

Empowered Leadership Influences Employee Motivation, Encourages Positive Behaviors, Lessens Emotional Exhaustion and Reduces the Likelihood of Turnover

Dr. John Motsamai Modise
South African Police Service

Abstract:- This article argues that through autonomous motivation, empowered leadership will lead to good behaviors, reduced emotional tiredness, and decreased turnover intention, and that personality variables in subordinates will regulate these correlations. The effects of perceived general self-efficacy and proactive personality in individuals are also studied in this study, as well as any potential relationships between empowering leadership and the aforementioned outcomes. What effects does a leader's facilitation have on employees' motivation, extracurricular activities, and general well-being. To support the performance of effective organizations and prevent unfavorable organizational outcomes, managers and executives can balance their authority and empowerment behaviors. To do this, they can use the investigation of this relationship to help businesses understand both the benefits and drawbacks of empowering leadership. The self-determination theory and social cognitive theory are both used in this study. The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of both enabling and burdening empowering leadership on employee motivation, extra-role behaviors, and well-being while accounting for individual characteristics such as employee general self-efficacy and proactive personality. Empowering leadership is connected with a range of positive organizational outcomes as well as positive individual outcomes for employees. Empowering leadership may increase employees' autonomy and responsibility, which may reduce both the company's and the employee's productivity. Empowerment, in the opinion of Forrester (2000) and Spreitzer (1995, 1996), should enable workers to reach their full potential, increase their motivation, make them more adaptive and responsive to their surroundings, and lessen the bureaucratic barriers that prevent response. The benefits of empowerment are unfortunately not always felt, and the challenges appear to be more the product of implementation mistakes than design problems (Ford & Fottler, 1995).

Keywords:- Leadership, Empowerment, Empowering Leadership, Leadership Constructs, Leadership behavior, Organizational performance, Citizenship.

I. INTRODUCTION

Organizations are constantly enhancing their processes to become more effective and efficient as well as to boost revenues while lowering expenses in today's corporate environment, which is becoming more complicated and cognitively demanding. To effectively develop and manage crucial firm resources, the strategic management literature emphasizes the importance of leadership at all levels of an organization. It also contends that those firms with the most distinctive and valuable resources will succeed more (Hitt & Ireland, 2002). Several studies (Hitt & Duane, 2002; Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine & Bachrach, 2000), argue that a company's human capital has been identified as a special and valuable resource for predicting positive organizational outcomes, particularly through improved employee performance and organizational citizenship behaviors.

According to Sims, Faraj, and Yun (2009), the typical impression of leadership is that it entails a powerful individual instructing and leading subordinates to accomplish a shared organizational purpose. However, empowering leadership entails eschewing a conventional hierarchical organizational structure by giving employees more autonomy and decision-making power. This increases their responsibility, self-efficacy, and risk-taking behaviors, which in turn improves performance (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Lee, Cheong, Kim & Yun, 2017). It has been demonstrated to be associated with a variety of positive organizational outcomes, including enhanced creativity (Zhang & Bartol, 2010) and intrinsic motivation (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990), improved employee performance, increased job satisfaction (Vecchio, Justin & Pearce, 2010), affective commitment, as well as a decrease in turnover intention (Dewettinck & Ameijde, 2011), empowering leadership has attracted more attention in research and practical settings.

These results suggest that leadership style and the relationship between leaders and subordinates can affect how much employees identify with and are willing to stay with their organization, as well as how satisfied they are with their jobs. All of these factors have a positive impact on the success of the organization. Citizenship encourages working group members to cooperate and interact socially, for example by being polite and assisting with work-related problems (Organ, 1988). There are two main sorts of pressure sources, challenge and impediment, and employees'

cognition and emotion differ under different pressure sources, which may have varied consequences on employees' behavioral reactions. Empowering leadership is a significant stressor. Through authorization, managers hope to see improvements in their staff members' self-management and self-leadership skills. As a result, leaders who are empowered and who exhibit power-sharing have drawn a lot of interest in theory and practice (Dong, Liao, Chuang, & Zhou, 2015; Hill & Bartol, 2016).

Many businesses have switched out their old hierarchical management structures with empowered (semi-autonomous or self-managing) work teams to increase the overall flexibility and efficiency of their operations. Teams with more power now handle tasks that used to be handled by managers, such as planning and controlling work. To lead these teams, the remaining managers have been required to assume a new set of tasks and duties (Manz and Sims, 1987; Lawler, 1986, 1992; Drucker, 1983). However, despite empowered teams' present popularity and extensive use, there is no empirical study that looks at the abilities required to lead them successfully. Employees will view it as a challenge stress when they are more aware that empowering leadership involves giving employees authority, opportunity, and power to participate in decision-making. This is done to inspire employee creativity, subjective initiative, and intrinsic motivation.

If a person believes that something is simple to overcome by working hard, pressure will be viewed as motivation and have a good impact on their growth and performance at work. The pressures that are seen as challenges affect employees favorably while causing stress. Employees who have enough interpersonal resources can handle obstacles better. By allocating resources, assisting in coordination, and adjusting to shifting objectives and needs, these acts boost organizational performance and productivity (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). According to a meta-analysis, citizenship effectively encourages and enhances performance at the organizational and unit levels (Podsakoff et al., 2009). Additionally, employees' citizenship has an impact on their performance ratings (Lam, Hui, & Law, 1999), as they think that these actions make the manager think favorably of them and have an impact on the award proposal (Allen & Rush, 1998; Kiker & Motowidlo, 1999).

The structure and procedures of traditional organizations and those of empowered or at organizations are in stark contrast. According to Manz and Sims (1987), the traditional organization is characterized by a hierarchical structure, centralized decision-making, and a top-down control ideology. The duties of managers and employees are clearly defined in this setting. Workers are in charge of completing the tasks that management has given them. In turn, managers are in charge of outlining and organizing the work of staff members, making crucial choices, awarding praise, and instructing staff on what to do (Lawler, 1986, 1988, Manz and Sims, 1987). Since the earliest organizational theorists, this structure and the related functions of managers and employees have come to represent organizations.

Different demands for both employees and management in these businesses have been brought on by the present emphasis on teams, and especially on empowered teams. Employees in empowered teams gradually get more freedom, discretion, and control over their working environment. Some teams are even in charge of hiring and firing staff members, procuring supplies, setting work schedules and vacations, and deciding salary raises (Lawler, 1986; Liden and Tewksbury, 1995). On the other side, managers must encourage self-management, empower teams, and provide support. Additionally, managers may be expected to set a good example, encourage social and emotional growth, foster openness and trust, promote self-reinforcement, provide resources and information to complete tasks, support the setting of personal goals, and communicate a clear vision (Bennis and Nanus, 1985).

Based on such a revolution, the beginning of empowered leadership appears to be a higher categorization of pioneers. The beginning of empowered leadership was anticipated in the 1990s. (Manz, & Sims, 1989) claim that the idea of "super leadership" was the inspiration behind empowering leadership. After extending the theory of leadership to include transformational, transactional, instrumental, and empowerment leadership using Exploring Factor Analysis (EFA) (Pearce, et al. 2003), Pearce proposed the idea of the four-factor theory. Additionally, using the tertiary trial and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), he demonstrated the aforementioned appropriateness. As a result, an autonomous style of leadership may not be able to achieve empowerment leadership.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A. Psychological Motivation Perspective

Power is a notion that can reflect social concepts, according to the social exchange theory. It depicts the asymmetric control of resources and the interdependent social function in the context of a specific scenario and social interactions (Magee et al., 2008: 111–127). According to this definition, having power means being able to dominate others and act independently to accomplish one's objectives. Power serves as a means of control. Those in positions of authority can influence others to work toward their objectives. In other words, power is the capacity that is unaffected by external factors.

A person will be largely free without power but will be subject to others. A person's capacity to offer the company useful resources can be a source of power. His position within the organizational hierarchy, his professional abilities, and his access to certain expertise or information are other possible contributing factors. From this vantage point, resource allocation strategies like empowerment can help to lessen reliance on high power. Decentralization, involvement, knowledge sharing, and training are just a few of the management techniques that make up the empowerment leadership behavior. (2010) Hakimi, et al. McClelland, 1975).

B. Measurement and Construction

Scholars have discussed the structure and measurement method of empowered leadership from two different theoretical views. Thomas presented a cognitive model made up of a sense of meaning, a sense of competency, a sense of autonomy, and a sense of influence from the perspective of psychological empowerment (Thomas and Velthouse, 1990). Spreitzer created a multidimensional scale of psychological empowerment based on this approach (Spreitzer, 1995).

With the use of the two-order confirmatory factor analysis, he also verified the reliability of this four-dimension scale. Through two questionnaire surveys of 23 enterprises, Li Chaoping et al. used an empirical study approach to confirm the application of Spreitzer's psychological empowerment scale to the context of Chinese culture (Thomas, and Tymon, 1994).

Using this measure, he looked at the effect of empowerment on employee attitude. Based on Hui and Thomas' empirical research (Arnold, Arad, Rhoades, and Drasgow, 2000) and Conger's qualitative study (Conger, and Kanungo, 1988), Ahearne separated empowerment leadership behavior into four categories and created an empowerment leadership scale. With an internal consistency coefficient of 0.88, the scale has a good degree of reliability.

III. DEFINING EMPOWERING LEADERSHIP

Leadership styles have changed to become more moral and people-centered, with a focus on the welfare of employees, to meet the demands and responsibilities of today's fast-paced and constantly changing workplace (Sharma & Kirkman, 2015; Van Dierendonck, 2011). This is consistent with the growing body of research on positive organizational behavior, which holds that firms will be more successful if their employees are more interested in their work and workplace (Van Dierendonck, 2011).

