Supervisor's Leadership Style, Personnel Empowerment, Engagement, Work-Life Balance, and Job Satisfaction for Personnel Intention to Stay in the Center for Disease Control and Prevention in Henan Province, China

Xu Bin¹ and Mary O' T. Penetrante²

ABSTRACT

The study aimed to analyze the role of leadership on medical laboratory personnel's empowerment, engagement, work-life balance, job satisfaction, and intention to stay in the Center for Disease Control and Prevention in Henan Province, China. A casual-comparative with retrospective pre-posttest research design and a self-assessed questionnaire was used to gather primary data from 334 medical laboratory personnel at the Disease Control and Prevention Centers in seventeen (17) cities in Henan Province, China. The level of empowerment personnel engagement of medical laboratory is high, work-life balance is "not sure", job satisfaction is slightly dissatisfied/ satisfied. These differs in age, education, and years of service. The strongest predictor of intention to stay of medical laboratory personnel is the level of engagement which is strongly correlated with the perceived leadership of the supervisors.

Keywords: leadership style, job satisfaction, work-life balance, engagement, personnel's empowerment

INTRODUCTION

Background and Rationale of the Study

China has emerged as the world's second largest economy in terms of total GDP and growth rate surpassing Japan and the US in 2010 (Sharma, Tejinder, 2017). Some researchers and economists (King, Peter & Zhang, Wei, 2014) (Hout & Michael, 2014) (Sharma, Tejinder, 2017) attributed these economic developments to the leadership styles of political and business leaders, which they characterized as a fusion of Chinese, Japanese, and American leadership styles.

The Chinese government implemented radical changes particularly on promoting public health and wellness, accelerating the implementation of policy for the development of medical and health personnel. The policy hopes to address the high employee turnover resulting in serious shortage of primary medical and health personnel to support the needs of the growing and aging population, the need to improve their work efficiency, and the organizational structure to facilitate equality and equity in public health governance from the national level down to the village level.

Despite China's new medical reform policy that clearly proposes to strengthen the construction of public health service systems, promote the gradual equalization of basic public health services, and improve the prevention and control system for major diseases and emergency public health emergency mechanisms, there is a magnitude of threat on public health and the severe shortage of medical laboratory personnel at all levels is hampering this reform initiatives (Zeng, Guang, 2019) (Wang, Kongliang, 2019). With the recent challenges being faced by CDC and recognizing that the medical and health personnel are an important guarantee for promoting the reform and development of medical and for health undertakings and safeguarding people's health, it is therefore vital to establish empirical evidences on the role of leadership styles on employees' empowerment, engagement, work-life balance, job satisfaction, and intention to stay in the Center for Disease Control and Prevention, before and after the supervisors' training better to understand the behaviors of medical laboratory personnel and to inform policy and decision-making in public health centers in the country.

General Objective of the Study

The study aims to analyze the role of leadership style on medical laboratory personnel's empowerment, engagement, work-life balance, job satisfaction, and intention to stay in the Center for Disease Control and Prevention in Henan Province, China to inform policy and decision making in public health centers in the country.

Specific Objectives

The study sought to achieve the following:

1. Determine the level of empowerment, engagement, work-life balance, and job satisfaction before and after the supervisor's training of the medical laboratory personnel;

2. Determine the leadership style of supervisors before and after their training as perceived by the medical laboratory personnel;

3. Determine the extent of intention to stay of medical laboratory personnel in the center before and after the supervisor's training;

4. Determine whether significant differences exist in the leadership styles of medical laboratory supervisors before and after the training as assessed by the personnel.

5. Determine whether significant differences exist in the personnel level of empowerment, engagement, worklife balance, and job satisfaction before and after the supervisors' training.

6. Determine whether there are significant changes in the medical laboratory personnel intention to stay before and after the supervisors' training.

7. Determine whether significant correlations exist between the supervisors' leadership styles and personnel level of empowerment, engagement, work-life balance, job satisfaction and intention to stay, before and after the supervisors' training.

8. Determine which among the independent variables can predict the personnel intention to stay in the CDC.

Hypotheses of the Study

Based on the assumed relationships of the study variables as shown above, the following are the hypotheses of this study:

 H_{a3} : No significant difference exists in the medical laboratory personnel intention to stay at CDC before and after the supervisors' training.

 H_{04} : No significant correlations exist between the supervisors' leadership style and the medical laboratory personnel level of empowerment, engagement, work-life balance, job satisfaction before and after the supervisors' training.

H₀₅: The medical laboratory personnel level of empowerment,

engagement, work-life balance, and job satisfaction are not significantly related to the extent of their intention to stay.

H₀₆: None of the independent variables can predict medical laboratory personnel intention to stay at CDC.

Theoretical Framework of the Study

The theory clarifies the logic why people have relationships with each other and specifies the suitable time for beginning and ending of the relationships. It also highlighted that personal relationships are along with its costs and rewards (Mustapha et al., 2010).

