

Reconceptualising Employee Motivation and Engagement through Empowerment Synergies: An Integrative Framework

Choo Bee Peng and Kenny S.L. Cheah

Abstract – Employee motivation and engagement are critical drivers of organisational performance; however, existing research remains fragmented in explaining how leadership, organisational culture, and job characteristics collectively translate into sustained engagement. This study develops an integrative conceptual framework that positions psychological empowerment as a central explanatory mechanism linking organisational conditions to motivational processes. Drawing on Self-Determination Theory, the Job Demands–Resources model, and empowerment theory, the study adopts a conceptual model development approach to synthesise previously disconnected literatures into a coherent framework. The analysis proposes that leadership, supportive organisational cultures, and enriched job characteristics function as structural and relational antecedents that shape employees' psychological empowerment. In turn, psychological empowerment activates intrinsic motivation, which subsequently manifests as employee engagement through vigour, dedication, and absorption. This study contributes to the literature by advancing a mechanism-based framework that clarifies the causal sequence linking organisational conditions to sustained engagement, addressing conceptual fragmentation in prior research. The framework also provides practical insights for organisations seeking to enhance workforce motivation and engagement through aligned leadership practices, empowering cultures, and enriched job design.

Keywords – Employee Motivation, Employee Engagement, Organisational Behaviour, Leadership, Empowerment

I. INTRODUCTION

Employee motivation and engagement constitute interrelated yet theoretically distinct mechanisms through which organisational conditions shape performance and sustainability. Recent debates increasingly emphasise the need to move beyond static or interchangeable treatments of these constructs toward models that specify their causal ordering and underlying mechanisms (Bakker & Albrecht, 2018; Schaufeli, 2021; Mazzetti et al., 2023). In this view, motivation represents the psychological energy that initiates goal-directed behaviour, whereas engagement reflects the sustained cognitive, emotional, and behavioural investment through which that energy is enacted over time. Treating the two as synonymous obscures explanatory precision and limits theory development.

Both motivation and engagement are widely recognised as critical drivers of organisational sustainability and competitive advantage (Macey & Schneider, 2008). Motivated and engaged employees contribute to a more productive workforce, lower turnover rates, and improved overall performance (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002). These employees are more likely to innovate, overcome

obstacles, and exceed basic job expectations in achieving organisational goals (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). As such, cultivating high levels of motivation and engagement is essential for organisations seeking to thrive in competitive and dynamic environments (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Organisations that successfully foster a motivated and engaged workforce not only achieve short-term performance improvements but also sustain long-term organisational success in rapidly changing business environments (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

Rapid technological changes, globalisation, and the rise of hybrid work structures have significantly intensified the challenges organisations face in sustaining employee motivation and engagement. The increasing pace of technological advancements, such as automation, artificial intelligence, and remote work tools, has reshaped work environments and expectations, requiring organisations to rethink traditional approaches to motivation and engagement (Cascio & Montealegre, 2016). Similarly, globalisation has led to a more diverse workforce, where cultural differences, time zone challenges, and cross-border collaboration can complicate the strategies used to maintain engagement (Zhao et al., 2020). Furthermore, the shift to hybrid work models, combining in-person and remote work, introduces unique challenges related to work-life balance, team cohesion, and maintaining a strong organisational culture (Golden, 2020). Given these complexities, there is a critical need to revisit these concepts through the lens of organisational behaviour to better understand how these factors influence employee outcomes.

Despite the extensive body of literature on employee motivation and engagement, existing research remains conceptually fragmented. Prior studies have largely examined antecedents such as leadership style, organisational culture, job characteristics, and empowerment in isolation, resulting in a piecemeal understanding of how these factors jointly shape motivational processes. Moreover, psychological empowerment is often treated as either a direct outcome or a peripheral variable, rather than as an integrative cognitive mechanism that explains how structural and relational conditions are internalised by employees. As a result, the causal logic linking organisational antecedents to motivation and subsequent engagement remains under-theorised and insufficiently clarified. This lack of an integrated empowerment lens limits the explanatory power of existing models and constraints the development of coherent frameworks capable of capturing the dynamic and interdependent nature of motivation and engagement in contemporary organisational contexts.

