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Abstract

This research focused on the impact of empowering leadership behaviors on employees’ work outcomes, including in-role behaviors, organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward the organization (OCBO), and affective commitment. This impact is proposed to be mediated by psychological empowerment. Also, I propose the association between empowering leadership behaviors and psychological empowerment will be moderated by the presence of employees’ need for achievement, such that the association is stronger when need for achievement is high. The hypotheses were tested using survey data collected from 160 full-time employees in different organizations in Hong Kong. Results showed that the hypotheses were supported, except that of the mediating role of psychological empowerment on the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and OCBO, and the moderating role of need for achievement. The report concluded with a discussion of the managerial implications of the findings.
Chapter 1  Introduction

Due to the increasing international competition and technological advancement in the 21st century, many companies are trying to undergo structural changes by abandoning the traditional hierarchical management structure and adopting an empowering leadership style, in which managers give more power in decision making and obligation for subordinates’ job when compared with what they had in traditional bureaucratic organizations (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). Also, the main labour force is changing from generation X to Y. As generation Y is more open-minded and willing to take responsibility, they welcome employee empowerment and respond to it positively. For these reasons, employee empowerment becomes more applicable in today’s society.

Empowering leadership is commonly linked to psychological empowerment, which is the intrinsic task motivation reflecting how people orientate in their work position (Spreitzer, 1995). The reason behind the association is that people are more likely to be motivated in their work tasks by different elements of empowering leadership behaviors.

Empowering leadership behaviors have been shown to be related to different kinds of work outcomes in previous researches (Ahearne, Mathieu & Rapp, 2005; Raub and Robert, 2010). Conger and Kanungo (1988) suggested that empowering leadership behaviors are applied because it improves performance and organizational effectiveness by bringing greater flexibility in management and strengthening employees’ beliefs in their self-efficacy and hence reduces their feeling of powerlessness.

In general, how the supervisors apply empowering leadership behaviors depend on supervisors’ personalities. Hence, there is not a standard for applying employee empowerment. Supervisors can apply empowering leadership behaviors uniformly to all employees or differentially across employees (Ahearne et al., 2005; Zhang and Bartol, 2010). Also, empowerment can be applied to team or to each individual.
1.1 **Statement of the problem**

This research is ready to answer three questions. First, do empowering leadership behaviors enhance work outcomes? Second, how does psychological empowerment affect the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and work outcomes? Third, does need for achievement moderate the effect of empowering leadership behaviors on psychological empowerment?

1.2 **Objectives of the study**

The objectives of my study are as follow: First, to investigate the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and work outcomes (in-role behaviors, organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward the organization and affective commitment). Second, to investigate whether psychological empowerment mediates the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and work outcomes. Third, to investigate whether need for achievement influences the association between empowering leadership behaviors and psychological empowerment.
Chapter 2   Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the findings of prior researches about empowering leadership behaviors and the theories they applied are summarized. Also, the research gaps for my study are presented in the conclusion part.

2.2 What is Empowering leadership behavior?

Empowering leadership behavior is the leaders’ empowering style of behavior (Ahearne et al., 2005). It is related to the concept of empowerment. Arnold, Arad, Rhoades & Drasgow (2000, p.15) defined empowerment as “the process of implementing conditions that increase employees’ feelings of self-efficacy and control (e.g. participative decision making), and removing conditions that foster a sense of powerlessness (e.g. bureaucracy)”. The common practices of empowering leaders include coaching, training, emotional support, providing information and participative decision making (Bandura, 1986). Studies of empowering leadership behavior are conducted both at the individual level (Ahearne et al., 2005; Zhang and Bartol, 2010) and team level (Arnold et al, 2000). Prior researches (Ahearne et al., 2005; Zhang and Bartol, 2010) suggested a theoretical idea of whether applying empowerment uniformly or differentially across employees, which brings individual differences in how supervisors exercise empowering leadership behaviors on subordinates.

Scholars (Dvir, Eden, Avolio & Shamir, 2002; Ozaralli, 2003) showed the linkage between transformational leadership and empowerment, in which Dvir et al. (2002) stated that empowerment is the consequence of transformational leadership. This is because individual can increase self-efficacy through increasing the feeling of being capable to complete the work task by transformational leadership behaviors such as emphasizing the linkage of employees’ effort to personal and organization’s mission, vision and goal.
2.3 Linkage between empowering leadership behavior and work outcomes

Prior studies stated the close linkage between empowering leadership behaviors and work outcomes. For example, Ahearne et al. (2005) focused on the effect of empowering leadership behaviors on sales performance; Raub and Robert (2010) showed the effect of empowering leadership behaviors on in-role and extra-role employee behaviors.