The theory supposes that good deeds should be paid back and that when people receive benefits from

others, they would feel later responsible and then repay through effort and loyalty (Mossholder et al., 2005). It is also to say that when employees feel that more benefits are provided by the organization, the more likely they feel responsible, and they intend to stay with the organization. This is because most relationships are made up of a certain amount of giveand-take, but this does not mean that they are always equal.

Conceptual Framework of the Study

From the theoretical perspective presented above, it is assumed in this study that there are three groups of variables that could explain the intention behavior of a personnel based on a set of possible alternative behaviors.



Figure 1. Conceptual Framework of the Study

Definition of Terms

Employee empowerment. In this study, it refers to the level of employee's power, authority, responsibility, resources, and freedom to make decisions and solve work related problems. It will be measured by determining the level of agreement or disagreement of the respondents in the given statements on employee empowerment using a 5-point Likert Scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 =disagree, 3 =slightly disagree/agree, 4 = agree, 5= strongly agree. (Choi et al., 2016).

Work-life Balance. In this study, it refers to the individual perception that work and non-work activities are compatible and promote growth in accordance with an individual's current life priorities. It will be measured by determining the respondents' level of agreement or disagreement on the statements on work-life balance using a 5-point Likert Scale where 1-strongly disagree, 2-disagree, 3-slightly disagree/agree, 4-agree, 5-strongly agree.

Employee engagement. It refers to an employee's emotional commitment to care about their work and their company and use discretionary effort to achieve the organizational goals(Kevin Kruse, 2012). This study will be measured by determining the level of agreement or

disagreement on the statements on work engagement particularly before and after the training of your supervisor using a 5-point Likert Scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 =disagree, 3 = slightly disagree/agree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree.

Employee job satisfaction. It refers to whether employees are happy, contented and fulfilling their desires and needs at work (Sageer et al., 2012). This study will be measured by determining the level of agreement or disagreement of the respondent in the statements on employee satisfaction using a 5-point Likert Scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 =disagree, 3 = slightly disagree/agree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree.

Intention to stay. It refers to an employee's willingness to stay with an organization (Tett & Meyer, 1993). This study will be measured by determining the respondent's level of agreement or disagreement in the statements on intention to stay in the organization using a 5-point Likert Scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 =disagree, 3 = slightly disagree/agree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree. These responses were analyzed and transformed into a range of scores where 1.0 - 2.33 means that the medical personnel extent of intention to stay is low, 2.34 - 3.66 means average and 3.67 – 5.0 means high.

Leadership style. Antonakis (Antonakis et al., 2003) defined leadership style as the nature of the influencing process and its resultant outcomes - that occurs between a leader and followers and how this influencing process is explained by the leader's dispositional characteristics and behaviors, follower perceptions and attributions of the leader, and the context in which the influencing process occurs and presented empirical evidence the three on leadership typologies Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-Faire. (Newstrom et al., 1993).

A 5-point Likert Scale was used to measure the study variables, where 1-strongly disagree, 2-moderately disagree, 3-slightly disagree/slightly agree, 4-moderately agree, and 5strongly agree. For Leadership style it was measured using the following scale: 1-Not at all, 2-Once in a while, 3-Sometimes, 4-Fairly often, 5-Frequently, if not always.

The more likely leadership style adopted by the supervisor is determined using the total scores of the respondents where a range 1-35 mean Laissez Fair, 36-70 means transactional and 71-105 means transformational.

Significance of the Study

The results of this study will benefit the following groups of individuals:

Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Thev will be provided with empirical evidence on the role of leadership styles on employee's empowerment, engagement, work-life balance, job satisfaction, and intention to stay in the organization to inform their plans enhancing the particularly in performance of the center and to effectively manage employee retention.

Managers and Policy Makers. They will be provided with scientific evidence on the leadership style and personnel engagement, empowerment, job satisfaction, and work-life balance, and intention to stay in the organization to inform policy development, implementation and evaluation. They would be able to take appropriate actions to enhance human resource development and performance in the country.

Scope and Limitation

This study will determine the role of leadership style on the medical laboratory personnel level of empowerment, work engagement, work-life balance, job satisfaction and intention to stay in the Center for Disease Control and Prevention in Henan Province, China.

The target population will only include those fulltime medical

laboratory personnel in the Center of Disease Control and Prevention in seventeen cities in Henan Province, China since 2009, that is, before the implementation of the new human resource development program by the government. Since this is a retrospective study, the data that will be gathered will depend on the recall of the respondents.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study is a causal comparative utilizing retrospective research design. It used a self-assessed questionnaire to gather primary data from the respondents who are full-time medical laboratory personnel at the Disease Control and Prevention Centers in seventeen (17) cities in Henan Province, China. Secondary data was also collected such as the existing human resource management policies of the government and those that are specific to the center.

personnel who have been working at the Center for Disease Control and Prevention in any of the seventeen cities in Henan Province, China since 2009 to be able to assess the leadership style of their respective supervisors before and after the implementation of the new policy on development human resource The total population of program. medical laboratory personnel during the conduct of the study was 447. To determine the sample size, the following formula was used (Nuankaew & Nuankaew, 2019).