Therefore, this study examines how leadership style, organisational culture, job characteristics, and psychological empowerment collectively shape employee motivation and engagement. By exploring these key organisational behaviour constructs, the study provides a comprehensive

Choo Bee Peng, Open University Malaysia, (Email address: gracechoo2026@gmail.com)

Kenny S.L. Cheah, University Malaya, (Email address: kennycheah@um.edu.my)

framework for understanding their interactions and their impact on overall employee performance and organisational success. In line with theory integration and framework-building traditions in organisational research, this study adopts a conceptual development approach that focuses on clarifying constructs, explicating relationships, and specifying underlying causal logic rather than testing hypotheses empirically. Consistent with Whetten's principles of conceptual contribution, the study seeks to address the questions of which antecedents matter, how they are theoretically connected, and why psychological empowerment functions as a central explanatory mechanism linking organisational conditions to employee motivation and engagement. Accordingly, the proposed framework advances theory by integrating fragmented literatures into a coherent and analytically structured model.

Despite extensive research on employee motivation and engagement, existing studies largely examine leadership, organisational culture, and job characteristics in isolation, resulting in a fragmented understanding of how these factors collectively influence motivational processes. Furthermore, limited attention has been given to psychological empowerment as a central explanatory mechanism that translates organisational conditions into sustained motivation and engagement. This lack of integration restricts theoretical development and limits the ability of existing models to explain the dynamic and interdependent nature of employee engagement in contemporary organisational contexts.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Employee Motivation

Employee motivation and engagement are pivotal elements in determining organisational success, influencing not only productivity but also job satisfaction and overall workplace well-being. Understanding the dynamics of motivation is crucial for organisations seeking to cultivate a motivated and engaged workforce. Self-Determination Theory (SDT) provides a comprehensive framework for understanding the types of motivation that drive employee behaviour, distinguishing between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985).

Contemporary motivation research increasingly highlights the limitations of treating job resources as directly motivational without accounting for employees' cognitive interpretation processes (Bakker & Demerouti, 2023; Schaufeli, 2021). While Self-Determination Theory explains *why* motivation emerges through autonomy, competence, and relatedness, and the JD-R model explains *where* motivational resources reside within work design, neither framework alone specifies *how* organisational conditions become subjectively meaningful and motivationally effective. Recent scholarship therefore calls for integrative mechanisms that connect structural resources to psychological experience. Positioning psychological empowerment as this cognitive bridge responds directly to this gap by explaining how leadership, culture, and job characteristics are internalised as autonomy-supportive and competence-enhancing, enabling motivation to evolve into

sustained engagement (Spreitzer et al., 2020; Tummers & Bakker, 2021).

Intrinsic Motivation

Intrinsic motivation refers to the internal drive to engage in activities for the inherent satisfaction they provide, rather than for external rewards or recognition. Employees who are intrinsically motivated find the work itself fulfilling and are more likely to exhibit high levels of persistence, creativity, and innovation. According to SDT, intrinsic motivation thrives in environments where employees experience a sense of autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Vallerand et al., 2003).

- **Autonomy** involves having control over one's tasks and decisions, which fosters a sense of ownership and responsibility (Deci & Ryan, 2000). This psychological need is linked to higher intrinsic motivation, as employees feel empowered to shape their work environment (Vansteenkiste et al., 2004).
- **Competence** refers to the opportunity to develop skills and master challenges, allowing employees to feel capable and effective in their roles (Deci & Ryan, 2002). The sense of competence is crucial in motivating employees to continue their efforts and seek new challenges (Boggiano & Pittman, 1992).
- **Relatedness** emphasises the importance of connection with colleagues and supervisors, contributing to a sense of belonging and community within the organisation (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Employees who feel connected to others are more likely to be motivated and engaged in their tasks (Baumeister & Leary, 1995).

