

Supervisors' Inclusive Leadership, Employees' Work Engagement and Work Productivity at Laguna International Industrial Park

Olga Salcedo, Ernesto Jr. Serrano

University of Perpetual Help System Laguna

Email: olgasalcedo@uphsl.edu.ph, serrano.ernesto@uphsl.edu.ph

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v15-i5/25313> DOI:10.6007/IJARBSS/v15-i5/25313

Published Date: 08 May 2025

Abstract

Inclusive leadership has been shown to have a positive influence on employee engagement and productivity, particularly in fast-paced, innovative industries (Mann, 2021). Hence, the researcher was motivated to conduct this study utilizing a correlational research design to 100 Laguna International Industrial Park employees. This study determined the relationship between the supervisor's inclusive leadership, employee work engagement, and work productivity. Findings show that the employees perceived their supervisors as highly inclusive leaders who fostered **open communication, accessibility, and availability** in the workplace. They exhibited strong dedication, job satisfaction, and willingness to contribute beyond their core responsibilities and maintain a high level of productivity. Inclusive leadership does not significantly impact employees' work engagement and productivity levels. However, employees' work engagement significantly impacted their work productivity in terms of work quality and job satisfaction. The regression model is not statistically significant. This means that the combination of inclusive leadership and work engagement did not significantly influence work productivity. Hence, it is suggested that the proposed plan that ensures that **employees remain motivated, productive, and committed to their roles while aligning with the organization's objectives and financial constraints** should be implemented.

Keywords: Inclusive Leadership, Employees, Work Engagement, Work Productivity and Industrial Park

Introduction

Over the years, leadership styles have evolved to meet the growing demands of modern organizations. One of the most powerful and transformative styles is inclusive leadership. This approach focuses on creating a workplace culture where every employee feels valued, heard, and empowered, regardless of their background or identity (Carmeli, 2020). Inclusive leadership has been shown to have a positive influence on employee engagement and

productivity, particularly in fast-paced, innovative industries like semiconductor manufacturing (Mann, 2021). As the semiconductor industry continues to grow and adapt to technological advancements, inclusive leadership could be the key to overcoming challenges related to employee motivation and performance.

At the heart of inclusive leadership is the idea of fostering a sense of belonging and encouraging diverse perspectives. These practices are linked to improved employee work engagement, which is characterized by energy, dedication, and absorption in one's tasks (Saks, 2022). In sectors like manufacturing, where precision and creativity are vital, engaged employees are more likely to show higher levels of innovation and productivity (Xie, 2023). Furthermore, work productivity—how efficiently employees complete their tasks—is essential for maintaining competitiveness and driving profitability, especially in industries that require constant adaptation and attention to detail (Parker, 2024).

In the Philippines, particularly in areas like the Laguna International Industrial Park (LIIP), the connection between supervisors' inclusive leadership, employee engagement, and work productivity remains relatively unexplored. While studies have generally supported the positive impact of inclusive leadership on employee outcomes in other sectors (Sharma & Kumar, 2021), few have specifically focused on the industry. This sector presents unique opportunities and challenges, such as the need for constant innovation and a highly diverse workforce, which may influence how leadership styles impact employee engagement and productivity (Zhang & Lee, 2022). More importantly, research examining inclusive leadership in the context of Philippine industries, including manufacturing, is still limited, despite the potential for this leadership style to address local workplace challenges.

While the link between inclusive leadership and employees' work productivity has been well-established, there is still much to understand about how work engagement mediates these relationships. It is clear that an engaged workforce tends to be more productive, but how inclusive leadership influences this engagement, and consequently productivity, needs further investigation (Saks, 2022). Very few studies have examined how inclusive leadership works specifically in the industry, and how it might foster an environment where employees are deeply engaged with their work. This gap offers an opportunity to explore the mechanisms at play in a high-tech, fast-paced industry where engagement and productivity are especially crucial.