Population and Sample Size

The target population of this study consisted of full-time laboratory

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2} = \frac{447}{1 + 447 \cdot .03^2} = 319$$
Where:

e = is the desired level of precision (2.5% margin of error),

N - is the population

Sampling Technique

The sample respondents were identified using simple random sampling. To provide an extra list of respondents in case anyone from the 319 selected respondents decided not to participate or continue with the survey, a total of 65 additional respondents were generated as it was expected that a few personnel might not be willing to participate. All the 384 respondents who were given a survey questionnaire participated in the softcopy survey. The of the questionnaire sent the was to respondents using a digital platform and was collated for data processing.

Instruments

Standardized instruments were adopted in this study. Permission from the authors of these instruments were secured before using it. The instruments were translated to Chinese language and were validated by a Chinese language expert to ensure that its psychometric properties are within acceptable standards. (Please see definition of terms for measurement scales).

Data Gathering Procedure

A letter of permission to conduct the study in seventeen CDC in Henan Province, China will be secured from respective authorities. Informed Consent will also be secured from each of the study participants to ensure that ethical standards in conducting research are considered. In addition, this document and all questionnaires will be submitted for plagiarism test and ethical review by the university Research Ethics Board.

The validated questionnaires will be distributed to the participants and they will be given enough time to answer the questionnaire. All submitted questionnaire will be reviewed for completeness, consistency, and validity.

Data Processing and Analysis

The data collected will be cleaned and then coded. For data analyses, Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 25 will be used. А quasi-experimental paired t-test or Wilcoxon signed-rank test will be used to determine differences in means of two-category variables, ANOVA or Kruskal-Wallis test for difference of more category-variable three or depending on the results of test of their normality and homogeneity of data. Pearson's correlations or Spearman Rho for test of correlations, and regression modeling to test the predictive ability of predictor variables on the outcome variable.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Differences in the Predictor Variables before and after the Supervisor Training

As shown in Table 1, all the variables recorded significant changes in the mean scores after the supervisor's training. The leadership style mean score increased by 9.281 points which means that the leadership style of supervisors as perceived by the

medical laboratory personnel has although both are still improved considered under transformational leadership. Empowerment, engagement, work-life balance, and satisfaction increased as well. This means that the level of empowerment, engagement, work-life balance, and job satisfaction were better after the supervisor's training.

Table 1

Difference in the Study Variables before and After the Training (N-334).

| Indicators | Mean Before | SD | Mean After | SD | Paired Diff. | T-test | df | Sig | Decision |
|-------------------|----------------|-------|---------------|-------|-----------------|--------|-----|--------|------------------------|
| Leadership Style | 79.562 | 5.000 | 88.844 | 5.000 | 9.281 | 95.728 | 333 | 0.000* | Reject Ho ₂ |
| Empowerment | 3.636 | 0.323 | 4.023 | 0.331 | 0.387 | 43.300 | 333 | 0.000* | Reject Ho ₂ |
| Engagement | 3.757 | 0.315 | 4.249 | 0.265 | 0.492 | 38.462 | 333 | 0.000* | Reject Ho ₂ |
| Work-Life Balance | 3.396 | 0.225 | 3.615 | 0.154 | 0.218 | 25.007 | 333 | 0.000* | Reject Ho ₂ |
| Satisfaction | 3.231 | 0.096 | 3.294 | 0.082 | 0.062 | 18.902 | 333 | 0.000* | Reject Ho ₂ |

*Statistically significant at 95% level of confidence

Extent of Intention to Stay in CDC of Medical Laboratory Personnel Before and After Training of Supervisors

The fifth objective of this study was to determine the extent of intention to stay of medical laboratory personnel in the Center for Disease Control and Prevention before and after the training of supervisors. The Intention to Stay Instrument developed by Graham (2012) of University of Toronto was used to measure the intent to stay of medical laboratory personnel. Results of the analysis are shown in the following tables.

The data in Table 2 show that the majority of the medical laboratory personnel was "not sure" (mean = 3.088 - 3.189) their intention to stay in the center, before and after the supervisors training which means that they are thinking of staying or leaving the center. However, there is a slight increase in the overall mean score after the supervisors training (mean = 3.189) as compared to the overall

mean score of before the training. When the difference in mean scores of the groups before and after the supervisors training were determined, results show that there is a significant increase in the means score of extent of intention to stay after the supervisors training (t=13.578, df= 333, Sig. = 0.000). The data show that majority of the personnel are not

sure of their intention to stay in the center, their intention to stay increased significantly after the supervisors training. These findings lead to the rejection of the null hypothesis (Ho3) that no significant difference exists in the medical laboratory personnel intention to stay at CDC before and after the supervisors' training.