The definition of empowering leadership given by Zhang & and Bartol (2010) is "the way on the way to objectifying circumstances that authorize offering dimensions on the way to a worker using showing the implication of the operative's action, giving further prominent basic leadership self-rule, collaborating belief in the worker's capabilities, in addition emptying interruptions to performance." Instead of exercising parallel control, empowerment leadership highlighted the technique of the subordinates' self-impact. Employees may concentrate on the characteristics of enabling leaders who are more self-directed and who provide more possibilities for performance (i.e., challenge stressors), as well as on the characteristics of empowering leaders who are more strict and accountable (i.e., hindrance stressors). These shifts in attention affect how empowering leaders are perceived over time, which in turn affects the subsequent behaviors (such as rudeness and good citizenship).

Particularly, leadership and the relationship between a leader and a follower are now understood to be crucial elements in boosting employee engagement and organizational success. Additionally, firms are increasingly

adopting a self-managed team structure in which leadership and responsibility are distributed among several individuals (Lord et al., 2001). This served as the basis for the definition of empowering leadership since it shows how this management approach encourages employee autonomy and self-leadership skills (Vecchio, Justin, & Pearce, 2010).

According to academics, empowering leadership is the process of giving followers more authority, autonomy, and responsibility to improve followers' internal motivation and increase organizational success (Ahearne, Mathieu & Rapp, 2005; Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014; Sharma & Kirkman, 2015; Sims, Faraj & Yun, 2009). According to Amundsen and Martinsen (2014), empowering leadership involves delegating authority from top management to staff members, giving them the freedom and power to decide on routine tasks while allowing upper management to concentrate on more crucial tasks.

According to some researchers, leaders need to embrace empowering behaviors because their jobs are getting harder and more demanding and it is not realistic nor practical for them to make every decision on their own (Sharma & Kirkman, 2015). Additionally, it has been demonstrated that firms using empowering efforts outperform those using more conventional hierarchical systems.

Accordingly, a leader who supports the growth of self-management and self-leadership skills in followers by giving them the same kind of power as the leader is referred to as an empowering leader (Pearce et al., 2003; Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014). An empowering leader will involve subordinates in decision-making, stress the importance of their work, show trust in their ability to complete duties and do everything in their power to reduce bureaucracy at work (Zhang & Bartol, 2010). This entails encouraging initiative and open communication among staff members, both of which have been connected to advances in individual performance (Chowhan, 2016).

To affect the aforementioned results, empowered leadership may do so through a variety of techniques, according to scholars. These include autonomy (Hocine and Zhang, 2014), psychological empowerment (Dewettinck & Ameijde, 2011), intrinsic motivation (Zhang & Bartol, 2010), self-efficacy and psychological ownership (Kim & Beehr, 2017), employee resistance (Vecchio, Justin & Pearce, 2010), job satisfaction (Salam, Cox & Sims, 1996), knowledge-sharing and team efficacy (Srivastava, Bartol & Lock), creativity and intrinsic motivation (Zhang & Bartol, 2010), top management team behavioral integration and potency (Carmeli, Schaubroeck & Tishler, 2011), working conditions in the form of cognitive resources and demands (Tuckey, Bakker & Dollard, 2012), self-awareness (Tekleab, Sims, Yun, Tesluk & Cox, 2008), passion (Hao, He & Long, 2018), job crafting (Kim & Beehr, 2017), and leader-member exchange (Lee, Willis & Tian, 2007).

Motivating leaders will also help their followers develop their leadership abilities by teaching them new skills and giving them more freedom and responsibility. The social cognitive theory of Bandura (1986), which describes how a person's behavior affects the environment they are in and then changes that person's behavior through observation (as mentioned in Pearce et al., 2003), can be used to generalize learning. According to the study, in the event of enabling leaders, their subordinates will imitate the self-leadership and autonomous behaviors they exhibit. As a result, an empowering organizational culture will be created as a result of the empowering leader's action which will then impact employee self-leadership behavior. Employees will be able to broaden their roles by taking on a variety of activities thanks to these self-leadership abilities and enhanced autonomy, which will show their superiors how skilled and competent they are at their jobs. According to some academics (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Bandura, 1977, as quoted in Thomas & Velthouse, 1990), empowerment can boost workers' self-efficacy. As a result, subordinates will be able to feel that they can complete their responsibilities successfully, which will enhance their cognitive abilities and professional competencies and ultimately improve their job performance.

IV. WORKPLACE LEADERSHIP EMPOWERMENT AND ITS BENEFITS

Several researchers (Chebat & Kollias, 2000; Conger, 1989; Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Hartline & Ferrell, 1996; Hui, 1994; Spreitzer, 1995, 1996; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990) have established and advanced the idea of empowerment. Empowerment has been highlighted as a concept that merits more exploration after previous studies showed that it is a key factor in organizational effectiveness (Kanter, 1989; Spreitzer, 1995; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). There are two ideas on empowerment in the literature. One approach defines empowerment as "a practice, or set of practices, involving the delegation of responsibility down the hierarchy to give employees increased decision-making authority concerning the execution of their primary work tasks" (Leach, Wall, & Jackson, 2003: 28). This definition places empowerment within the organizational context.

Based on employees' feelings of (a) significance, (b) competence, (c) self-determination, and (d) influence, a second approach views empowerment as a four-dimensional psychological state (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Spreitzer, 1995, 1996; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). The two techniques were delineated by Leach et al. (2003), who also made the case that the second approach is a natural outgrowth of an essential companion to situational empowerment (Liden & Tewksbury, 1995). Leach et al. (2003: 28) investigated how the "central aspect of psychological empowerment... namely self-efficacy" mediates the effects of the situational view of empowerment on employee outcomes when combined with other variables. In this study, we follow a similar methodology and investigate how LEB affects employee effectiveness as mediated by self-efficacy and employee adaptability.

According to Arnold, Arad, Rhoades, and Drasgow (2000), leadership empowerment behavior (hereinafter referred to as LEB) entails the process of putting in place circumstances that increase employees' feelings of self-efficacy and control (for example, participatory decision-making), eliminating circumstances that foster a sense of powerlessness (for example, bureaucracy), and giving them the freedom to be as flexible as the situation warrants. More specifically, we contend that LEB involves leader behaviors that are in line with the four components mentioned above, building on the work of Conger and Kanungo (1988) and Hui (1994).

It is reasonable to state that "leaders appear to be a forgotten group" (Druskat & Wheeler, 2003) given the recent trend toward more flexible and empowering organizational designs. However, successful leadership is a key factor in empowered businesses' performance (Druskat & Wheeler, 2003; Manz & Sims, 1984). The important thing to remember is that good leadership takes on a different form in empowered environments than it does in more conventional ones.

However, empowering leadership might not always be advantageous. According to some academics, excessive empowerment, particularly if it is unchecked, can lead to deviant behavior or have negative effects on both the employees and the organization in which they work (Forrester, 2000; Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Kim & Beehr, 2017). Researchers have proposed a curvilinear relationship between empowering leadership and employee outcomes as a result of other research showing that employee empowerment has erratic impacts on workers (Forrester, 2000; Lee, Cheong, Kim & Yun, 2017).

In 2016, Cheong, Spain, Yammarino, and Yun proposed this as a burdening effect of empowering leadership, whereby empowerment entails some loss of control by the leader, and if it continues in an unregulated manner, it could result in role ambiguity or ignorance toward the task performance of the employee, leading to detrimental overconfidence and a reduction in efficiency. Employee burnout (Kim & Stoner, 2008) and emotional exhaustion (Rizzo, House & Lirtzman, 1970) have both been connected to increased turnover intention and absenteeism, and these demanding working conditions have also been proven to be a prelude to both. Further, according to Cheong and colleagues (2016), ignoring both enabling and burdening aspects would lead to an incomplete understanding of empowering leadership and its effects. For this reason, it is crucial for research and practice to determine when an empowering leader's behavior is seen as burdensome or enabling.

However, employee performance has been the primary focus of research on the burdensome component of empowering leadership, thus this study aims to add to the body of knowledge by looking at its implications on other employee outcomes. Although empowering leadership can have both positive and negative effects on employee outcomes at work (Cheong et al., 2016; Kim & Beehr, 2017), research to date has not directly examined these effects on

employee motivation, extra-role performance, and well-being (or ill-being).

The methods through which empowering leadership is supposed to have these conflicting impacts are also poorly understood. This study posits that these impacts occur through employees' work motivation and tries to explore the consequences that empowering leadership has on extra-role performance, employee well-being, and turnover intention. The self-determination theory of motivation, which is used in this study, emphasizes the importance of autonomy in creating the best kind of motivation—autonomous motivation—Baard, Deci, and Ryan (2004). The perfect degree of autonomy and direction will benefit the workers in a properly managed empowering work environment, enabling them to perform to the best of their abilities while still adhering to the parameters of their job tasks.

V. DISTINGUISHING EMPOWERING LEADERSHIP FROM RELATED APPROACHES

Theoretically and empirically, empowering leadership can be separated from other leadership philosophies. Pearce and colleagues (2003) claimed that there are four different forms of leadership: directive, transactional, transformational, and empowering, based on a meta-analytic examination of the literature on leadership. The directive leader will largely influence subordinates by intimidation and command. Directive leadership is a top-down leadership style that is founded in bureaucracy and that is built on legitimate and coercive power. The transactional-transformational paradigm that has historically characterized the leadership literature is congruent with transactional leadership since it depends on an effort-reward exchange between the leader and followers (Pearce et al., 2003; Sims, Faraj, & Yun, 2009).

