion dimension, the cynicism dimension and the inefficiency dimension (Maslach, 2006; Lee and Ashforth, 1990). The burnout dimension is the core component of burnout. It refers to individual stress that leads to feelings of weakness, emptiness and no source of energy (Lee et al., 2011). Also, the lack of strength to continue at work and to face another day or another problem (Maslach and Jackson, 1981). Regarding the cynicism dimension, it represents the interpersonal context component of burnout (Maslach, 2006). It usually appears once the first dimension is reached, i.e. the excess of emotional exhaustion. This dimension is defined as negative and insensitive responses to various aspects of work. For example, individuals with cynicism reduce effort, performance and the amount of time and energy they put into their work. Finally, the inefficiency dimension represents the self-evaluation component of burnout. In this dimension, the individual feels incompetent, lacking achievement, success and productivity at work (Lee and Ashforth, 1990).

2.3.2. Peace of mind

The concept of peace of mind is defined as the level of inner peace and harmony experienced by an individual (Tsai et al. 2006). This phenomenon was defined with words related to the LAP circumplex model of emotions, such as peaceful, serene, calm, comfortable, harmonious and balanced (Tsai, 2006; Lee et al., 2013). Furthermore, Lee et al. (2013) revealed that people who achieve an inner state of calmness and harmony are more likely to be confident in themselves, their decisions, challenges and goals. They also tend to deal with problems in a positive way based on the search for effective solutions (Watson and Tellegen 1985; Carson and Langer, 2006). On the other hand, peace of mind allows the individual to live in the present and achieve spiritual, mental, emotional and physical harmony leading to greater awareness, mindfulness and critical thinking (Lee et al., 2013). Also, Kant (1795) suggests that peace of mind gives rise to a number of emotions related to people, such as empathy, the pursuit of well-being, love and temperance (1795).

At the organisational level, the construct peace of mind has been related to organisational well-being (Chiva and Guinot, 2021), specifically, to more conscious, humane and sustainable organisations (Lee et al., 2013; Sophie et al., 2022). It is an internal state of peace that affects both the individual's mind and their environment (Chiva and Guinot, 2021). In other words, the peace of mind of the members of the organisation is reflected in the work climate and in the results. Among the benefits of peace of mind, the following stand out: firstly, it increases productivity because peace of mind further develops concentration (Sharifzadeh and Almaraz, 2014). Secondly, it promotes mental clarity for better decision-making (Lee et al., 2013). Thirdly, it fosters relationships and connection between workers (Chiva and Guinot, 2021). Fourth, it reduces stress, burnout and tension (Weigelt et al., 2019). Finally, it fosters positive emotions and reduces conflicts and negative emotions (Weigelt et al., 2019). For this reason, more and more companies apply meditation and mindfulness methods in the workplace, due to the concern for the physical and mental well-being of their employees (Cheng, 2016).

3. HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Figure 2 illustrates our research model. Specifically, it reveals a multilevel (team level/individual level) study that looks at how self-management team could improve work well-being through reduced burnout and improved peace of mind. Furthermore, this relationship can be better understood by considering the learning capacity of the team as a moderating variable. The model posits four hypotheses, which will be discussed below.

3.1. Hipótesis 1.a: Self – Management Teams y Burnout

Self-management teams operate in a shared responsibility regime where members share a high level of autonomy (Lee et al., 2017). Decisions are made by consensus, looking at the interests of all members and seeking mutually beneficial solutions (Robertson, 2015). Agreements are made following processes of dialogue, discussion of ideas and exchange of knowledge (Laloux, 2014). Disagreements, diversity of opinions and individual differences are accepted. There is no authority that imposes its vision or conditions the will of the team members (Yang and Guy, 2011). There is also no system of individual rewards and punishments, but all responsibility for results is shared (Banai et al., 2000). Members also have a high level of freedom to express themselves, redesign working methods or manage working times. Each team member must take responsibility for his or her own work, while at the same time being able to coordinate with the other members (Robertson, 2015). In self-managed teams, the design of objectives, the distribution of roles and responsibilities, the evaluation of results or the recognition of work are tasks that are fully assumed by the team members. They also have the freedom to propose and implement new work practices (Milikin et al., 2010; Micheal et al., 2017).

This literature suggests that the lack of delegation of tasks, the absence of autonomy in decision-making or the lack of recognition are aspects that negatively affect worker satisfaction (Warr and Nielsen, 2018; Chung et al., 2020). In particular, it has been found that when workers are subjected to an excessively hierarchical, rigid and monotonous work system, their morale may eventually succumb. Moreover, in such a work context, workers are more likely to perceive their work as uninspiring, meaningless and excessively boring. Not surprisingly, new models of human resource management have

moved away from this management paradigm towards one in which the employee can take on more responsibility and enjoy greater autonomy. The results of research on these new management approaches confirm that by ceding responsibility to the employee and following a more horizontal hierarchical operation, not only better performance results are achieved, but also better job satisfaction (Laloux, 2014; Cheng, 2016; Chiva and Guinot, 2021). Thus, while hierarchical, rigidly controlling and disciplinary structures undermine the will, trust and worth of individuals, more democratic, participative and horizontal structures ultimately result in a source of satisfaction (Finlay et al., 1995; Nelson and Quick, 2011).