Table 2

Extent of Intention to Stay in CDC Before and After Training of Supervisor of Medical Laboratory Personnel by Age.

| loval of Intention to stay | Before T | raining | After Training | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-------------|----------------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | f | % | f | % | | | | | |
| High | 53 | 15.9 | 53 | 15.9 | | | | | |
| Unsure | 279 | 83.5 | 276 | 82.6 | | | | | |
| Low | 2 | 0.6 | 5 | 1.5 | | | | | |
| Total | 334 | 100.0 | 334 | 100.0 | | | | | |
| Mean | 3.08 | 38 | 3 | 8.189 | | | | | |
| Standard Deviation | 0.43 | 11 | C |).463 | | | | | |
| Difference in mean scores | Mean= 0.100, | SD = 0.135, | t=13.578 | | | | | | |
| | df= 333, | Sig.= 0.000 | | | | | | | |
| *Statistically significant at 5% level (p-value<0.05) | | | | | | | | | |

Legend: Low = 1.0 - 2.33; Not Sure = 2.34 - 3.67; High = 3.68 - 5.00

Correlations between Independent and Dependent Variables Before and After the Supervisors' Training

All the independent and dependent variables are significantly correlated with each other as shown by the Pearson's r test results and its corresponding p-values. The Zeroorder correlations test results show that after the supervisor's training, leadership style has significant moderate positive correlations with (r=0.581, empowerment p-value 0.000) and engagement (r=0.627, p-0.000); has significant value = negligible positive correlations with work-life balance (r=0.123, p-value = 0.000, p-value =0.000), and significant high negative correlation with job

satisfaction (r=-0.757, p-value =0.000) and significant low positive correlation with intention to stay (r=0.374, p-value =0.000).

Before the supervisor's training, leadership style has significant low positive correlations with empowerment (r=0.369, p-value = 0.000) and intention to stay (r=0.336, p-value = 0.000), significant moderate correlations with work-life balance (r=0.594, p-value = 0.000), significantmoderate negative correlation with job satisfaction (r=0.578, p-value= 0.000), and significant high positive correlations with engagement (r=0.837, p-value = 0.000).

When the leadership style after the training was controlled, the results show an increased in the correlations between Empowerment A and Intention A (r = 0.901 to r = 906),

Engagement A and Intention A (r=908 to r=0.933), Work-life balance A and Intention A (r=881 to r=907), Satisfaction and Intention Α Α (r=0.617 to r=0.551). Based on these findings, there is enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis (H04) that no significant correlations exist between the supervisors' leadership style and the medical laboratory personnel level of empowerment, engagement, worklife balance, job satisfaction before and after the supervisors' training.

The results show that the leadership style, in this case transformational, moderates positively the relationships between the predictor variables and intention to stay. It also shows that leadership style has helped enhance the intention to stay in the CDC of medical personnel.

Table 3

Correlations between Independent and Dependent Variables Before and After the Supervisors Training Controlling for Leadership Style.

