Psychological Correlates of Workers Empowering Behaviours: An Empirical Analysis among Selected Organisations in Lagos Metropolis

Gabriel A. Akinbode

Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Lagos

Email: aakinbode@unilag.edu.ng

Abstract

This study investigated psychological correlates of workers empowering behaviours (perceived leadership behaviours -interpersonal relations, emancipatory, autocratic, productive and patriotic), and organizational commitment variables-job identification, emotional involvement, job loyalty. The data were collected through questionnaires returned by a sample of 605 workers in public and private service organisations in Lagos metropolis of Nigeria. Pearson correlations and multiple regression analyses indicated that workers' perceptions of their boss leadership behaviour are significantly related to their feelings of empowerment. As expected interpersonal relations, emancipatory and patriotic leadership behaviour was positively correlated with workers empowering behaviours: autonomy, participation and responsibility, respectively. Also, Job identification, emotional involvement, job loyalty were significant predictors of employees empowering behaviours: autonomy, participation and responsibility among the selected workers. Theoretical and Practical implications of the study are discussed in relation to the emerging trends in global human resource management.

Keywords: leadership behaviour, organisational commitment, empowerment, participative management

Introduction

Employee empowerment is not just a fad for the twenty-first century (Malone, 1999). The nature of the decision-making processes is changing rapidly due to the introduction of new information technologies, Internet, wireless communications, and network centric operations. The challenge in recent times for most work organisations is to create an empowered organizational culture. An organisational culture that is capable of ensuring and promoting cognitive motivational task among its employees has become a global strategy (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990; Malone, 1999). The cognitive motivational tasks of concern here are mainly based on five tasks related cognitions: e.g. choice fullness, meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact (Malone, 1999; Cunningham, Hyman & Baldry). These cognitive motivational tasks depict important behavioural dimensions of empowerment from the manager and the employee viewpoint. Considering the major

psychological issues that arose from these constructs, creation of an empowered organizational culture will definitely be time consuming and requires the dedication of the top management and the involvement of the employees to make it happen. Furthermore, the social context in organisations has been consistently connected to individual well-being. Other people at work, especially the leader (or supervisor), can affect the way individuals feel about themselves and their work. Poor supervisor–subordinate relationships, poor communication, as well as a lack of feedback, impact negatively on the well-being of employees (Namasivayam, Guchait & Lei, 2014), May, Gilson & Harter, 2004). In a longitudinal study, Van Dierendonck, Haynes, Borrill and Stride (2004) showed that leadership behaviour affects the well-being of employees; if leader behaviour is supportive and trustworthy in nature it is likely to produce feelings of safety at work (May *et al.*, 2004), which will contribute to employee empowerment behaviours. There are many challenges to the employee empowerment (Kyei-Frimpong et al, 2024)**.**

Scholars have made significant headway in developing the construct of employee empowerment. They have failed, however, to reach consensus on what employee empowerment actually means (Potterfield, 1999; Conger and Kanungo, 1988; Thomas and Velthouse, 1990). Bowen and Lawler defined (1992, 1995) for example define empowerment as an "approach to service delivery" entailing various management practices aimed at sharing four organizational "ingredients" with frontline employees: "(1) information about the organization's performance, (2) rewards based on the organization's performance, (3) knowledge that enables employees to understand and contribute to organizational performance, and (4) power to make decisions that influence organizational direction and performance" (1992). It is a management approach designed to give frontline employees the authority they need to do what needs to be done without having to check with management (Kendall, 2002).

Two distinct theoretical perspectives have emerged in the literature, a managerial and a psychological one. From a managerial perspective has first proposed by Robbins define the concept of "empowerment as a participative management, delegation, and the granting power to lower-level employees to make and enforce decisions" (2005). According to this

view, employee empowerment is a relational construct that describes how those with power in organizations (i.e., managers) share power and formal authority with those lacking it (i.e., employees) (Conger and Kanungo, 1988).

The second view of empowerment is proposed by Thomas and Velthouse (1990). They define it in term of cognitive motivational concept. It is mainly based on the following five tasks related cognitions: (1) choice fullness, i.e., the employee's feelings of choosing what work activity they ought to put their effort on, (2) meaning, i.e., the employees' determination of the intrinsic value of a particular work role, (3) competence, i.e., self-belief in the employee's ability to fully perform specific tasks, (4) self-determination, i.e., the employee's belief that he or she has control over decisions about work-related activities and behaviours, (5) impact, i.e., the employee's belief that his or her actions can make a difference in the organization strategies, tactics, and outcomes.

Empowering leadership model represents a significant paradigm shift and emphasizes follower self-influence rather than external, top-down influence (e.g., Manz & Sims, 1990, 1991). Leaders who use empowering behaviours believe that followers are an influential source of wisdom and direction. These leaders emphasize self-influence; self-management; self-control; or, to use Manz and Sims' (1990, 1991) term, *self-leadership*. Historical perspectives that were instrumental for the development of empowering leadership variables are behavioural self-management (e.g., Mahoney & Arnkoff, 1978), social learning theory (e.g., Bandura, 1997), and cognitive behaviour modification (e.g., Meichenbaum, 1977). Empowering leadership creates followers who are effective self-leaders. Self-leadership, in turn, involves developing actions and thought patterns that we use to influence our own behaviour. Several recent studies (Ahearne, Matthieu, & Rapp; 2005; Ensley; Manz & Sims, 1987; Pearce & Sims, 2002, Pearce, Yoo, & Alavi, 2004; Yun, Cox, & Sims, 2006; Yun, Faraj, & Sims, 2005) have recognized empowering leadership as distinct from transformational leadership. Pearce et al. (2003) developed a leadership typology based on literature review and analysis of three samples, and argued that empowering leadership is distinct from transformational leadership. Akinbode (2022) in a thematic appraisal of leadership and supervision noted that the success and failure of any organisation is largely dependent on the leadership.