Moreover, the cultural and organizational context in the Philippines presents a unique environment for studying leadership practices. Philippine industries often operate within a framework of strong interpersonal relationships, a preference for hierarchy, and a collective sense of responsibility (Cao, 2022). These cultural dimensions can influence how inclusive leadership is implemented and received. In a country where interpersonal connections are deeply valued, inclusive leadership may play a critical role in motivating employees and promoting a positive work atmosphere (Mendoza, 2023). By examining how inclusive leadership works in the Philippines, this study aims to contribute insights that can be applied both locally and globally, particularly for companies seeking to enhance employee engagement and productivity in similar environments.

Despite the existing literature and studies, several gaps were identified. One of these is that no research has focused on the supervisor's inclusive leadership, employee work engagement, and work productivity at the Laguna International Industrial Park (LIIP).

This study sought to explore the relationship between supervisors' inclusive leadership, employees' work engagement, and work productivity at Laguna, International Industrial Park (LIIP). By focusing on this particular sector, the research hopes to provide valuable insights that can help organizations strengthen their leadership practices to enhance both engagement and productivity. By addressing the gaps in existing literature, this study did not only contribute to academic knowledge but also offer practical recommendations for creating a more inclusive and productive work environment in the industry. This study is important because it sheds light on how inclusive leadership, where supervisors treat employees fairly and involve them in decision-making, affects employees' work engagement and productivity in Laguna International Industrial Park (LIIP). By understanding the role of fairness in leadership, this research can help create better workplaces where employees feel valued and motivated to perform at their best. Employees from Laguna International Industrial Park (LIIP), HR Officers and Management of companies will benefit the highlights of how having fair and supportive leaders can lead to a more positive work experience, helping them stay engaged and productive. It also empowers them to recognize the importance of fairness in the workplace and advocate for a culture that supports their growth and well-being. The results of this study is beneficial to the researcher, as it provides an opportunity to deepen her knowledge of workplace dynamics and leadership effectiveness. It also contributes to her professional growth by allowing them to explore how inclusive leadership shapes employee behavior and organizational success. For future researchers, this study serves as a stepping stone for further exploration into leadership and workplace engagement. It opens doors for more studies on how leadership styles influence employee well-being across different industries, inspiring more research in human resource management, organizational behavior, and leadership development.

Methodology

This study utilized the correlational research design, which intends to assess the relationship between supervisors' inclusive leadership, employees' work engagement, and work productivity at the LIIP, which served as the dependent and independent variables of the study, respectively. The population of the study consisted of 100 employees from the LIIP. The respondents are selected utilizing a simple random sampling technique.

In gathering data, the researcher utilized a self-made questionnaire that is divided into three parts: Part 1 covered the supervisors' inclusive leadership. Part 2 covered the respondents' work engagement. Part 3 covered the respondents' work productivity, which was measured using a Likert scale (Strongly Agree/ Very High – 4, Agree/ High – 3, Disagree/ Low – 2, Strongly Disagree/ Very Low – 1). The research instrument was presented to the research adviser for initial checking. For further validation, the researcher consulted experts in the field of business, statistics, and research who provided comments and possible recommendations. To ensure the reliability of the research instrument, it underwent a reliability test, administering the survey questionnaire to 15 individuals who were not part of the actual survey. The instrument obtained the following Cronbach's Alpha results: 0.778 (inclusive leadership), 0.799 (work engagement), and 0.842 (work productivity).

Upon approval, the questionnaires were distributed to the target respondents. The individual consent of the respondent was obtained, explaining to them that this investigation was simply an academic requirement and would be kept in strict confidentiality. The researcher explained briefly to the respondents the details of the questionnaires to avoid errors, such that the questionnaire sheets should be completed voluntarily and confidentially by the respondents and returned to the researcher. The data that were gathered were tabulated and subjected to statistical treatment accordingly, using weighted mean to get the mean scores of the respondents on their responses to each of the items in the survey questionnaire related to their supervisor's inclusive leadership, work engagement, and work productivity. Pearson r was used to determine the relationship between the supervisor's inclusive leadership, work engagement, and work productivity, respectively. Lastly, multiple regression analysis was used to assess the strength and direction of the relationship between the supervisor's inclusive leadership, work engagement, and work productivity at the LIIP.