| | | Zero Ol | rder (2-tailed) | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|-------------------|------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|
| Indicators (N334) | Empowerment | Engagement | Work-Life Bal | Satisfaction | Intention | Decision |
| | r (p-value) | r (p-value) | r (p-value) | r (p-value) | r (p-value) | |
| Empowerment A | | 0.948 (0.000) | 0.786 (0.000) | -0.728 (0.000) | 0.901 (0.000) | Reject Ho ₄ |
| Empowerment B | | 0.451(0.000) | 0.720 (0.000) | -0.524 (0.000) | 0.837 (0.000) | Reject Ho₅ |
| Engagement A | 0 948 (0 000) | | 0 774 (0 000) | -0 759 (0 000) | 0 908 (0 000) | Reject Ho |
| Engagement B | 0.451 (0.000) | | 0.728 (0.000) | -0.530 (0.000) | 0.418 (0.000) | Reject Ho ₅ |
| 5.5 | | | | () | () | 2 |
| Mark Life Deleves A | 0.700 (0.000) | 0 774 (0 000) | | 0.447 (0.000) | 0.001(0.000) | Deinetlle |
| Work-Life Balance A | 0.786 (0.000) | 0.774 (0.000) | | -0.447 (0.000) | 0.881(0.000) | Reject Ho4 |
| Work Life Buildrice B | 0.720 (0.000) | 0.720 (0.000) | | 0.332 (0.000) | 0.705 (0.000) | Reject nos |
| Satisfaction A | -0.728 (0.000) | -0.759 (0.000) | -0.447 (0.000) | | -0.617 (0.000) | Reject Ho ₄ |
| Satisfaction B | -0.524 (0.000) | -0.530 (0.000) | -0.592 (0.000) | | -0.578 (0.000) | Reject Ho₅ |
| Intention to Stay A | 0.001 (0.000) | 0 009 (0 000) | 0.991 (0.000) | 0 617 (0 000) | | Point Ho. |
| Intention to Stay A | 0.901 (0.000) | 0.908 (0.000) | 0.881(0.000) 0.763(0.000) | -0.517 (0.000) | | Reject Hos |
| | | 0.110 (0.000) | 01705 (01000) | 0.570 (0.000) | | Rejecting |
| Leadership Style A | 0.581 (0.000) | 0.627 (0.000) | 0.123 (0.000) | -0.757 (0.000) | 0.374 (0.000) | Reject Ho ₄ |
| Leadership Style B | 0.369 (0.000) | 0.837 (0.000) | 0.594 (0.000) | -0.538 (0.000) | 0.336 (0.000) | Reject Ho₅ |
| | | Controlling for L | adarchin Style (2-ta | ilad) | | |
| Indicators (N334) | Empowerment | Engagement | Work-Life Bal | Satisfaction | Intention | Decision |
| | r (p-value) | r (p-value) | r (p-value) | r (p-value) | r (p-value) | |
| Empowerment A | | 0.921 (0.000) | 0.885 (0.000) | 0.542 (0.000) | 0.906 (0.000) | Reject Ho ₄ |
| Empowerment B | | 0.281 (0.000) | 0.670 (0.000) | -0.416 (0.000) | 0.815 (0.000) | Reject Ho₅ |
| Engagement A | 0 921 (0 000) | | 0 901 (0 000) | 0 558 (0 000) | 0 933 (0 000) | Reject Ho |
| Engagement B | 0.281 (0.000) | | 0.523 (0.000) | -0.172 (0.000) | 0.266 (0.000) | Reject Hos |
| 5.5. | | | | | | - , |
| Work-Life Balance A | 0.885 (0.000) | 0.901 (0.000) | | 0.546 (0.000) | 0.907 (0.000) | Reject Ho ₄ |
| Work-Life Balance B | 0.670 (0.000) | 0.523 (0.000) | | -0.402 (0.000) | 0.743 (0.000) | Reject Ho₅ |
| Satisfaction A | -0.542 (0.000) | 0.558 (0.000) | -0.546 (0.000) | | -0.551 (0.000) | Reject Ho₄ |
| Satisfaction B | -0.416 (0.000) | -0.172 (0.000) | -0.402 (0.000) | | -0.501 (0.000) | Reject Ho |
| | 0.120 (0.000) | | 51.102 (0.000) | | | |
| Intention to Stay A | 0.818 (0.000) | 0.878 (0.000) | 0.833 (0.000) | 0.575 (0.000) | | Reject Ho ₄ |
| Intention to Stay B | 0.815 (0.000) | 0.266 (0.000) | 0.743 (0.000) | 0.501 (0.000) | | Reject Ho₅ |

p<0.05

Regression Analysis on the Independent and Dependent Variables after the Training

The final objective of this study is to determine which among the independent variables can predict the personnel intention to stay in the CDC. The regression analysis using the after the training of supervisor's data was performed and the results are shown in Table 36.

The data in Table 3 shows the regression test results after the supervisors training and Table 4 shows the regression test results before the training. As the most relevant data is the after the training, Table 4 shows that the regression model 1 comprising 45

the variables empowerment, engagement, work-life balance, and satisfaction recorded the highest regression coefficient (R=0.953, Regression = 47.360, p-value = 0.000) as compared to the other models (Model 2-4). The results show that the studv variables (engagement, empowerment, work-life balance, and satisfaction) taken together have a 47.36% predictive ability on intention to stay given a transformational leadership style. Moreover, the beta coefficient of the variables included in model 1 shows that the level of engagement has the highest predictive ability (beta = 0.445) followed by the level of work-life balance (beta = 0.404), and level of empowerment (beta = 0.191). However, the level of satisfaction is not a good predictor of intention to stay as reflected by its beta = 0.041, p-value = 0.143. These findings show that there is enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis (Ho6) which states that none of the independent variables can predict

medical laboratory personnel intention to stay at CDC.

The results further show that in every unit change in the level of engagement of medical personnel, there is a 0.445 unit change in their intention to stay in the center given the transformational leadership style of supervisors, while in in work-life balance, there is a corresponding 0.404 unit change in their intention to stay in the center, 0.191 unit change in every unit change in the level of empowerment, and 0.041 unit change in every unit change in the level of satisfaction. This means that the level personnel work of engagement, empowerment, work-life balance, and satisfaction when taken together can be used to estimate the employees' extent of intention to stay in the center. However, when taken independently, only the level of satisfaction is not a good basis for determining the personnel intention to stay.