Literature Review

Empowerment is characterised by the redistribution, or devolution, of decision-making power to those who do not currently have it, and gives employees the power to do the job their positions demand (Carson & King, 2005; Cunningham et al, 1996; Johnson, 1994). Empowered employees become active problem solvers who contribute to the planning and execution of tasks (Cunningham *et al.*, 1996). Therefore, the types of behaviours that leaders utilise require attention (Arnold, Arad, Rhoades & Drasgow, 2000; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). According to Johnson (1994), leadership empowerment behaviour creates an environment that fosters success, because employees are empowered through greater responsibility, decision-making authority, information and feedback, as well as motivation, support and encouragement (Konczak *et al.*, 2000; (May *et al.*, 2004; Ryan & Deci, 2001). Such individuals will feel safer in engaging in their (May *et al.*, 2004; Ryan & Deci, 2001). Such individuals will feel safer in engaging in their work (Kyei-Frimpong et al, 2024; Junio, G. & Sintaasih, (2019).

Leaders are by nature in a position of social power and ethical leadership focuses on how leaders use their social power in the decisions they make, actions they engage in, and ways they influence others (Gini, 1997, 1998; Avolio, 1992; Turner, Barling, Epitropaki, Butcher, & Milder, 2002). Relatively few studies on (perceived) ethical leader behaviour have been done to date and the behavioural studies that are available tend to focus on only one component of ethical leadership, such as fairness and integrity (e.g., Craig & Gustafson, 1998) or on an overall perception of ethical leadership (e.g., Brown et al., 2005), rather than incorporating potentially different elements of ethical leadership in a single study (e.g., De Hoogh & Den Hartog, 2008; Resick, Hanges, Dickson, and Mitchelson, 2006; Kanungo & Mendoca, 1996; Kanungo, 2001).

In line with this, leaders' level of cognitive moral development and their moral standards have been suggested as antecedents of ethical leadership (e.g., House & Howell, 1992; Howell & Avolio, 1992; Turner, Barling, Epitropaki, Butcher, & Milder, 2002). Relatively few studies on (perceived) ethical leader behaviour have been done to date and the behavioural studies that are available tend to focus on only one component of ethical leadership, such as fairness and integrity (e.g., Craig & Gustafson, 1998) or on an overall perception of

ethical leadership (e.g., Brown et al., 2005), rather than incorporating potentially different elements of ethical leadership in a single study (e.g., De Hoogh & Den Hartog, 2008).

Another element of perceived ethical leadership that is mentioned in previous work is providing followers with voice and allowing them to share in decision making on issues that concern them and their work (Brown et al., 2005; De Hoogh & Den Hartog, 2008). Kanungo and Mendoca (1996) suggested that leaders with altruistic motives use ethical empowerment strategies. These empowerment strategies are in turn related to followers' perceptions of benevolent leader intentions. Similarly, Resick et al. (2006) hold that ethical leaders are encouraging and empowering so that followers gain a sense of personal competence that helps them to be self-sufficient (see also Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Gini, 1997). Here, we label this combination ''empowering leader behaviour''.

Empowerment was seen as a relational construct, emphasizing delegation, participation of followers in decision making processes, and sharing of organizational resources. Conger and Kanungo (1988) took a different route and treated empowerment as a motivational construct focusing on employees' need for self-determination and personal efficacy. They define empowerment as a process of enhancing self-efficacy of organizational members through identifying and removing conditions that foster powerlessness both by formal organizational practices and informal techniques of providing efficacy information. Spreitzer (1995) describes psychological empowerment as the gestalt of four cognitions: a sense of meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact. She shows that these dimensions differentially relate to important work outcomes, which has been supported by many studies (Okolie & Ochei, 2020; Umah, Amah & Wokoch, 2014; Behling & McFillen, 1996; McCann, Langford, & Rawlings, 2006; Niehoff, Moorman, Blakely, & Fuller, 2001).

Purpose of the Study

This study sought to investigate the relationship between leadership-behaviours and organisational commitment as predictor variables on workers' empowerment behaviours.

Specifically, answers will be provided to the following questions:

1. Will perceived leadership-behaviour variables correlates positively, thus, independently and jointly predict workers' empowering behaviours.
2. Will worker's organisational commitment variables correlates, thus, independently and jointly predict workers' empowering behaviours.

Hypotheses

In order to investigate the relationship between the variables under reference the following hypotheses were stated and tested with appropriate statistics.

Hypothesis 1: Perceived leadership-behaviour variables will independently and jointly predict workers' empowering behaviours.

Hypothesis 2: Employee's organisational commitment variables will independently and jointly predict workers' empowering behaviours.

