The Role of Supportive Leadership and Organizational Learning Culture as a Moderator on the Relationship of Psychological Empowerment and Organizational Commitment

Ismi Darmastuti

Faculty of Economics and Business, Semarang, 50275, Indonesia

Severity of competition is forcing organizations to psychological empower their employees for maximum performance. In the presence of organizational learning culture and supportive leadership, psychological empowerment of employee will lead to organizational commitment. This paper attempted to analyze the relationship among these variables in the context of existing literature. Present days managers face the challenges of motivating employees. Psychological empowerment is the one of the best tool to provide them feelings of autonomy and self-driver. This conceptual development presented here with the hope that future researchers will analysis these relationships more deeply for the performance optimization of the organization.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the field of human resources, employee satisfaction, creativity, and innovation are largely dependent on the commitment of the organization. Many earlier studies have discussed the psychological empowerment, organizational learning culture, supportive leadership, and organizational commitment separately; however, very little research done on this variable with supportive leadership as a moderator variable. There is no research identify the effect of psychological empowerment as individual characteristics and the effects of supportive leadership as organizational factors on organizational commitment.

Based on the description of the background issues, the following research questions were formulated whether there is a relationship of psychological empowerment of the organization's commitment to the moderating influence of organizational learning and leadership culture supportive.

The primary objective of this study was to find the relationship of psychological empowerment of the organization's commitment to the moderating influence of organizational learning and leadership culture support. The focus of this research was in the public sector. Psychological empowerment, organizational learning culture, supportive leadership, and organizational commitment are also important for employees in the public sector. This study is expected to fill the major gap focusing on the effects of supportive leadership as moderating variable and the

relationship of psychological empowerment and organizational commitment.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

There are two concepts of empowerment in the literature of management and organization. First, based on the Theory of Empowerment Structural Kanter,[5] workers feel empowered when they are given access or permission to empower the organizational structure in order to complete their work, which includes the opportunity, information, support, resources, formal power, and informal power. Both types of power are related to autonomy and mastery, the opposite of domination and control. Second, another concept of empowerment comes from a psychological perspective. In this approach, the empowerment is described as the embodiment of a four-dimensional orientation of the workers about their role, i.e., meaning (meaningfulness), competence (ability), self-determination (self-determination), and impact (influence).[17] In the concept of psychological empowerment (psychological empowerment), the confidence of employees to what extent they have a work environment, competence, meaningful work, and autonomy in work, is related to working attitude. More specifically, psychological empowerment is achieved by increasing the confidence of workers of the importance of the work they are doing, their capabilities to the success of their

work, determination themselves, and their autonomy in influencing their work (Hechanova et al.).[5]

According to Conger and Kanungo,[7] the empowerment has two sides. The first is the concept of empowerment as a relationship (relational construct). If empowerment is considered a dynamic relationship, then empowerment becomes a process in which the leader or manager divides the power with his/her subordinates. Power, in this context, is construed as a formal power of ownership or control over organizational resources. The emphasis mainly lies in the idea of sharing authority. Conger and Kanungo found that in the majority of the management literature, the concept of empowerment is offered by the technique of participative management, such as management by objectives (management by objective), quality circles, and goal setting by subordinate (goal setting by subordinates), as a means to delegate authority or power sharing.

The second is the concept of empowerment as a motivation (motivational construct). In the literature of psychology, power and control are used as a motivation and/or expectation on the conviction that lies within the individual. For example, an individual is assumed to have a need for power which is connoted as an internal drive for influencing and controlling others (McClelland).[7] Conger and Kanungo proposed that empowerment can be seen as a motivation, which means to enable, not just delegate. Enable (enabling), indirectly, means creating conditions for heightening the motivation in the completion of the task, through the development of a strong sense of the self ability.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

This study was conducted to test the hypothesis by using research methods that have been designed in accordance with the variables to be studied in order to obtain an accurate research results. The discussion in this research method includes the types and sources of data, population and sample, the method of data collection, and data analysis techniques. This research is a scientific deductive approach uses the theory of the structure to form a hypothesis, and then use the empirical facts or to test hypotheses for the conclusion.

4. RESULT

The organization's commitment achieved the peak point in the field of organizational behavior. Most of the work had been done in this field and had found a positive relationship between organizational commitment, behavior, and attitudes in the workplace. Organizational commitment means employees psychologically really in touch with the organization.[15] Talented employees and organizational factors is a very important indicator for organizational commitment.[1, 2] In organizational commitment, leadership is a key predictor of leadership that supports and is playing an important role in the commitment of individuals and organizations.[15] Most experts argued that organizational commitment is more stable as compared to job satisfaction because of the satisfaction of fluctuation depending on the current situation more stable organizational commitment.[3]

There were three components that play an important role in organizational commitment; affective, continuant, and normative commitment. Affective commitment explained the strong confidence and adoption of beliefs and goals of organizational values.