Table 4

Regression Analysis on the Independent and Dependent Variables Controlling for Transformational Leadership Style (After Training).

| Model R | R^2 | Regression | Res | idual | F Change | Df1/2 | Sig | Decision |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| 1 0.953 | 0.907 | 47.360 | 4. | 835 | 805.583 | 4/329 | 0.000* | Reject Ho ₆ |
| 2 0.908 | 0.825 | 43.057 | 9.139 | | 1564.254 | 1/332 | 0.000* | Reject Ho ₆ |
| 3 0.951 | 0.904 | 47.171 | 5.025 | | 1553.615 | 1/331 | 0.000* | Reject Ho ₆ |
| 4 0.952 | 0.907 | 47.329 | | 4.867 | 1069.661 | 1/330 | 0.001* | Reject Ho ₆ |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Model 1 | β | Std Error | Beta | t-test | Zero Order | Partial | Sig | Decision |
| Empowerment | 0.234 | 0.068 | 0.191 | 3.453 | 0.901 | 0.187 | 0.001* | Reject Ho ₆ |
| Engagement | 0.558 | 0.072 | 0.445 | 7.718 | 0.908 | 0.392 | 0.000* | Reject Ho ₆ |
| Work-Life Bal | 0.709 | 0.052 | 0.404 | 13.734 | 0.881 | 0.604 | 0.000* | Reject Ho ₆ |
| Satisfaction | 0.167 | 0.114 | 0.041 | 1.467 | 0.617 | 0.081 | 0.143 | Accept Ho ₆ |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Model 2 | β | Std Error | Beta | t-test | Zero Order | Partial | Sig | Decision |
| Engagement | 1.140 | 0.029 | 0.908 | 39.551 | 0.908 | 0.908 | 0.000* | Reject Ho ₆ |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Model 3 | β | Std Error | Beta | t-test | Zero Order | Partial | Sig | Decision |
| Engagement | 0.709 | 0.034 | 0.565 | 20.977 | 0.908 | 0.755 | 0.000* | Reject Ho ₆ |
| Work-Life Bal | 0.777 | 0.047 | 0.443 | 16.461 | 0.881 | 0.671 | 0.000* | Reject Ho ₆ |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Model 4 | В | Std Error | Beta | t-test | Zero Order | Partial | Sig | Decision |
| Engagement | 0.518 | 0.067 | 0.413 | 7.722 | 0.908 | 0.391 | 0.000* | Reject Ho ₆ |
| Work-Life Bal | 0.736 | 0.048 | 0.420 | 15.282 | 0.881 | 0.644 | 0.000* | Reject Ho ₆ |
| Empowerment | 0.220 | 0.067 | 0.179 | 3.271 | 0.901 | 0.177 | 0.001* | Reject Ho ₆ |
| Engagement Work-Life Bal Satisfaction <u>Model 2</u> Engagement Work-Life Bal <u>Model 4</u> Engagement Work-Life Bal Engagement Work-Life Bal Empowerment | 0.558 0.709 0.167 β 1.140 β 0.709 0.777 B 0.518 0.736 0.220 | 0.072 0.052 0.114 Std Error 0.029 Std Error 0.034 0.047 Std Error 0.067 0.048 0.067 | 0.445 0.404 0.041 Beta 0.908 Beta 0.565 0.443 0.413 0.413 0.420 0.179 | 7.718 13.734 1.467 <i>t-test</i> 39.551 <i>t-test</i> 20.977 16.461 <i>t-test</i> 7.722 15.282 3.271 | 0.908 0.881 0.617 Zero Order 0.908 Zero Order 0.908 0.881 Zero Order 0.908 0.881 0.908 0.881 0.901 | 0.392 0.604 0.081 Partial 0.908 Partial 0.755 0.671 Partial 0.391 0.644 0.177 | 0.000* 0.000* 0.143 Sig 0.000* 0.000* 0.000* 0.000* 0.000* 0.000* 0.000* | Reject Ho Reject Ho Accept Ho Decision Reject Ho Reject Ho Reject Ho Reject Ho Reject Ho Reject Ho Reject Ho Reject Ho |

p-value <0.05

Model 1 Predictors: Work-Life Balance, Empowerment, Engagement

Model 2 Predictors: Engagement

Model 3 Predictors: Engagement, Work-Life Balance

Model 4 Predictors: Engagement, Work-Life Balance, Empowerment

Dependent Variable: Intention to Stay

Table 5

Regression Analysis on the Independent and Dependent Variables Controlling for Transformational Leadership Style (Before Training).

