

EFFECT OF EMPOWERING LEADERSHIP ON ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE: EXAMINING MEDIATING ROLE OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

A STUDY INTO SELECTED HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, KABUL, AFGHANISTAN

Dr. Mohammad Qasim Ayaz^{*1}, Dr. Amna Ali², Dr. Adil Adnan³;Umair Ali⁴

^{*1}Lecturer (HRM), Business Administration Department, Salam University, Kabul, Afghanistan;

²Associate Professor, Business Administration Department, Iqra National University, Peshawar, Pakistan;

³Professor, Business Administration Department, Iqra National University, Peshawar

⁴Phd Scholar, Iqra National University, Peshawar

^{*1}ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5999-7701>

Received: 08 March, 2024

Revised: 13 March, 2024

Accepted: 19 March, 2024

Published: 29 March, 2024

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of the study was to examine the Effect of empowering leadership on organizational performance; mediating role of organizational commitment. This study, conducted on private health sector in Kabul, Afghanistan. This means, that there were three main variables in this study, independent variable (empowering leadership), dependent variable (organizational performance) and mediating variable (organizational commitment). For the current study, the targeted population and unit of analysis was all employees working in selected higher educational institutions in Kabul. The total sample size of the current study was 400 individuals. Which means, they were the main participant in the study, to provide information related to the questions asked from them. For data collection, this study utilized adopted questionnaires, which was organized in Likert scale (1= strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3= neutral, 4= agree and 5 =strongly agree). The participant was asked to select only one option for each question asked. The study found positive correlation between variables. Furthermore, there was a positive mediation because of trust in leader as a mediator in this study. The current study suggests that future researchers may take other leadership styles as independent variable. Meantime, another suggestion for choosing different outcomes than the employees psychological empowerment. Finally, the current study suggests other mediation such as organizational culture.

Keywords: Empowering leadership, Organizational performance, organizational commitment

INTRODUCTION

In today's challenging setting, the success of organizations is due to the Organizational performance, employees and Organizational Affective Commitment (Anwar, & Abdullah, 2021). Most of the researchers, investigated the term Organizational performance, some researchers such as (Lee & Yu, 2004; Al Ajna & Atan, 2020), argued that Organizational performance is due to the leadership styles. Therefore, the leaders always strive to use different affective styles for the organizational promotion (Graham, Ziegert and Capitano, 2015). Furthermore, in case companies hope for increasing

their performance, leaders must have different capacities or qualities to enhance creativity, employees 's innovativeness, and to stimulate employees values toward improving their performance (Koinig & Diehl, 2021). Even though these faults, it is widely accepted that leadership is responsible for the critical link between Organizational effectiveness and people's performance at the employee's level (Judge, et al., 2002; Avolio, 1999; Bass, 1999; Keller, 2011; Teece et al., 1997; Yukl, 2002; McGrath and MacMillan, 2000; McEwan, Mullen & Purcell, 2007).

A large number of managerial experts have debated the efficacy of various leadership panaches and performances (Avery, 2004; Analoui, 1999; Drath, 2001; House and Aditya, 1997; Shamir and Howell, 1999; Kakabadse et al., 1999; Shamir et al., 1993; Yukl, 1999; Elenkov, 2002). Empowering is a coercive and seemingly arbitrary leadership style centered on the leader's desire to accumulate power, which is used to marginalize assistants and force them to follow any request. It's all too relaxed to dismiss oppression as a character complaint or the foundation of unlawful, totalitarian regimes. While it may be difficult to sympathize with authoritarian instruction, there are times when it appears to be unavoidable and even beneficial a humane prelude to a more supportive relationship between those in charge and those who follow. Inmates in the most secure all-out security prisons, for example, include a large number of violent, unequal, and mentally unstable employees (Thomas, 1988; Garcia-Morales et al., 2008).

Moreover, the researchers discuss two different approaches on Organizational Commitment, In the literature, there are two methods to defining Organizational Commitment. To begin, promise is defined as an operative's desire to endure working for the company (Cohen, 2007). Second, Organizational Commitment can be well-defined as an assertiveness that happens between an employees and a society in the form of an attachment, and is imitated in the relative strength of an employee's psychological documentation and participation with the institute (Ridwan, Mulyani and Ali, 2020). Therefore, for two reasons, this study supports the second description. First, there is evidence in the literature of a conceptual distinction between Organizational Commitment and intentions to leave but Organizational performance, as well as the directionality of such a relationship (Guzeller & Celiker, 2020; Allen et al., 2003; Schwepker, 2001). Second, the behavioral approach is widely used in the description of Organizational Commitment (Spector, 2002), because Organizational Commitment refers to employees' attitudes toward the company rather than their intentions to leave but the intention toward Organizational performance.

Organizations are required to participate in a complex and operationally uncertain environment as a result of globalization and rapid economic changes (Gandrita, Gandrita & Rosado, 2022). In such a complex environment, they must make rapid changes

in order to remain competitive (Prem et al., 2017). Moreover, today all type of organizations is looking toward the performance, if it is belonging to workers s, team, department or an overall Organizational performance. Organizations believe on complex Organizational environment that goes into more complexity day by day. Moreover, a very less and insignificant research studies were conducted in this area especially considering Afghanistan context. Therefore, the current study is looking to examine the influence of empowering leadership (Hoang, Wilson, Lockstone and Luu, 2021), on Organizational performance (Mai et al., 2022), in the presence of mediating role Organizational Commitment (Kim & Vandenberghe, 2021), in higher education sector. Moreover, the existing literature recommends more needed research work in relationship to the empowering leadership and organizational performance, with examining mediating role of organizational commitment. Thus this study answers the following research questions;

RQ1: What is the effect of empowering leadership on Organizational performance?

RQ2: Dose Organizational Commitment mediates the association between empowering leadership and Organizational performance?