Method

A correlational design was used to select 605 workers by a careful multistage sampling technique from some selected public and private service organizations in Lagos Metropolis, Nigeria. The participants were selected from public and private service organisations. Biographical analysis of respondents showed that 47.7% were males, while 52.9% were females. The workers were aged between 18-24years, 25-29 years, 26.3%, 30-42years, and 43years or above, respectively. The average age and job tenure was 38.5 and 6.8 years respectively. The employees were selected from private and public sector organisations workers comprising 312 (51.6%) males and 293 (48.4%) females sampled from seven departments of some selected public and private organizations in Lagos and Abuja metropolis participated in the study. There were 349 (57.6%) drawn from private organizations and 256 (42.4%) drawn from public organizations. Their job tenures with their organizations ranged from (1) to (18) years with a mean tenure of 8 .4 years (SD. = 2.13), their ages ranged from 24 to 59 years with a mean age 39.5 years.

Instruments

Leadership-Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBD-35): LBD-35 developed by Akinbode (2011) is a 35-item inventory designed to measure five dimensions of perceived leadership behaviour in organizations Response structure for LBD-35 are weighted on 4-point Likert scale ranging from 0= Never, 1= Seldom/rarely, 2= Often, 3= Always. LBD-35 has a Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients of .90, .79, .76, .25, and .41, respectively and Spearman-Brown Split half reliability of .83, .76, .67, .28, .32. A concurrent validity of .416 was obtained by correlating the scores on LBD-Inventory with Fleishman's SBDQ. Construct analysis of the scale was supported in a confirmatory analysis. Wilk's Lambda evaluation of fit for the measurement model showed a moderate fit for the five-factor model, $\chi2$ (35, 504, = 51.186, p<0.05).

Perception of Empowerment (PEI_15) Scale: It was developed by Akinbode and Eze, (2011). The PEI_15 measures three dimensions of empowerment: Autonomy, Participation, and responsibility. Autonomy refers to an individual's perception of the level of freedom and personal control that he or she possesses and is able to exercise in performance job tasks. Participation measures perceptions of influence in producing job outcomes and the degree to which employees feel they input into organizational goals and processes. Responsibility measures the psychological investment an individual feel toward his/her job and the commitment he/she brings to the job. The inventory is a 15-items inventory. Higher sores indicate higher perceptions of empowerment. Internal consistency of 0.80 to 0.87 was reported. The author reported Criterion-related validity of 0.82.

Organisation Commitment Scale (OC-Scale): It was developed by Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M. and Porter, L.W. (1979). The instrument is on 7-point Likert Scale from 1= Strongly disagree to = 7 Strongly agree. Direct score items were added together by summing the values of the numbers shaded in the relevant items of a 7-point Likert scale. For the reverse score items, the values of the number were change from 1,2,3,4,5,6,7 to 7,6,5,4,3,2,1, respectively and these were added together in a reversed manner of the numbers shaded in the relevant items. The results were added to determine the score for the particular scale for each participant. The overall organizational commitment score now gives the scores of the three scales for each participant.

Procedure

Data was collected through personally administered questionnaire by accidental and random sampling technique at workplaces and employed students of professional master degree programme in Masters in Pubic and International Affairs (MPIA), Managerial Psychology (MMP) and Masters of Public Administration (MPA). Participation in the survey was strictly voluntary and anonymous. The questionnaire included items to measures leadership-behaviour and employees empowering behaviour. In addition to the items to measure the independent and dependent variables, demographics were also included, such as age, gender, highest level of education, nature of job, income level and tenure in the organisation. Out of the 605 questionnaires, 210 were administered personally at workplace though some HR Managers resisted due to time constraint. The rest 395 were administered employed students of professional master degree programmes in University of Lagos. Participants were briefed about (i) the purpose of the questionnaire (ii) anonymity and confidentiality of their response (iii). Participants were assured that the instrument is not a test; therefore, there were no right or wrong answers. The overall response rate of the questionnaires used in the analyses was 62% (ranging from 43% to 79% in the different work groups).

Results

In order to investigate the influence of perceived leadership behaviour on worker's empowerment behaviour, Pearson product moment correlation analysis was computed. The results of various analysis conducted are presented in Tables as follows.

Table 1a: **Summary of Pearson's 'r' inter-correlation matrix of leadership-behaviours organizational commitment and sub-ordinates Empowerment Behaviour -Autonomy**

Pearson Correlation	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 Interpersonal relations	1.00					
2 Emancipatory	.589**	1.00				
3 Autocratic	.667**	.548**	1.00			
4 Productive	.276**	.274**	.299**	1.00		
5 Patriotic	.277**	.211**	.402**	.190**	1.00	
6. Workers Empowerment Behaviour (i.e. Autonomy)	.789**	.669*	-.345	.198	.403*	
Mean	**24.15**	**12.47**	**17.11**	**7.92**	**4.81**	**25.22**
SD	**1.65**	**1.22**	**2.63**	**1.57**	**1.84**	**1.71**

* - Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**- Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

***- Emotional   Involvement.

The result indicated that interpersonal relations and emancipatory leadership behaviour had significant positive correlations with *autonomy* variables. In order to determine whether leadership-behaviours investigated significantly predict workers' empowerment behaviour -*Autonomy*, multiple regression analysis was computed. The result is presented in Table 2b.