When these three psychological needs are met, employees are more likely to remain engaged, going beyond the basic requirements of their roles to innovate and contribute to the organisation's goals in meaningful ways (Gagne & Deci, 2005). The fulfilment of intrinsic motivation enhances overall job satisfaction, leading to better individual and organisational outcomes (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Deci & Ryan, 2000).

Extrinsic Motivation

Extrinsic motivation, in contrast, is driven by external factors such as rewards, recognition, or avoiding negative consequences. While extrinsic motivators like salary, bonuses, promotions, and public recognition can lead to short-term performance boosts, they may not sustain long-term engagement if used exclusively (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Deci et al., 1999). SDT suggests that over-reliance on extrinsic rewards can undermine intrinsic motivation in a phenomenon known as the "over-justification effect" (Deci, 1971). This occurs when individuals begin to focus more on external rewards than on the intrinsic enjoyment or value of the task, thus reducing their intrinsic motivation (Lepper et al., 1973).

The challenge for organisations lies in balancing intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors. While extrinsic rewards can be effective for encouraging specific behaviours or achieving short-term goals, it is intrinsic motivation that plays a more substantial role in fostering sustained employee

engagement, innovation, and creativity (Gagne & Deci, 2005; Harter et al., 2002).

Incorporating both intrinsic and extrinsic elements within organisational strategies is key to fostering a motivated and engaged workforce. A holistic approach that recognises the importance of meaningful work, personal development, and external recognition will ensure long-term commitment and high performance across diverse organisational settings (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Vallerand et al., 2003).

Employee Engagement

Employee engagement is a multifaceted concept, characterised by vigour, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Vigour refers to the high energy levels employees demonstrate when engaging with their work, while dedication involves a strong sense of enthusiasm and commitment to the work, with employees feeling proud of their tasks and work outcomes (Mazzetti et al., 2020). Absorption is characterised by full concentration and deep involvement in work tasks, where employees feel “immersed” in their work activities (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Engaged employees go beyond the minimal expectations of their job roles and willingly invest time, effort, and cognitive resources, demonstrating an enduring commitment to organisational goals (Bakker et al., 2008). This heightened engagement contributes to increased organisational performance, productivity, and employee satisfaction (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002; Macey & Schneider, 2021).

Social Exchange Theory (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005) suggests that engagement is driven by reciprocal relationships between employees and their organisations. When organisations provide employees with support, recognition, and a positive work environment, employees feel a sense of obligation to reciprocate with higher levels of engagement. This exchange fosters mutual trust and a stronger psychological contract (Blau, 1964), where both parties invest in the relationship, leading to higher job satisfaction and organisational commitment (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). In this context, employee engagement can also be viewed as a form of employee well-being (Kular et al., 2019).

Additionally, leadership behaviours and organisational culture significantly influence employee engagement. Transformational leaders, who inspire and motivate employees through visionary communication, personalised support, and fostering a sense of ownership, are found to enhance engagement (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Research has also shown that servant leadership, which emphasises empathy, active listening, and prioritising employee needs, contributes to higher engagement levels (Snyder & Green, 2021). Furthermore, an engagement-friendly culture, marked by open communication, opportunities for professional development, and recognition of achievements, also plays a pivotal role in sustaining high engagement levels (Saks, 2006; van den Broeck et al., 2020). When employees perceive that their organisation values them, they are more likely to invest extra effort towards their roles, demonstrating higher levels of commitment and passion for their work (Hakanen et al., 2008; Bakker & Albrecht, 2018).

Leadership and Organisational Culture

Recent leadership research increasingly conceptualises transformational leadership not as a set of leader traits but as a climate-shaping mechanism that structures employees’ empowerment experiences (Avolio et al., 2018; Jansen et al., 2020; Nguyen et al., 2022). Through vision articulation, ethical consistency, and individualised support, transformational leaders influence motivation indirectly by shaping cultural norms of autonomy, trust, and psychological safety. This systemic influence positions leadership as an antecedent to empowerment rather than a direct predictor of engagement, aligning with contemporary calls to model leadership effects through intervening psychological mechanisms.