According to scholarly debate on leadership, top-down control based on a bureaucratic framework were emphasized in leadership concept (Marion & McKelvey, 2007). Though, in today's overexcited competitive worldwide economic environment and rapidly changing technical setting, administrations are placing a greater emphasis on worker's encouragement rather than hierarchical managerial and requiring helpful conduct with colleagues (Arnold, 2000). As discussed the main determination of the study is to investigate the role of empowering leadership on Organizational performance in the presences of structural Commitment as an intermediary. Therefore, the study contributes the expanding of existing literature, it also contributes the researcher, scholars and academicians on in-depth understanding of the term empowering or encouragement of leaders, workers and its impact on Organizational performance, in educational sector (Huang, Liu, and Huang, 2021).

On other hand, Organizational performance is a key priority to the managerial board (Barney, 1997). Almost, all type of organizations need performance to ensure their competitive success, it is defined by (Foss, 2002), as an organizations ability to achieve

its pre-determined goals and objectives through the effective and efficient utilization of resources. Therefore, the current study takes empowering leadership (Bhatti et al., 2021), as an independent variable, and Organizational performance (Mai et al., 2021), as outcome variable. Moreover, this study examines the Organizational Commitment as a mediating variable in this study (Juan Du et al., 2021).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Organizational Performance

Few studies use reliable descriptions and processes of Organizational performance, making it an astonishing open query (Hurduzeu, 2015). Performance is so mutual in managerial investigation that its construction and description are infrequently openly justified; in its place, its suitability, in any form, is expected without query (March & Sutton, 1997). For investigators absorbed in just about any feature of organization, Organizational performance is the eventual dependent variable of attention. Organizational performance is dangerous to the existence and achievement of modern industries due to market struggle for customers, contributions, and wealth (Arif & Akram, 2018). As a result, this concept has come to serve as the ostensive goal of modern manufacturing action (Para-Gonzalez et al., 2018). Promotion, procedures, human resources, and approach are all assessed based on how well they add to overall Organizational performance. First and foremost, this discussion is necessary to keep research thinking current (Garcia-Morales, Llorens-Montes, Verdu-Jover, 2008).

The expansion of the Organizational performance domain has inferences for procedural repetition as well as the association among theoretical study and organization practice. Simply put, we may not be calculating the performance that directors are responsible for. For example, Boyd, et al. (2005), discovered that performance was the most common dependent in papers issued in the four leading managerial papers from 1998 to 2000, and that it was measured using a single indicator in 38.1 percent of the cases. One of the well-known researcher Mayer in (1997), states that there is strong relation between leadership, Commitment and presentation. Firms with "adaptive values," according to (Rollins, 1993), are powerfully related with superior long-term performance as opposed to just short-term performance. The importance of "adoptiveness" in

determining Organizational performance is demonstrated by this finding. Oakland & Oakland (1998), and Srivastava, Bartol, & Locke, (2006), supported this hypothesis in their studies of long-lived, monetarily fruitful businesses. Inside incorporation and external adaptation, as well as change and stability, were contrasted by Tung & Chang (2011).

In other hand, marketing, processes, human resources (HR), and approach are all evaluated in terms of their contribution to general administration performance. To begin with, this discussion is vital to keep researcher thought current. Although several early reviews on level of functioning were issued in the 1980s (Wong et al., 2014; Carmeli, Schaubroeck & Tishler, 2011), the last 20 years have seen the emergence of a greater number of performance events with a broader scope (e.g., the triple bottom line) as well as significant empirical and methodological advancements that have yet to be comprehensively combined (e.g., the triple bottom line). Leadership is another way that businesses can improve their performance. (Bisharat et al., 2017; Pradhan and Pradhan, 2015).

Leadership is regarded as one of the most important factors influencing Organizational performance and fortunes. There are two ways in which leadership affects Organizational performance. To begin with, leadership has a direct impact on performance (Hassan, Mahsud, Yukl & Prussia, 2013).

Empowering Leadership

The role of leadership in an association is dangerous in terms of generating a vision, mission, trying to define and two key challenges, strategy is based, regulations, and methods of achieving overall Administrative objectives professionally and efficiently, as well as directing and controlling efforts and activities of the organization (Byun et al., 2020). Several scholars have promoted the encouragement ideology, which were first introduced in the 1980s (Hartline & Gracia et al., 2020; Faulks et al., 2021; Van Assen, 2020). The basic premise of encouragement was to increase employee's productivity (Spreitzer, & Bartunek 2006) by taking advantage of technological and marketable changes in the workplace (Moldogaziev, & Fernandez, 2011). The nature of work has changed dramatically in recent decades, and the workplace has become more complex and cognitively difficult, requiring employees that is more elastic, highly

expert, and eager to grow and mature (Lee, & Ding, 2020).

Empowering leadership has emerged as a distinct type of leadership in this fast-paced changing environment (Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014). Supportive, directive, contingent reward, transactional, & transformational leadership are all examples of traditional leadership styles (Nesterkin, 2013; Babic et al., 2014). It has been defined from two opposing standpoints: "sharing of power" and "self-efficacy" (Zhang & Bartol, 2010; Wang, Seibert & Court, 2011). The first viewpoint emphasizes the delegation of influence and accountability to assistants in order to achieve self-managerial (Arnold et al., 2000), whereas the second emphasizes employees' psychological experiences (Li et al., 2016). To attain the mission and vision, as well as manage with fluctuations in the outside workplace, top-notch leadership is obligatory (Harris, et al., 2007). Many businesses primary goal is to achieve their stated objectives; as a result, effective leaders are required to coordinate and motivate their employees (Vigoda-Gadot, 2012).

However, it is becoming more widely documented that managerial can be studied at the group level, with supporters affected by a communal leader's effects (Feinberg, Ostroff & Burke, 2005). Authorizing leadership has thus been studied at the employees or group level (Bartol, & Locke, 2006; Zhang & Bartol, 2010). At the employee's level, it has been shown to be confidently connected with task performance (Mathieu, & Rapp, 2005) and employee's creativity (Zhang & Bartol, 2010), and there is indication of an affirmative connotation with team performance (Bartol, & Locke, 2006), as well as a cross-level connotation with employees groundbreaking and teamwork behaviors and turnover intentions, with emotional encouragement an affirmative association with psychological encouragement (Zhang & Bartol, 2010).