In an environment where the employee is mistrusted and not given freedom of action or responsibility, this is likely to undermine his or her self-confidence. In addition, if the employee does not see the job as his or her own because he or she cannot make decisions that affect the job, a sense of depersonalisation may develop. Emotional exhaustion is also more likely to occur when the employee loses the ability to act on what influences their daily work (Bakker and Oerlemons, 2016). In contrast, the possibility of directly influencing the design of goals, the way tasks are executed or the implementation of new initiatives can end up being a positive stimulus for the worker (Warr and Nielsen, 2018). Furthermore, more participative ways of working also serve to arouse feelings of greater self-efficacy and usefulness for the task at hand (Maslach, 2011; Lee et al., 2011). Consequently, working in self-managed teams is likely to mitigate the worker's perception of ineffectiveness and uselessness, arousing in the worker a greater interest and enthusiasm for their work, and also reducing their sense of emotional exhaustion. Accordingly, we put forward the following hypothesis:

H1a: Self-Management Team is negatively related to Burnout.

3.2. Hipótesis 1.b: Self-Management Teams y Peace of Mind

As noted in the previous hypothesis, functioning in self-managed teams could have an impact on workers' mental health or emotional well-being. A large number of studies have tried to explore the question of which working conditions positively or negatively affect well-being at work (Russell, 1989; Warr and Nielsen, 2018). Among these studies, one of the issues that emerges as having an impact on workers' well-being is the functioning of work teams (Lee and Edmondson, 2017; Kim et al., 2022). The way in which teams

are led, their structure, the level of camaraderie, the determined use of rewards or fairness in decision-making are, among other issues, elements that have been linked to well-being within the company (Maslach, 2011; Robertson, 2015).

This form of teamwork therefore brings with it greater levels of responsibility but also greater levels of freedom. The worker can freely decide many questions about his or her own work, without being subject to continuous discipline and surveillance, while working interdependently with the other members with a common goal (Lee and Edmonson, 2017). This way of working therefore combines individual freedom with collective commitment. The worker will benefit not only from being able to deploy himself at work with full autonomy, but will also find himself working for a common project (Michael et., 2017). He/she can therefore feel more self-fulfilled and satisfied by enjoying high levels of autonomy, and also find the protection of the team. If there is greater autonomy for the worker, shared responsibility among members and a work climate of cooperation and mutual recognition, this is likely to result in the worker experiencing greater levels of harmony, peace of mind, stability and self-satisfaction. Previous studies are beginning to point in this direction, noting that organisational models and cultures based on horizontal structures give rise to more positive emotions and mental states (Warr and Nielsen, 2018; Chiva and Guinot, 2021). Along these lines, the hypothesis put forward here is that working in self-managed teams would lead to a work climate conducive to enhancing employee peace of mind.

H1b: Self-Management Teams is positively related to Peace of Mind.

3.3.. Hypothesis 2.a: The Moderating Role of Team Learning Capabilities between Self-Management Teams and Burnout

In addition to exploring the direct effects of the relationship between SMT and Burnout, the introduction of facilitating variables would help us to further explain this relationship. In this way, some variables could help us explain this effect and discover specific processes that condition the effect produced by SMT on burnout.

First, the SMT variable could have a positive effect on TLC. And on the other hand, the FTA supposes that the worker can be involved in making important decisions, get involved in the search for solutions and interact with the agents in their environment

(Alegre and Chiva, 2013; Imran et al., 2016) . It can therefore be deduced that this could arouse a greater interest in the worker for his work issues and reinforce his enthusiasm for his daily task. On the other hand, when you are supported by your teammates in making decisions and feel that you can count on them in solving problems, emotional exhaustion may take longer to set in. In turn, when the worker is invited to take risks, experiment with new processes and participate in important decisions, this can increase their perception of worth and give their work greater meaning (Camps et al., 2016; Cheng and Chien, 2016). On the other hand, the perception of usefulness of the work could also rise if the worker is recognized as an integral part of the team and the organization (Michael et al., 2017), which is coupled with the TLC. Likewise, if the worker can collect information from their environment and interact with it and know and manage enough information, this can result in a greater perception of efficacy (Alegre and Chiva, 2013; Cheng and Chien, 2016). In addition, the fact that they are granted high autonomy in decision-making can also contribute to this perception of effectiveness. Being able to get involved in decision-making and having his opinions taken into account could be key for the worker to make a better assessment of his professional work and his own effectiveness (Camps et al., 2016; Altinay et al., 2016). In short, the practices or behaviors that accompany TLC could be reducing emotional exhaustion and loss of interest and enthusiasm for work while increasing the worker's perception of usefulness, value, and efficacy. That is, the TLC would reduce the experimentation of burnout.

Taking into account the previous premises, we propose that the negative effect between SMT and burnout could be conditioned by the TLC. Specifically, the SMT would positively affect the TLC and this would have a negative effect on burnout. Therefore, TLC could moderate the relationship between SMT and burnout. Therefore, we put forward the following hypothesis:

H2a: Team Learning Capabilities negatively moderates the relationship between Self-Management Teams and Burnout.