Table 1b: Relative Contributions of the Predictor Variables to the prediction of Criterion Variable Empowerment Behaviour -Autonomy

Variables	Beta	T	P	R	R^2	F_{ratio}	Sig

1 Interpersonal relations	.693	3.722	P<0.05				
2 Emancipatory	.702	4.646	P<0.05	.756	.571	*15.025	p<0.05
3 Autocratic	-.003	1.006	Ns				
4 Productive	-.225	-.569	Ns				
5 Patriotic	.454	3.956	P<0.05				

Dependent variable: Empowerment Behaviour: Autonomy; *$p<0.05$, df = (5,498), N = 504:* R^2 is significant.

The results show that interpersonal relations significantly contributed to the variance in workers *Autonomy* (Beta = .693, t = 3.722 at p<0.05). Meanwhile, emancipatory leadership-behaviour accounted for 70.2% of the variance in workers' Autonomy (Beta = .702, t = 4.646, at p<0.05). Similarly, patriotic leadership behaviour significantly contributed to the variance in workers *Autonomy* (Beta = .454, t = 3.956 at p<0.05). The joint influence of leadership behaviours, however, yielded significant coefficient of regression R^2 = .571 (p<0.05). This implies about 57.1% of the observed variance in workers *Autonomy* is accounted for by leadership behaviour.

In order to identify the relative influence of leadership-behaviour on of subordinate's empowerment (i.e. participation), Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was computed. The result is presented in Table 3a.

Table 2a: Summary of Pearson's 'r' inter-correlation matrix of leadership-behaviours organizational commitment and sub-ordinates Empowerment Behaviour

Pearson Correlation	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 Interpersonal relations	1.00					
2 Emancipatory	.564**	1.00				
3 Autocratic	.447**	.318**	1.00			
4 Productive	.376**	.244**	.299**	1.00		
5 Patriotic	.767**	.211**	.402**	.190**	1.00	
6. Worker Empowerment Behaviour (i.e. Participation)	.767**	.672**	.302*	.290*	.560*	1.00
Mean	**23.35**	**14.49**	**17.02**	**6.92**	**5.86**	**25.06**
SD	**1.09**	**1.12**	**2.16**	**1.07**	**1.54**	**2.71**

* - Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**- Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The result indicated that interpersonal relations and emancipatory leadership behaviour had significant positive correlations with workers *Participation* (r = .767**, at p<0.01). In order to determine whether leadership behaviours investigated significantly predict workers' *Participation*, a multiple regression analysis was computed. The result is presented in Table 3b.

Table: 2b: **Relative Contributions of the Predictor Variables to the prediction of Criterion Variable Empowerment Behaviour -Participation**

Variables	Beta	T	P	R	R^2	F_{ratio}	Sig

1 Interpersonal relations	.493	4.261	P<0.05				
2 Emancipatory	.502	3.346	P<0.05	.678	.459	*10.127	p<0.05
3 Autocratic	.271	1.126	Ns				
4 Productive	.235	2.569	Ns				
5 Patriotic	.454	3.346	P<0.05				

Dependent variable: Empowerment Behaviour: Participation*; *p<0.05, df = (5,498), N = 504:* R^2 is significant.

The results show that interpersonal relations significantly contributed to the variance in workers' *participation* (Beta = .493, t = 4.261 at p<0.05). Similarly, emancipatory and patriotic leadership-behaviour contributed significantly to the prediction of workers' Participation (Beta = .502, t = 3.346, at p<0.05; Beta = .454, t = 3.346 at p<0.05). Expectedly, autocratic and productive leadership behaviour did not promote worker's participation (Beta = .271, t = 1.126, at p>0.05; Beta = .235, t = 2.569 at p>0.05). Albeit, the joint influence of leadership behaviours, yielded significant coefficient of regression R^2 = .459 at p<0.05), which implies that the leadership behaviours put together accounted for about 45.9% of the observed variance in workers *Participation*.

Table 3a: Summary of Pearson's 'r' inter-correlation matrix of leadership-behaviours organizational commitment and sub-ordinates Empowerment Behaviour –Responsibility

Pearson Correlation	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 Interpersonal relations	1.00					
2 Emancipatory	.809**	1.00				
3 Autocratic	.567*	.138*	1.00			
4 Productive	-.256	.274*	.279*	1.00		

5 Patriotic	.347*	.481**	.102	.190**	1.00	
6. Worker Empowerment Behaviour (i.e. Responsibility)	.672**	.653*	-.102	.348*	.556**	1
Mean	**21.85**	**17.49**	**16.12**	**8.92**	**4.80**	**27.25**
SD	**7.79**	**4.82**	**4.66**	**2.57**	**1.84**	**8.70**

* - Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**- Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The result indicated that interpersonal relations, emancipatory, productive and patriotic leadership behaviours had significant positive correlations with workers' *Responsibility*. Further, multiple regression analysis was computed to investigate the prediction of workers. The result is presented in Table 3b.

Table: 3b: **Relative Contributions of the Predictor Variables to the prediction of Criterion Variable Empowerment Behaviour -Responsibility**

Variables	Beta	T	P	R	R^2	F_{ratio}	Sig
1 Interpersonal relations	.533	3.214	P<0.05				
2 Emancipatory	.422	4.552	P<0.05	.669	.447	*9.307	p<0.05
3 Autocratic	-.310	-1.106	P>0.05				
4 Productive	-.025	-1.569	P>0.05				
5 Patriotic	.344	2.956	P<0.05				

Dependent variable: Empowerment Behaviour: Responsibility; **p<0.05, df = (5,498), N = 504:* R^2 is significant.