This is another example of top-down leadership where employees perform their duties in return for rewards. Transformational leaders, like developmental leaders, seek to enthuse people by displaying charismatic conduct and communicating ideological ideals (Pearce et al., 2003; Choi, Goh, Adam & Tan, 2016). A leader who empowers followers, on the other hand, concentrates on fostering initiative, self-management, and self-leadership in them by giving them more freedom, accountability, self-assurance, and development chances. The meta-analysis by Pearce and colleagues (2003) recommends empowering leadership as a new kind of leadership from the traditional transactional-transformational paradigm.

Empowering leadership can be separated from other encouraging and uplifting leadership ideologies like servant leadership, participative leadership, and leader-member exchange (LMX). A servant leader puts the needs of their followers first and seeks to provide possibilities for those followers to advance within the company (Dierendonck, 2011). Servant leaders, in essence, put the needs of their team members above their own (Liden, Wayne, Meuser, Hu, Wu, & Liao, 2015). Even though servant leaders give their team members authority, this part of their leadership approach is not their top priority.

Instead of necessarily providing opportunities for followers to progress, giving followers the flexibility and responsibility to complete their responsibilities as they see fit and to create their opportunities within the company will empower leaders. Because workers will be able to see themselves as leaders, the outdated organizational structure will be abolished. Participative leadership, which aims to involve subordinates in decision-making processes, and leader-member exchange (LMX), which focuses primarily on the unique two-way interaction between leader and subordinate, are both distinct from empowering leadership (Sharma & Kirkman, 2015).

Participatory leadership has been positively correlated with involvement, adaptability, and psychological empowerment, which includes sentiments of intrinsic motivation, self-determination, and self-efficacy (Bell, Chan, & Nel, 2014). Motivating leaders will allow their followers the freedom to make their own decisions and will involve them in the decision-making process. A positive, trusting relationship between the leader and the subordinate is often fostered by this technique, which also tends to increase subordinate confidence. Participative leadership and LMX are both parts of the greater notion of empowering leadership.

VI. THE IMPACT OF WORKER READINESS

According to Armenakis, Harris, and Feild (1999), readiness is arguably one of the most crucial components in employees' initial support for change projects. Although Jacobson (1957) may have been the first to develop the idea of readiness, the basis for readiness as a distinct construct has been included in several theoretical models of how change occurs.

Van de Ven and Poole (1995) combined theories of change from many academic fields, providing researchers, managers, and organizational development specialists with a theoretical framework for comprehending the phenomenon. To achieve predetermined objectives, organizational leaders frequently implement deliberate, system-wide changes (referred to as teleological change by Van de Ven & Poole, 1995). Differences and disagreements between the organizational leaders and members could arise as these deliberate changes are implemented, though. Conflicts must be settled so that organizational members' views and cognitions coincide with those of the leaders for change to happen in the direction that leadership wishes (Van de Ven & Poole, 1995; they refer to this process as dialectical transformation). A state of readiness needs to be established.

It follows that it is not surprising that several instruments have been created to serve this function, as well as that the assessment of readiness before the introduction of change has been advocated (Cunningham et al., 2002; Jones, Jimmieson, & Griffiths, 2005; Weeks, Roberts, Chonko, & Jones, 2004). According to Holt, Armenakis, Harris, and Feild (in press), these tools now in use appear to gauge preparedness from a variety of angles, including change process, change content, change context, and individual qualities. The actions used to effect the change are referred to as the change process.

The level of employee participation is one aspect of the change process that might be considered. The organizational change content, which refers to the specific endeavor being introduced (and its features), is a second viewpoint. Usually, content is focused on the organizational qualities that are administrative, procedural, technological, or structural. The context within the organization is the third viewpoint. The circumstances and setting in which employees work make up the context. Employees in a learning business, for instance, are more willing to accept ongoing change. The characteristics of each employee individually represent the fourth and final perspective. Some employees may be more likely to support organizational changes than others due to individual characteristics.

We've assumed that empowerment will benefit everyone up to this point. However, some scholars contend that attempts to give employees more autonomy do not always pay off and sometimes even backfire (Forrester, 2000; Randolph & Sashkin, 2002). So, the question of "Who Benefits from Empowerment?" is in question. We contend that a key moderator of the effects of leader behaviors will be the degree to which employees are prepared to accept and exercise the freedoms provided by empowerment.

We consider employee readiness as a multidimensional composite variable—what Edward (2001) referred to as an aggregate multidimensional construct—arising from the convergence of salespeople's product knowledge, their tenure in the field, and their tenure with the current employer, in line with the conceptions of experience advanced by several authors (Quinones, Ford, & Teachout, 1995; Tesluk & Jacobs, 1998).

The logic is that to the extent employees possess an array of attributes that enable them to be successful in an empowered environment, they will respond more positively to L. According to this logic, employees will react more favorably to LEB if they have a variety of traits that allow them to succeed in an atmosphere where they have more control. In light of this, we define employee empowerment readiness as the degree to which employees have a variety of task-relevant knowledge and expertise that will enable them to take advantage of and succeed in an empowered workplace.

In light of this, we define employee empowerment readiness as the degree to which employees have a variety of task-relevant knowledge and expertise that will enable them to take advantage of and succeed in an empowered workplace. Self-efficacy levels are more likely to be higher in people with a wealth of prior relevant job experience than in people with less relevant experience (Bandura, 1997; Chen & Klimoski, 2003; Gist & Mitchell, 1992). Higher levels of relevant information will provide people with more resources to draw from and allow them to report higher levels of efficacy (Phillips & Gully, 1997).

Similarly, more relevant work experience and knowledge have been linked favorably to individuals' performance adaptability (Pulakos, Arad, Donovan, & Plamondon, 2000; Leach et al., 2003; LePine, Colquitt,

& Erez, 2000). As a result, we put out the following two theories.

VII. WORKPLACE SELF-EFFICIENCY OF LEADERS AND PROACTIVE FOLLOWERS

According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy is the belief that a person has in their capacity to complete activities successfully and effectively. However, a lot of scholars have claimed that this definition is too limited and has given the construct an overly restricted focus. This has led to more studies and the establishment of a distinction between task-specific and generic self-efficacy (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001). The general self-efficacy construct is more inclusive and takes into account a person's success in a range of circumstances and tasks.

While task-specific self-efficacy is viewed as a motivating condition, general self-efficacy is perceived more as a motivational trait. To understand how individual attribute differences affect the perception of empowering leaders on a variety of subordinate outcomes, general self-efficacy will be explored in this study. According to Langfred and Moye (2004), employees who have high levels of self-efficacy may desire greater autonomy than employees who have low levels of self-efficacy, suggesting that these people might gain from having an empowering leader and be shielded from the burdensome effects that such leaders might have.

As opposed to passive followers, proactive followers tend to influence their environment to guarantee that their objectives are met (Bateman & Crant, 1993). To reduce the potential demands on their psychological resources, employees with proactive personalities may be more proactive in controlling the conduct of their boss (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Self-efficacy and an assertive attitude may therefore be crucial factors in determining whether an employee perceives an empowering boss as enabling or burdensome.

VIII. EMPOWERMENT, EMPOWERING LEADERSHIP, AND THE FIVE STAGE PROCESS OF EMPOWERMENT

Empowerment: According to Bass and Riggio (2006), empowerment has become a popular topic of study in recent years. Although other authors have defined the appearance of empowerment as an example of empowering others, Menon (2001) goes on to define this concept as the internal processes of the employee being engaged. It has also been called a comprehensive and motivational methodology (Tuckey et al., 2012) that consists of different activities designed to share information, rewards, resources, and authority with subordinate staff (Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2015).

It is common knowledge in the literature that employees who are psychologically empowered are characterized as such. According to Thomas and Velthouse (1990), this is defined by an inherent motivation that is expressed in four sensitivities: competence, meaning, self-determination, and effect. The mistrust of empowerment as

it relates to notions of participatory management and employee associations is addressed by Spreitzer, Kizilos, and Nason (1997). Employee empowerment, from a managerial perspective, is a relational structure that outlines how managers distribute information, authority, and resources to those who require them (Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2015).

Process of empowerment in five stages: As soon as dependents feel helpless, the need to empower them becomes risky. Due to this, it is crucial to identify internal organizational circumstances that replace knowledge of dependency among dependents. When these situations are identified, empowering strategies and diplomacies can be employed to end them.

However, changing external circumstances is not always feasible, and it might not be acceptable for dependents to gain power without the methods and diplomacy that directly result in personal effectiveness evidence for them. Many of the elements endorsed by Bandura and Gervone (1986) as how individuals learn about their efficacy should be applied while creating empowerment strategies. This method states that empowerment may be shown to grow in five stages, which include the psychological context of empowerment understanding, its predicament context, and its behavioral implications.

Stage 1 identifies the five primary stages. The development of conditions within the organization that is formally in charge of methods of dependant incapacity can be found in the very early stages. Stage 2 results in managers using empowerment strategies. Stage 3 entails putting these techniques to use to give subordinates information about their self-efficacy, as well as to lessen some of the external causes of their inability. After hearing such knowledge, subordinates become aware of their empowerment in Stage 4, and then in Stage 5, they begin to perceive their empowerment in terms of their behavior.

Superior politeness is a key component of empowering leadership, which has been defined in management literature. Empowering leadership is still recognized as the most effective way to give executive staff self-sufficiency today (Lawler et al., 2001; Chamberlin et al., 2018). The original opinion of consultants was that empowered leadership positively contributes to the inventiveness of the workforce by fostering a sense of individuality among employees (Chow, 2018). Workers who want to empower leadership must share information as well as seek it out (Bunderson & Sutcliffe, 2003; Mathieu et al., 2017). Giving employees more autonomy is, in essence, what empowerment in leadership refers to (Bass & Riggio, 2006). In addition, empowering pioneers encourage people to take an interest in fundamental leadership (Tuckey et al., 2012), assign tasks to others (Bass & Riggio, 2006), and encourage coworkers to work together and autonomously without being given specific instructions.