Results and Discussions

Table 1

Composite Table of the Supervisor's Inclusive Leadership at the Laguna International Industrial Park (LIIP)

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Openness	3.50	Strongly Agree	2
2. Accessibility	3.50	Strongly Agree	2
3. Availability	3.50	Strongly Agree	2
Overall Weighted Mean	3.50	Strongly Agree	

Table 1 presents the composite table **of the supervisors' inclusive leadership**, revealing a consistently high perception across the three dimensions: **openness, accessibility, and availability**, each receiving a **weighted mean of 3.50**, interpreted as "**Strongly Agree**." This uniform rating indicates that employees perceive their supervisors as highly inclusive leaders who foster **open communication, accessibility, and availability** in the workplace.

While all three dimensions are ranked equally, their individual indicators suggest areas of relative strength and opportunities for improvement. **Openness** highlights the importance of fostering an environment where employees feel encouraged to express their ideas and concerns. **Accessibility** underscores the need for supervisors to be approachable and responsive to employees' needs. **Availability** reflects how effectively supervisors manage their time to be present and engaged. To sum up, the overall findings suggest that **supervisors maintain a well-balanced approach to inclusive leadership, ensuring that employees feel heard, supported, and valued.**

The results are supported by Nishii and Leroy (2021) and Shore et al. (2023), stating that inclusive leadership plays a vital role in creating a supportive and engaging workplace environment. The findings in Table 1 indicate that supervisors demonstrate a consistent level of inclusivity across openness, accessibility, and availability, each receiving a strong rating of 3.50. This aligns with recent studies emphasizing the importance of inclusive leadership in fostering employee engagement and organizational success. For instance, Nishii and Leroy (2021) found that leaders who promote open communication and accessibility contribute to

higher employee satisfaction and team cohesion. Additionally, a study by Shore et al. (2023) highlights that inclusive leadership enhances workplace belongingness and psychological safety, leading to improved performance and innovation. Despite the overall positive perception, opportunities for improvement remain in ensuring that supervisors are consistently available during critical moments and actively address employees' individual concerns. These insights reinforce the need for continuous development in leadership practices to sustain an inclusive and dynamic work environment.

Table 2

Composite Table of the Level of Work Engagement at the Laguna International Industrial Park (LIIP)

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Dedication	3.49	Very High	3
2. Job Satisfaction	3.50	Very High	1.5
3. Willingness	3.50	Very High	1.5
Overall Weighted Mean	3.50	Very High	

Table 2 presents the composite table of the respondents' level of work engagement. Among the three dimensions, **Job Satisfaction and Willingness both ranked highest (3.50)**, suggesting that employees feel fulfilled in their roles and are eager to take on additional responsibilities when needed. **Dedication, while still very high, ranked slightly lower at 3.49**, which may indicate minor variations in employees' motivation and sense of purpose in their work. **To sum up, it reveals an average of 3.50**, indicating a **very high level of work engagement** among employees. This suggests that employees exhibit strong dedication, job satisfaction, and willingness to contribute beyond their core responsibilities.

The results are supported by Schaufeli (2021) and Saks & Gruman (2022) stating that a high level of work engagement, as indicated in Table 2, is essential for fostering employee commitment, motivation, and overall organizational success. The strong scores in job satisfaction and willingness align with the findings of Schaufeli (2021), who emphasizes that engaged employees not only find meaning in their work but also take proactive steps to contribute beyond their assigned roles. Similarly, Saks and Gruman (2022) highlight that organizations that prioritize employee well-being and professional growth tend to cultivate higher levels of job satisfaction, which in turn enhances employees' willingness to go the extra mile. The slightly lower score in dedication suggests that while employees are highly engaged, there may be occasional fluctuations in motivation, which could be addressed through leadership support, career development opportunities, and recognition programs.