Organizational Commitment

As psychological construct research on Organizational Commitment is a heavily studied concept (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Mowdays et al., 1982; and Morrow, 1993). Employees attitudinal Organizational Commitment is clearly defined as the strength of employees identified with the involvement in particular organization (Morrow, 1993). Many other earlier researchers such as Zajac, (1990), the variable Organizational Commitment is

the most studied in the Organizational behavior. Two more researchers known as Randall (1990), and Cohen (1991), agrees upon the role of Organizational Commitment that enhance employees 's performance as well as Organizational performance. Furthermore, empirical studies on Organizational performance show that empowering leadership is the key to increase Organizational Commitment (Steffens, 2018). The term Organizational Commitment is also explained by Swailes (2002), the degree to which workers identifies to participate in particular organization. Organizational Commitment is confirmed as a high result oriented, affirmative outcome for organizations and their members (Meyer et al., 2002).

Previews researchers also discussed the role of Organizational Commitment in different other counties for instance, using an example of staff nurses employed by a large public hospital in Singapore (Sharma & Sinha, 2015), discovered an affirmative relationship between transformational leadership and Organizational obligation. In Singapore, Koh, Steers, & Terborg (1995) found a similar link between leadership and affirmative attitudes and performance among students and their principals. In a laboratory experiment involving Asian and Caucasian students, Jung & Avolio (1999), found that Asian students produced more philosophies when working with a transformational leader than Caucasians. In the fields of leadership and managerial, Organizational behavior, and human resource managerial, the concept of workplace Obligation is still one of the most challenging and researched concepts (Cohen, 2003; Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005; Morrow, 1993). Researchers such as, Geyer & Steyrer (1998) examined a sample of Australian banks and found that leadership had positive effects on workers' level of effort and impartial performance. Researchers such as, Dasborough & Ashkanasy, 2002), they revealed that leadership resulted in considerably improved supporter performance under close bodily coldness conditions in a longitudinal study of Canadian public banking managers. According to the researchers such as, Walumbwa, Wang, et al. (2004), found that among banking staff from China and India, leadership was positively correlated with collective efficacy.

Empowering Leadership and Organizational Performance

According to scholarly discussion on leadership, top-down control based on an organizational structure were harassed in leadership concept (Uhl-Bien, Marion & McKelvey, 2007). However, in today's hyper modest global monetary circumstances and fast-paced technological varying environment, firms are stressing worker's encouragement and supporting behavior with colleagues (Arnold et al., 2000). Because it stimulates decision-making and helps people break out from passive attitudes (Zhang & Bartol, 2010). Furthermore, it liberates workers from organizational limitations, creating confidence in high performance and feelings of elasticity (Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014), encouraging them to take risks and improve their performance by gaining enlarged self-responsibility and independence (Arnold et al., 2000). Moreover, research shows the need to look at specific factors that affect this association (Vecchio et al., 2010). According to several studies, "EL" has a positive link with factors that are relevant to worker's performance, including task gratification, the sense of decision-making efficiency, self-leadership, intent to leave their position, and inventiveness (Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014).

Furthermore, it delivers greater choice autonomy, a facilitative and supportive environment to employees, which may have diverse consequences on their outputs, making the person feel valued and the task tough (Li et al., 2016). However, not all prior study has produced consistent outcomes. Some research studies suggest that encouraging leadership outcome association can be damaging some time due to individual's negative behaviors and task outcomes in the workplace (Ahearne et al., 2005; Robert et al., 2000). Empowering leadership, as an example we can add that, has been demonstrated to generate resistance and task uncertainty (Maynard et al., 2007), both of which can impair employees and Organizational performance. According to a summary of previous encouragement research, empowering leadership is critical for worker's s task performance. Is it possible, however, to have too much of a good thing? According to some research, independence can be a two-edged blade when it comes to presentation (Langfred, 2004) and personal happiness (Nagel, 2010), and found that team independence lets worker's s to make their own self-governing choices that are in the greatest interests of

their tasks. High autonomy, on the other hand, may cause teams to developed remote from their setting, with less contribution from others as a result of extraordinary level of person decision-making, resulting in poor presentation (Langfred, 2004).

Organizational Commitment as a Mediator

To survive in long-term, organizations are facing with key challenges and inspiring factors one of them known as Organizational Commitment (Ding & Jia, 2012). Researchers, like Silzer & Church (2009), considers Organizational Commitment more important than the workers' Commitment. Mowday, Steers & Porter, (1979), supports this believe, because with no Organizational Commitment, there were be an automatic negative result on workers' Commitment. These are all resource based perspective investigated by different leadership to ensure the importance of Organizational Commitment as the intervening variable (Zhang & Rajagopalan, 2010). Yet, many scholars have argued on better understanding of motivational factors that effects Organizational Commitment (Ryan & Haslam, 2007). Accordingly, many other researchers such as (Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2012), urged on the importance of Organizational Commitment as a mediating variable between leadership and the performance. According to meta-analyses, Commitment is negatively associated with turnover (CooperHakim & Viswesvaran, 2005), absence (Farrel & Stamm, 1988), and counterproductive behavior (Dalal, 2005), and affirmatively associated with task satisfaction (Viswesvaran, 2005), motivation (Button, Mathieu & Zajac, 1996), and Organizational nationality behavior (Riketta, 2002). One of the main fundamental factors of interest in studies on management and organizational behavior is commitment. Scholars are endeavoring to comprehend the causative precursors of it. The aim of this research is to examine the connection between perceived organizational backing and staff dedication to the company (Yousef, 2000).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In order to reach the research objective for the current study, a quantitative study was conducted. The basic advantage utilizing this approach, numerical data for further analysis were provided and interpretation to support the researcher to reach the final findings accordingly which is proposed in objectives and

hypothesis of the current research study (Apuke, 2017). Data were collected from the employees working in the selected higher educational institutions in Kabul, Afghanistan. To find accurate data, we considered adopted questionnaire were utilized for the current study table 1 shows the instruments of the study. Furthermore, convenient sampling technique was considered. Moreover, this research considered positivism research philosophy

with the consideration of five targeted higher institutions as the main unit of analysis (Kardan University, Bakhtar University, Rana University, Salam University, and Karwan University). A total of 1200 survey questionnaire was distributed where 400 complete surveys was returned for analysis, and was analyzed as the sample size of the current research work.