According to Menon (2001), the achievement of organizational objectives is necessary for the effective empowerment of followers. Therefore, if employees and the

organization have different aims, empowering supporters may not be beneficial (Bass & Riggio, 2006). For example, Amundsen and Martinsen (2014), Sharma and Kirkman (2015), Sims Jr, Faraj, and Yun (2009), Str, Arnold, Arad, Rhoades, and Drasgow (2000), and Sharma and Kirkman (2015) all demonstrated the idea of empowerment leadership as per the method of supremacy allocation, passing on self-sufficiency and dedication to followers, accumulations through specific leader activities aimed at personnel on the way to intensify internal enthusiasm while also building employment development.

Excessive dependable leadership (Bowers & Seashore, 1966), job training, and employing techniques stumped in conceptual theories like situational leadership theory (Hersey, Blanchard, & Natemeyer, 1979), participative leadership theory (Locke & Schweiger, 1979), super leadership theory (Manz & Sims Jr., 1990), and individualized leadership theory explain continuous expansion planned for the initiative regarding empowerment leadership.

By Conger & Kanungo (1988) and Thomas & Velthouse (1990), employee empowerment is regarded as the "sharing of power" that is insufficient and must incorporate the motivating effect of empowerment on followers. According to Tuckey et al. (2012), empowering leadership may result in higher psychological labor demands. They explain that this is a result of the followers receiving more responsibility and training in critical thinking from the empowered pioneer. Additionally, they discovered that empowered leaders boosted activity resources for employees and that the combination of higher expectations and resources increased workers' dedication to their jobs.

Based on this, it is feasible that empowered leadership triggers a process that may convert stress into vigor and passion for the job (Tuckey et al., 2012). According to Tuckey et al. (2012), the goal of empowering leadership is to develop employees' capacities for self-leading. They claim this is accomplished by giving them the chance to adjust to new things, which also helps them develop their skills and abilities and take on new responsibilities. In light of how academics perceive leadership in the workplace, empowering leadership is thus viewed as a distinctive leadership style that may be suitable for the academic environment.

IX. TWO PRINCIPALS FOR EMPOWERING LEADERSHIP

A. *Social Relationships as a Viewpoint*

The managerial observers inspired by a collective affiliation or socio-structure lookout where a leader's empowering acts carry out significant effort are the subject of the social connection perspective (Arnold et al., 2000; Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Manz & Sims Jr., 1990; Strauss, 1964). For this reason, scientists considered the leader's clever acts, level of leadership empowerment, and discrimination as extra-related leadership concepts. According to Arnold et al. (2000), the five key components of empowering leadership are "leading by example,"

"participative decision making," "coaching," "informing," and "demonstrating individual concern." The scopes of empowering leadership, according to (Ahearne et al., 2005), include "improving the meaningfulness of work," "fostering participation in decision-making," "expressing confidence in high performance," and "providing autonomy from bureaucratic constraints."

Self-sufficiency and progression support are the two primary dimensions of empowered leadership that Amundsen and Martinsen (2015) discuss. Control is a starting point that can reproduce social concepts, according to the social exchange theory. As previously stated ascribed to the connected communal role along with the asymmetric arrangement of resources along with results against the backdrop of specific circumstances and collective associations (Magee et al., 2008). Through the aforementioned clarification, it is suggested that to accomplish goals in an orderly manner, one must both observe others and be independent of them. Supremacy is constantly used as an instrument of control.

To accomplish their goals, those in positions of control can tell others how to support them. Additional declaration states that control is a skill that should not be exaggerated by others. An individual will always be dependent on those with less power and will also always be somewhat in charge. The ability of the individual to provide appreciated qualities to the company is the basis of the power. The aforementioned person is knowledgeable about his position within the organizational structure, has concentrated skills, and can access interesting facts and figures. According to the aforementioned point of view, empowerment is primarily defined as a resource allocation strategy that can forgo the need for top authority. According to an evolution of management functions, including devolution, contribution, information allocation, and guiding, activities of the empowered leadership can be categorized (Hakimi., et al., 2010, McClelland., 1975).

B. Perspective on Psychological Motivation

According to Spreitzer (1995; Thomas &Velthouse, 1990), the psychological motivation perspective is an understanding of how motivational circumstances have complex meaning, aptitude, self-determination, and effects that replicate employees' psychosomatic reactions in the way that employees' assignments function. Leadership empowerment and psychological empowerment are two distinct beginnings that are combined in a correspondingly speculative and investigative effort that has individual as well as group effects.

According to Maynard, Gilson, and Mathieu (2012), Seibert, Wang, and Courtright (2011), Zhang &Bartol (2010), and others, empowering leadership is intended to be a specific collection of leader behaviors that improve psychological empowerment and as a result, expand various mandatory job fallouts. As a backdrop for psychological empowerment, closing to empower leadership most likely will work (for example, "individual-level psychological empowerment": Amundsen &Martinsen, 2015; "group level psychological empowerment": Lorinkova, Pearsall, & Sims,

2013). Seibert et al. (2011) psychological empowerment meta-analysis identifies the study of psychological empowerment as being related to the concept of empowering leadership by emphasizing that: "More hurriedly blend of leadership and psychological empowerment thoughts give the impression to be a considerable growth justifying further study" (p. 998). In the case of Seibert et al. (2011), the characteristics of a successful work strategy, perceptions of leadership, socio-political sustainability, and top executive performances are all set against a background of psychological empowerment.

According to the psychological literature, dominance, and control are measures of the conditions that define a person's inner motivation or expectation. For instance, a person is well prepared to have the desire for control prepared (McClelland, 1975). Numerous psychologists' devotion has been influenced by power and control. These studies combine achievement, the primary and secondary controls, as well as internal and external control. Employees' influence needs will become apparent when it becomes clear that they lack the self-assurance to grasp the emotional state of others or the state of their own relationships or life events. On the other hand, if the person senses that their level of power is exceedingly low, their ability requirements won't be satisfied. According to the viewpoint of this study, control is linked to a claim in personal self-efficacy that defines internal individuality (Bandura, &Gervone, 1986).

According to this approach, empowerment leadership behavior is any managerial action or revolution that increases an employee's intrinsic motivation by enhancing his or her autonomy or self-productivity (Ahearne, et al., 2005; Conger, &Kanungo, 1988). The development of the level of intrinsic motivation and the intended idea of "psychological empowerment" are combined to provide Thomas' reflection on the idea of empowerment (Thomas &Velthouse, 1990). Spreitzer described the four aspects of an employee's understanding of their work as denotation, self-efficacy, self-government, and inspiration (Spreitzer, 1995).

X. EMPOWERING LEADERSHIP AND RELATED LEADERSHIP THEORIES: A COMPARISON

The idea of empowering leadership was founded on leader-oriented recognized wisdom, and it is inevitable to evaluate empowering leadership using additional well-known leadership concepts. However, the aforementioned distinctive qualities of empowering leadership set it apart from other leadership theories, which are predefined in views linked to leader support.

- Path-Goal;
- Shared leadership;
- Leader-Member Exchange (LMX);
- Self-Leadership;
- Ethical leadership;
- Transformational Leadership;
- Participative Leadership.

A. Path-Goal

The path-goal leadership theory is viewed as a background for associations between task- and person-oriented administrator actions, as well as fanaticism and supporter satisfaction, and a variety of front-line situations where such connotations will continue to be relevant (House, 1971, 1996; House & Mitchell, 1974). Using a congregational-level investigation, House (1996) enhanced the path aim hypothesis but did not provide any supporting evidence for this idea.

B. Empowerment Leadership v/s Path Goal

Path goal theory has been reformulated (House, 1996), and it discusses the idea of supporter empowerment as well as the challenges involved in achieving it through a variety of leader actions, such as path-goal instructive actions and success focused on leader actions (House, 1996; House & Mitchell, 1974). However, a key concept of the path-goal theory is an exciting and directive-loaded reflection on the actions of leaders that may provide supporters with the necessary rigorous illuminations to ensure their work and associated activities would synthesize with the achievement of work impartial line and reach appropriate rewards (House, 1996).

The compassion of empowerment leadership, which is regarded as a specific leader action proposing toward intensifying supporters' inner enthusiasm over power distribution and providing additional self-sufficiency, is not the same as this meta-theory, which highlights various types of leader behaviors, obvious variations of supporters, in addition to job circumstances along with to deal with leadership skill.

C. Shared Leadership

Common leadership is a cooperative approach to leadership that emphasizes both common and divergent levels of confidence among followers (Yammarino, 2012). According to Pearce and Sims Jr. (2002), a conservative perspective on leadership that advises leadership originates as of determined leader of the squad, shared leadership via relating over vertical leadership is developed. The idea of shared leadership emphasizes leadership that extends beyond team members or organizations, in contrast to a recognized leader who has been nominated (Pearce & Sims Jr., 2002).

D. Empowerment Leadership vs Shared Leadership

Although the historical concept of power sharing through expected leadership is still a concept with two opposing views, empowering leadership is defined as explicit leader actions intended for authority distribution and passing on additional self-sufficiency as well as tasks to followers in organizations. The fundamental difference between shared and empowering leadership that is still present was applied by Pearce & Sims Jr. in 2002 and Ensley, Hmieleski, & Pearce in 2006. Their research suggests that shared leadership is implied by several different forms of leader behavior and its associated component, vertical leadership.