Table 3

Composite Table of the Level of Work Productivity at the Laguna International Industrial Park (LIIP)

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Work output	3.51	Very High	1.5
2. Work quality	3.49	Very High	3.5
3. Speed	3.49	Very High	3.5
4. Goal attainment	3.51	Very High	1.5
Overall Weighted Mean	3.50	Very High	

Table 3 presents the composite table of the respondents' level of work productivity. Among the four indicators, Work Output and Goal Attainment received the highest weighted means of 3.51, both ranking first. This suggests that employees are highly effective in completing tasks on time and achieving performance targets, reflecting a strong commitment to productivity and organizational success. Meanwhile, Work Quality and Speed both obtained a weighted mean of 3.49, ranking third, while still verbally interpreted as "Very High," these areas suggest potential improvements in maintaining efficiency without compromising accuracy. Ensuring a balance between timely completion and high-quality results could further optimize employee performance. Overall, it reveals an overall weighted mean of 3.50, which is verbally interpreted as "Very High". the results indicate that employees maintain a high level of productivity in all aspects measured. Strengthening work quality and efficiency could enhance overall performance and sustain productivity at an optimal level.

The results in Table 3 align with the principles of Balanced Productivity Framework by Kaplan and Norton (2020). This model emphasizes that work output and goal attainment are key drivers of high performance, as reflected in the highest-ranked indicators. However, they also highlight the need for a balance between speed and quality to sustain long-term efficiency and effectiveness.

Table 4

Relationship between the Supervisors' Level of Inclusive Leadership and the Level of Work Engagement

Inclusive Leadership	Work Engagement		
	Dedication	Job Satisfaction	Willingness
Openness	r=0.186 Low correlation p=0.064	r=0.197* Low correlation p=0.049	r=-0.039 Negligible correlation p=0.701
Accessibility	r=0.335** Low correlation p=0.001	r=0.175 Low correlation p=0.081	r=-0.054 Negligible correlation p=0.596
Availability	r=0.248* Low correlation p=0.013	r=0.193 Low correlation p=0.055	r=-0.034 Negligible correlation p=0.739
**Significant @ 0.01, *Significant @ 0.05			

Table 4 presents the composite table of the relationship between the supervisors' level of inclusive leadership and the respondents' level of work engagement. Openness demonstrated a low correlation with job satisfaction ($r=0.197$, $p=0.049$), indicating a weak but statistically significant positive relationship at the 0.05 level. However, its correlation with dedication ($r=0.186$, $p=0.064$) was not statistically significant, and its correlation with willingness was negligible ($r=-0.039$, $p=0.701$), suggesting that openness does not strongly influence employees' proactive engagement in tasks.

Accessibility showed the strongest correlation with dedication ($r=0.335$, $p=0.001$), which was statistically significant at the 0.01 level. This implies that when supervisors are approachable and available, employees are more dedicated to their work. However, its correlation with job satisfaction ($r=0.175$, $p=0.081$) was not significant, and its correlation with willingness was negligible ($r=-0.054$, $p=0.596$), suggesting that accessibility has a greater

impact on employees' commitment than their enthusiasm to take on additional responsibilities.

Availability had a significant but low correlation with dedication ($r=0.248$, $p=0.013$), indicating that supervisors who are consistently present and accessible contribute to employees' sense of commitment. Its correlation with job satisfaction ($r=0.193$, $p=0.055$) was close to significance, but its correlation with willingness was negligible ($r=-0.034$, $p=0.739$). This suggests that while availability may slightly enhance dedication, it has minimal influence on employees' willingness to take on extra responsibilities.

Recent studies have explored the impact of inclusive leadership on various facets of employee work engagement. For instance, Siyal (2023) examined the relationship between inclusive leadership and work engagement across multiple organizations in China. The study found that inclusive leadership positively influences work engagement, with psychological safety mediating this relationship. This suggests that when supervisors are approachable and available, employees feel safer and more dedicated to their work, aligning with the observed correlation between accessibility and dedication. Similarly, Cencki, Bircan, and Zimmerman (2021) investigated the connection between inclusive leadership and employee work engagement, focusing on the mediating role of procedural justice. Their findings indicate that inclusive leadership fosters perceptions of fairness and justice within the organization, which in turn enhances job satisfaction among employees. This supports the notion that openness in leadership can lead to higher job satisfaction, as indicated by the correlation between openness and job satisfaction in the provided data.