3.4. Hypothesis 2.b: The moderating role of Team Learning Capabilities between Self-Management Teams and Peace of Mind

In the same way as in the previous hypothesis, the introduction of explanatory variables could shed light on the initially proposed positive effect between TLC and SMT. Specifically, to try to offer a more complete explanation of this effect, it is proposed to introduce a variable that could moderate the relationship proposed in H1b. To do this, following the same line of argument that we have proposed in the previous hypothesis, we are going to reintroduce the TLC variable on this second starting hypothesis. As explained, working in self-managed teams grants workers full autonomy to be able to make decisions in many areas of their work at the team level (Lee and Edmondson, 2017). This implies from the roles assumed, the way to achieve the objectives or the way to measure performance (Ciborra, 1996; Adler, 2001) . This form of teamwork also means that workers will know how to recognize the work of teammates and congratulate each other for a job well done (Robertson, 2015). In addition, they will be able to collectively find new formulas to find better solutions and face problems. In order to function in this way, it is therefore necessary for open and frequent communication to take place between all team members (Edmondson, 2002; Michael., 2017). In addition, peer recognition for a job well done will strengthen relationships and mutual commitment.

On the other hand, as explained, these teams solve their problems collectively, reaching consensus and discussing improvement ideas as a group (Arzola, 2018). Furthermore, in these teams, problems are solved in groups and are configured so that they can continually experiment and propose ideas to others (Lee & Edmondson, 2017). Likewise, the way of coordinating tasks is through mutual adaptation. That is, direct observation is used to be able to coordinate (Davis et al., 2009). They are teams that are also committed to continuous improvement (Edmondson, 2002).

Organizations that work with self-managed teams are organized through work teams. In other words, the work teams are the axis on which the functioning of the organization revolves (Robertson, 2015; Magpili and Pazos, 2018). Therefore, information flows fluctuate horizontally, making communication more open. This also causes workers to have a high capacity for intervention in decision-making since it is mainly the members of the teams and not senior management who make most of the decisions. By delegating this power, people will have to be willing to take more risks and jump into new ideas. This organizational and teamwork scheme in which there is mutual support and a spirit

of collaboration would help workers receive greater support when they submit proposals (Robertson, 2015). In addition, due to the idiosyncrasy of these teams, being part of a self-managed team would also invite workers to search on their own for information necessary for their work (for example, from customers, suppliers, competitors, etc.), thus promoting Interaction with other groups outside the company.

In accordance with the above, it could be suggested that self-managed teams could facilitate the dimensions of organizational learning capacity. That is, the work in these teams could promote experimentation, risk acceptance, interaction with the external environment, dialogue and participatory decision-making. In turn, organizational learning ability could have a positive effect on employee peace of mind. For example, by feeling involved in decision-making and being able to talk freely and work in an atmosphere of mutual acceptance, the worker is likely to experience higher levels of harmony and satisfaction. Likewise, frequent communication and the fact of being part of a collective or team, which is characteristic of team organizational learning, can help the worker feel less restlessness and greater stability (Chiva et al., 2007; Camps et al. , 2016). On the other hand, receiving the support of other colleagues when they express ideas or propose initiatives, this can lead to more serene and relaxed states of mind. In short, team organizational learning would be capable of producing feelings of greater peace and stability in the worker, making the worker feel satisfied with himself and feeling in harmony and calm. In this way, by promoting team organizational learning, the employee's peace of mind would be favored.

In summary, as has been proposed here, self-managed teams would increase team organizational learning, and in turn, the latter could have a positive impact on peace of mind. Therefore, the positive effect between self-managed teams and peace of mind could be strengthened by team organizational learning. Thus, we put forward the following hypothesis:

H2b: Team Learning Capabilities positively moderates the relationship between Self-Managed Team and Peace of Mind.

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1. *Sample and data collection*

The study is based on a database that collects a list of companies from different sectors and sizes. Specifically, data was collected from a total of 120 national and international companies but located in Spain. In each of them, four members responded to the questionnaire, broken down into 3 members of the work team and 1 leader or manager. The questionnaire is divided into three levels: individual level, organizational level and team level. Telephone interviews were used to complete the survey, since this technique is useful when the questions are asked by different people from the same company or when it is difficult to contact them. In the end, a total of 480 collected questionnaires was obtained.

The size of the companies ranges from 10 to 250 employees, therefore, they are small, medium and large companies. The average number of employees is 90 (mean=90), and an average seniority of the company of 5 years. The average age of the respondents differs if they are employees or leaders. In the case of employees, the average age ranges from 40 years, and in the case of leaders it is 47 years. 54.4% of the surveyed employees are men and 45.6% are women. It is observed that the difference is not very high. However, a great gender difference is observed in the leaders or managers surveyed, the male sex is reported in 65% and the female sex in 35%. On the other hand, most of the employees surveyed have a university degree (44.4%) and a Master's degree (39.7%). Similarly, 64.2% of the leaders of the selected companies have a university master's degree. The average seniority of the employees in the company is 5 years, however, the average seniority of the leaders is 9 years.