Table 1
Research Items

<i>S/N</i>	<i>Variables</i>	<i>No – Items</i>	<i>References</i>
1	Empowering Leadership	10 – Items	Amundsen, S., & Martinsen, Ø. L. (2014).
2	Organizational Performance	5 – Items	Agha, S., Alrubaiee, L., & Jamhour, M. (2012).
3	Organizational Commitment	12 – Items	Hartmann & Bambacas, 2000

Data Analysis and Interpretation
Demographic Characteristics

Table 2 shows the demographic features of the participants. In the current study, total number of participant were N= 400, the above statistical table explains that Male = 263, 65.8%, Female = 137, 34.3% in total. The researcher also asked the age level of the worker’s s and the statistical results were as followings. Age level between 25 – 30 = 146, 36.5%, age level between 31 – 35 = 185, 46.3%, age level between 36 – 40 = 69, 17.3% from total 400 workers s. Furthermore, the researcher asked workers s to mention their education level while filling the questionnaires and the statistical results were bachelor = 128, 32.0%, MBA = 164, 41.0%, MS 97, 24.3%, and PhD = 11, 2.8%. Moreover, this research study asked workers s to mention their experience level and the statistical results were as followings; experience level between 0 – 5 years = 105, 26.3%, experience level between 6 – 10 = 108, 27.0%, experience level between 11 – 15 = 151, 37.8%, and experience level from 16 or above = 36, 9.0%.

Table 2
Demographic Characteristics of Participant

<i>Characteristics</i>	<i>N = 400</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Gender Status		
Male	263	65.8%
Female	137	34.3%
Age Level		
25 – 30	146	36.5%
31 – 35	185	46.3%
36 – 40	69	17.3%
Education Level		
Bachelor	128	32.0%
MBA	164	41.0%
MS	97	24.3%
PhD	11	2.8%
Experience Level		
0 – 5 years	105	26.3%
6 – 10	108	27.0%
11 – 15	151	37.8%
16 – Above	36	9.0%

Table 2 shows the expressive statistics and correlations results for the study variables. In the above table n = 400, M = (39.1, 20.31, 23.83), SD = (4.7, 3.4, 3.7). Furthermore, the table revealed that empowering leadership has affirmative relationship with Organizational Commitment ($r=.432, P <.01$) and Organizational performance ($r = .659, P <.01$). Organizational commitment has significant affirmative correlations with Organizational performance ($r = .566, P <.01$).

Table 2
Mean, Standard Deviation and Correlation

Variables	n	M	SD	1	2	3
Empowering Leadership	400	39.1	4.7	—		
Organizational Commitment	400	20.31	3.4	.432**	—	
Organizational Performance	400	23.83	3.7	.659**	.566**	—

* $P < .05$, ** $P < .01$, *** $P < .001$

Table 3 show the impact of empowering leadership, Organizational commitment on Organizational performance. The R^2 value of 32.6 revealed 36.6% variance in the outcome variable with $F(2, 397) = 96.185, P < .001$. From above findings it reveals that empowering leadership predicted Organizational

behavior ($\beta = .104, P < .001$) where's Organizational Commitment also significantly effects Organizational behavior ($\beta = .497, P < .001$). The overall regression coefficient results of empowering leadership and Organizational commitment shows affirmative impact on Organizational performance.

Table 3
Regression Coefficients of Empowering Leadership and Organizational Commitment on Organizational Performance

Variables	B	SE	t	P	95% CI
Constant	6.48	1.2	5.47	.000	[4.148, 8.798]
Empowering Leadership	.075	.075	1.90	.058	[.003, .153]
Organizational Commitment	.458	.050	9.08	.000	[.359, .557]

Note: CI = Confidence Interval

Table 4 shows the direct and indirect effect of empowering leadership on Organizational performance in presence of Organizational Commitment as a mediator. The statistical results revealed that there is a significant relationship between empowering leadership and Organizational performance in present of mediating role of Organizational Commitment. In statistical table 4, it

is clearly shown that indirect effect explains partial mediation of organization Commitment in the relationship between empowering leadership and Organizational performance. Therefore, the researcher considering the above statistical results claim that there is partial supporting of the 2nd hypotheses.

Table 4
Mediation Role of Organizational Commitment between Empowering Leadership and Organizational Performance

Direct Effect of Empowering Leadership on Organizational Performance						
	C.Effect	S.E	t	P	LLCI	ULCI
	11.3356	0.9242	12.2658	.0000	9.5188	13.1525
Indirect Effect of Empowering Leadership on Organizational Performance						
Mediator	C.Effect	S.E	t	P	LLCI	ULCI
Organizational Commitment	0.7785	0.0582	13.3789	.000	0.6641	0.8929

$N = 400, R^3 = .32, Bootstrap Number: 5000, CI: 95$

Discussion

The main aim of this research study were, to investigate the effects of empowering leadership on Organizational performance in presence of Organizational Commitment as mediator. empowering leadership, according to scholars, is a process of sharing power and assigning self-

sufficiency and accountabilities to subordinates, teams, or collectives through a specific set of leader behaviors for workers to improve inner inspiration and achieve work achievement (Rapp, 2005; Martinsen, 2014a). Because the concept of authorizing leadership has been developed in line with a stream of affirmative

scholarship (Fineman, 2006; Spreitzer, 1995; Doneson, 2005), the returns of empowering leadership are frequently claimed to be mostly helpful, caring, and righteous (Farh et al., 2011; Locke et al, 2006; Vecchio, et al., 2010). As a result, there is a growing interest among academics and physicians in the effectiveness of authorizing leadership, particularly in terms of its affirmative aspects (Tian, 2018).