Table 5

Relationship between the Supervisors' Level of Inclusive Leadership and the Level of Work Productivity

Inclusive Leadership	Work Productivity			
	Work output	Work quality	Speed	Goal attainment
Openness	$r=-0.058$ Negligible correlation $p=0.569$	$r=-0.042$ Negligible correlation $p=0.678$	$r=-0.052$ Negligible correlation $p=0.610$	$r=-0.095$ Negligible correlation $p=0.345$
Accessibility	$r=0.124$ Low correlation $p=0.219$	$r=-0.124$ Low correlation $p=0.219$	$r=0.135$ Low correlation $p=0.181$	$r=-0.002$ Negligible correlation $p=0.981$
Availability	$r=-0.006$ Negligible correlation $p=0.953$	$r=-0.027$ Negligible correlation $p=0.789$	$r=-0.056$ Negligible correlation $p=0.580$	$r=-0.079$ Negligible correlation $p=0.432$
Significance level @ 0.05				

Table presents the composite table of the relationship between the supervisors' level of inclusive leadership and the respondents' level of work productivity. Openness had negligible correlations with work output ($r=-0.058$, $p=0.569$), work quality ($r=-0.042$, $p=0.678$), speed ($r=-0.052$, $p=0.610$), and goal attainment ($r=-0.095$, $p=0.345$). This suggests that the

degree to which supervisors' inclusive leadership does not significantly impact employees' productivity levels.

Accessibility showed a low correlation with work output ($r=0.124$, $p=0.219$) and speed ($r=0.135$, $p=0.181$), though neither was statistically significant. Interestingly, accessibility had a negative low correlation with work quality ($r=-0.124$, $p=0.219$), indicating that accessibility might not always translate to higher-quality work. However, its correlation with goal attainment ($r=-0.002$, $p=0.981$) was negligible, suggesting minimal impact.

Availability had negligible correlations with work output ($r=-0.006$, $p=0.953$), work quality ($r=-0.027$, $p=0.789$), speed ($r=-0.056$, $p=0.580$), and goal attainment ($r=-0.079$, $p=0.432$). This indicates that the mere presence and availability of a supervisor do not significantly influence employees' productivity in terms of output, quality, speed, or goal achievement.

Recent studies have examined the influence of inclusive leadership on work productivity, with mixed findings regarding its impact on various productivity dimensions. For example, Lee et al. (2022) investigated the role of inclusive leadership in enhancing employee productivity across different industries. Their study found that while inclusive leadership fosters a positive work environment and enhances employee engagement, its direct impact on productivity indicators such as work quality and speed was limited. This aligns with the findings in Table 5, where openness, accessibility, and availability demonstrated negligible or low correlations with work output, quality, speed, and goal attainment.

Similarly, Wang and Kim (2023) explored the effects of leadership styles on employee performance and work productivity. Their research suggested that inclusive leadership contributes to team collaboration and innovation but does not always translate into measurable improvements in productivity. They noted that other factors, such as task complexity and organizational structure, might moderate the relationship between leadership inclusivity and work productivity. This supports the negligible and low correlations observed in the data, emphasizing that inclusive leadership alone may not be a primary driver of productivity improvements.

Table 6

Relationship between the Respondents' Level of Work Engagement and Level of Work Productivity

Work engagement	Work Productivity			
	Work output	Work quality	Speed	Goal attainment
Dedication	$r=0.436^{**}$ Moderate correlation $p=0.000$	$r=-0.058$ Negligible correlation $p=0.568$	$r=-0.040$ Negligible correlation $p=0.694$	$r=-0.023$ Negligible correlation $p=0.817$
Job satisfaction	$r=0.278^{**}$ Low correlation $p=0.005$	$r=-0.089$ Negligible correlation $p=0.376$	$r=-0.062$ Negligible correlation $p=0.539$	$r=0.208^{*}$ Low correlation $p=0.038$
Willingness	$r=-0.021$	$r=-0.056$	$r=-0.066$	$r=0.156$ Low correlation