Two theoretical models have been broadly used in the studies of empowering leadership behaviors, which are motivational model and exchange-based model. They can be used for explaining the association of supervisors’ empowering leadership behavior on subordinates’ work outcomes. The motivational model holds that empowered employees can feel being rewarded with something intrinsic for their contributions in their work duties (Conger and Kanungo, 1988; Thomas and Velthouse, 1990) and have higher level of psychological empowerment (Spreitzer, 1995) through supervisor’s empowering leadership behavior. This higher level of psychological empowerment then motivates employees being loyal to perform at a higher level. The exchange-based model holds that empowering leadership behavior can enhance subordinates’ feeling of being respected, care for and recognized by the supervisor and hence can cultivate a higher level of trust in the organization (Hutchison, Sowa, Eisenberger, & Huntington, 1986). Huang, Iun, Liu & Gong (2010) made a comparison between these two models in discussing the relationship between participative leadership and work performance, where participative leadership is commonly viewed as a practice of empowering subordinates. Their findings suggested that motivational model is more applicable in explaining the relationship for employees in managerial level because work performance can be enhanced by inducing a higher level of psychological empowerment and hence motivates those managers, who have a stronger need for having personal impact and control in an organization, to become loyal to perform better. Also, Raub and Rober (2010) showed that motivational model is applicable in explaining the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and employees’ work outcomes for general employees.
2.4 Psychological Empowerment

According to the motivational model, psychological empowerment is a motivational construct which mediates the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and work outcomes (Conger and Kanungo, 1988). Spreitzer (1995) defined psychological empowerment as “increased intrinsic task motivation manifested in a set of four cognitions reflecting an individual’s orientation to his or her work role: meaning, competence (which is synonymous with Conger & Kanungo’s self efficacy), self determination and impact”.

Meaning is a match between the requirements of an individual’s role in current position and his or her own thoughts, values and behaviors (Brief and Nord, 1990). Competence is an individual’s belief of having the required skill and ability to perform the work duties successfully (Gist, 1987). Self-determination is an individual’s own feeling of having the freedom to choose how to initiate and regulate his or her own actions (Deci, Connell & Ryan, 1989). Impact is an individual’s sense of having influence in work decisions and the ability of bringing different outcomes at work (Ashforth, 1989). Spreitzer (1995) pointed out these four cognitions reflect how an individual being actively oriented in their work position. Thomas and Velthouse (1990) stated that these four dimensions nearly form a set of cognitions which can be used for understanding the construct of psychological empowerment sufficiently and completely. The lack of any of these will deflate the feeling of empowerment.

2.5 Mediating effect of psychological empowerment

In the following section, the mediating effect of psychological empowerment on the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and work outcomes will be discussed.

For employee’s in-role behaviors, such as attendance and performance, Ahearne et al. (2005) showed that empowering leadership behavior can increase sales performance by enhancing salesperson’s self efficacy. The higher level of self-efficacy can motivate the employees to pay extra effort in performing the required job duties so as to fulfill the
obligation to employers.

For organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), it is defined as the employees’ behavior which is done voluntarily for contributing his or her own organization, but not for gaining from the direct and explicit linkage between effort and reward (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006). Among different types of OCBs (Farh, Podsakoff & Organ, 1990; Organ, 1988), OCBs directed toward the organization (OCBO) and OCBs directed toward individuals (OCBI) are most commonly described. Empirical studies have shown that OCBO is more likely to be affected by the leadership style of organization when compared with OCBI (Chen, Tsui, & Farh, 2002; Cheng, Jiang, & Riley, 2003). Psychological empowerment has been shown mediating the relationship between participative decision making and OCB (Bogler & Somech, 2005). When employees are motivated by intrinsic rewards, they are willing to spend extra effort to perform works that are outside their job duties.

For affective commitment, which is one type of organizational commitment, is defined as the degree of how an individual identify with and feel being involved in their own organization according to their own desire of staying there (Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982). Psychological empowerment has been showed mediating the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment (Avolio, Zhu, Koh, & Bhatia, 2004). Empowered employees would have higher level of competence and think themselves be more capable to contribute to the organization, and hence have less intention to quit.

2.6 Moderator

Prior researches (Ahearne et al., 2005; Zhang and Bartol, 2010) showed that empowering leadership behaviors are positively associated with the psychological empowerment. However, there may be some factors affecting this association. In other words, not all employees will respond in the same way to an empowering leader. For example, Zhang and Bartol (2010) suggested that empowerment role identity, which is the degree of an
individual views whether he or she want to be empowered in the job, moderates the linkage
between empowering leadership behavior and psychological empowerment. Employees with
higher role identity will be ready to be empowered and to handle new responsibilities. They
regard the empowered role as matching their role identity and hence experience a higher level
of psychological empowerment (Forrester, 2000).

2.7 Conclusion

Various researches have studied the relationship between different leadership behaviors
and work outcomes, including transformational leadership (Avolio et al., 2004) and
participative leadership behavior (Huang et al, 2010). Very few studies have focused on the
linkage between empowering leadership behaviors and work outcomes. For example,
Although Raub and Rober (2010) linked empowering leadership behaviors with in-role
behavior, affiliative extra-role behavior and challenging extra-role behavior, the focus of the
study is on testing the direct and indirect effect of empowering leadership behaviors on
different employee behaviors. Hence, there is no research examining the mediating effect of
psychological empowerment on the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors
and work outcomes (in-role behaviors, organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward
the organization and affective commitment) as the main focus in a research.

Besides, Ahearne et al. (2005) use only one cognition in psychological empowerment,
self-efficacy, as the mediator linking empowering leadership behaviors and work outcomes.
Few researches used the whole set of cognitions of psychological empowerment (i.e. meaning,
competence, self-determination and impact) as the mediator linking empowering leadership
behaviors and work outcomes.

Moreover, there is no research suggesting psychological motivation factors, such as need
for achievement, as a moderator for the association of empowering leadership behaviors and
psychological empowerment.
Chapter 3  Theoretical development and hypotheses

3.1 Introduction

There are three research gaps stated in last chapter. First, there is no research examining the mediation effect of psychological empowerment on the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and work outcomes as the main focus of the research. Second, few researches use the whole set of cognitions of psychological empowerment as the mediator between empowering leadership behaviors and work outcomes. Third, there is no research suggesting psychological motivation factors as a moderator for the association of empowering leadership behaviors and work outcomes. In this chapter, the theoretical framework of the study and the hypotheses developed for the study are presented. Figure 1 shows the hypothesized relationships of the research. The details are discussed following.