The field work began in 2020 and the definitive database was obtained in 2022. In addition, the anonymity of the respondents was guaranteed in all phases to promote their security and confidence in participation and stimulate sincere responses, thus improving the reliability of the sample to develop empirical and quantitative studies. The questionnaire variables consist of a series of items that were measured using the 7-point Likert scale method. Each item on the Likert scale was answered based on the degree of agreement or disagreement, that is, the value 1 indicates a very low degree of agreement with the statement and the value 7 corresponds to a very high degree.

4.2. Measures and reliability of measurement scales

Las medidas de los constructos se basan en escalas validadas por la literatura y publicadas anteriormente. Para comprobar la fiabilidad de la escala se utilizaron, además del coeficiente alfa de Cronbach (Cronbach, 1951), tres indicadores: la fiabilidad compuesta (Fornell y Larcker, 1981) y la varianza media extraída (Alegre y Chiva, 2008) y la prueba de esfericidad de Bartlett (Barlett et al., 2017) (ver Tabla 1). Tanto los valores del coeficiente alfa de Cronbach como la fiabilidad compuesta están por encima del valor mínimo aceptable de 0,7 (Nunnally, 1978). Además, la varianza media extraída muestra valores superiores al mínimo recomendado de 0,5 (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black 1998; Nunnally, 1978).

4.2.1. Independent Variable

Self Management Teams

We measure the construct of self management teams or self managing teams using the Rousseau and Aubé scale (2010). The Rousseau and Aubé scale items were generated from literature and measures of self-management behaviors (eg, Diefendorff et al., 2006; Lambe et al., 2009). The scale consists of 8 items that measure self-planning, self-monitoring, self-reinforcement, and self-adjustment. The items are (a) “We plan the accomplishment of our work activities,” (b) “We clarify the roles and the responsibilities of each member,” (c) “We assess the effectiveness of our team functioning,” (d) “We monitor the results of our work,” (e) “We congratulate our team mates when they do well,” (f) “We recognize the contributions of our team mates,” (g) “We search for better ways of working ,” and (h) “We put into place new practices to do our work”. The authors confirmed the validity of the measurement scale and demonstrated its psychometric properties. Respondents gave their responses to the items on a 7-point Likert scale (degree of agreement).

The items of the Rousseau and Aubé scale show complete reliability ($\alpha > 0.70$; Bartlett Test $< .001$; Composite reliability ($0.70 < 0.847 < 1$); Variance extracted ($0.50 < 0.685 < 1$))

4.2.2. Dependent Variables

Burnout

The burnout variable was analyzed at the individual level, that is, a list of items was presented to the employees to express how they feel in their workplace. For this, we have used the scale derived from the work of Schaufeli et al. (nineteen ninety six). The items that were raised were grouped into 3 subscales: the exhaustion (AG) subscale is made up of 5 items (for example, "I am emotionally exhausted by my work", "I am "consumed" at the end of a work day"). The cynicism (Ci) subscale also comprises 5 items (for example, "I have lost interest in my job since I started in this position", "I have lost enthusiasm for my job"). The professional effectiveness subscale comprises 6 items (for example, "In my opinion I am good at my position", "I have achieved many valuable things in this position"). High scores on exhaustion and cynicism and low scores on professional efficiency define the burnout variable. Therefore, the burnout construct consists of 16 items. However, there are works by the authors Salanova et al. (2000) who reduce the scale to 15 items. In our analysis we will use the scale with 15 items. The scale used is Likert-type from 1 to 7 points, with 1 being the lowest level and 7 being the highest.

The reliability of the scale is validated where Cronbach's alpha exceeds the value recommended by the literature 0.70 and the Bartlett test is $< .001$. Likewise, the composite reliability and the average variance extracted are above the minimum accepted value (Composite reliability: $0.70 < 0.831 < 1$; Variance extracted: $0.50 < 0.779 < 1$).

Peace of Mind

The peace of mind variable is a construct that is studied at the individual level. The fundamental interest was to analyze this phenomenon at the employee level, for this reason, the peace of mind scale was raised in the questionnaire addressed to employees. To do this, we measure the peace of mind construct using the scale of Lee, Lin, Huang and Fredrickson (2012). The scale compiles a list of emotional words related to the peace

and harmony of the individual. For the generation of the items, the authors used the LAP circumplex model of emotions (Russell 1980; Tsai et al. 2006), including words such as peaceful, serene, calm, harmonious and balanced. This list of words defined the items of the peace of mind construct. Each item was designed to capture inner peace along with inner harmony, a total of 7 items were written to reflect experiences of inner peace and harmony. The items are (a) “My mind is free and at ease”, (b) “I feel content and comfortable with myself in daily life”, (c) “My lifestyle gives me feelings of peace and stability”, (d) “I have peace and harmony in my mind”, (e) “It is difficult for me to feel settled (Reverse)”, (f) “The way I live brings me feelings of peace and comfort”, (g) “I feel anxious and uneasy in my mind (Reverse).” Respondents gave their responses to the items on a 7-point Likert scale (degree of agreement).

Peace of mind is a construct that has been previously validated by the authors Lee et al., (2012). All the items demonstrate consistency and reliability to be able to develop the proposed study ($\alpha > 0.70$; Bartlett Test $< .001$; Composite reliability $(0.70 < 0.883 < 1)$; Variance extracted $(0.50 < 0.764 < 1)$).