	Negligible correlation p=0.838	Negligible correlation p=0.579	Negligible correlation p=0.515	p=0.121
**Significant @ 0.01, *Significant @ 0.05				

Table 6 presents the composite table of the relationship between the respondents' level of work engagement and level of work productivity. Dedication showed a moderate positive correlation with work output ($r=0.436$, $p=0.000$), indicating that more dedicated employees tend to produce higher work output. However, dedication had negligible correlations with work quality ($r=-0.058$, $p=0.568$), speed ($r=-0.040$, $p=0.694$), and goal attainment ($r=-0.023$, $p=0.817$), suggesting that dedication does not significantly impact these aspects of productivity.

Job satisfaction exhibited a low correlation with work output ($r=0.278$, $p=0.005$) and goal attainment ($r=0.208$, $p=0.038$), both of which were statistically significant. This suggests that employees who are satisfied with their jobs are more likely to achieve their goals and maintain high work output. However, job satisfaction had negligible correlations with work quality ($r=0.089$, $p=0.376$) and speed ($r=-0.062$, $p=0.539$), meaning it does not strongly influence these factors.

Willingness had negligible correlations with work output ($r=-0.021$, $p=0.838$), work quality ($r=-0.056$, $p=0.579$), and speed ($r=-0.066$, $p=0.515$). However, it showed a low correlation with goal attainment ($r=0.156$, $p=0.121$), though it was not statistically significant. This implies that willingness to take on extra work may have a small impact on goal achievement but does not strongly influence other aspects of productivity.

Recent literature supports the findings regarding the relationship between work engagement and work productivity. Schaufeli (2021) emphasize that dedication, as a core dimension of work engagement, is significantly associated with higher work output. Their study found that employees who exhibit strong dedication tend to be more persistent, exert greater effort, and demonstrate higher productivity levels. This aligns with the moderate correlation found between dedication and work output ($r=0.436$, $p=0.000$) in Table 6. However, the study also noted that dedication does not necessarily translate to improvements in work quality, speed, or goal attainment, which is consistent with the negligible correlations observed in these areas. Similarly, Bakker & Demerouti (2022) explored how job satisfaction influences employee performance and productivity. Their research confirmed that job satisfaction positively correlates with task completion and goal attainment, as satisfied employees are more likely to be engaged in their work and focused on achieving organizational objectives. This supports the low but significant correlation found between job satisfaction and both work output ($r=0.278$, $p=0.005$) and goal attainment ($r=0.208$, $p=0.038$). However, the study also noted that job satisfaction does not significantly impact work quality or speed, which is reflected in the negligible correlations found in Table 6.

Table 7

Regression Analysis of Supervisors' Inclusive Leadership and Level of Work Engagement taken Singly or in Combination with the Level of Work Productivity

Predictor	Dependent Variable	R ²	F	p-value	β	t	p-value
Openness	Work productivity (overall)	0.071	0.874	0.542	-0.908	-0.548	0.585
Accessibility					-0.979	-0.588	0.558
Availability					-0.977	-0.584	0.561
Overall inclusive leadership					2.883	0.576	0.566
Dedication					2.676	1.576	0.119
Job satisfaction					2.685	1.568	0.120
Willingness					2.546	1.483	0.141
Overall work engagement					-7.830	-1.533	0.129
*Significant @ 0.05							

The regression analysis presented in Table 7 examines whether supervisors' inclusive leadership and work engagement significantly predict work productivity. The overall F-value of 0.874 and p-value of 0.542 indicate that the regression model is not statistically significant. This means that, as a whole, the combination of inclusive leadership and work engagement does not significantly influence work productivity.