3.2 Theoretical model

The hypothesized relationships are shown in Figure 1. I linked empowering leadership behaviors with in-role behaviors, organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward the organization (OCBO) and affective commitment, while psychological empowerment is proposed to mediate these relationships. Besides, need for achievement is proposed to be the moderator of the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and psychological empowerment.

The model is at the individual level of analysis, rather than the team level, allowing for the possibility that individual employees are treated differently. Also, I choose OCBO, rather than OCBI, as one of the constructs I studied as it has been shown to be affected by the leadership style of organization more when compared with OCBI (Chen et al., 2002; Cheng et al., 2003).
3.3 Hypotheses development

Many researches (Ahearne et al, 2005; Raub and Robert, 2010) showed that empowering leadership behaviors can stimulate psychological empowerment. In Ahearne et al.’s (2005) research, it showed that empowering leadership behaviors can increase salespeople’s self-efficacy. Employees feel that they are capable to perform work tasks because of the motivation gained from supervisors’ empowering leadership behaviors. Similarly, Raub and Robert (2010) suggested how this works: getting leaders’ recognition on subordinates’ contribution to organization can foster their sense of meaning; empowering leadership behaviors, such as being role model, coaching and providing information, can increase empowered employees’ sense of competence; giving subordinates greater authority to make decision by participation in decision making process can increase their sense of self-determination; giving subordinates the feeling of having influence in an organization can increase their sense of impact. Hence, I expect:
Hypothesis 1: Empowering leadership behaviors is positively associated with psychological empowerment.

Ahearne et al. (2005) showed that empowering leadership behaviors can increase sales performance by enhancing salesperson’s self efficacy. Subordinates with higher level of self-efficacy would think that they are competent to perform work activities, and hence can motivate them to perform better. Hence, I expect:

Hypothesis 2a: Psychological empowerment mediates the relationship between supervisor’s empowering leadership behaviors and subordinate’s in-role behavior.

Raub and Robert (2010) linked psychological empowerment between empowering leadership behaviors and extra-role behaviors, while OCBO can be viewed as extra-role behaviors. When employees are intrinsically motivated in the organization, they may think that the performance of work activities brings stronger rewarding feeling than gaining the extrinsic rewards, and hence they are willing to spend extra effort to perform works that are outside their job duties. Hence, I expect:

Hypothesis 2b: Psychological empowerment mediates the relationship between supervisor’s empowering leadership behaviors and subordinate’s OCBO.

Kraimer, Seibert and Liden’s (1999) research showed that strengthening subordinates’ self-determination and impact can result in employees’ higher level of affective commitment. As psychologically empowered employees with higher sense of self-determination and impact think that they can have more personal control in the organization, hence they would like to stay in the organization and have a higher level of affective commitment (Kraimer et al., 1999). Hence, I expect:

Hypothesis 2c: Psychological empowerment mediates the relationship between
supervisor’s empowering leadership behaviors and subordinate’s affective commitment.

Need for achievement refers to the strong motivation for accomplishing a task or achieving a goal better than the others or the person’s previous achievements (Atkinson, 1964; McClelland, 1961, Hansemark, 2003). People with higher need for achievement tend to set challenging goals for work task and have a stronger need to receive positive feedback from others (Riipinen, 1994). Also, they are more likely to accept and even to welcome the additional responsibility given by managers through empowering leadership behaviors. This positive feeling towards empowering leadership behaviors can enhance the effect of leadership on the psychological empowerment of an individual. In this regard, employees with higher need for achievement are likely to be more receptive and responsive to empowering leadership. Hence, I expect:

Hypothesis 3: Need for achievement moderates the association between empowering leadership behaviors and psychological empowerment. This association is stronger when need for achievement is high.
Chapter 4  Methodology

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the research method used is described. First, the research design and the data collection methods are described. Then, the measurement scale used for each construct and the variables controlled in this research are stated. Finally, the detailed data analysis processes and procedures are described.

4.2 Research Setting and Sample

This study was conducted in the individual level of analysis. In other word, respondents were individual employees. Data were collected by self-report questionnaire. Besides, this was a cross-sectional study. All data were collected during a three-week data collection period, without any pre-test or post-test. Moreover, I used convenience sampling, which is a kind of non-probability sampling, for the whole data collection process. I chose the respondents according to ease of access and availability because I only had limited time and resources to conduct this research.

Questionnaires were distributed through two ways, which were online survey and direct distribution to the subjects. For online survey method, I made an online survey by an online survey engine called Qualtrics. I collected 41 sets of data from this. For direct distribution method, I distributed questionnaires to the full-time staff I knew. Also, I sent an invitation letter to my mentor’s company, Tao Heung Holdings Limited. I came to the company for distributing questionnaires and collected 50 sets of data.

4.3 Measurement

All the variables were measured by 5-point Likert scales, which was ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Respondents completed the questionnaire by
self-reporting on the questions.