4.2.3. Moderating Variable

Team Learning Capability

To measure the team learning capability variable, the organizational learning capability scale of the authors Chiva, Alegre and Lapiedra (2007) has been used. These authors defined the concept of learning ability based on three perspectives: the social perspective (for example, Brown and Duguid 1991; Weick and Westley 1996), the individual perspective (for example, Hedberg 1981; Popper and Lipshitz 2000) and organizational or team perspective (eg, Pedler et al. 1997; Ulrich et al. 1993). The individual perspective considers learning as an individual phenomenon and, consequently, understands that organizations learn through individuals (Chiva and Alegre 2008; Simmons 1991). The social perspective considers learning as a social phenomenon and, therefore, understands that organizations learn through communities and groups (Brown and Duguid 1991; Chiva and Alegre 2008). The learning organization focuses mainly on the development of normative models for the creation of a learning organization (Alegre and Chiva 2008; Ulrich et al. 1993). This literature (Goh and Richards 1997; Pedler et al. 1997) describes

a set of actions that ensure the ability to learn: effective generation of ideas through the implementation of a set of practices such as experimentation, continuous improvement, teamwork and group problem solving, observing what others are doing, or participatory decision making. Based on this literature, the authors Chiva, Alegre and Lapiedra (2007) defined a final scale on learning capacity that can be focused at the organizational level or at the work team level. This scale consisted of five dimensions and a total of 14 items. These dimensions are experimentation, risk taking, interaction with the external environment, dialogue and participation (Chiva and Alegre 2009). The scale used is a Likert-type scale from 1 to 7 points, with 1 being the lowest level of confidence and 7 being the highest. In this investigation we are going to analyze the concept of learning capacity at the team level (TLC). Some items on the scale are: (a) "People receive support when they present new ideas", (b) "There is open communication in work groups", (c) "Teamwork between people from different teams is a common practice", (d) "We have systems and procedures to receive, collate and share information from outside the company/organization", (e) "People feel involved in the main decisions".

The validity and reliability of the TLC scale is verified by the following indicators ($\alpha > 0.70$; Bartlett Test $< .001$; Composite reliability ($0.70 < 0.778 < 1$); Variance extracted ($0.50 < 0.784 < 1$))

4.2.4. control variables.

To take into account the heterogeneity of the sample, age and sex were controlled for both employees and leaders. The aforementioned control variables were chosen because they have been shown to be associated with job well-being (Van der Hulst 2003; Warr, 1992). Specifically, burnout (Huhtala et al., 2015) and peace of mind (Lee et al., 2012) have been considered as predictor variables.

5. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

5.1. Analyses

Traditional approaches to cross-level models in the organizational sciences have been to either disaggregate data, assigning group-level variables to individuals, or to aggregate individual data to the group level. Each of these options has potential empirical and conceptual weaknesses. Disaggregation provides biased estimates of standard errors; aggregation to the group level weakens statistical power, discards meaningful individual-level variance, and perhaps leads to inappropriate inferences (Bryk & Raudenbush, 1992; Hofmann, 1997).

We used hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) version 8.1 with Restricted Maximum Likelihood to test these hypotheses because it is an appropriate approach for testing cross-level models. HLM allows an analyst to explicitly model both individual- and group-level variance in individual outcomes. The intercept and slope from the level 1, or within-group, analysis serve as the dependent variables in the level 2, or between-groups, analysis. A significant parameter estimate (γ_{10}) for the level 1 predictor indicates an individual-level effect, and a significant parameter estimate (γ_{01}) for the level 2 predictor of the level 1 intercepts indicates a group level effect (Hofmann, 1997; Bryk & Raudenbush, 1992). HLM was the most appropriate approach because it allowed use of individual predictors at the individual level and group predictors at the group level without the shortcomings of the aggregation or disaggregation approaches.

The next step of the hierarchical analysis, since a group-level variable can explain only differences between groups, is to show that significant between-groups differences exist for the dependent variables of our study (Hofmann, 1997). Thus, we ran null models with no predictors, including only burnout and peace of mind as dependent variables. Results indicate that 32% ($ICC(1) = 0.32, \chi^2[119] = 289.84, p < .001$) of the variance in burnout, as well as 24% ($ICC(1) = 0.24, \chi^2[119] = 233.34, p < .001$) of the variance in peace of mind, resided at team level, justifying the use of HLM as an adequate analytical technique.

5.2. Results

Table 1 presents means, standard deviations, and correlations among the study variables. The results showed that self-managed team was positively related to team learning capabilities ($r = .48, p < .01$) comparable to prior research (Bresman and Zellmer-Bruhn, 2013) where team structure coefficients were correlated with team learning experience ($r = .29, p < .05$).

Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations, and Bivariate Correlations among Study Variables

Variables	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3
Level 1: Individual level					
1. Gender ^a	.46	.50			
2. Age (in years)	41.30	7.42	- .19**		
3. Burnout	3.52	.42	.01	-.02	
4. Peace of mind	4.71	.38	.01	- .11*	-.12*
Level 2: Team level					
1. Leader gender ^a	.35	.48			
2. Leader sge (in years)	47.87	6.68	-.17		
3. Self-managed team	5.54	.55	-.04	.00	
4. Team learning capabilities	5.58	.43	.03	.10	.48**

Source: own elaboration

Note. N employees = 360 N teams = 120. ^aGender: 0 = Male, 1 = Female. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 2 provides a summary of the models and results used to test our hypotheses. To reduce possible multicollinearity problems and help the interpretation of variables, all the study variables in our models were grand mean centered (Enders and Tofighi, 2007).