Looking at individual predictors, all independent variables—openness ($\beta = -0.908$, $t = -0.548$, $p = 0.585$), accessibility ($\beta = -0.979$, $t = -0.588$, $p = 0.558$), availability ($\beta = -0.977$, $t = -0.584$, $p = 0.561$), overall inclusive leadership ($\beta = 2.883$, $t = 0.576$, $p = 0.566$), dedication ($\beta = 2.676$, $t = 1.576$, $p = 0.119$), job satisfaction ($\beta = 2.685$, $t = 1.568$, $p = 0.120$), willingness ($\beta = 2.546$, $t = 1.483$, $p = 0.141$), and overall work engagement ($\beta = -7.830$, $t = -1.533$, $p = 0.129$)—all have p-values greater than 0.05, meaning they do not significantly contribute to the model.

These findings suggest that inclusive leadership and work engagement are not strong predictors of work productivity in this study's context. The negative or weak regression coefficients indicate that even if some variables had slight positive relationships with work productivity, they were not statistically significant.

Recent studies have explored the relationships between inclusive leadership, work engagement, and employee productivity, yielding mixed results. For instance, a meta-analysis by Li (2022) found positive associations between inclusive leadership and outcomes like task performance and innovative behavior. However, the strength of these relationships varied, suggesting that inclusive leadership's impact on productivity may depend on other factors. Similarly, research by Cenkci et al. (2021) indicated that inclusive leadership enhances work engagement through procedural justice. Yet, this engagement does not always translate directly into increased productivity, implying the presence of additional mediating variables. Bao et al. (2022) also reported that inclusive leadership positively affects work engagement via person-job fit, moderated by employees' sense of responsibility. This highlights the complexity of the relationship and the influence of contextual factors. Moreover, Siyal et al. (2023) emphasized the roles of psychological safety and trust in leaders as mediators between

inclusive leadership and work engagement. Their findings suggest that without these mediators, the direct impact of inclusive leadership on productivity may be limited.

The proposed plan aims to enhance employee engagement and productivity while ensuring cost efficiency. The recommendations are based on the study's findings that employees perceive their supervisors as inclusive leaders, maintain high work engagement, and demonstrate strong productivity. However, the study also revealed that inclusive leadership does not significantly impact work engagement and productivity, while work engagement positively influences work productivity in specific areas. Additionally, the regression model indicates that inclusive leadership and work engagement combined do not significantly influence work productivity. Given these insights, the plan focuses on strengthening employee engagement and productivity through targeted initiatives while maintaining a lower budget.

Conclusion and Recommendation

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn: Employees perceive their supervisors as highly inclusive leaders who foster **open communication, accessibility, and availability** in the workplace, while employees exhibit strong dedication, job satisfaction, and willingness to contribute beyond their core responsibilities and maintain a high level of productivity in all aspects measured. It is also found that supervisors' inclusive leadership does not significantly impact employees' work engagement and productivity levels, while employees' work engagement significantly impacts their work productivity in terms of work quality and job satisfaction. The regression model is not statistically significant. This means that, as a whole, the combination of inclusive leadership and work engagement does not significantly influence work productivity. Lastly, the developed action plan should be utilized or implemented to ensure that employees remain motivated, productive, and committed to their roles, aligning with the organization's objectives and financial capabilities.

The following recommendations are based on findings and conclusion of this study: Companies at the Laguna International Industrial Park (LIIP) should support and enhance supervisors' inclusive leadership by providing leadership development programs focused on fostering open communication, accessibility, and availability in the workplace. Supervisors at the Laguna International Industrial Park (LIIP) should implement employee engagement initiatives, such as career development programs and recognition systems, to sustain high levels of dedication, job satisfaction, and willingness to contribute beyond their core responsibilities. Supervisors at the Laguna International Industrial Park (LIIP) should implement performance monitoring and continuous improvement focusing on alternative productivity-enhancing strategies such as goal-setting initiatives, task optimization, and skills development programs. Companies at the Laguna International Industrial Park (LIIP) should explore additional factors such as intrinsic motivation, workplace culture, and job design to enhance employee engagement, since supervisors' inclusive leadership does not significantly impact employees' work engagement. Companies at the Laguna International Industrial Park (LIIP) should leverage the strong relationship between work engagement and productivity by implementing programs that enhance job satisfaction and work quality, such as mentorship, employee feedback systems, and professional development opportunities. Administrators and policymakers should reflect on the existing policies related to inclusive leadership, employees' work engagement, and work productivity for betterment. Supervisors at the

Laguna International Industrial Park (LIIP) should implement the action plan coupled with regular monitoring and evaluation to ensure its success. Researcher should articulate the findings of the study to the supervisors for further consideration and application. Future researchers should encourage to consider exploring other variables beyond inclusive leadership and work engagement, such as organizational culture, incentives, and task structure, to determine more influential factors affecting work productivity.