The results show that interpersonal relations significantly contributed to the variance workers' *Responsibility* (Beta = .533, t = 3.214 at p<0.05). Also, emancipatory leadership-behaviour and patriotic leadership behaviours contributed significantly to the prediction of

workers' workers' *responsibility* (Beta = .422, t = 4.552, at p<0.0 and (Beta = .344, t = 2.956, at p<0.05), respectively at p<0.05. Interestingly and expectedly too, autocratic and productive leadership behaviour failed to independently predict worker's responsibility behaviour (Beta = -.310, t = -1.106, at p>0.05) and (Beta = -.025, t = -1.569, at p>0.05), respectively. Nevertheless, the joint influence of leadership behaviours, however, yielded significant coefficient of regression R^2 = .447 at p<0.05. This hitherto implies that about 44.7% of the workers' *responsibility* is accounted for by leadership behaviours under reference.

Table 4a: **Summary of Pearson's 'r' inter-correlation matrix of leadership-behaviours organizational commitment and sub-ordinates Empowerment Behaviour -Autonomy**

Pearson Correlation	1	2	3	4	5
1. Job identification	1				
2. Emotional involvement	.198**	1			
3. Job Loyalty	.252**	.213**	1		
4. Org. commitment	.322**	.282**	.292**	1	
5. Empowerment Behaviour (i.e. Autonomy)	.372**	.352**	.339**	.470*	1
Mean	**24.85**	**19.49**	**17.12**	**7.92**	**4.90**
SD	**1.19**	**2.72**	**1.36**	**2.37**	**1.82**

* - Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**- Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The result indicated that job identification, emotional involvement and job loyalty had significant positive correlations with workers' *Autonomy*. In order to determine whether

organizational commitment variables significantly predict workers' *Autonomy*, multiple regression analysis was computed result of which is presented in Table 5b.

Table: 4b: **Relative Contributions of the Predictor Variables to the prediction of Criterion Variable Empowerment Behaviour -Autonomy**

Variables	Beta	T	P	R	R^2	F_{ratio}	Sig
1. Job identification	.543	3.214	P<0.05				
2. Emotional involvement	.392	4.552	P<0.05	.566	.320	8.702	P<.05
3. Job Loyalty	.410	3.106	P<0.05				
4. Org. commitment	.325	2.569	P<0.05				

Dependent variable: Empowerment Behaviour: Autonomy; **p<0.05, df = (5,498), N = 504:* R^2 is significant.

The results in Table 4b showed that *Job identification, Emotional Involvement* and *Job Loyalty* significantly contributed to the variance in workers' *Autonomy:* contributing 54.3%, 39.2% and 41.1%, respectively. Workers' overall organizational commitment accounted to 32.5% of the variance in workers *Autonomy* (Beta = .325, t = 2.569, at p<0.05). The joint influence of the organizational commitment variables produced significant coefficient of regression R^2 = .320 at p<0.05, which implies that organizational commitment variables accounted for 32.0%% of the variance in workers' *Autonomy*.

In order to identify the relative influence of worker's organizational commitment on subordinate's empowerment (i.e. participation), Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was computed. The result is presented in Table 6a.

Table 5a: **Summary of Pearson's 'r' inter-correlation matrix of organizational commitment variables and sub-ordinates Empowerment Behaviour**

Pearson Correlation	1	2	3	4	5
1. Job identification	1				
2. Emotional involvement	.198**	1			
3. Job Loyalty	.252**	.213**	1		
4. Org. commitment	.322**	.282**	.292**	1	
5. Workers Empowerment Behaviour (i.e. Participation)Participation	.452**	.381**	.439**	.270*	1
Mean	**24.75**	**12.09**	**14.11**	**6.12**	**4.76**
SD	**1.33**	**1.12**	**1.46**	**1.37**	**0.84**

* - Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**- Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 5a presents the results of the inter-correlation analysis between worker's organizational commitment variables and workers' *participation.* Result showed that organizational commitment variables had significant positive correlations with Workers' *participation.* Also, multiple regression analysis was computed revealed that organizational commitment variables significantly predicted workers' *participation*. The result is presented in Table 6b.

Table: 5b: **Relative Contributions of the Predictor Variables to the prediction of Criterion Variable Empowerment Behaviour -Participation**

Variables	Beta	T	P	R	R^2	F_{ratio}	Sig
1. Job identification	.413	3.014	P<0.05				
2. Emotional involvement	.369	2.552	P<0.05	.666	.443	12.702*	P<.05
3. Job Loyalty	.410	3.206	P<0.05				
4. Org. commitment (Overall)	.405	2.669	P<0.05				

Dependent variable: Empowerment Behaviour: Participation*; *p<0.05, df = (5,498), N = 504:* R^2 is significant.

The results Table 5b showed that organizational commitment variables significantly contributed to the variance in workers' *participation* accounting for 41.3%, 36.9% 41.0% and 40.5%, respectively. The joint influence of organizational commitment variables under reference accounted for about 44.3% of the observed variance in workers' *participation*.