Table 2. *HLM Analysis on Employee Burnout and Peace of Mind*


Predictor variable	Dependent variable							
	Burnout				Peace of mind			
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Coefficient	s.e.	Coefficient	s.e.	Coefficient	s.e.	Coefficient	s.e.
Intercept (γ_{00})	3.52***	.03	3.52***	.03	4.71***	.02	4.71***	.02
Level 1 variables								
Gender (γ_{10})	.02	.02	.02	.02	-.05	.03	-.05	.03
Age (γ_{20})	.00	.03	.00	.03	-.04	.03	-.04	.03
Level 2 variables								
Leader gender (γ_{01})	-.03	.03	-.04	.03	.03	.02	.04	.02
Leader age (γ_{02})	-.02	.02	-.03	.02	.00	.03	.01	.03
Self-managed team (γ_{03})	-.09** (H1a)	.03	-.09**	.03	.05* (H1b)	.03	.06*	.03
Team learning capabilities (γ_{04})			-.01	.03			.01	.03
Self-managed team X Team learning capabilities (γ_{05})			-.04* (H2a)	.02			.06**(H2b)	.02
R^2	.04		.05		.14		.18	

Note. N at Level 1 = 360, Level 2 = 120. R^2 values indicate the percentage of total variance explained by predictors in the model. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Main effects of self-managed team. Hypothesis 1a claims that self-managed team is negatively related to employee burnout. As shown in Model 1 of table 2, the HLM results revealed that self-managed team negatively influences employee burnout ($\gamma = -.09$, $p < .01$), suggesting that self-managed team could act as a deterrent to burnout. Thus, hypothesis 1a was supported.

Hypothesis 1b proposes that self-managed team positively predicts peace of mind. As illustrated in Table 2, results from testing Model 3 indicate that the relationship between self-managed team and employee peace of mind is positive ($\gamma = .05, p < .05$), providing support for hypothesis 1b.

Figure 2. Study hypotheses




Source: own elaboration

Interactions between self-managed team and team learning capabilities. Hypothesis 2a states that team learning capabilities negatively moderate the relationship between self-managed team and employee burnout. When team learning capabilities is high, self-managed team was expected to be less strongly related to burnout than when self-managed team is low. As shown in Table 2, the interaction between self-managed team and team learning capabilities was significant ($\gamma = -.04, p < .05$, Model 2). In addition, we conducted simple slope tests to confirm the nature of the moderation effect (Aiken & West, 1991; Preacher et al., 2006). Figure 2 shows that when team learning capabilities was high (1 *SD* above the mean), self-managed team was negatively related to burnout ($b_{\text{high}} = -.14, t = -3.74, p < .001$); while when team learning capabilities was low (1 *SD*

below the mean), the slope was non-significant ($b_{low} = -.05$, $t = -1.43$, *n.s.*). Therefore, hypothesis 2a was supported.


Figure 3. The interactive effect of self-managed team and team learning capabilities on burnout



Source: own elaboration

Hypothesis 2b posits that team learning capabilities positively moderates the relationship between self-managed team and employee peace of mind. When team learning capabilities is high, self-managed team was expected to be more strongly related to peace of mind than when self-managed team is low. As shown in Table 2, the interaction between self-managed team and team learning capabilities was significant ($\gamma = .06$, $p < .01$, Model 4). We also ran simple slope tests (depicted in Figure 3) showing that when team learning capabilities was high (1 *SD* above the mean), self-managed team was significantly and positively related to employee peace of mind ($b_{high} = .13$, $t = 3.84$, $p < .001$). In contrast, when learning capabilities of the team were low (1 *SD* below the mean), the relationship between self-managed team and employee peace of mind became non-significant ($b_{low} = .00$, $t = -.10$, *n.s.*). Hence, supporting hypothesis 2b.

Figure 4. The interactive effect of self-managed team and team learning capabilities on peace of mind



Source: own elaboration

6. CONCLUSIONS

In the constant search to improve productivity, efficiency and employee satisfaction, many organizations have explored different management approaches and methodologies. One of the approaches that has gained popularity in recent years is self-management, where teams have a high degree of autonomy and decision-making. This approach has captured the attention of researchers due to its benefits and advantages that it offers to companies that opt for this form of management (Laloux, 2014; Robertson, 2015; Lee and Edmondson, 2017). One of the greatest benefits of self-management or self-managed teams is that they encourage collaboration and cooperation among workers (Edmondson, 2002). By allowing team members to work together autonomously, an environment is created in which everyone can contribute ideas and solutions (Lee & Edmondson, 2017).

This autonomous work environment makes the work environment more pleasant and rewarding, as well as allows the company to adapt to the turbulent changes in the environment. Likewise, the literature suggests that self-managed teams foster a positive work environment based on mutual support and learning (Milikin et al., 2010; Michael et al., 2017). By giving team members the autonomy to manage, hold accountable, and control their own work, this leads them to foster communication, experimentation, and team cohesion, which in turn can lead to more learning.