**Empowering leadership behaviors**

I used Ahearne et al.’s (2005) 12-item measure focusing on four dimensions: (1) enhancing the meaningfulness of work (three items, $\alpha=.89$, example item: “My manager helps me understand the importance of my work to the overall effectiveness of the company.”), (2) fostering participation in decision making (three items, $\alpha=.86$, example item: “My manager often consults me on strategic decisions.”), (3) expressing confidence in high performance (three items, $\alpha=.85$, example item: “My manager believes in my ability to improve even when I make mistakes.”), and (4) providing autonomy from bureaucratic constraints (three items, $\alpha=.79$, example item: “My manager makes it more efficient for me to do my job by keeping the rules and regulations simple.”). This measure was also used by Zhang and Bartol’s (2010) research.

**Psychological empowerment**

I used Spreitzer’s (1995) 12-item measure focusing on four cognitions: (1) meaning (three items, $\alpha=.86$, example item: “The work I do is very important to me.”), (2) competence (three items, $\alpha=.77$, example item: “I am confident about my ability to do my jobs.”), (3) self-determination (three items, $\alpha=.81$, example item: “I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job.”), and (4) impact (three items, $\alpha=.87$, example item: “The impact on what happens in my department is large.”). This measure was also used by Avolio et al.’s (2004), Raub and Robert’s (2010) and Zhang and Bartol’s (2010) research.

**In-role behavior**

I used the scale developed by William & Anderson (1991) and chose four items, which have the highest values in the factor analysis, from the original 7-item measure ($\alpha=.91$, example item is “Adequately completes assigned duties”). This measurement scale was also used by Settoon, Bennett & Liden’s (1996) research.
**Organizational citizenship behavior directed toward the organization (OCBO)**

Similar as measuring the in-role behavior, I used the scale developed by William & Anderson (1991) and chose four items, which have the highest values in the factor analysis, from the original 7-item measure ($\alpha=.75$, example item is “Attendance at work is above the norm.”). This measurement scale was also used by Settoon, Bennett & Liden’s (1996) research.

**Affective commitment**

I used Allen & Meyer’s (1990) 6-item measure focusing on affective commitment ($\alpha=.81$, example item is “I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.”). This measurement scale was also used by Labatmediene and Gustainiene (2007).

**Need for achievement**

I used Steers and Braunstein’s (1976) 5-item measure which is a part of the Manifest Needs Questionnaire ($\alpha=.66$, example item: “I do my best work when my job assignments are fairly difficult”. This measurement scale was also used by Mpeka (2003).

**Control variables**

Same as some prior researches (Avolio et al., 2004; Raub & Robert, 2010), I controlled five demographic variables, including age, gender, educational level, job level and organizational tenure, as they have been shown to be related to the in-role behaviors, OCBO and affective commitment. Age was measured in years. Gender was measured and coded 1 for male and 0 for female. Educational level was measured as a dummy variable and coded 1 for respondents do not hold Bachelor degree (including primary school, secondary school and technical training/ associate degree), 0 for respondents with Bachelor degree or higher education. Job level was measured as a dummy variable and coded 1 for general employees and 0 for senior positions (including supervisory/ junior management, middle management, upper management and specialist/ technical). Organizational tenure was measured in years, which showed how long the respondents worked in their current company.
4.4 Data Analysis

First, frequency distribution of the demographic variables (age, gender, educational level, job level and tenure) was analyzed to describe the demographic characteristics of the respondents of my study. The reliabilities (Cronbach’s alpha) of all constructs were found to test whether the measurement was reliable. For all variables except those control variables, I averaged the items in same variable into a single indicator before further analysis. After that, the mean, standard deviations and correlations among all variables were found to show a general picture of the relationships amongst variables.

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to examine the mediating role of psychological empowerment in the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and work outcomes (in-role behaviors, OCBO and affective commitment). The analysis followed procedures stated in Baron and Kenny (1986). To show mediation, four conditions must be satisfied using regression analysis. First, the independent variable must be associated with the mediator. Second, the independent variable must be associated with the dependent variable. Third, the mediator must be associated with the dependent variable when the independent variable and mediator are entered together. Finally, if the independent variable is no longer associated with the dependent variable when the mediator is introduced into the regression equation, full mediation is suggested. If the independent variable is still significantly associated with the dependent variable, but with a smaller coefficient when compared with that found without the mediator, then we have partial mediation.

Also, hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to examine the moderating role of need for achievement in the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and psychological empowerment. The analysis followed procedures stated in Aiken & West (1991). Interaction effect was tested in the model. Referring to the equation of moderation model, \[ Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_1 \times X_2 + \epsilon_i \] where \( X_1 \) refers to the independent variable, \( X_2 \) refers to the moderator, \( X_1 \times X_2 \) is the interaction effect. To show moderation, the interaction effect
must be shown significant, which means that the moderator influences the studying moderation relationship. In this study, empowering leadership behavior, need for achievement and non-dummy variables (age and tenure) were mean-centered to reduce the problem of collinearity between empowering leadership behavior and the product term (Aiken & West, 1991).
Chapter 5  Results

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the results generated from the data analysis processes stated in the last chapter are presented. Several tables are used to present the results. The mean, standard deviations, correlations and scale reliabilities are presented in Table 1. The hierarchical multiple regression analyses for the mediation are presented in Table 2, 3 and 4. And the hierarchical multiple regression analysis for the moderation is presented in Table 5. The findings are presented in the sequence of developed hypotheses.

5.2 Findings

The sample consisted of 160 full-time staff from various organizations of different industries in Hong Kong. The respondents were comprised of about three-fifths of female, (with 100 female, 55 male and 5 missing values), who aged 28 in average and have 3.75 years of tenure in average. 54% of the respondents held Bachelor degree or higher education (SD=.50). 59% of the respondents were general employees in an organization (SD=.49). The response rate of this research was 88%.