According to two distinct studies, vertical empowerment and shared empowerment leadership were conceptualized and empirically tested at the time by their potential (Pearce & Sims Jr., 2002; Ensley et al., 2006). Additionally, from a level of analysis perspective, the concept of shared leadership is still misunderstood in addition to being learned from cumulative levels of research and measured as occurring on two levels (Carson, Tesluk, & Marrone, 2007; Pearce & Sims Jr., 2002; Yammarino, 2012).

E. Leader-Member Exchange

Leader-member exchange (LMX) is a clearly defined authority of the leader-member association (Gooty & Yammarino, 2016; Graen & Scandura, 1987; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Liden, Erdogan, Wayne, & Sparrow, 2006). According to the role theory and social exchange theory, LMX focuses on well-known relationships between leaders and members of the congregation as well as the total superiority of individual relationships, which ranges from very low or no superiority to extraordinarily high aptitude (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975; Graen & Scandura, 1987; Graen & Uhlbien, 1995).

F. Empowering Leadership v/s Leader-Member Exchange

Even though empowering leadership, LMX, and many other concepts have been the subject of several preliminary research (e.g., Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014a; Hassan et al., 2013), specific descriptions of twin observation, LMX, and empowerment leadership continue to be theoretically sound. Empowerment leadership is defined as effective leadership behaviors related to delegating authority and responsibility while boosting individual motivation in the course of daily tasks. Previous research has shown that LMX differs from empowered leadership in practice (see Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014a; Tekleab et al., 2008).

G. Self-Leadership

According to Manz and Sims Jr. (1980), self-leadership is a set of activities that a person engages in to plan and motivate his or her actions to gain an understanding of what motivates them and how to manage their internal state of affairs and processes.

H. Empowering Leadership v/s Self-Leadership

Even though leaders can be reallocated to more important managerial tasks thanks to the same perceptions of self-leadership and empowerment leadership (Markham & Markham, 1995), the impact of empowering leadership is still notably superior to self-leadership. Empowering leadership is defined as a leader's actions that are evaluated about the development of supporters' perceived credibility and inevitableness about work, involvement, and autonomy. Contrary to popular belief, self-leadership is a set of essential behaviors that employees adopt to manage their performance. As a result, empowerment leader acts may serve as indirect self-leadership for followers. Through the use of ongoing realities, (Yun et al. 2006) initialized leader empowerment acts completely exaggerated followers' self-leadership related to followers' duty for self-sufficiency.

I. Ethical Leadership

In general, ethical leadership focuses on a leader's guidance about making the best decisions, exercising autonomy, dispersing goodness, and perfectly leading people through collaboration on ethics, ethical procedures, and satisfying dependents' moral obligations. (Brown & Trevio, 2006; Den Hartog, 2015; Dionne et al., 2014; Hassan, Mahsud, Yukl, & Prussia, 2013; Palanski & Yammarino, 2009) Leaders embodying ethical principles fundamentally transform followers' legal obligation for ethical activities.

J. Empowering Leadership v/s Ethical

The aforementioned approach may be crucial for empowerment leaders who are grounded in the proper direction, but empowerment leadership isn't the same as the concept of ethical leadership for the reason that an empowering leader's direction doesn't take into account the right perception. Let's imagine that moral leaders might impose moral principles and directives on various job tasks, but they might currently be in control of the bulk of the decision-making by refusing to do so.

K. Transformational Leadership

Previously regarded as the main model of leadership (Day & Antonakis, 2012), transformational leadership now refers to acts taken by the leader on four different levels: idealistic collision, inspirational motivation, customized concern, and intellectual stimulation. It is important to take into account what encourages supporters to allocate and inquire about conception as well as work to support the organization (Bass, 2008; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Yammarino & Bass, 1990; Yukl, 2002).

L. Empowerment leadership v/s Transformational leadership

In contrast to transformational leaders, empowerment leaders must take steps to fully develop each follower's true individual potential among group members (Manz & Sims Jr., 1987, 2001). Continuous experimental studies have found strong correlations between transformational leadership and empowerment leadership (e.g., Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014a). Furthermore, it might be better to be ourselves practically than to follow a well-planned reputation.

Numerous research have experimentally supported the difference between transformational leadership and empowerment leadership in line with this evolution (e.g., Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014a; Arnold et al., 2000; Pearce & Sims Jr., 2002). Similarly, through clear sub-dimensions differentiation that create notions beyond transformational leadership in addition to empowerment leadership, the main message of empowerment leadership informs towards granting supporters self-sufficiency, as well as through supporters for decision making. These ratios continue to be inappropriate when compared to the dimensions that make up transformational leadership (Ahearne et al., 2005; Arnold et al., 2000).

M. Participative Leadership

According to Lam, Huang, and Chan (2015), participatory leadership is the practice of a leader delegating control over decision-making to followers but also involving followers in group decision-making (Armenakis, Harris, and Mossholder, 1993). Normative models linked to the leader's decision-making process were created through participatory leadership (Vroom & Yetton, 1973; Vroom & Jago, 2007). To identify a leader's dual wide-ranging decision-making styles, participative & and autocratic, in addition to all reliable decisions of decision-making styles within numerous conditions stranded on 11 decision investigative, the mainstream mainstream motivation at the back-hand succession of the normative decision-making model was used (Vroom & Yetten, 1973).

N. Leadership empowering v/s Participative

While empowering leadership also imitates a comprehensive thought and incorporates the idea of supporters' participative level decision-making through a secondary component, the dual views of participative leadership and empowering leadership both assert the existence of self-motivated followers throughout the evolution of decision-making (Ahearne et al., 2005; Arnold et al., 2000). Furthermore, even under unsuitable circumstances for empowering leadership, participative leadership acts continue to be decisive characteristics.

(Tekleab, Sims Jr., Yun, Tesluk, & Cox, 2008) support the empowering leadership idea using extraordinary in addition to self-directed ideas (Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014a). According to wide-ranging serious anxiety (Banks, Gooty, Ross, Williams, & Harrington, 2018; Meuser et al., 2016), issues related to concept expulsion in all aspects of leadership activities are on the rise. In addition, theory cropping or fortifying the "theoretical space" of a particular leadership idea under consideration is convincing. The ideas presented in Table 1 below identify the theoretical focus of empowerment leadership as well as related theories of leadership.

O. The efficiency of leadership empowerment

In a synthesis study, Robert Raub found that different levels of empowering leadership existed (Raub, 2010). The study found that, as empowerment leadership and psychological empowerment activities were seen, collaborative outcome factors expanded at various phases. The study model combines responsibility focused on on-the-job behaviors with interactive relationships focused on comprehending external job conduct as well as the motivational rank focused on encouraging exterior work deeds.

The study identified psychological empowerment as a significant central variable among the empowerment leadership in addition to encouraging external job action, and it recognized the likelihood that empowerment leadership may have an impact on workers' interactive effects on tierce stages. To advance worker voice, Gao concentrated on stimulating exterior job behavior, employee voice behavior in the telecommunications industry, exposing employee faith in managers, and empowering leadership

behavior (Gao, Janssen, & Shi, 2011). Chen evaluated the mechanisms underlying the impact of empowerment leadership on team members and asserted that it overemphasized team affiliation and creative behavior relative to psychological empowerment and emotional liability (Chen et al. 2011).

Table 1: Emphasis on theory among theories of empowering leadership and related leadership theories

P. Type of Leadership

Through congregational-level observation, Kirkman began investigative research relating to empowering leadership (Kirkman & Rosen, 1999). Four American firms were used as samples, two of which remained huge corporations and the other two small. Consequences indicated related empowering leadership based on gathering level included four dimensions: power, meaningfulness, autonomy, and influence; in addition, there was legal responsibility on how to improve organizational performance for decision-making using traditional leadership.

Empowerment leadership, in Humborstad's opinion, is still important for improving work performance (Humborstad et al., 2014). Wellins said that the empowered team was also practical, recognizing the need for ongoing planning to increase work quality, ongoing work growth, and the exploration of creative outcomes (Wellins et al., 1991). Guzzo restrained the team with creative awareness that they could improve the experience for both internal and external customers (Guzzo et al., 1991).

Gorn measured worker's work contentment must be progressive once work was supplementary expressive (Gorn, & Kanungo, 1980). Cordery initiated the empowered team and had an innovative organizational liability level associated with the traditional team in a similar corporation (Cordery, Mueller, & Smith, 1991). Kirkman supposed that the upcoming study ought to emphasize containing individual and group-level combinations (Kirkman, & Rosen, 1999).

XI. CONSEQUENCES OF EMPOWERING LEADERSHIP AND INVILITY

When employees focus more on empowering leadership, which will result in more work content, greater demands, and more duties, they are unable to predict the future, which is beyond their control. Authorization may also result in higher role pressure on employees because it is challenging for people to take on the expectations and demands of other people's roles, which makes it harder for them to perform their social roles properly.

Empowering leadership may be seen as a kind of hindrance stressor when required by the employees face work such as role ambiguity, employees can't clearly understand the expectations referred to, and the task, leaving the individual unable to work through their efforts to improve the sense of control, easy to fall into long-term anxiety or stress state of mind, and a negative impact, such as the outcome of the work. Employees' self-resources may

be depleted by a hindrance stressor; in this weakened state, they won't be able to keep an eye on their actions. According to Robinson (2008), incivility is a type of interpersonal deviant conduct that takes the shape of subtle transgressions of social norms and acceptable communication styles, such as being unpleasant, uncourteous, or indifferent to other people.

Uncivilized behavior tends to be low intensity, making it challenging for witnesses to comprehend the motivation behind such behavior. Since actors are not likely to be identified or penalized for their rudeness, it is a relatively safe aberrant conduct in this regard (O'Reilly, Robinson, Berdahl, & Banki, 2015). Employees "have less energy, motivation, and time to pay attention to politeness" when they are focused on stressful work situations, which leads to poor manners (Widrick et al., 2005).