Self-leadership has been categorized into three different strategies: behavior-focused, expected reward-focused, and positive thought design strategies (Manz, 1986). Self-leadership is typically seen as a set of strategies and skills through which people influence themselves toward higher levels of performance and effectiveness (Manz & Sims, 2001). Self-observation, self-goal setting, self-cueing, self-rewarding, and self-correcting feedback are examples of behavior-focused tactics to encourage constructive conduct and deter unconstructive behavior (Manz & Neck, 2004). Discovering and concentrating on the pleasurable and intrinsically motivating elements of jobs, looking for delightful pursuits, and engaging in job- or task-redesign are examples of natural reward systems (Houghton & Neck, 2002; Manz, 1986). Lastly, changing problematic thought patterns requires improving awareness of beliefs and assumptions, picturing effective performance, and using positive self-talk. Given the motivating, encouraging, and power-sharing components in Amundsen and Martinsen's (2014) conception, it makes sense to assume that EL has a good impact on job satisfaction, work effort, and innovation.

Accordingly, Vecchio et al. (2010) discovered that leaders who delegate authority to subordinates typically help those subordinates achieve higher levels of performance and job satisfaction. Likewise, supervisors that encourage employees to take initiative in their job are more likely to boost their productivity, creativity, well-being, and sense of fulfillment (Stone, Deci, & Ryan, 2009). The current study, found affirmative relationship between the study variables, the R² value explained 32.6 which means there were 32.6% variance in Organizational performance, because of the empowering leadership. While the rest 67.4% variance may occur because of the other than the

empowering leadership. The current study, found significant value of .000 for the study variables. Moreover, the study found that there was a mediating role of Organizational Commitment between empowering leadership and Organizational performance, the statistical results are clearly shown in table 4 of the analysis chapter. For the current study, the researcher was targeted a total of 400 respondents to the questionnaires. Among them, 263 were male participants and 137 were female participants. The study on hand, also asked the participants to mention about their educational level, experience level and even age level, the results statistically shown in table 1 of the current study.

CONCLUSION

In this study, we mainly aimed to see the role of empowering leadership toward organizational performance, in the presence of organizational commitment as mediating variable. The study, found that there was positive influence of empowering leadership toward organizational performance and organizational commitment mediates the relationship between the study variables.

Recommendations

The current study was conducted to know the relationship between empowering leadership and Organizational performance in the presence of Organizational Commitment as intervening variable. The study collected data from selected higher educational institutions operating in Kabul, Afghanistan. The current study suggests some recommendations for better Organizational change/performance and competitive advantages as followings;

As a part of leadership, the researcher through analysis and interpretations, confirms that higher educational institution needs to be carried and managed by leaders with high level qualities and different skills. The study observed that there is lack of leadership and they are not actively involved in the organizations success as needed. There is a general concept that everyone accepts, and that is types of authority or decision making style in an organization. The current study, strongly recommends decentralization approach during decision making. This approach were help employees 's motivation, onboarding and

facilitates team work that could lead to the more possible Organizational performance and achievements.

We believe, on proper Organizational structure, where authorities and responsibilities are clearly defined, the study reach to the point that most of the higher educational institution weren't carried by having proper Organizational structure, therefore the findings suggest that there must be a defined and proper Organizational structure that supports Organizational performance.

The current study used Organizational Commitment, to see how this variable were make affirmative intervention in an organization and specially to the Organizational performance. The study, accepts that Organizational Commitment is the most important part of the organization success and branding. Therefore, this is a strong recommendation, that top managerial, supervisors, head of the department and even a team leader must show steady Commitment, that could further influence Organizational Commitment as a whole.

The current study found, that most of the participants were not authorized even to participate in such studies. Therefore, this makes a bit harder for the researcher to find relevant data. It is a recommendation, that education sector should provide relevant data to facilitate the research. Because, these research than further helps the institutions to develop and reach to their pre-determined goals. Moreover, these higher institutions need to authorize of make their employees free for sharing at least the data which is supportive to the research process, that could further enhance the institutions statues and brandings.

Limitations and Future Direction

Like other research studies, the current study also has some limitation, that need to be addressed properly to support future researchers. These limitations are as followings;

The current study, targeted higher educational institution only, future researcher may consider other sectors than the education sector. And this could be possibly first limitation/gap for future researcher.

The current study, used empowering leadership only, future studies may investigate other types/style of leadership.

Future studies, may also add some more leadership styles and theories, to investigate their impact on other outcomes. Such as, motivational leadership, participative leadership.

Organizational performance was the only outcome, future studies may look financial performance, Organizational productivities, and even Organizational Commitment.

In the current study, the researcher used Organizational Commitment as mediating variable, in future the researchers may use some other variables to see its impact, for instance Organizational culture, managerial skills etc.

The sample size for the current study were 400 employees working in higher institutions, this number might increase in future studies.

The current study, conducted in Afghanistan based higher educational institutions, same model might be implemented in other geographical units and educational systems.

REFERENCES

- Agha, S., Alrubaiee, L., & Jamhour, M. (2012). Effect of core competence on competitive advantage and organizational performance. *International Journal of Business and management*, 7(1), 192. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v7n1p192>
- Ahearne, M., Mathieu, J., & Rapp, A. (2005). To empower or not to empower your sales force? An empirical examination of the influence of leadership empowerment behavior on customer satisfaction and performance. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 90(5), 945. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.945>
- Al Aina, R., & Atan, T. (2020). The impact of implementing talent management practices on sustainable organizational performance. *Sustainability*, 12(20), 8372. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12208372>
- Allen, D. G., Shore, L. M., & Griffeth, R. W. (2003). The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resource practices in the turnover process. *Journal of management*, 29(1), 99-118. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630302900107>
- Amundsen, S., & Martinsen, Ø. L. (2014). Empowering leadership: Construct clarification, conceptualization, and validation of a new scale. *The leadership*