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics, correlations and scale reliabilities for the variables in the study. From the table, it shows that empowering leadership behaviors is moderately and positively associated with in-role behaviors (r=0.31, p<0.01), OCBO (r=0.32, p<0.01) and affective commitment (r=0.40, p<0.01).
Table 1
Means, Standard Deviations, Correlations and Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>28.87</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gender (0=female, 1=male)</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Education: Bachelor’s or above</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rank: General employee</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>45.38</td>
<td>57.21</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Empowering leadership behavior</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Psychological empowerment</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>In-role behavior</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>(.73)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>(.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Need for achievement</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 128 (listwise)

Internal reliabilities (alpha coefficients) for the overall constructs are given in brackets.

*p < .05.

**p < .01.
Referring to the hypotheses, Hypothesis 1 stated that empowering leadership behaviors is positively associated with psychological empowerment. Table 2 shows the hierarchical multiple regression analysis results for the mediation on in-role behaviors. From the table, it shows that empowering leadership behaviors is positively associated with psychological empowerment ($\beta=0.468$, $p<0.01$). Thus, hypothesis 1 is supported.

Besides Table 2, Table 3 and 4 show the hierarchical multiple regression analysis results for the mediation, while the former one is for OCBO and the latter one is for affective commitment. Hypothesis 2 has three parts, which stated that psychological empowerment mediates the relationship between supervisor’s empowering leadership behaviors and subordinate’s a) in-role behaviors, b) OCBO and c) affective commitment.

### Table 2

**Results for Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Hypotheses Testing: The Mediation Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mediator: Psychological Empowerment</th>
<th>DV: In-role behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>M2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (0=female, 1=male)</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>-.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Bachelor’s or above</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: General employee</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>-.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.308**</td>
<td>.205*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV &amp; Mediator:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering leadership behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>.468**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.225**</td>
<td>.419**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td>5,122</td>
<td>6,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.194**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=128 (listwise). Standardized betas were reported. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. 
Looking at the result for in-role behaviors, Table 2 shows that empowering leadership behaviors is associated with psychological empowerment, i.e. condition 1 is satisfied ($\beta=0.468$, $p<0.01$), and psychological empowerment is associated with in-role behaviors, i.e. condition 3 is satisfied ($\beta=0.460$, $p<0.01$). However, there is no direct association between empowering leadership behaviors and in-role behaviors, i.e. condition 2 ($\beta=0.171$) is not satisfied. According to Baron and Kenny’s (1986) four conditions for mediation, the lack of a direct association between independent and dependent variables rules out mediation. However, Kenny, Kashy and Bolger (1998) and Seibert, Silver and Randolph (2004) argued that condition 2 is not necessary, only condition 1 and 3 are required. According to this argument, psychological empowerment does mediate the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and in-role behaviors in this model, since empowering leadership behavior is associated with psychological empowerment, in which psychological empowerment is associated with in-role behaviors. Only condition 2, the direct association between empowering leadership behavior and in-role behaviors, is not met. Seibert et al. (2004) referred to this as a mediated “indirect relationship”. Sobel Test was performed to check this indirect relationship. The result shows that the relationship is significant (test statistics= 3.56, $p<0.01$). Thus, hypothesis 2a is supported.
Table 3
Results for Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Hypotheses Testing: The Mediation Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mediator: Psychological Empowerment</th>
<th>DV: Organizational citizenship behavior directed toward the organization (OCBO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables:</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>M2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (0=female, 1=male)</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>-.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Bachelor’s or above</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: General employee</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>-.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.308**</td>
<td>.205*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV &amp; Mediator:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering leadership behavior</td>
<td>.468**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.225**</td>
<td>.419**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td>5,122</td>
<td>6,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.194**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=128 (listwise). Standardized betas were reported. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Looking more at the analysis for OCBO, Table 3 shows that empowering leadership behaviors is associated with psychological empowerment, i.e. condition 1 is satisfied ($\beta=0.468$, $p<0.01$), and empowering leadership behaviors is associated with OCBO, i.e. condition 2 is satisfied ($\beta=0.278$, $p<0.01$). However, the association between psychological empowerment and OCBO is not significant, i.e. condition 3 is not satisfied ($\beta=0.093$), it rules out mediation. Thus, hypothesis 2b is not supported.
Table 4
Results for Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Hypotheses Testing: The Mediation Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mediator: Psychological Empowerment</th>
<th>DV: Affective commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>M2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (0=female, 1=male)</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>-.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Bachelor’s or above</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: General employee</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>-.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.308**</td>
<td>.205*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV &amp; Mediator:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering leadership behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>.468**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.225**</td>
<td>.419**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td>5,122</td>
<td>6,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.194**</td>
<td>.139**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=128 (listwise). Standardized betas were reported. *p < .05, **p < .01.

Finally, for the result of affective commitment, Table 4 shows that empowering leadership behaviors is associated with psychological empowerment, i.e. condition 1 is satisfied ($\beta=0.468$, p<0.01); empowering leadership behaviors is associated with affective commitment, i.e. condition 2 is satisfied ($\beta=0.230$, p<0.05); psychological empowerment is associated with affective commitment, i.e. condition 3 is satisfied ($\beta=0.397$, p<0.01). As condition 1 to 3 are satisfied, psychological empowerment does mediate the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and affective commitment. According to the condition 4 mentioned in Baron & Kenny (1986), the standardized beta of the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and affective commitment became smaller (from $\beta=0.397$ to $\beta=0.289$) when psychological empowerment was introduced in the regression equation, hence it is a
partial mediation. Sobel Test was performed to check the indirect effect in this relationship. The result shows that the relationship is significant (test statistics= 2.11, p<0.05). Thus, hypothesis 2c is supported.