| Model | R | R ² | Regression | Residual | F Change | Df1/2 | Sig | Dec | cision |
|-----------|--------|----------------|------------|----------|----------|------------|---------|--------|-----------------|
| 1 | 0.882 | 0.778 | 48.714 | 13.913 | 280.987 | 4/321 | 0.000* | Reje | ct Ho₁ |
| 2 | 0.836 | 0.699 | 43.790 | 18.837 | 753.206 | 1/324 | 0.000* | Reje | ect Ho1 |
| 3 | 0.864 | 0.747 | 46.791 | 15.836 | 477.173 | 1/323 | 0.000* | Reje | ect Ho1 |
| 4 | 0.874 | 0.765 | 47.883 | 14.744 | 348.567 | 1/322 | 0.000* | Reje | ect Ho1 |
| Мо | del 1 | В | Std Error | Beta | t-test | Zero Order | Partial | Sig | Decision |
| Empowe | erment | 0.715 | 0.054 | 0.525 | 13.168 | 0.836 | 0.592 | 0.001* | Reject |
| | | | | | | | | | Ho ₆ |
| Engagem | nent | -0.412 | 0.069 | -0.238 | 5.982 | 0.377 | 0.317 | 0.000* | Reject |
| | | | | | | | | | Ho ₆ |
| Work-Lif | e Bal | 1.359 | 0.150 | 0.460 | 9.083 | 0.750 | 0.452 | 0.000* | Reject |
| | | | | | | | | | Ho ₆ |
| Satisfact | ion | 0.808 | 0.184 | 0.149 | 4.380 | 0.564 | 0.237 | 0.143 | Accept |
| | | | | | | | | | Ho ₆ |
| Model 2 | | В | Std Error | Beta | t-test | Zero Order | Partial | Sig | Decision |
| Empowe | erment | 1.140 | 0.042 | 0.836 | 27.445 | 0.836 | 0.836 | 0.000* | Reject |
| | | | | | | | | | Ho₀ |
| Model 3 | | В | Std Error | Beta | t-test | Zero Order | Partial | Sig | Decision |
| Empowe | erment | 0.836 | 0.054 | 0.613 | 15.361 | 0.836 | 0.650 | 0.000* | Reject |
| | | | | | | | | | Ho₀ |
| Work-Lif | e Bal | 0.924 | 0.118 | 0.312 | 7.823 | 0.750 | 0.399 | 0.000* | Reject |
| | | | | | | | | | Ho ₆ |
| Model 4 | | В | Std Error | Beta | t-test | Zero Order | Partial | Sig | Decision |
| Empowe | erment | 0.777 | 0.054 | 0.570 | 14.399 | 0.836 | 0.626 | 0.000* | Reject |
| | | | | | | | | | Ho ₆ |
| Work-Lif | e Bal | 1.422 | 0.153 | 0.481 | 9.288 | 0.750 | 0.460 | 0.000* | Reject |
| | | | | | | | | | Ho₀ |
| Engagem | nent | -0.334 | 0.068 | -0.193 | -4.883 | 0.377 | -0.263 | 0.001* | Reject |
| | | | | | | | | | Ho ₆ |

p-value < 0.05

Model 1 Predictors: Satisfaction, Work-Life Balance, Empowerment, Engagement

Model 2 Predictors: Engagement

Model 3 Predictors: Engagement, Work-Life Balance

Model 4 Predictors: Engagement, Work-Life Balance, Empowerment

Dependent Variable: Intention to Stay

Table 6

Model Fit Controlling for Transformational Leadership Style.

| Model | R | <i>R</i> ² | Regression | Residual | F Cha | F Change | | Sig | Decision |
|---------------|-------|-----------------------|------------|----------|------------|---------------|---------|--------|------------------------|
| 1 | 0.953 | 0.907 | 47.360 | 4.835 | 805. | 805.583 | | 0.000* | Reject Ho ₆ |
| 2 | 0.882 | 0.778 | 48.714 | 13.913 | 280. | 280.987 | | 0.000* | Reject Ho ₆ |
| | | | | Before | e Training | | | | |
| Мо | del 1 | В | Std Error | Beta | t-test | Zero Order | Partial | Sig | Decision |
| Empowe | rment | 0.234 | 0.068 | 0.191 | 3.453 | 0.901 | 0.187 | 0.001* | Reject Ho ₆ |
| Engagen | nent | 0.558 | 0.072 | 0.445 | 7.718 | 0.908 | 0.392 | 0.000* | Reject Ho ₆ |
| Work-Lif | e Bal | 0.709 | 0.052 | 0.404 | 13.734 | 0.881 | 0.604 | 0.000* | Reject Ho ₆ |
| Satisfact | ion | 0.167 | 0.114 | 0.041 | 1.467 | 0.617 | 0.081 | 0.143 | AcceptHo ₆ |
| | | | | After th | e Training | | | | |
| Мо | del 1 | В | Std Error | Beta | t-test | Zero Order | Partial | Sig | Decision |
| Empowe | rment | 0.715 | 0.054 | 0.525 | 13.168 | 0.836 | 0.592 | 0.001* | Reject Ho ₆ |
| Engagen | nent | -0.412 | 0.069 | -0.238 | 5.982 | 0.377 | 0.317 | 0.000* | Reject Ho ₆ |
| Work-Life Bal | | 1.359 | 0.150 | 0.460 | 9.083 | 0.750 | 0.452 | 0.000* | Reject Ho ₆ |
| Satisfact | ion | 0.808 | 0.184 | 0.149 | 4.380 | 0.564 | 0.237 | 0.143 | Accept Ho ₆ |

Conclusions

the All variables recorded significant changes in the mean scores after supervisor's the training. Empowerment, engagement, work-life balance, and satisfaction increased as This means that the level of well. empowerment, engagement, work-life balance, and job satisfaction were better after the supervisor's training. The leadership style was transformational before and enhanced significantly after the training which means that the leadership style of perceived supervisors as by the medical laboratory personnel has improved although both are still considered under transformational leadership.