XII. WHY EMPOWERING A LEADER IN AN ORGANIZATION IS IMPORTANT: PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

Even for the most seasoned managers, managing effectively in a leadership position is no easy task. According to research, 35% of Dutch managers believe their position inside the company is the most challenging, and another 23% believe that in the next years, their position will only get harder.

Change is one of the difficult variables that impacts all different sorts of businesses both directly and indirectly. As flatter organizational structures make work more efficient, quick, and adaptable, many firms nowadays change to them. As a result of their inability to keep up with these dynamic changes, hierarchical top-down structures, formerly thought to be effective, are no longer viable. Instead, the emphasis is now on a future-oriented mindset, ongoing development, growth, and advancement. Because of this transformation, we must alter the way we manage our businesses, making change management an essential component of leadership.

As a result, an evolution in leadership practices is required to reflect the constant transition in organizational structures. A change in leadership is necessary in addition to the organizational change. We require empowered leadership more than ever who can adapt, motivate, and steer through the murky waters of organizational transformation.

➤ *Leadership is difficult, and great leaders should be able to:*

- **Crafting the vision:** A compelling vision that is in line with the organization's mission and market dynamics must be developed by leaders. Effective communication and making sure that everyone knows this goal are the challenges.
- **Decision-making:** Decisions made by leaders often have broad repercussions. The seriousness of these decisions, whether about money or strategy, can be overpowering.
- **Managing diversity:** Organizations are populated by people from a wide range of backgrounds and dispositions. A true test of leadership is striking a

balance between meeting their needs and promoting a productive and positive work atmosphere.

- **Leading change:** Leaders frequently assist their teams through change, which calls for the use of motivating techniques, foresight, and resistance management.
- **Staying current:** Leaders must always learn and adapt to keep up with rapidly changing market trends and technology advancements.
- **Being accountable:** Leaders have increased stress because they are responsible for the team's effectiveness.
- **Developing others:** Focusing on developing their team's abilities, an empowering leader invests a lot of time and energy into successful coaching and mentoring.

Leadership is fundamentally about finding your way through a maze of obligations, difficulties, and demands. It impacts every area of business and is essential to any corporation. This position requires a diverse set of abilities, characteristics, and expertise due to its complexity and subtleties. Organizations must therefore prioritize leadership empowerment by providing their leaders with the resources and encouragement they require for success.

XIII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In light of the evaluation of the research literature on empowerment leadership, the current work suggests rethinking the evaluation of empowerment leadership against the backdrop of various methodologies. According to empowerment leadership, both the team and the employees favored greater self-sufficiency, self-leadership, as well as control over the working environment. Instead, CEOs must provide support, reassurance in self-management, and increasing empowerment. A recognized organization needs to be well-regulated for the proper business environment to change. This environment must be agreed upon over the increasingly fierce international competition that encounters customer needs and is planned for in terms of innovative assets that can also describe the shift from industrial actions to support-oriented ventures.

Therefore, CEOs need to dedicate themselves to empowerment leadership training tasks including providing inspiration and sustenance, restructuring participatory decision-making, team leading, and taking on new roles and responsibilities. While the topic of empowering leadership has recently received more attention, there are significant challenges and gaps in the current study. The empowerment leadership philosophy has its start in Western culture by way of a matter of first importance.

Western academics invested a lot of time and resources into studies on empowerment leadership structure from different perspectives. They also completed a lot of work using empowerment leadership scales for various shaped circumstances. The individual measurement survey technique that is prone to mistakes transmission is often acknowledged by the current study. Empowerment leadership has been evaluated from several points of view by combining intricate techniques such as case studies and inside-out meetings to ensure accuracy.

Similarly, future research should give empowerment leadership measures more consideration when examining their acceptability. Accordingly, previous research has clearly shown that the focus of the study examining empowering leadership outcome variables is on the individual and collective levels. Therefore, plan on less politeness for shareholders inside the industrial chain when it comes to leadership stimulation and empowerment at the organizational level. Western culture created the product economy with strong freedom and ineffective control variety in mind.

The focus of the upcoming study will be on how empowerment and leadership differ in various social contexts as part of a cross-cultural search. I intended to summarize the present literature on empowered leadership and also suggest two new lines of demand that would subtly build on earlier research. Although the majority of studies on empowerment leadership have emphasized positive outcomes, I advise that future research focus on characteristics that may 1) predict empowerment leadership and 2) describe the processes through which more negative than just unintentional, negative effects of empowerment leadership may occur.

REFERENCES

- [1.] Ahearne, J.M., et al. (2005) To Empower or Not to Empower Your Sales Force? An Empirical Examination of Influence of Leadership Empowerment Behavior on Customer Satisfaction and Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 945-955. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.945> [Citation Time(s):2]
- [2.] Ahearne, J.M., Mathieu, J., & Rapp, A. (2005). To Empower or Not to Empower Your Sales Force? An Empirical Examination of Influence of Leadership Empowerment Behavior on Customer Satisfaction and Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 945-955. <https://doi.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.945>
- [3.] Allen, T. D., & Rush, M. C. (1998). The Effects of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Performance Judgments: A Field Study and a Laboratory Experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 247-260. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.2.247>
- [4.] Amundsen, S., & Martinsen, Ø. L. (2014a). Empowering Leadership: Construct Clarification, Conceptualization, and Validation of a New Scale. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25, 487-511. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.009>
- [5.] Amundsen, S., & Martinsen, Ø. L. (2015). Linking Empowering Leadership to Job Satisfaction, Work Effort, and Creativity: The Role of Self-Leadership and Psychological Empowerment. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 22, 304-323. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2F1548051814565819>
- [6.] An "interpretive" model of intrinsic task motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 15, 666-681.
- [7.] Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Feild, H. S. (1999). Making change permanent: A model for

- institutionalizing change interventions. In W. A. Pasmore & R. W. Woodman (Eds.), *Research in organizational change and development* (Vol. 12, pp. 97-128). New York: JAI.
- [8.] Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating Readiness for Organizational Change. *Human Relations*, 46, 681-703. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F001872679304600601>
- [9.] Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating readiness for organizational change. *Human Relations*, 46, 681-703.
- [10.] 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, 249-269.
- [11.] Arnold, J. J., 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, 249-269.
- [12.] Arnold, J.A., Arad, S., Rhoades, J.A. and Drasgow, F. (2000) The Empowering Leadership Questionnaire: The Construction and Validation of a New Scale for Measuring Leader Behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 249-269. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1379\(200005\)21:3<249::AID-JOB10>3.0.CO;2-#](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(200005)21:3<249::AID-JOB10>3.0.CO;2-#) [Citation Time(s):1]
- [13.] Bandura, A., & Gervone, D. (1986). Differential Engagement of Self-Reactive Influences in Cognitive Motivation. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, 38, 92-113. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(86\)90028-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(86)90028-2)
- [14.] Bandura, A., & Locke, E. A. (2003). Negative self-efficacy and goal effects revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 87-99.
- [15.] Banks, G. C., Gooty, J., Ross, R. L., Williams, C. E., & Harrington, N. T. (2018). Construct Redundancy in Leader Behaviors: A Review and Agenda for the Future. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29, 236-251. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.12.005>
- [16.] Bass, B. M. (2008). *The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.
- [17.] Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational Leadership*. New York, NY: Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410617095>
- [18.] Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, Character, and Authentic Transformational Leadership Behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 181-217.
- [19.] Bennis, W. and Nanus, B. (1985). *Leadership*, Harper & Row, New York.
- [20.] Bowers, D. G., & Seashore, S. E. (1966). Predicting Organizational Effectiveness with a Four-factor Theory of Leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 11, 238-263. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2391247>
- [21.] Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical Leadership: A Review and Future Directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 595-616. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004>
- [22.] Bunderson, J. S., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2003). Management Team Learning Orientation and Business Unit Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 552-560. <https://doi.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.88.3.552>
- [23.] Carson, J. B., Tesluk, P. E., & Marrone, J. A. (2007). Shared Leadership in Teams: An Investigation of Antecedent Conditions and Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 1217-1234.
- [24.] Chamberlin, M., Newton, D. W., & LePine, J. A. (2018). A Meta-Analysis of Empowerment and Voice as Transmitters of High-Performance Managerial Practices to Job Performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39, 1296-1313. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2295>
- [25.] Chebat, J.-C., & Kollias, P. (2000). The impact of empowerment on customer contact employees' roles in service organizations. *Journal of Services Research*, 3(1), 66-81.
- [26.] Chen, G., & Klimoski, R. J. (2003). The impact of expectations on newcomer performance in teams as mediated by work characteristics, social exchanges, and empowerment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46, 591-607.
- [27.] Chen, G., Sharma, P. N., Edinger, S. K., Shapiro, D. L., & Farh, J. L. (2011). Motivation and Demotivating Forces in Teams: Cross-Level Influence of Empowering Leadership and Relationship Conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 541-557. <https://doi.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0021886>
- [28.] Cheong, M., Yammarino, F. J., Dionne, S. D., Spain, S. M., & Tsai, C. Y. (2019). A Review of the Effectiveness of Empowering Leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 30, 34-58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.08.005>
- [29.] Chow, I. H. S. (2018). The Mechanism Underlying the Empowering Leadership-Creativity Relationship. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 39, 202-217. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-03-2016-0060>
- [30.] Conger, J. A. (1989). `Leadership: the art of empowering others, *Academy of Management Executive*, 3(1),
- [31.] Conger, J. A. and Kanungo, R. N. (1988). `The empowerment process: integrating theory and practice,
- [32.] Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The Empowerment Process: Integrating Theory and Practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 471-482.
- [33.] Conger, J.A. and Kanungo, R.N. (1988) The Empowerment Process: Integrating Theory and Practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 471-482. [Citation Time(s):2]
- [34.] Cordery, J. L., Mueller, W. S., & Smith, L. M. (1991). Attitudinal and Behavioral Effects of Autonomous Group Working: A Longitudinal Field Study. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 464-476.