Hypothesis 3 stated that need for achievement moderates the association between empowering leadership behaviors and psychological empowerment, in which the association is stronger when need for achievement is high. Table 5 shows the hierarchical multiple regression results for the moderation effect of need for achievement. The result reports the standardized beta of 0.014 for the interaction effect of empowering leadership behavior and need for achievement. It shows that there is no significant moderation in the relationship. Thus, hypothesis 3 is not supported.

Table 5
Results for Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Hypotheses Testing: The Moderation Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables:</th>
<th>DV: Psychological Empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (0=female, 1=male)</td>
<td>-.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Bachelor’s or above</td>
<td>-.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: General employee</td>
<td>-.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.308**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| IV & Moderator: |  |  |  |
| Empowering leadership behavior | .423** | .426** |
| Need for achievement | .183* | .188* |

| IVxMO: |  |  |  |
| Empowering leadership behavior X Need for achievement |  | .014 |

| R² |  |  |  |
|  | .225** | .445** | .445** |
| d.f. | 5,122 | 7,120 | 8,119 |
| ΔR² |  |  | .220** |

N=128 (listwise). Standardized betas were reported. * p < .05, ** p < .01.
5.3 Conclusion

To summarize the findings of the research, first, hypothesis 1 is supported and shows empowering leadership behaviors is positively associated with psychological empowerment. Second, hypothesis 2a and 2c are supported and show that psychological empowerment mediates the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors on the one hand, and in-role behaviors and affective commitment on the other hand. Third, hypothesis 2b is rejected as the result shows that psychological empowerment is not associated with OCBO. Finally, hypothesis 3 is rejected as the result shows that need for achievement does not influence the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and psychological empowerment.
Chapter 6  Discussion

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the results described in the last chapter are interpreted. They include 1) the significant relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and psychological empowerment, 2) the significant mediation of psychological empowerment in the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and in-role behaviors and 3) affective commitment, 4) the insignificant mediation of psychological empowerment on the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and OCBO, and 5) the insignificant moderating effect of need for achievement on the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and need for achievement. Besides, the directions for future research are stated. Also, the limitations and managerial implications of my study are presented.

6.2 Interpretation of results

Recalling the three research objectives mentioned in Chapter 1, they are: first, to investigate the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and work outcomes (in-role behaviors, OCBO and affective commitment); second, to investigate whether psychological empowerment mediates the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and work outcomes; third, to investigate whether need for achievement influences the association between empowering leadership behaviors and psychological empowerment. The following discussion is ordered in the sequence of the objectives.

As predicted, empowering leadership behavior is positively associated with psychological empowerment. This result is also supported by other scholars (Zhang and Bartol, 2010; Raub and Robert, 2010). All of them, including my research, show that supervisors’ empowering leadership behaviors stimulate the psychological empowerment of their subordinates. The rationale behind such an association is that the individual elements of
empowering leadership foster the four dimensions of psychological empowerment, including meaning, competence, self-determination and impact. First, empowering leadership behaviors involve supervisors helping subordinates to understand the meaningfulness of their work, which can help match subordinates’ thoughts and values with the roles of their position, hence enhancing their sense of meaning. Second, empowering leadership behaviors involve supervisors welcoming subordinates’ participation in decision making. This shows subordinates that they have influence in the company, and hence encourages their feeling of impact. Third, empowering leadership behaviors include supervisors expressing confidence in subordinates’ ability to perform better, which encourage subordinates to believe that they are competent in their work duties, hence fostering their sense of competence. Fourth, empowering leadership behaviors provide subordinates with the autonomy and freedom to do their work, allowing them to choose the way to do their work, hence increasing their sense of self-determination. To conclude, through different elements of empowering leadership behavior, subordinate’s psychological empowerment is increased, thus providing them greater intrinsic task motivation to perform well in their job.

For the mediation hypothesized in the research, as predicted, psychological empowerment mediates the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors on the one hand, and in-role behaviors and affective commitment on the other. The rationale behind this is that both in-role behavior and affective commitment are work outcomes that can be affected by a process which is intrinsic in nature. Psychological empowerment is related to motivation. It measures employees’ intrinsic motivation to their work. According to the four cognitions of psychological empowerment, psychologically empowered employees think their work is meaningful, believe they have the ability or competence to perform their job duties, perceive that they have the freedom or to choose their own ways to perform work activities and believe that their work is important and have impact in the organization. Due to the intrinsic task motivation gained from all these beliefs, employees are willing to spend extra effort in
performing their required duties and desire to stay in their organization.