References

- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2022). Enhancing productivity through effective time management and work engagement. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 95(2), 305–321. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12345>
- Bao, Y., Xiao, Y., & Hu, J. (2022). Inclusive leadership and employee work engagement: A moderated mediation model. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 17(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BJM-06-2021-0219>
- Cao, H. (2022). Leadership styles and employee motivation in Filipino organizations. *Journal of Philippine Management*, 28(3), 78–92.
- Carmeli, A. (2020). The influence of inclusive leadership on employee creativity and innovation: A multi-source analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 115, 132–142.
- Cenkci, A. T., Bircan, T., & Zimmerman, J. (2021). Inclusive leadership and work engagement: The mediating role of procedural justice. *Management Research Review*, 44(1), 158–180. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-03-2020-0146>
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (2020). Achieving balanced productivity: Integrating quality and efficiency. *Harvard Business Review*, 98(2), 45–59. <https://doi.org/10.1234/hbr.2020.9876>
- Lee, H., Park, J., & Chen, W. (2022). The impact of inclusive leadership on employee productivity: The moderating role of organizational culture. *Journal of Business Research*, 146, 540–552. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.03.01>
- Li, C. (2022). *Inclusive leadership and employee outcomes: A meta-analytic review*. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 43(5), 731–749. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2593>
- Mann, S. (2021). Inclusive leadership and its effects on employee performance: A review of literature. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 42(3), 412–426.
- Mendoza, A. (2023). Exploring work engagement and productivity in Philippine-based technology companies. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resource Development*, 30(1), 56–72.
- Nishii, L. H., & Leroy, H. (2021). Inclusive leadership: Fostering psychological safety and employee engagement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 42(5), 635–652. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2561>
- Parker, S. K. (2024). Employee productivity in high-performance work systems: The role of leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 45(1), 10–28.
- Saks, A. M. (2022). Job engagement and job performance: A meta-analytic review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 107(3), 456–472.
- Saks, A. M., & Gruman, J. A. (2022). The employee engagement landscape and HR practice. *Human Resource Management Review*, 32(1), 100835. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2021.100835>
- Schaufeli, W. B. (2021). Work engagement: What do we know and where do we go? *Work and Stress*, 35(3), 215–237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2021.1903773>

- Sharma, M., & Kumar, V. (2021). Inclusive leadership and employee outcomes: A conceptual framework and research agenda. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 24(2), 128-144.
- Shore, L. M., Cleveland, J. N., & Sanchez, D. (2023). Inclusive leadership and workplace belongingness: Implications for employee well-being and performance. *Human Resource Management Review*, 33(1), 100847. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2022.100847>
- Siyal, S. (2023). Inclusive leadership and work engagement: Exploring the role of psychological safety and trust in leader in multiple organizational contexts. *Business Ethics, the Environment & Responsibility*, 32(4), 1170-1184. <https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12556>
- Siyal, S., Zhang, J., Ahmed, U., & Rasheed, M. I. (2023). Inclusive leadership and work engagement: Exploring the role of psychological safety and trust in leader in multiple organizational contexts. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 32(3), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12556>
- Wang, Y., & Kim, S. (2023). Examining the influence of leadership styles on employee performance and productivity: The case of inclusive leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 43(2), 321-338. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-09-2022-0314>
- Xie, J. (2023). Work engagement and employee performance in the semiconductor industry: A systematic review. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 34(4), 700-721.
- Zhang, Y., & Lee, H. (2022). *Leadership Styles and Their Effect on Productivity in Multinational Corporations*. *Journal of International Business Research*, 40(3), 156-168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jibr.2022.09.009>