This research shows that self-managed teams can improve the well-being of workers. As revealed, self-managed teams can reduce stress and pressure at work. By giving team members the freedom to manage their work without superior control, you reduce the need to work under constant supervision and the pressure to meet management-imposed deadlines and targets. This can lead to a less stressful and healthier work environment. As highlighted in this research, the form of management based on self-managed teams could reduce stress or burnout for all team members, as well as lead to a state of mind based on serenity, peace and tranquility.

This study also reveals that participation in self-suggested teams promotes team learning ability (TLC) in various ways. First of all, in self-managed teams, feedback becomes an integral part of the work process. Team members have a responsibility to provide feedback to one another, which allows them to identify strengths, areas for improvement, and learning opportunities. Continuous feedback facilitates individual and collective learning (Chiva et al., 2007), since team members can adjust their performance and develop new skills based on the feedback received. Second, all team members have the freedom to try new ideas and approaches. This ability to experiment encourages creativity and innovation (Alegre and Chiva, 2013), and also allows learning through discovery. As team members try different approaches and solutions, they learn from successes and failures, giving them valuable insight and allowing them to continually adapt and improve.

However, despite the potential benefits of self-management on workplace well-being, many companies have not yet ventured into establishing self-managed teams. Among the reasons for this reluctance to implement this management model, the fear of change would be highlighted. Many organizations are used to a traditional hierarchical structure, where roles and responsibilities are clearly defined. Taking a self-managing approach

means redistributing power and allowing teams to make decisions without constant oversight. This change can be intimidating for some leaders and employees, as it involves relinquishing some control and trusting in the skills and abilities of the team. Likewise, another factor that can contribute to the reluctance of companies to establish a management model that improves the well-being of workers is the ego of the leaders. At times, leaders may have a personal attachment to the power and authority held in the traditional hierarchy. The establishment of self-managing teams implies, among other things, distributing power, which can threaten the leadership position of some individuals.

Theoretical and practical implications

The results of the study reveal some major contributions to the literature on organizational management. First of all, this study is the first to propose and empirically validate a multilevel model on the influence of self-managed teams and labor well-being, dealing with concepts that have not been previously explored in depth, such as burnout and peace of mind. As well as, analyzing its antecedents and its consequences. Therefore, this research advances the understanding of self-managed teams and their relationship to wellbeing, providing evidence and insights that can help organizations adopt more effective approaches to team management and wellness promotion in the workplace. of work. Secondly, this study is the first to reveal the importance of learning but at the team level (CAE). Specifically, exploring how the learning capacity of the team can contribute to the improvement of labor well-being by generating a greater sense of purpose, development of skills and recognition of individual and collective achievements.

Among the practical implications to be concluded from the study, the following would be highlighted. First, organizations interested in a self-managed team approach establish a formula for improving workplace well-being. This involves providing an appropriate balance between workload and available resources, promoting a climate based on respect and mutual support, encouraging participation and recognition, and providing opportunities for personal and professional development. By investing in employee well-being, organizations can increase talent satisfaction, motivation, and retention. Second, organizations can foster a learning-based climate that values knowledge sharing, experimentation, and continuous improvement. This involves creating spaces for collaborative learning, promoting constructive feedback, and acknowledging successes

and lessons learned. In addition, leaders must exercise participatory leadership and facilitate access to learning resources, such as training and professional development. In turn, the results of this climate tend to improve the mental health of individuals.

Limitations of the study and future lines of research

Inevitably, our study has a number of limitations that could be improved in future replications and extensions. For example, the organizations included in the study sample belong to different sectors and are of different sizes. Therefore, future research could focus on a single sector or on companies of a similar size. Another limitation is the cross-sectional nature of the sample. Long-term longitudinal studies would be convenient to confirm the causes and consequences. Longitudinal studies better validate sample data because they allow data collection at different times.

Regarding future lines of research, it would be necessary to continue exploring the factors that influence self-managed teams and labor well-being. For example, it would be interesting to identify and evaluate the critical factors that contribute to the success of self-managed teams. This involves looking at how decision-making structures, internal communication, assignment of tasks and responsibilities, and the autonomy given to team members are established. Also, comparative studies can be carried out between self-managed teams and traditional teams to analyze variables such as job satisfaction, commitment, stress, burnout and quality of life at work. This will allow a better understanding of the benefits and challenges associated with the implementation of self-managed teams and their influence on the well-being of employees. Another interesting line of research to explore would be to analyze the influence of organizational culture on self-managed teams and labor well-being. The objective of this proposed line of research would be to understand how organizational culture influences the implementation and operation of self-managed teams, as well as the occupational well-being of employees. To do this, variables such as organizational values, leadership, performance management practices and institutional support can be explored. Finally, in addition to focusing on analyzing the labor well-being of individuals, it would be important to investigate the effects of self-managed teams on organizational results. For example, prepare studies that can measure variables such as productivity, innovation, work quality and customer satisfaction in the context of self-managed teams. Understanding how these teams impact

the overall results of the organization is crucial to justify their adoption and promote their implementation in diverse work environments.

REFERENCES

Álvarez, R. F. (2011). El síndrome de burnout: síntomas, causas y medidas de atención en la empresa. *Éxito empresarial*, 160, 1-4.