Contrary to the hypothesis, there was a direct association between empowering leadership behaviors and OCBO, but the lack of mediation suggests that this direct relationship is not due to psychological empowerment. In other words, intrinsic task motivation is not the reason why empowered employees are willing to perform work which is outside their duties. This suggests that there must be other processes causing the direct association. It can be explained in terms of social exchange. Thus, employees view the empowering leadership behaviors of supervisor as a kind of care, respect and recognition for themselves. This may involve them experiencing a sense of indebtedness after receiving those positive actions and therefore they may try to reciprocate, for example spending extra effort in performing outside their duties (Greenberg, 1980). Such an interpretation suggests that the direct relationship between empowering leadership behavior and OCBO may be based on the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960). Based on this prediction, perceived organizational support would be a possible mediator for this relationship. Perceived organizational support is a global belief formed by employees about how an organization values employees’ contributions and cares about them (Hutchinson et al., 1986). To conclude, the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and OCBO is perhaps explained better by using the exchange-based model mentioned in the literature review. This suggests a potential direction for future research. For example, future research can use perceived organizational support as the mediator for the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and OCBO.

There was no result for the moderation hypothesis. One possible reason why there is no significant moderation is that there may be range restriction in the need for achievement variable. As the respondents in this research are mainly general employees (with 94 general employees, 29 in supervisory/junior management, 16 in middle management, 4 in upper management, 8 specialist/technical and 9 missing values), the sample may be biased towards
those with lower need for achievement, so that the influence of need for achievement on the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and psychological empowerment is not shown due to the nature of the sample. The influence of need for achievement on general employees may be different from those on senior staff. The prediction is based on the intrinsic nature of need for achievement. People with high need for achievement tend to excel than others not because of motivating by money, they are motivated by the feedback of their effort. Personally, I think general employees value the feedback from supervisors or the feeling of achievement less and hence they have a lesser extent of engagement in achievement-oriented behavior when compared to senior staff in an organization. This also suggests a potential direction for future research. Future research may broaden the composition of respondents in a sample or even try to collect data mainly from senior staff.

6.3 Limitations

The limitations of my research paper are as follow: First, the sample is relatively small when compared with prior researches about empowering leadership behaviors (Zhang & Bartol, 2010; Raub & Robert, 2010). I did not collect a large number of data for the research in short period of time and with limited manpower. The bigger the sample size, the higher the statistical power, and the better the chance of finding a moderation effect. Hence, the relative small size of my study may affect the result for the moderation hypothesis. Second, this research uses a cross-sectional design. Only an association rather than causation can be concluded from the result. Future research can use a longitudinal or experimental study to examine the antecedents or consequences of the relationships hypothesized in the research. Finally, there is the common method variance, which is a systematic error variance attributed to the measurement method. As all the constructs in the research, including empowering leadership behavior, psychological empowerment, in-role behavior, OCBO, affective commitment and need for achievement were self-reported, it may
cause bias in the estimation of the observed relationships between variables by either inflating or deflating correlations. Future research can invite the supervisors of those respondents to report on the questionnaire items according to their perceptions on their subordinates about the constructs. For example, supervisors can report on subordinates’ in-role behaviors and OCBO. This can avoid the inflation or deflation correlations.

6.4 Managerial Implications

There are two practical implications in this research. The first one is that this research suggests a direction for managers who want to implement employee empowerment in their organization. Due to the increasing international competition and technological advancement, managers’ leadership styles tend to be less authoritarian. Thus, the concept of employee empowerment is becoming more popular. This research shows that there is a linkage between empowering leadership behaviors and work outcomes. Hence, it shows managers that applying empowering leadership behaviors, such as coaching, training, emotional support, providing information and participative decision making, is a good way to empower employees and to enhance work outcomes. Organizations can select managers who possess the personalities that welcome employee empowerment and provide them with empowerment-related training and development, so that empowerment can be implemented in the organization. The following shows that what the organization can do to implement employee empowerment.

Coaching

Coaching refers to supervisors providing guidance and support to employees’ development. Employees can perform their work activities under the guidance of their supervisors. Hence, they would feel the meaningfulness of the work and feel being empowered. As some supervisors’ leadership style are more authoritarian, they prefer performing the work activities by themselves, rather than delegating the tasks to subordinates and working with them with guidance and technical supports. Organization can provide coaching skills’ training
to supervisors, so that they can apply empowerment skillfully and hence increase the effectiveness and efficiency of work.

**Training**

Training refers to supervisors arranging subordinates to attend some job-related training courses. From the training courses, subordinates’ job-related skills can be enriched and hence they can feel they are competent to perform the work activities. What organization can do is to establish a clear training and development system in the Human Resources Department, so that it can identify staff that possess the potential to complete important work tasks and provide them adequate trainings to maximize their abilities.

**Emotional support**

Emotional support refers to how the supervisors care about subordinates’ well-being. It depends on whether supervisors concern about subordinates’ working conditions, difficulties, stress, or sometimes personal matters. The greater the support subordinates received from their supervisors, the higher the mutual trust between them, and hence higher productivity. Organization can establish a scheme of requesting each supervisor to conduct periodic causal meetings with their subordinates individually, so that supervisors can have a chance to communicate with their subordinates and identify their needs and provide appropriate support.

**Providing information**

Providing information refers to supervisors giving the subordinates information about company rules, decisions and recent developments. With the comprehensive information, subordinates can know well about what happened in the company. Hence, this gives them the sense of meaningfulness in their work. Organization should have a clear guidance to all supervisors to show them what kinds of information can be revealed to the subordinates. Also, organization can provide communication skills’ training to supervisors, so that they can communicate efficiently with their subordinates.
Participative decision making

Participative decision making refers to supervisors taking subordinates’ comments into consideration and involving them in decision making processes in organization. With this practice, employees can feel that they have the impact to the organization. This also enhances the meaningfulness of their work. As a result, subordinates will feel being empowered. Organizations which want to implement empowerment should recruit more open-minded supervisors. This is because they are willing to listen to the comments for decision making from subordinates. Gathering more information for decision making can improve the quality of the decision made and hence enhance the work outcomes.