Recommendations

Considering the major findings and conclusions presented above, the following are recommended:

1. To enhance the medical personnel intention to stay in the center, their level of work engagement should be enhanced through a more engaging work environment and transformational type of leadership.

2. Programs towards enhancing work-life balance should be pursued especially directed to the younger groups, single and with master's degree as they are more likely to be "unsure" of their intention to stay in the organization and their level of engagement, empowerment, and work-life balance is lower compared to older, married and with college degree.

3. The perceived leadership style is transformational where supervisors are perceived to be concerned about the level of empowerment, engagement, and work-life balance of medical laboratory personnel. It is suggested that to make this leadership style work, the supervisors should not only look at the job performance of personnel but also consider their level of engagement, empowerment, and work-life balance.

4. If the training is intended to enhance the intention to stay of the medical laboratory personnel in the center, there should be training on how to enhance personnel engagement, empowerment, work-life balance, as these are the significant predictors of medical personnel intention to stay, despite that about 48% of the intention to stay can be directly accounted by these variables.

5. The government should also look at its policy in enhancing the public health services in the center by assessing the quality of work-life balance of the personnel as this variable is by itself found strongly related to other variables such as employee engagement, empowerment, and job satisfaction.

6. It is also recommended to the future researchers that other variables organizational such as culture, professional commitment, advancement, economic, and available external opportunities be considered in the study as there are feedback from medical the personnel that the prevailing culture and available external job opportunities maybe a strong factor that may influence personnel intention to stay in the center.

REFERENCES

Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*(3), 261–295. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(03)00030-4

Hout, T., & Michael, D. (2014). A chinese approach to management. *Harvard Business Review, 92*(9), 103–107.

Kevin Kruse. (2012). *What is employee engagement*. https://www.forbes.com/sites/kev inkruse/2012/06/22/employeeengagement-what-andwhy/#61ff8fea7f37

King, Peter & Zhang, Wei. (2014). Chinese and western leadership models: A literature review. *Journal of Management Research*, *6*(2). https://www.questia. com/library/journal/1P3-3258907031/ chinese-andwestern-leadership-models-aliterature

Mossholder, K. W., Settoon, R. P., & Henagan, S. C. (2005). A relational perspective on turnover: Examining structural, attitudinal, and behavioral predictors. *Academy of Management Journal*, *48*(4), 607– 618. https://doi.org/ 10.5465 /amj.2005.17843941

Mustapha, N., Ahmad, A., Uli, J., & Idris, K. (2010). *Job characteristics as antecedents of intention to stay and mediating effects of work family facilitation* *and family satisfaction among single mothers in Malaysia. 1*(3), 17.

Newstrom, J. W., Davis, K., & Pierce, J. L. (1993). *Organizational behavior: Human behavior at work*.

Nuankaew, W., & Nuankaew, P. (2019). The Study of the Factors and Development of Educational Model: The Relationship between the Learner Context and the Curriculum Context in Higher Education. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (IJET), 14*, 205. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v14i2 1.11034

Sageer, A., Dr. Sameena Rafat, & Ms. Puja Agarwal. (2012). Identification of variables affecting employee satisfaction and their impact on the organization. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management, 5*(1), 32–39. https://doi.org/ 10.9790/487X-0513239

Sharma, Tejinder. (2017). *Leadership Style in China-International Human Resource Management*. Youtube. https://www.youtube. com/watch?v=xY7XqigD3Pg

Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, *46*(2), 259–293. https://doi.org/ 10.1111/j.1744-6570. 1993.tb00874.x

Wang, K. (2019). With reform and innovation as the driving force, steady development of the hoof disease to achieve high-quality development of public health services 以改革创新为动力 蹄疾步 稳实现公共卫生服务高质量发展. *Population and Health 人口与健 康*, *02*, 38–40.

Zeng, G. (2019). Thinking of public health reform in the tide of medical reform 在医改大潮中思考 公共卫生改革. *Health News 健康* 报, 005.

Zhang, Q. (2020). Political advisor Gao Fu calls for reform of the disease control system. *China Youth Daily*. http://zqb.cyol. com/html/2020-05/28/nw.D110000zgqnb_ 20200528_5-06.htm