Table 6a: **Summary of Pearson's 'r' inter-correlation matrix of leadership-behaviours organizational commitment and sub-ordinates Empowerment Behaviour –Responsibility**

Pearson Correlation	1	2	3	4	5
1 Job identification	1				
2 Emotional involvement	.198**	1			
3 Job Loyalty	.252**	.213**	1		
4 Org. commitment	.322**	.282**	.292**	1	
5. Workers Empowerment Behaviour (Responsibility)	.572**	.442**	.369**	.474*	1
Mean	**23.85**	**18.49**	**17.12**	**9.92**	**4.80**
SD	**1.19**	**1.43**	**1.33**	**2.55**	**1.84**

* - Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**- Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 6a result indicated that organizational commitment variables had significant positive correlations with workers' *responsibility*.   Also, in order to determine whether organizational commitment variables predicted workers' *responsibility*, a multiple regression analysis was computed and result is presented in Table 7b.

Table: 6b: **Relative Contributions of the Predictor Variables to the prediction of Criterion Variable Empowerment Behaviour -Responsibility**

Variables	Beta	T	P	R	R^2	F_{ratio}	Sig
1. Job identification	.323	3.284	P<0.05				
2. Emotional involvement	.491	2.752	P<0.05	.489	.239	6.679*	P<.05
3. Job Loyalty	.340	3.286	P<0.05				
4. Org. commitment (Overall)	.395	3.669	P<0.05				

Dependent variable: Empowerment Behaviour: Responsibility; *p<0.05, df = (5,498), N = 504:* R^2 is significant.

In Table 6b, the results showed that organizational commitment variables significantly contributed to the variance in workers' *responsibility.* Multiple regression analysis yielded significant coefficient of regression R^2 = .239 at p<0.05. This implies that 32.9% of the observed variance in workers' *responsibility* is accounted for the joint influence of organizational commitment variables.

Discussion

This study investigated the relationships between workers empowering behaviours, perceived leadership behaviours and organizational commitment variables. The first hypothesis focused on the relationships between workers empowering behaviours, perceived leadership behaviours. Analysis yielded results that were largely consistent with the predictions envisaged. In this study, it was found that interpersonal relations and emancipatory leadership behaviour had significant positive correlations with workers empowering behaviours: autonomy, participation and responsibility, respectively. Specifically, interpersonal relations and emancipatory leadership behaviour significantly contributed to the prediction of the observed variance in worker's empowering behaviors: autonomy, participation and responsibility, respectively. The observed F-ratios associated

with the R^2 change three empowerment behaviours are significant at p<.05 level. This is an indication that the effectiveness of a combination of the leadership behaviour variables in predicting workers' empowering behaviours could not have occurred by chance. The magnitude of the relationship between leadership behaviours and workers' empowering behaviours variables and a combination of both is reflected in the values of the coefficients of multiple correlations and R^2 change as shown in Tables 1b, 2b and 3b, respectively. It may be said that about 57.1%, 45,9% and 44.7% of the observed total variance in autonomy, participation and responsibility is accounted for by a linear combination of the five leadership behaviour variables. The results highlight the detrimental influence of task orientation leadership behaviour on workers' empowering behaviour.

A very important contribution of this study is that it clearly established that task orientation leadership (i.e. autocratic and productive leadership behaviour) failed to predict workers' autonomy, participation and responsibility empowering behaviours. The results and findings demonstrated that, consistent with other studies (Manz & Sims, 1987; Pearce & Sims, 2002; Rizwana & Sayyed, Mehdi, 2016; Namasivayam, Guchait & Lei, 2014; May, Gilson & Harter, 2004), other people at work, especially the leader (or supervisor), can affect the way individuals feel about themselves and their work. Poor supervisor–subordinate relationships, poor communication, as well as a lack of feedback, impact negatively on the well-being of employees (Rizwana & Sayyed, Mehdi, 2016; Namasivayam, Guchait & Lei, 2014), May, Gilson & Harter, 2004). Leadership behaviour affects the well-being of employees; most especially if leader behaviour is supportive and trustworthy in nature it is likely to produce feelings of safety at work (Manz & Sims, 1987; Pearce & Sims, 2002May *et al.*, 2004), which will contribute to employee empowerment behaviours. The findings of this current study clearly supports the conclusions of many other studies that have established that leader behaviours and managerial practices that empower followers such as assuring followers of their competency and providing them opportunities for success or allowing them influence on decisions and room for experimentation promote empowerment in subordinates (e.g., Behling & McFillen, 1996; McCann, Langford, & Rawlings, 2006; Niehoff, Moorman, Blakely, & Fuller, 2001; Ahearne,

Matthieu, & Rapp; 2005; Ensley; Manz & Sims, 1987; Pearce & Sims, 2002, Pearce, Yoo, & Alavi, 2004; Yun, Cox, & Sims, 2006; Yun, Faraj, & Sims, 2005).