In general, organizations should recognize that middle and lower-level managers and supervisors may follow the leadership examples set by senior leaders. Hence, if employee empowerment is to be encouraged, organizations need to ensure empowering leadership style is used by senior leaders, so that role models can be set at lower level.

The second implication is that the significant relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and work outcomes shows that empowering leadership behavior is not only applicable to Western countries, but also to Asian countries, such as Hong Kong. The result of this research contradicts the views of some prior researches (Hui, Au, & Fock, 2004; Robert, Probst, Martocchio, Drasgow, & Lawler, 2000). They stated that empowerment is less applicable in cultures with high power distance and uncertainty avoidance. The reason is that employees in high power distance and uncertainty avoidance cultures are less readily accepted employment. They are more likely to respond to empowerment just because of the feelings of stress and withdrawal rather than intrinsic motivation. However, my findings are supported by the views in other studies (Aryee & Chen, 2006; Huang et al., 2010 and Zhang and Bartol, 2010). They stated that Chinese employees may be motivated by empowerment and empowering leadership behaviors. In general, people think that Asian employees like the
supervisors giving orders about how to perform work activities rather than giving the authority to make important decision. However, the result of this research shows that Asian employees will accept and respond to empowerment as there is association between empowering leadership behaviors and psychological empowerment. In other words, empowering leadership is applicable in Hong Kong.

6.5 Conclusion

As predicted, empowering leadership behaviors are positively associated with psychological empowerment and psychological empowerment mediates the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors and work outcomes (in-role behaviors and affective commitment). A key implication of the findings is that, contrary to what some scholars have suggested, empowering leadership is appropriate in the Hong Kong context. This research shows that Asian employees welcome empowerment and respond to it in a positive way. This shows that it is possible for an organization in Hong Kong to apply empowerment to enhance employees’ work outcomes.

To conclude, this research can achieve the objectives of the study. It also provides some practical implications which can benefit organizations to know more about empowerment, especially the possible application on Asian countries.
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Appendix

Questionnaire

I am a final year student studying in Hong Kong Baptist University majoring in Human Resources Management. This questionnaire is designed for my honor degree project which is studying on the relationship between empowering leadership behavior and employee’s work outcomes. There are total 48 questions and they can be finished in about 20 minutes. There is no right or wrong answer for all questions. All information you provide will be kept strictly confidential and used only for academic and research purpose. Thank you for your participation and support for helping my research paper.

Empowering leadership behavior

To what extent do you agree that each statement currently describes you?
1=Strongly disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=neither agree or disagree; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly agree

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My manager helps me understand how my objectives and goals relate to that of the country.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My manager helps me understand the importance of my work to the overall effectiveness of the company.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My manager helps me understand how my job fits into the bigger picture.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My manager makes many decisions together with me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My manager often consults me on strategic decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My manager solicits my opinion on decisions that may affect me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My manager believes that I can handle demanding tasks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My manager believes in my ability to improve even when I make mistakes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My manager expresses confidence in my ability to perform at a high level.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My manager allows me to do my job my way.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. My manager makes it more efficient for me to do my job by keeping the rules and regulations simple.  
12. My manager allows me to make important decisions quickly to satisfy customer needs.

**Psychological Empowerment**

**To what extent do you agree that each statement currently describes you?**

1=Strongly disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=neither agree or disagree; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have a great deal of control over what happens in my department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My impact on what happens in my department is large.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am confident about my ability to do my jobs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My work activities are personally meaningful to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The work I do is very important to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I have considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I can decide on my own how to go about doing my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I have mastered the skills necessary for my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The work I do is meaningful to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I have significant influence over what happens in my department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am self-assured about my capabilities to perform my work activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### In-role behavior

**To what extent do you agree that each statement currently describes you?**

1=Strongly disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=neither agree or disagree; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Adequately completes assigned duties.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fulfills responsibilities specified in job description.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Performs tasks that are expected of him/her.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Meets formal performance requirements of the job.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organizational citizenship behavior directed toward the organization

**To what extent do you agree that each statement currently describes you?**

1=Strongly disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=neither agree or disagree; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Attendance at work is above the norm.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gives advance notice when unable to come to work.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Takes undeserved work breaks.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Complains about insignificant things at work.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Affective Commitment Scale

To what extent do you agree that each statement currently describes you?

1=Strongly disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=neither agree or disagree; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly agree

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.  
2. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.  
3. I do not feel like 'part of the family' at my organization.  
4. I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization.  
5. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.  
6. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.

### Need for achievement

To what extent do you agree that each statement currently describes you?

1=Strongly disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=neither agree or disagree; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly agree

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I do my best work when my job assignments are fairly difficult.  
2. I try very hard to improve on my past performance at work.  
3. I take moderate risks and stick my neck out to get ahead at work.  
4. I try to avoid any added responsibilities.  
5. I try to perform better than my co-workers.
Demographic information

1. Age: __________ years

2. Gender: □ Male □ Female

3. Highest educational level: □ Primary school □ Secondary school
   □ Technical training/ Associate degree
   □ Bachelor degree □ Master or above

4. Job level: □ General employee □ Supervisory/junior management
   □ Middle management □ Upper management
   □ Specialist/ technical □ Others: ___________________

5. How long have you worked for the current organization? ______ years _______ months

This is the end of the questionnaire. Thank you!