- quarterly, 25(3), 487-511.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.009>
- Amundsen, S., & Martinsen, Ø. L. (2014). Self–other agreement in empowering leadership: Relationships with leader effectiveness and subordinates' job satisfaction and turnover intention. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(4), 784-800.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.04.007>
- Anwar, G., & Abdullah, N. N. (2021). The impact of Human resource management practice on Organizational performance. *International journal of Engineering, Business and Management (IJEEM)*, 5.
<https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijeem.5.1.4>
- Apuke, O. D. (2017). Quantitative research methods: A synopsis approach. *الكويت الفصول العربية اليومية من مراجعة الأعمال*, 33(5471), 1-8.
<http://doi:10.12816/0040336>
- Arif, S., & Akram, A. (2018). Transformational leadership and organizational performance: the mediating role of organizational innovation. *SEISENSE Journal of Management*, 1(3), 59-75.
<https://doi.org/10.33215/sjom.v1i3.28>
- Arnold, J. A., Arad, S., Rhoades, J. A., & Drasgow, F. (2000). The empowering leadership questionnaire: The construction and validation of a new scale for measuring leader behaviors. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 21(3), 249-269.
[https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1379\(200005\)21:3%3C249::AID-JOB10%3E3.0.CO;2-%23](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(200005)21:3%3C249::AID-JOB10%3E3.0.CO;2-%23)
- Arnold, J. A., Arad, S., Rhoades, J. A., & Drasgow, F. (2000). The empowering leadership questionnaire: The construction and validation of a new scale for measuring leader behaviors. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 21(3), 249-269.
[https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1379\(200005\)21:3%3C249::AID-JOB10%3E3.0.CO;2-%23](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(200005)21:3%3C249::AID-JOB10%3E3.0.CO;2-%23)
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 72(4), 441-462.
<https://doi.org/10.1348/096317999166789>
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 72(4), 441-462.
<https://doi.org/10.1348/096317999166789>
- Bartunek, J. M., & Spreitzer, G. M. (2006). The interdisciplinary career of a popular construct used in management: Empowerment in the late 20th century. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 15(3), 255-273.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492606291201>
- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European journal of work and organizational psychology*, 8(1), 9-32.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/135943299398410>
- Bhatti, S. H., Iqbal, K., Santoro, G., & Rizzato, F. (2022). The impact of corporate social responsibility directed toward employees on contextual performance in the banking sector: A serial model of perceived organizational support and affective organizational commitment. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 29(6), 1980-1994.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2295>
- Boyd, B. K., Gove, S., & Hitt, M. A. (2005). Construct measurement in strategic management research: illusion or reality?. *Strategic management journal*, 26(3), 239-257.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.444>
- Busenitz, L. W., & Barney, J. B. (1997). Differences between entrepreneurs and managers in large organizations: Biases and heuristics in strategic decision-making. *Journal of business venturing*, 12(1), 9-30.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026\(96\)00003-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(96)00003-1)
- Button, S. B., Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1996). Goal orientation in organizational research: A conceptual and empirical foundation. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 67(1), 26-48.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1996.0063>
- Byun, G., Lee, S., Karau, S. J., & Dai, Y. (2020). The trickle-down effect of empowering leadership: a boundary condition of performance pressure. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 41(3), 399-414. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-06-2019-0246>
- Carmeli, A., Schaubroeck, J., & Tishler, A. (2011). How CEO empowering leadership shapes top management team processes: Implications for firm performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(2), 399-411.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.02.013>

- Chughtai, A. A., & Zafar, S. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment among Pakistani university teachers. <http://hdl.handle.net/123456789/634>
- Cohen, A. (1991). Career stage as a moderator of the relationships between organizational commitment and its outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of occupational psychology*, 64(3), 253-268. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1991.tb00558.x>
- Cohen, A. (2007). Commitment before and after: An evaluation and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review*, 17(3), 336-354. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2007.05.001>
- Cohen, M. D. (1991). Individual learning and organizational routine: Emerging connections. *Organization science*, 2(1), 135-139. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2.1.135>
- Cooper-Hakim, A., & Viswesvaran, C. (2005). The construct of work commitment: Testing an integrative framework. *Psychological bulletin*, 131(2), 241. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0033-2909.131.2.241>
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of applied psychology*, 90(6), 1241. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1241>
- Dasborough, M. T., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2002). Emotion and attribution of intentionality in leader-member relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(5), 615-634. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(02\)00147-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00147-9)
- Ding, R., & Jia, Y. (2012). Auditor mergers, audit quality and audit fees: Evidence from the PricewaterhouseCoopers merger in the UK. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, 31(1), 69-85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaccpubpol.2011.08.002>
- Elenkov, D. S. (2002). Effects of leadership on organizational performance in Russian companies. *Journal of business research*, 55(6), 467-480. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(00\)00174-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(00)00174-0)
- Faulks, B., Song, Y., Waiganjo, M., Obrenovic, B., & Godinic, D. (2021). Impact of empowering leadership, innovative work, and organizational learning readiness on sustainable economic performance: an empirical study of companies in Russia during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Sustainability*, 13(22), 12465. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132212465>
- Feinberg, B. J., Ostroff, C., & Burke, W. W. (2005). The role of within-group agreement in understanding transformational leadership. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 78(3), 471-488. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317905X26156>
- Fernandez, S., & Moldogaziev, T. (2011). Empowering public sector employees to improve performance: Does it work?. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 41(1), 23-47. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074009355943>
- Foss, N. J. (2002). New organizational forms-Critical perspectives. *International Journal of the Economics of Business*, 9(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13571510110102949>
- Gandrita, D., Gandrita, A., & Rosado, D. P. (2022). Overcoming Remote Leadership Challenges: Lessons Learned from Covid-19. *Journal of Business and Management studies*, 4(4), 170-183. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jbms.2022.4.4.27>
- García-Morales, V. J., Lloréns-Montes, F. J., & Verdú-Jover, A. J. (2008). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational performance through knowledge and innovation. *British journal of management*, 19(4), 299-319. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2007.00547.x>
- García-Morales, V. J., Lloréns-Montes, F. J., & Verdú-Jover, A. J. (2008). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational performance through knowledge and innovation. *British journal of management*, 19(4), 299-319. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2007.00547.x>
- Gracia, F. J., Tomas, I., Martinez-Corcoles, M., & Peiro, J. M. (2020). Empowering leadership, mindful organizing and safety performance in a nuclear power plant: A multilevel structural equation model. *Safety Science*, 123, 104542. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2019.104542>
- Graham, K. A., Ziegert, J. C., & Capitano, J. (2015). The effect of leadership style, framing, and promotion regulatory focus on unethical pro-organizational behavior. *Journal of business ethics*, 126, 423-436. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1952-3>