In continuant commitment, employees already knew the disadvantages he/she faced in the case if the stop. In the normative commitment, employees want to become a permanent part of the organization.[14] Of three, two components were out of manager's control. The first was a continuant commitment in which employees who always keep being closer to the company would expect a higher level of continuant commitment than those who stayed away from the company. Normative commitment also affects the performance of employees.

As an employee, a person felt a deeper psychological empowerment within the organization where he adhered more strongly and committed to the organization. In the contrary, if an individual felt less empowerment, he/she would not commit to the organization and the organization might fail to achieve its goals. Therefore, psychological empowerment is positively related to the organizational commitment.

Few researchers have discussed the relationship between organizational learning culture and commitment to the organization. Joo[10] proposed that the learning culture plays an important role as the aspect of a moderate correlation with organizational commitment. Thus, we could say that an employee was to be psychologically very strong attached to the organization when the employee considered the organization provided employee autonomy learning opportunities to be both developed and a good leader.

People working in an organization are committed to the best of the organization if they feel the empowerment.[4] To improve the psychological empowerment of the people, organizational learning culture is an important element to gain the empowerment through time and work.[7]

The last competitive era of leadership reached a critical concern by some researchers. Many theories of leadership discussed theories of leadership from different angles, for example, some discussed the leadership style of decision-making and some discussed the links between employees and leaders.[12] In the last decade, some experts studied various types of leadership styles. Several studies addressed the concept of collectivism in detail, especially in the Asian region. Supportive leadership led to strong employee commitment with the organization since the main focus of this research was the driving force that provides psychological empowerment to individuals and resulted in a firm commitment is a direct and indirect links between individuals and leaders.

Some experts pointed out the relationship between people and their effect on the individual's commitment to the organization. Supportive leadership acted as moderator to solve interpersonal conflicts with the commitment through employee empowerment. Individual was more creative when he/she felt the empowerment of leaders in the work. Empirical research suggested that there are many predictors whether employees commit or leave the organization. Organizational culture and subcultures have a great connection with the commitment, if the employee provided with supportive culture has a strong commitment.[13] Likewise, a leader who is highly sensitive in the case of individuals, the level of individual commitment by the organization is to be high.[16]

Each organization performed better on the basis of individual employees and sufficient commitment to the organization as they got more support from the leader. When the leaders played an important role in this regard they supported employees in every aspect in order to make employee more committed to the organization. Therefore, we suggested that supportive leadership will

moderate the relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational commitment.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The main contribution of this study is to develop a framework for further research on personal factors and contextual organization, especially the relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational commitment with organizational learning and supportive leadership as a moderating variable. Individual who earns more psychological empowerment feel more autonomous and more committed to the organization. Organizational learning and supportive leadership will moderate the relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational commitment. There is also a positive relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational commitment.

References and Notes

1. Allen and Meyer, *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 49, 252 **(1996)**.
2. N. J. Allen and J. P. Meyer, *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 63, 1 **(1990)**.
3. H. L. Angle and J. L. Perry, *Work and Occupations* 10, 123 **(1983)**.
4. A. Bandura, *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology* 2, 128 **(1990)**.
5. I. Boonyarit, S. Chomphupart, and Natthawut Arin, *The Journal of Behavioral Science* 5, 1 **(2010)**.
6. Castro, C. Barroso, M. Mar Villegas Perinan, and J. C. C. Bueno, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 19, 1842 **(2008)**.
7. J. A. Conger and R. N. Kanungo, *Academy of Management Review* 13, 471 **(1988)**.
8. B.-K. Joo (Brian) and J. H. Shim, *Human Resource Development International* 13, 425 **(2010)**.
9. B. Joo, *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 21, 69 **(2010)**.
10. B. Joo and T. Lim, *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies* 16, 48 **(2009)**.
11. R. M. Kanter, The Change Masters, Simon and Schuster, New York **(1983)**.
12. M. I. Kiran and L. F. David, Jr., *Asia Pac. J. Manage* 27, 321 **(2009)**.
13. P. Lok, J. Crawford, P. Lok, and J. Crawford, The relationship between commitment and organizational culture, subculture, leadership style and job satisfaction in organizational change and development, 365 **(1999)**.
14. J. P. Meyer and N. J. Allen, *Human Resource Management Review* 1, 61 **(1991)**.
15. R. T. Mowday, L. W. Porter, and R. M. Steers, Employee organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism and Turnover, Academic Press, New York **(1982)**.
16. R. W. Rowden, *The Leadership and Organization Development Journal* 21, 30 **(2000)**.
17. G. M. Spreitzer, *Academy of Management Journal* 38, 1442 **(1995)**.