Schaufeli, W., & Salanova, M. A. R. I. S. A. (2014). Burnout, boredom and engagement at the workplace.

Hatch, P. H., Winefield, H. R., Christie, B. A., & Lievaart, J. J. (2011). Workplace stress, mental health, and burnout of veterinarians in Australia. *Australian veterinary journal*, 89(11), 460-468.

Maslach, C. (2011). Burnout and engagement in the workplace: New perspectives. *European Health Psychologist*, 13(3), 44-47.

Laschinger, H. K. S., Finegan, J., Shamian, J., & Wilk, P. (2003). Workplace empowerment as a predictor of nurse burnout in restructured healthcare settings. *Longwoods Review*, 1(3).

Chiva, R., & Guinot, J. (2021). Well-being, Happiness, Satisfaction, Burnout and the Future of Work. In *New Directions in the Future of Work*. Emerald Publishing Limited.

Sophie, V., Sara, C., Jellen, T. J., & Lieven, A. (2022). The Role of 'Peace of Mind' and 'Meaningfulness' as Psychological Concepts in Explaining Subjective Well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 1-16.

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2006). Burnout. *Stress and quality of working life: current perspectives in occupational health*, 37, 42-49.

Lee, R. T., & Ashforth, B. E. (1990). On the meaning of Maslach's three dimensions of burnout. *Journal of applied psychology*, 75(6), 743.

Sharifzadeh, M., & Almaraz, J. (2014). Happiness and Productivity in the Workplace. *American Journal of management*, 14(4), 19.

Weigelt, O., Syrek, C. J., Schmitt, A., & Urbach, T. (2019). Finding peace of mind when there still is so much left undone—A diary study on how job stress, competence need satisfaction, and proactive work behavior contribute to work-related rumination during the weekend. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 24(3), 373.

Cheng, F. K. (2016). What does meditation contribute to workplace? An integrative review. *Journal of Psychological Issues in Organizational Culture*, 6(4), 18-34.

Hill, B. D. (2011). *The sequential Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin procedure as an alternative for determining the number of factors in common-factor analysis: A Monte Carlo simulation*. Oklahoma State University.

Banai, M., Nirenberg, J., & Menachem, M. (2000). Leadership in self-managing organizations: Orpheus and a date plantation. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7(3), 3-17.

Druskat, V. U., & Wheeler, J. V. (2004). How to lead a self-managing team. *MIT Sloan Management Review*.

Millikin, J. P., Hom, P. W., & Manz, C. C. (2010). Self-management competencies in self-managing teams: Their impact on multi-team system productivity. *The leadership quarterly*, 21(5), 687-702.

Warr, P., & Nielsen, K. (2018). Wellbeing and work performance. *Handbook of well-being*. Salt Lake City, UT: DEF Publishers.

Warr, P., & Nielsen, K. (2018). Wellbeing and work performance. *Handbook of well-being*. Salt Lake City, UT: DEF Publishers.

Kim, H. S., Kim, M., & Koo, D. (2022). From teamwork to psychological well-being and job performance: the role of CSR in the workplace. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, (ahead-of-print).

Chung, H. C., Chen, Y. C., Chang, S. C., Hsu, W. L., & Hsieh, T. C. (2020). Nurses' well-being, health-promoting lifestyle and work environment satisfaction correlation: A psychometric study for development of nursing health and job satisfaction model and scale. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 17(10), 3582.

Nelson, D. B., & Quick, J. C. (2011). Understanding organizational behavior. Mason, OH: South-Western Cengage Learning

Finlay, W., Martin, J. K., Roman, P. M., & Blum, T. C. (1995). Organizational structure and job satisfaction: Do bureaucratic organizations produce more satisfied employees?. *Administration & Society*, 27(3), 427-450.

Adler, P. S. (2001). Market, hierarchy, and trust: The knowledge economy and the future of capitalism. *Organization science*, 12(2), 215-234.

Ciborra, C. U. (1996). The platform organization: Recombining strategies, structures, and surprises. *Organization science*, 7(2), 103-118.

Edmondson, A. C. (2002). The local and variegated nature of learning in organizations: A group-level perspective. *Organization science*, 13(2), 128-146.

Davis, J. P., Eisenhardt, K. M., & Bingham, C. B. (2009). Optimal structure, market dynamism, and the strategy of simple rules. *Administrative science quarterly*, 54(3), 413-452.

- Camps, J., Oltra, V., Aldás-Manzano, J., Buenaventura-Vera, G., & Torres-Carballo, F. (2016). Individual performance in turbulent environments: The role of organizational learning capability and employee flexibility. *Human resource management*, 55(3), 363-383.
- Imran, M. K., Ilyas, M., & Aslam, U. (2016). Organizational learning through transformational leadership. *The learning organization*.
- Sheng, M. L., & Chien, I. (2016). Rethinking organizational learning orientation on radical and incremental innovation in high-tech firms. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(6), 2302-2308.
- Altinay, L., Madanoglu, M., De Vita, G., Arasli, H., & Ekinci, Y. (2016). The interface between organizational learning capability, entrepreneurial orientation, and SME growth. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 54(3), 871-891.