- Guzeller, C. O., & Celiker, N. (2020). Examining the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intention via a meta-analysis. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 14(1), 102-120. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCTHR-05-2019-0094>
- Harris, A. (2007). Distributed leadership: Conceptual confusion and empirical reticence. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 10(3), 315-325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603120701257313>
- Hartmann, L. C., & Bambacas, M. (2000). Organizational commitment: A multi method scale analysis and test of effects. *The international Journal of organizational analysis*, 8(1), 89-108. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb028912>
- Hassan, S., Mahsud, R., Yukl, G., & Prussia, G. E. (2013). Ethical and empowering leadership and leader effectiveness. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 28(2), 133-146. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683941311300252>
- Hoang, G., Wilson-Evered, E., Lockstone-Binney, L., & Luu, T. T. (2021). Empowering leadership in hospitality and tourism management: a systematic literature review. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 33(12), 4182-4214. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-03-2021-0323>
- Hurduzeu, R. E. (2015). The impact of leadership on organizational performance. *SEA-Practical Application of Science*, 3(07), 289-293. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-14908-0_9
- Ilham, M. N., Indrawan, M. I., & Ritonga, H. M. (2022). An Effect of Job Characteristics and Interpersonal Relations Organizational Commitments in PT. AEP (Anglo Eastern Plantation) Ukindo Blankahan Estate. *International Journal of Economic, Technology and Social Sciences (Injects)*, 3(2), 178-185. <https://doi.org/10.53695/injects.v3i2.736>
- Judge, T. A., & Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. (2012). Job attitudes. *Annual review of psychology*, 63, 341-367. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100511>
- Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: a meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(3), 530. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.530>
- Keller, S., & Price, C. (2011). Beyond performance. *How Great Organizations Build Ultimate*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119202455>
- Kim, D., & Vandenberghe, C. (2021). Ethical leadership and organizational commitment: the dual perspective of social exchange and empowerment. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 42(6), 976-987. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-11-2020-0479>
- Koh, W. L., Steers, R. M., & Terborg, J. R. (1995). The effects of transformational leadership on teacher attitudes and student performance in Singapore. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 16(4), 319-333. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030160404>
- Koinig, I., & Diehl, S. (2021). Healthy leadership and workplace health promotion as a pre-requisite for organizational health. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 18(17), 9260. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18179260>
- Langfred, C. W., & Moye, N. A. (2004). Effects of task autonomy on performance: an extended model considering motivational, informational, and structural mechanisms. *Journal of applied psychology*, 89(6), 934. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.89.6.934>
- Lee, M. C., & Ding, A. Y. (2020). Comparing empowering, transformational, and transactional leadership on supervisory coaching and job performance: A multilevel perspective. *PsyCh journal*, 9(5), 668-681. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pchj.345>
- Lee, S. K. J., & Yu, K. (2004). Corporate culture and organizational performance. *Journal of managerial psychology*, 19(4), 340-359. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940410537927>
- M. Babić, V., D. Savović, S., & M. Domanović, V. (2014). Transformational leadership and post-acquisition performance in transitional economies. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 27(6), 856-876. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-02-2014-0028>
- Ma, E., Du, J., Xu, S. T., Wang, Y. C., & Lin, X. (2022). When proactive employees meet the autonomy of work—A moderated mediation model based on agency theory and job characteristics theory. *International journal of hospitality management*, 107, 103326. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2022.103326>
- Mai, N. K., Do, T. T., & Ho Nguyen, D. T. (2022). The impact of leadership competences, organizational learning and organizational

- innovation on business performance. *Business Process Management Journal*, 28(5/6), 1391-1411. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BPMJ-10-2021-0659>
- March, J. G., & Sutton, R. I. (1997). Crossroads—organizational performance as a dependent variable. *Organization science*, 8(6), 698-706. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.8.6.698>
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological bulletin*, 108(2), 171. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0033-2909.108.2.171>
- Mayer, R. E. (1997). Multimedia learning: Are we asking the right questions?. *Educational psychologist*, 32(1), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep3201_1
- Maynard, M. T., Mathieu, J. E., Gilson, L. L., O'Boyle Jr, E. H., & Cigularov, K. P. (2013). Drivers and outcomes of team psychological empowerment: A meta-analytic review and model test. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 3(2), 101-137. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386612456868>
- McEwan, T., Mullen, P. E., & Purcell, R. (2007). Identifying risk factors in stalking: A review of current research. *International journal of law and psychiatry*, 30(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2006.03.005>
- McGrath, R. G., & MacMillan, I. C. (2000). Assessing technology projects using real options reasoning. *Research-Technology Management*, 43(4), 35-49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08956308.2000.11671367>
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnysky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 61(1), 20-52. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842>
- Morrow, P. C. (2011). Managing organizational commitment: Insights from longitudinal research. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 79(1), 18-35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.12.008>
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 14(2), 224-247. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(79\)90072-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(79)90072-1)
- Nagel, J. J. (2010). Treatment of music performance anxiety via psychological approaches: A review of selected CBT and psychodynamic literature. *Medical problems of performing artists*, 25(4), 141-148. <https://doi.org/10.21091/mppa.2010.4031>
- Nesterkin, D. A. (2013). Organizational change and psychological reactance. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 26(3), 573-594. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09534811311328588>
- Oakland, J. S., & Oakland, S. (1998). The links between people management, customer satisfaction and business results. *Total Quality Management*, 9(4-5), 185-190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0954412988866>
- Para-González, L., Jiménez-Jiménez, D., & Martínez-Lorente, A. R. (2018). Exploring the mediating effects between transformational leadership and organizational performance. *Employee Relations*, 40(2), 412-432. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-10-2016-0190>
- Pradhan, R. K., Kumari, I. G., & Kumar, U. (2017). Human resource flexibility and organisational effectiveness: mediating role of organisational citizenship behaviour. *International Journal of Human Resources Development and Management*, 17(3-4), 282-300. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJHRDM.2017.087125>
- Prem, R., Ohly, S., Kubicek, B., & Korunka, C. (2017). Thriving on challenge stressors? Exploring time pressure and learning demands as antecedents of thriving at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(1), 108-123. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2115>
- Randall, D. M. (1990). The consequences of organizational commitment: Methodological investigation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11(5), 361-378. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030110504>
- Ridwan, M., Mulyani, S. R., & Ali, H. (2020). Improving employee performance through perceived organizational support, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*, 11(12). <https://www.sysrevpharm.org/abstract/improving-employee-performance-through-perceived-organizational-support-organizational-commitment-and-organizational-cit-67128.html>