The second research hypothesis focused on the influence of organizational commitment variables on worker's empowerment behaviour. These relationships were characterized by significant positive relationships. The results established the findings that organizational commitment variables: job identification, emotional involvement and job loyalty was related to workers' empowering behaviours. In the study, job identification, emotional involvement and job loyalty is related to workers' Autonomy, participation and responsibility. Not only that, it was clearly established that Job identification, Emotional Involvement and Job Loyalty significantly predicted workers' Autonomy, participation and responsibility thereby contributing about 54.3%, 39.2% and 41.1%, respectively. The observed F-ratios associated with the R^2 change three empowerment behaviours are significant at $p<.05$ level. Further, workers' overall organizational commitment accounted to 32.5% of the variance in workers Autonomy, about 44.3% of the observed variance in workers' participation and 32.9% of the observed variance in workers' responsibility is accounted for the joint influence of organizational commitment variables. This study in the light of this findings has demonstrated the influence of leadership-behaviours and organisational commitment/job involvement on employee empowerment behaviours. On the basis of theory (e.g. Manz & Sims, 1990, 1991; Mahoney & Arnkoff, 1978; and past research (e.g. Okolie & Ochei, 2020; Umah, Amah & Wokoch, 2014; Ahearne, Matthieu, & Rapp; 2005; Ensley; Manz & Sims, 1987; Pearce & Sims, 2002, Pearce, Yoo, & Alavi, 2004; Yun, Cox, & Sims, 2006; Yun, Faraj, & Sims, 2005), this pattern was expected among workers.

Conclusion

First, the results of this study suggest that employees who perceive leaders as showing more interpersonal relations reported more autonomy in management, participation in decision and responsibility of purpose, variables that are generally seen as important for the long-term stability of the organization. Promoting leadership environment that promote empowerment behaviours in workers should therefore be of paramount of

interest for every organisation, whether public or private sector. Both demonstrating fairness in interpersonal relationships, emancipatory, patriotism/integrity and a concern for empowering followers are important for managers to be perceived as an ethical leader. Thus, organizations may want to pay specific attention to the development and promotion of these appropriate leader's behaviours (interpersonal relations, emancipatory, productive and patriotic leadership-behaviours) for example, through focusing on these behaviours in training and reward systems. Developing performance standards and rewards that discourage leaders' self-serving and exploitative behaviour can also help to signal the importance the organization places on acting ethically. Organizations can also raise the awareness of the importance of ethical behaviour among their lower level managers through other forms of communication, such as a statement of ethical conduct that is supported by top management and consistently communicated and enforced.

The results suggest that managers should imbibe and demonstrate appropriate empowerment behaviours, because it affects employee engagement, which in turn affects their turnover intention. This suggests that subordinates' ideas of whether a leader is honest and patriotic are based on observations of how a leader treats others generally. Thus, subordinates can see leaders as unpatriotic even if these specific subordinates themselves have not (yet) been treated unfairly by their leader. Thus, treating everyone equally fairly is important. In contrast, empowering seems to occur more on a one-to-one basis and does involve a more individualized perspective. What is sufficient support to build confidence or sufficient opportunity to voice opinions needs to be tailored to each individual's needs.

References

Ahearne, M., Mathieu, J., & Rapp, A. (2005). To empower or not to empower your sales force? An empirical examination of the influence of leadership empowerment behavior on customer satisfaction and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(5), 945–955.

Akinbode, G. A. (2022). Leadership And Supervision:A Thematic Appraisal Of Leadership, Supervision & Developmental Sequence In The Workplace Small Groups In Lauree,

Tilton-Weaver, Akinbode, Gabriel et al (Eds)., Issues of Child Development in Nigeria. A Festschrift in Honour of Professor Agiobu-Kemmer. Markabliss Press Chap. Seven, pg112 -149

Akinbode, G.A. (2011). Development and validation of a multi-dimensional leadership style Questionnaire. *African Journal for the Psychological Studies of Social Issues. 14(1).* 57-81.

Akinbode, G.A. & Eze, L.N (2011). Development and validation of a perception of empowerment scale. *Unpublished Monogragraph*, Department of Psychology, University of Lagos.

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.

Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character and authentic transformational leadership behaviour. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 181–218.

Behling, O., & McFillen, J. M. (1996). A syncretical model of charismatic/transformational leadership. *Group and Organization Management,* 21, 163–191.

Bowen, D. E., & Lawler, E. E. (1992). The empowerment of service workers: What, why, how, and when. MIT Sloan Management Review, 33, 31-39.

Bowen, D. E., & Lawler, E. E. (1995). Empowering service employees. Sloan Management Review. 36, 73–84.

Brown, M. E., Trevin˜o, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning

perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behaviour and Human*

Decision Processes, 97, 117-134.

Carson, C.M., & King Jr., J.E. (2005). Conceptual paper. Leaving leadership: Solving leadership problems through empowerment. *Management Decision, 43*, 1049–1053.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 471–482.

Craig, S. B., & Gustafson, S. B. (1998). Perceived leader integrity scale: An instrument for assessing emplorees' perceptions of leader integrity. *Leadership Quarterly,* 9, 127-145.

Cunningham, I., Hyman, J., & Baldry, C. (1996). Empowerment: The power to do what? *Industrial Relations Journal, 27*(2), 143–154

De Hoogh &Den Hartog (2009). Empowering behaviour and leader fairness and integrity: Studying perceptions of ethical leader behaviour from a levels-of-analysis perspective. *European Journal of work and Organizational Psychology,* 18 (2), 199–230

De Hoogh, A. H. B., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2008). Ethical and despotic leadership, relationships

with leader's social responsibility, top management team effectiveness and subordinates' optimism: A multi-method study. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 297–311.

De Hoogh, A. H. B., & Den Hartog, D. N. (in press). Ethical leadership: The socially responsible use of power. In D. Tjosvold & B. M. van Knippenberg (Eds.), Power and interdependence in organizations. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Gini, A. (1997). Moral leadership: An overview. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16, 323–330.