- [35.] Cunningham, C. E., Woodward, C. A., Shannon, H. S., MacIntosh, J., Lendrum, B., Rosenbloom, D., et al. (2002). Readiness for organizational change: A longitudinal study of workplace, psychological, and behavioral correlates. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75, 377-392.
- [36.] Dansereau, F., Graen, G., &Haga, W. J. (1975). A Vertical Dyad Linkage Approach to Leadership within Formal Organizations: A Longitudinal Investigation of the Role Making Process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13, 46-78. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(75\)90005-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(75)90005-7)
- [37.] Dansereau, F., Yammarino, F. J., Markham, S. E., Alutto, J. A., Newman, J., Dumas, M., & Lee, S. (1995). Individualized Leadership: A New Multiple-Level Approach. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 413-450. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(95\)90016-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90016-0)
- [38.] Day, D. V., &Antonakis, J. (Eds.). (2012). *The Nature of Leadership* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- [39.] Den Hartog, D. N. (2015). Ethical Leadership. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 2, 409-434. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032414-111237>
- [40.] Dionne, S. D., Gupta, A., Sotak, K. L., Shirreffs, K. A., Serban, A., Hao, C., &Yammarino, F. J. (2014). A 25-Year Perspective on Levels of Analysis in Leadership Research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25, 6-35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.002>
- [41.] Dong, Y. T., Liao, H., Chuang, A., Zhou, J., & Campbell, E. M. (2015). Fostering Employee
- [42.] Drucker, P. F. (1983). Twilight of the first-line supervisor? *Wall Street Journal*, June, 7.
- [43.] Druskat, V., & Wheeler, J. (2003). Managing from the boundary: The effective leadership of self-managing work teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46, 435-459.
- [44.] Edwards, J. R. (2001). Multidimensional constructs in organizational behaviour research: An integrative analytic framework. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4, 144-193.
- [45.] Empowering Leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 1364-1380.
- [46.] Ensley, M. D., Hmieleski, K. M., & Pearce, C. L. (2006). The Importance of Vertical and Shared Leadership within New Venture Top Management Teams: Implications for the Performance of Start-ups. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 217-231. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.02.002>
- [47.] Fernandez, S., &Moldogaziev, T. (2015). Employee Empowerment and Job Satisfaction in the US Federal Bureaucracy: A Self-Determination Theory Perspective. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 45, 375-401. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0275074013507478>
- [48.] Forrester, R. (2000). Empowerment: Rejuvenating a potent idea. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14(3), 67-80.
- [49.] Gao, L., Janssen, O., & Shi, K. (2011). Leader Trust and Employee Voice: The Moderating Role of Empowering Leader Behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 787-798. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.05.015>
- [50.] Gecas, V. (1989). 'The social psychology of self-efficacy', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 15, 291-316.
- [51.] Geographically Dispersed Teams. *Personnel Psychology*, 69, 159-198.
- [52.] Gist, M. E., & Mitchell, T. R. (1992). Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *Academy of Management Review*,
- [53.] Gooty, J., &Yammarino, F. J. (2016). The Leader-Member Exchange Relationship: A Multisource, Cross-Level Investigation. *Journal of Management*, 42, 915-935. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0149206313503009>
- [54.] Gorn, G. J., &Kanungo, R. N. (1980). Job Involvement and Motivation: Are Intrinsically Motivated Managers More Job Involved? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 26, 265-277. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(80\)90059-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(80)90059-8)
- [55.] Graen, G. B., &Scandura, T. A. (1987). Toward a Psychology of Dyadic Organizing. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 9, 175-208.
- [56.] Graen, G. B., &Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-Based Approach to Leadership: Development of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory of Leadership over 25 Years: Applying a Multi-Level Multi-Domain Perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 219- 247. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(95\)90036-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90036-5)
- [57.] Guzzo, R.A. et al. (1991). What Makes High-Performing Teams Effective? Unpublished Manuscript, College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- [58.] Hakimi, N., et al. (2010) Leader Empowering Behavior: The Leader's Perspective. *British Journal of Management*, 21, 701-716. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2010.00703.x> [Citation Time(s):2]
- [59.] Hakimi, N., Van Knippenberg, D., &Giessner, S. (2010). Leader Empowering Behavior: The Leader's Perspective. *British Journal of Management*, 21, 701-716. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2010.00703.x>
- [60.] Hartline, M. D., & Ferrell, O. C. (1996). The management of customer contact
- [61.] Hassan, S., Mahsud, R., Yukl, G., & Prussia, G. E. (2013). Ethical and Empowering Leadership and Leader Effectiveness. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 28, 133-146. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683941311300252>
- [62.] Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., &Natemeyer, W. E. (1979). Situational Leadership, Perception, and the Impact of Power. *Group & Organization Studies*, 4, 418-428. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F105960117900400404>
- [63.] Hill, N. S., &Bartol, K. M. (2016). Empowering Leadership and Effective Collaboration in
- [64.] Holt, D. T., Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., &Feild, H. S. (in press). Toward a comprehensive definition of readiness for change: A review of research and

- instrumentation. In W. A. Pasmore & R. W. Woodman (Eds.), *Research in organizational change and development*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.
- [65.] House, R. J. (1971). A Path-Goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 321-339. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2391905>
- [66.] House, R. J. (1996). Path-Goal Theory of Leadership: Lessons, Legacy, and a Reformulated Theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 323-352. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(96\)90024-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(96)90024-7)
- [67.] House, R. J., & Mitchell, T. R. (1974). Path-Goal Theory of Leadership. *Journal of Contemporary Business*, 9, 81-97.
- [68.] [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(99\)00016-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00016-8)
- [69.] <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038969>
- [70.] <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12108>
- [71.] <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12109>
- [72.] <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.1110>
- [73.] <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1988.4306983>
- [74.] Hui, C. (1994). *Effects of leadership empowerment behaviors and followers' personal control, voice, and self-efficacy on in-role and extra-role performance: An extension and empirical test of Conger and Kanungo's empowerment process model*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University Bloomington.
- [75.] Humborstad, S. W., Nerstad, C. G. L., & Dysvik, A. (2014). Empowering Leadership, Employee Goal Orientations and Work Performance: A Competing Hypothesis Approach. *Personnel Review*, 43, 246-271. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-01-2012-0008>
- [76.] Jackson and Associates (Eds.) (1992). *Working Through Diversity: Human Resources Initiatives*, Guilford Press, New York.
- [77.] Jacobson, E. H. (1957, April). *The effect of changing industrial methods and automation on personnel*. Paper presented at the Symposium on Preventive and Social Psychology, Washington, DC.
- [78.] Johnston, W. B. and Packer, A. H. (1987). *Workforce 2000*, Hudson Institute, Indianapolis.
- [79.] Jones, R. A., Jimmieson, N. L., & Griffiths, A. (2005). The impact of organizational culture and reshaping capabilities on change implementation success: The mediating role of readiness for change. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42, 361-386.
- [80.] *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 981-1003. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022676>
- [81.] Kanter, R. M. (1989). The new managerial work. *Harvard Business Review*, 67(6), 85-92.
- [82.] Kiker, S., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1999). Main and Interaction Effects of Task and Contextual Performance-Supervisory Reward Decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 602-609. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.84.4.602>
- [83.] Kirman, B.L., & Rosen, B. (1999). Beyond Self-Management: Antecedents and Consequences of Team Empowerment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 58-74.
- [84.] Lam, C. K., Huang, X., & Chan, S. C. (2015). The Threshold Effect of Participative Leadership and the Role of Leader Information Sharing. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58, 836-855. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2013.0427>
- [85.] Lawler, E. E. (1988). 'Substitutes for hierarchy', *Organizational Dynamics*, 17(1), 415.
- [86.] Lawler, E. E. (1992). *The Ultimate Advantage: Creating High-Involvement Organization*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- [87.] Lawler, E. E., Mohrman, S. A., & Benson, G. (2001). *Organizing for High Performance: Employee Involvement, TQM, Reengineering, and Knowledge Management in the Fortune 1000*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- [88.] Leach, D. J., Wall, T. D., & Jackson, P. R. (2003). The effect of empowerment on job knowledge: An empirical test involving operators of complex technology. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 76, 27-52.
- [89.] Leadership of Self-Managing Work Teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32, 106-129. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392745>
- [90.] LePine, J. A., Colquitt, J. A., & Erez, A. (2000). Adaptability to changing task contexts: Effects of general cognitive ability, conscientiousness, and openness to experience. *Personnel Psychology*, 53, 563-593.
- [91.] Li, Y., & Wei, F. (2010). Evolution of Leadership Theory and Frontier Progress. *Journal of Management*, 4, 517-524.
- [92.] Liden, R. C. and Tewksbury, T. W. (1995). 'Empowerment and work teams'. In: Riffs, G. R., Rosen, S. D. and Barnum, D. T. (Eds.) *Handbook of Human Resource Management*, Blackwell Publishers, Cambridge, Mass., pp. 386±403.
- [93.] Liden, R. C., Erdogan, B., Wayne, S. J., & Sparrowe, R. T. (2006). Leader-Member Exchange, Differentiation, and Task Interdependence: Implications for Individual and Group Performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27, 723-746. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.409>
- [94.] Locke, E. A., & Schweiger, D. M. (1979). Participation in Decision-Making: One More Look. In B. M. Staw (Ed.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (pp. 265-339). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- [95.] Lorinkova, N. M., & Perry, S. J. (2017). When Is Empowerment Effective? The Role of Leader-Leader Exchange in Empowering Leadership, Cynicism, and Time Theft. *Journal of Management*, 43, 1631-1654. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0149206314560411>
- [96.] Lorinkova, N., Pearsall, M., & Sims, H. (2013). Examining the Differential Longitudinal Performance of Directive versus Empowering Leadership in Teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56, 573-596. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0132>
- [97.] Magee, J. C., et al. (2008). Power and the Objectification of Social Targets. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 95, 111-127.
- [98.] Magee, J.C., et al. (2008). Power and the Objectification of Social Targets. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 95, 111-127. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.111> [Citation Time(s):1]