- Riketta, M. (2002). Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 23(3), 257-266. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.141>
- Robert, C., Probst, T. M., Martocchio, J. J., Drasgow, F., & Lawler, J. J. (2000). Empowerment and continuous improvement in the United States, Mexico, Poland, and India: Predicting fit on the basis of the dimensions of power distance and individualism. *Journal of applied psychology*, 85(5), 643. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.85.5.643>
- Rollins, T. (1993). Two studies define link between corporate culture and business performance. *Employment Relations Today*, 20(2), 141-157. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ert.3910200202>
- Ryan, M. K., & Haslam, S. A. (2007). The glass cliff: Exploring the dynamics surrounding the appointment of women to precarious leadership positions. *Academy of management review*, 32(2), 549-572. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.24351856>
- Schwepker Jr, C. H. (2001). Ethical climate's relationship to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention in the salesforce. *Journal of business research*, 54(1), 39-52. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(00\)00125-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(00)00125-9)
- Seibert, S. E., Wang, G., & Courtright, S. H. (2011). Antecedents and consequences of psychological and team empowerment in organizations: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of applied psychology*, 96(5), 981. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022676>
- Sharma, P., & Sinha, V. (2015). The influence of occupational rank on organizational commitment of faculty members. *Management: Journal of Contemporary Management Issues*, 20(2), 71-91. <https://hrcak.srce.hr/150565>
- Silzer, R., & Church, A. H. (2009). The pearls and perils of identifying potential. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 2(4), 377-412. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2009.01163.x>
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human resource management review*, 12(2), 269-292. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(02\)00049-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00049-9)
- Srivastava, A., Bartol, K. M., & Locke, E. A. (2006). Empowering leadership in management teams: Effects on knowledge sharing, efficacy, and performance. *Academy of management journal*, 49(6), 1239-1251. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2006.23478718>
- Srivastava, A., Bartol, K. M., & Locke, E. A. (2006). Empowering leadership in management teams: Effects on knowledge sharing, efficacy, and performance. *Academy of management journal*, 49(6), 1239-1251. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2006.23478718>
- Swales, S. (2002). Organizational commitment: a critique of the construct and measures. *International journal of management reviews*, 4(2), 155-178. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2370.00082>
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic management journal*, 18(7), 509-533. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0266\(199708\)18:7%3C509::AID-SMJ882%3E3.0.CO;2-Z](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7%3C509::AID-SMJ882%3E3.0.CO;2-Z)
- Thomas, A. B. (1988). Does leadership make a difference to organizational performance?. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 388-400. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392715>
- Tung, H. L., & Chang, Y. H. (2011). Effects of empowering leadership on performance in management team: Mediating effects of knowledge sharing and team cohesion. *Journal of Chinese Human Resources Management*, 2(1), 43-60. <https://doi.org/10.1108/20408001111148720>
- Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity leadership theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *The leadership quarterly*, 18(4), 298-318. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.04.002>
- Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity leadership theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *The leadership quarterly*, 18(4), 298-318. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.04.002>
- van Assen, M. F. (2020). Empowering leadership and contextual ambidexterity—The mediating role of committed leadership for continuous improvement. *European Management*

- Journal*, 38(3), 435-449.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2019.12.002>
- Viswesvaran, C., Schmidt, F. L., & Ones, D. S. (2005). Is there a general factor in ratings of job performance? A meta-analytic framework for disentangling substantive and error influences. *Journal of applied psychology*, 90(1), 108.
<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.90.1.108>
- Walumbwa, F. O., Wang, P., Lawler, J. J., & Shi, K. (2004). The role of collective efficacy in the relations between transformational leadership and work outcomes. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 77(4), 515-530.
<https://doi.org/10.1348/0963179042596441>
- Wei, F., Li, Y., Zhang, Y., & Liu, S. (2018). The interactive effect of authentic leadership and leader competency on followers' job performance: The mediating role of work engagement. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 153(3), 763-773.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3379-0>
- Wong Humborstad, S., GL Nerstad, C., & Dysvik, A. (2014). Empowering leadership, employee goal orientations and work performance: A competing hypothesis approach. *Personnel Review*, 43(2), 246-271.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-01-2012-0008>
- Yousef, D. A. (2000). Organizational commitment: a mediator of the relationships of leadership behavior with job satisfaction and performance in a non-western country. *Journal of managerial Psychology*, 15(1), 6-24.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940010305270>
- Yukl, G., Gordon, A., & Taber, T. (2002). A hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behavior: Integrating a half century of behavior research. *Journal of leadership & organizational studies*, 9(1), 15-32.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/107179190200900102>
- Zajac, E. J. (1990). CEO selection, succession, compensation and firm performance: A theoretical integration and empirical analysis. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11(3), 217-230.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250110304>
- Zhang, X., & Bartol, K. M. (2010). Linking empowering leadership and employee creativity: The influence of psychological empowerment, intrinsic motivation, and creative process engagement. *Academy of management journal*, 53(1), 107-128.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.48037118>
- Zhang, X., & Bartol, K. M. (2010). The influence of creative process engagement on employee creative performance and overall job performance: A curvilinear assessment. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 95(5), 862.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020173>
- Zhang, Y., & Rajagopalan, N. (2010). Once an outsider, always an outsider? CEO origin, strategic change, and firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 31(3), 334-346.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.812>
- Zhao, F., Hu, W., Ahmed, F., & Huang, H. (2023). Impact of ambidextrous human resource practices on employee innovation performance: the roles of inclusive leadership and psychological safety. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 26(5), 1444-1470. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-04-2021-0226>