Gini, A. (1998). Moral leadership and business ethics. In C. B. Ciulla (Ed.), Ethics, the heart of leadership. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

House, R. J., & Howell, J. M. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 3, 81–108.

Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1992). The ethics of charismatic leadership: Submission or liberation? *Academy of Management Executive*, 6, 43–54.

instrument for assessing employees' perceptions of leader integrity. Leadership Quarterly, 9, 127–145.

Johnson, P.R. (1994). Brains, heart and courage: Keys to empowerment and self-directed leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 9*(2), 17–21.

Kanungo, R. N. (2001). Ethical values of transactional and transformational leaders. Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 18, 257-265.

Kanungo, R. N., & Mendoca, M. (1996). Ethical dimensions of leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kendall L. Stewart (2002). Empowerment: Some practical questions & answers, A presentation for Hempstead Manor

Konczak, L.J., Stelly, D.J., & Trusty, M.L. (2000). Defining and measuring empowering leader behaviors: Development of an upward feedback instrument. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 60*, 301–313.

Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading Change.* Boston, MA. 102.

Kyei-Frimpong, M., Berko-Obeng, D.O. & Osafroadu, A.M. (2024), "Modeling innovative work behaviour through leadership behaviors in the hospitality industry; the role of work–family enrichment", *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights*, 7(2), 1010-1030.

Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization: its management and values.* McGraw-Hill.

Manz, C. C., & Sims Jr., H. P. (1987). Leading workers to lead themselves: The external leadership of self-managing work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32, 106-129.

Manz, C.C. & Sims, H.P (1991). Super Leadership: Beyond the myth of heroic leadership. *Organisational Dynamics*, 19(4), 18-35.

Mahoney, M. J., & Kazdin, A. E. (1979). Cognitive behavior modification: Misconceptions and premature evacuation. *Psychological Bulletin, 86*(5), 1044–1049.

Malone, T. W. (1999). Is 'Empowerment' just a fad? Control, Decision-Making, and IT. *BT Technology Journal*, 17(4), 141.

May, D., Gilson, R., & Harter, L. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness,

safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77,* 11–37.

Mowday, R., Steers, R., and Porter, L. (1979). The Measurement of Organizational Commitment, *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 14, 224–227.

McGregor, D. (1960). The Human Side of Enterprise, McGraw-Hill, New York.

McCann, J.J., Langford, P.H., and Rawlings, R.M. (2006). Testing Behling and McFillen's syncretical model of charismatic transformational leadership, *Group & Organization Management*, 31, 237–263.

Meichenbaum, D. (1977). Cognitive-Behavior Modification: An integrative approach. New York: Plenum.

Namasivayam, K., Guchait, P. & Lei, P. (2014). The influence of leader empowering behaviors and employee psychological empowerment on customer satisfaction, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26(1), 69-84.

Niehoff, B. P.,Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G., & Fuller, J. (2001). The influence of empowerment and job enrichment on employee loyalty in a downsizing environment. *Group and Organization Management,* 26, 93–113.

Okolie, U.C, & Ochei, J.O. (2020). Employee empowerment and continuance commitment in the Nigerian manufacturing industry, International Journal of New Economics & Social Sciences (IJONESS), 11(1), 11 (1): 209-222.

Pearce, C.L., H. P. Sims, J. F. Cox, G. Ball, E. Schnell, & K. A. Smith (2003). Transactors, transformers and beyond: A multimethod development of a theoretical typology of leadership. *Journal of Management Development*, 22(4), 273–307.

Pearce, C. L., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (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*(2), 172–197.

Pearce, C. L., Yoo, Y., & Alavi, M. (2004). Leadership, social work, and virtual teams: The relative influence of vertical versus shared leadership, in the Nonprofit Sector. In R. E. Riggio & S. S. Orr (Eds.), *Improving leadership in nonprofit organizations* (pp. 180–203). Jossey-Bass.

Potterfield, J.A. (1999). *The business of employee empowerment: Democracy and ideology in the workplace.* Westport, CT: Qourum, Book.

Resick, C. J., Hanges, P. J., Dickson, M. W., & Mitchelson, J. K. (2006). A cross-cultural examination of the endorsement of ethical leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 63, 345-359-359.

Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 1442–1465.

Thomas, K.W., & Velthouse, B.A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An 'interpretive' model of intrinsic task motivation. *Academy of Management Review, 15(4),* 666–681.

Turner, N., Barling, J., Epitropaki, O., Butcher, V., & Milder, C. (2002). Transformational leadership and moral reasoning. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 304-311.

Umah, G. I. Amah, E., &Wokoch, I. H. (2014). Employee benefits and continuance commitment in the Nigerian manufacturing industry. IOSR Journal of Business and Management, 16(2), 69-74.

Van Dierendonck, D., Haynes, C., Borrill, C., & Stride, C. (2004). Leadership Behavior and Subordinate Well-Being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 9*(2), 165–175.

Yun, S., Cox, J., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (2006). The forgotten follower: a contingency model of leadership and follower self-leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*(4), 374–388.

Yun, S., Faraj, S., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (2005). Contingent Leadership and Effectiveness of Trauma Resuscitation Teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(6), 1288–1296.

Wellins, R.S., Byham, W.C., & Wilson, J.M. (1991). *Empowered teams.* San Francisco: Jossey–Bass.