- [99.] Manz, C. C. and Sims, H. P. Jr. (1987). 'Leading workers to lead themselves: the external leadership of self-managed work teams', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32, 106128.
- [100.] Manz, C. C., & Sims Jr., H. P. (1980). Self-Management as a Substitute for Leadership: A Social Learning Theory Perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 5, 361-367. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1980.4288845>
- [101.] Manz, C. C., & Sims Jr., H. P. (1987). *Leading Workers to Lead Themselves: The External*
- [102.] Manz, C. C., & Sims Jr., H. P. (2001). *The New Super Leadership: Leading Others to Lead Themselves*. Oakland, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- [103.] Manz, C.C., & Sims Jr., H.P. (1990) *Super Leadership*. New York, NY: Berkeley Books.
- [104.] Markham, S. E., & Markham, I. S. (1995). Self-Management and Self-Leadership Reexamined: A Levels-of-Analysis Perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 343-359. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(95\)90013-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90013-6)
- [105.] Mathieu, J. E., Hollenbeck, J. R., van Knippenberg, D., & Ilgen, D. R. (2017). A Century of Work Teams in the *Journal of Applied Psychology*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102, 452-467. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000128>
- [106.] Maynard, M. T., Gilson, L. L., & Mathieu, J. E. (2012). Empowerment—Fad or Fab? A Multilevel Review of the Past Two Decades of Research. *Journal of Management*, 38, 1231-1281. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312438773>
- [107.] McClelland, D. C. (1975). *Power: The Inner Experience* (Vol. 95, pp. 427-429). New York, NY: Irvington Publishers.
- [108.] McClelland, D.C. (1975) *Power: The Inner Experience*. Vol. 95, Irvington Publishers, New York, 427-429. [Citation Time(s):2]
- [109.] Menon, S. (2001). Employee Empowerment: An Integrative Psychological Approach. *Applied Psychology*, 50, 153-180.
- [110.] Methot, J. R., Lepine, J. A., Podsakoff, N. P., & Siegel, J. (2016). Are Workplace Friendships
- [111.] Meuser, J. D., Gardner, W. L., Dinh, J. E., Hu, J., Liden, R. C., & Lord, R. G. (2016). A Network Analysis of Leadership Theory: The Infancy of Integration. *Journal of Management*, 42, 1374-1403. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316647099>
- [112.] Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books
- [113.] Palanski, M. E., & Yammarino, F. J. (2009). Integrity and Leadership: A Multi-Level Conceptual Framework. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20, 405-420. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.03.008>
- [114.] Pearce, C. L., & Sims Jr., H. P. (2002). Vertical versus Shared Leadership as Predictors of the Effectiveness of Change Management Teams: An Examination of Aversive, Directive, Transactional, Transformational, and Empowering Leader Behaviors. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 6, 172-197. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.6.2.172>
- [115.] Pearce, C.L., Sims, H.P., Cox, J.F., Ball, G., Schnell, E., Smith, K.A., & Trevino, L. (2003). Transactors, Transformers and Beyond A Multi-Method Development of a Theoretical Typology of Leadership. *Journal of Management Development*, 22, 273-307. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710310467587>
- [116.] Pearce, Craig and Barkus, Bruce. 2004. The Future of Leadership: Combining Vertical and Shared Leadership to Transform Knowledge Work and Executive Commentary. *Journal article*. *The Academy of Management Executive* (1993-2005) Vol. 18, No. 1 (Feb. 2004), pp. 47-59 (13 pages) Published By: Academy of Management
- [117.] Podsakoff, M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Critical Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, 26, 513-563. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600307>
- [118.] Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. (2009). Individual- and Organization-Level Consequences of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 122-141. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013079>
- [119.] Pulakos, E. D., Arad, S., Donovan, M. A., & Plamondon, K. E. (2000). Adaptability in the workplace: Development of a taxonomy of adaptive performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 612-624.
- [120.] Randolph, W. A., & Sashkin, M. (2002). Can organizational empowerment work in multinational settings? *Academy of Management Executive*, 16(1), 102-115.
- [121.] Raub, S., & Robert, C. (2010). Differential Effects of Empowering Leadership on In-Role and Extra-Role Employee Behaviors: Exploring the Role of Psychological Empowerment and Power Values. *Human Relations*, 63, 1743-1770. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310365092>
- [122.] Role of Justice and Leadership in Explaining Work Stressor-Job Performance Relationships.
- [123.] Seibert, S. E., Wang, G., & Courtright, S. H. (2011). Antecedents and Consequences of Psychological and Team Empowerment in Organizations: A Meta-Analytic Review.
- [124.] Service Creativity: Joint Effects of Customer Empowering Behaviors and Supervisory
- [125.] service employees: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Marketing*, 60(10), 52-70.
- [126.] Sharma, P. N., & Kirkman, B. L. (2015). Leveraging Leaders: A Literature Review and Future Lines of Inquiry for Empowering Leadership Research. *Group & Organization Management*, 40, 193-237. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315574906>
- [127.] Sims Jr., H. P., Faraj, S., & Yun, S. (2009). When Should a Leader Be Directive or Empowering? How to Develop Your Situational Theory of Leadership.

- Business Horizons, 52, 149-158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2008.10.002>
- [128.] Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological Empowerment in the Work-Place: Dimensions, Measurement, and Validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 1442-1465. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256865>
- [129.] Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 1442-1465.
- [130.] Spreitzer, G. M. (1996). Social structural characteristics of psychological empowerment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 483-505.
- [131.] Spreitzer, G. M., Kizilos, M. A., & Nason, S. W. (1997). A Dimensional Analysis of the Relationship between Psychological Empowerment Effectiveness Satisfaction, and Strain. *Journal of Management*, 23, 679-704. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F014920639702300504>
- [132.] Strauss, G. (1964). Some Notes on Power Equalization. In H. J. Leavitt (Ed.), *The Social Science of Organizations: Four Perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- [133.] Tekleab, A. G., Sims Jr., H. P., Yun, S., Tesluk, P. E., & Cox, J. (2008). Are We on the Same Page? Effects on Self-Awareness of Empowering and Transformational Leadership. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 14, 185-201. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1071791907311069>
- [134.] Tesluk, P., & Jacobs, R. (1998). Toward an integrated model of work experience. *Personnel Psychology*, 51, 321-355.
- [135.] Thomas, K. and Tymon, W. (1994) Does Empowerment Always Work? Understanding the Role of Intrinsic Motivation and Personal Interpretation. *Journal of Management Systems*, 6, 1-13. [Citation Time(s):1]
- [136.] Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive Elements of Empowerment: An "Interpretive" Model of Intrinsic Task Motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 15, 666-681. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1990.4310926>
- [137.] Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment:
- [138.] Thomas, K., & Tymon, W. (1994). Does empowerment always work? Understanding the role of intrinsic motivation and personal interpretation. *Journal of Management Systems*, 6(1), 1-13.
- [139.] Thomas, K.W. and Velthouse, B.A. (1990) Cognitive Elements of Empowerment: An "Interpretive" Model of Intrinsic Task Motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 15, 666-681. [Citation Time(s):2]
- [140.] Tuckey, M. R., Bakker, A. B., & Dollard, M. F. (2012). Empowering Leaders Optimize Working Conditions for Engagement: A Multilevel Study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17, 15-27. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1990.4310926>
- [141.] Van de Ven, A. H., & Poole, M. S. (1995). Explaining development and change in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 510-540.
- [142.] Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (2007). The Role of the Situation in Leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62, 17-24. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.17>
- [143.] Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. W. (1973). *Leadership and Decision Making*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt6wrc8r>
- [144.] Weeks, W. A., Roberts, J., Chonko, L. B., & Jones, E. (2004). Organizational readiness for change, individual fear of change, and sales manager performance: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 24, 7-18.
- [145.] Wellins, R. S., Byham, W. and Wilson, J. (1991). *Empowered Teams: Creating Self-Directed Work Groups That Improve Quality, Productivity, and Participation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- [146.] with Job Performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 69, 311-355.
- [147.] Yammarino, F. J. (2012). Leadership. In V. S. Ramachandran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Human Behavior* (2nd ed., pp. 517-524). Oxford: Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-375000-6.00219-6>
- [148.] Yammarino, F. J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). Transformational Leadership and Multiple Levels of Analysis. *Human Relations*, 43, 975-995. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F001872679004301003>
- [149.] Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in Organizations*. Upper-Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- [150.] Yun, S., Cox, J., & Sims Jr., H. P. (2006). The Forgotten Follower: A Contingency Model of Leadership and Follower Self-Leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21, 374-388. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610663141>
- [151.] Zhang, X. M. & 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, 107-128. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.48037118>
- [152.] 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, 107-128. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.48037118>
- [153.] Zhang, Y., LePine, J. A., Buckman, B. R., & Wei, F. (2014). It's Not Fair. Or Is It? The