Transformational leaders act as role models by demonstrating integrity, ethical conduct, and consistency between values and actions, thereby reinforcing shared norms and behavioural expectations (Bass, 1999; Buil et al., 2019). These leadership practices cultivate an empowering culture, characterised by trust, autonomy, and psychological ownership, where employees feel valued and capable of contributing meaningfully. Within such a culture, employees are more likely to align their personal goals with organisational objectives, strengthening intrinsic motivation, commitment, and proactive engagement (Tims, Bakker, & Xanthopoulou, 2011; Jansen et al., 2020). By shaping collective values and reinforcing consistent behavioural standards, transformational leadership operates at a systemic level, influencing motivation through cultural mechanisms rather than isolated leader–follower interactions.

Organisational culture, particularly when it is supportive and collaborative, further amplifies the motivational effects of transformational leadership. Supportive cultures characterised by open communication, mutual respect, and teamwork create emotionally secure environments in which employees feel connected to both the organisation and their colleagues, thereby enhancing engagement and affective commitment (Schein, 2010; Cameron & Quinn, 2011). In addition, learning-oriented cultures, which encourage experimentation, knowledge sharing, and continuous improvement, enable employees to view challenges as opportunities for growth rather than threats. Such cultures promote risk-taking, innovation, and idea-sharing, which are closely associated with higher motivation and sustained engagement (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Kundu & Gahlot, 2017).

Furthermore, transformational leadership plays a pivotal role in cultivating psychologically safe organisational cultures, which function as a critical cultural mechanism linking leadership to engagement. When leaders promote openness, recognition, and developmental support, they establish cultural norms that legitimise voice, inquiry, and constructive dissent. Employees operating within psychologically safe cultures are more willing to express ideas, raise concerns, and engage creatively without fear of negative consequences (Edmondson, 2018; Choi & Pak, 2020). This sense of safety strengthens belonging, trust, and emotional investment in work roles, which are essential foundations for sustained motivation, engagement, and organisational commitment (Kahn, 1990; Madsen et al., 2020). Collectively, these dynamics highlight how

supportive, empowering, and learning-oriented cultures function as the primary mechanisms through which transformational leadership shapes employee motivation and engagement.

Psychological Empowerment

Although psychological empowerment was originally conceptualised as a multidimensional cognitive state encompassing meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact, recent research increasingly treats empowerment as a dynamic interpretive mechanism linking job resources to motivational outcomes (Spreitzer et al., 2020; Tummers & Bakker, 2021). Contemporary studies emphasise that empowerment does not automatically arise from job design alone but depends on leadership support and cultural signals that legitimise autonomy and impact. This shift reframes empowerment from a static perception to a central explanatory process within motivational systems.

To maintain conceptual clarity, this study explicitly distinguishes job characteristics as structural work conditions from psychological empowerment as an individual psychological perception. Job characteristics refer to objectively designed features of work, such as autonomy, task variety, feedback, and skill utilisation, which are embedded within organisational systems and function as job resources. Within the Job Demands–Resources framework, these characteristics represent structural antecedents that create the potential for motivation but do not, in themselves, ensure motivated or engaged behaviour.

In contrast, psychological empowerment reflects the subjective cognitive appraisal through which employees interpret and internalise these structural conditions. While job characteristics describe what is built into the job, empowerment captures how those features are psychologically experienced. Employees exposed to similar job designs may therefore differ in their motivational responses depending on leadership support, organisational culture, and individual meaning-making processes. Psychological empowerment thus functions as a proximal psychological mechanism that translates job resources into intrinsic motivation and sustained engagement.

Consistent with Self-Determination Theory and the JD-R model, this study positions empowerment as a mediating construct linking organisational and job-level conditions to motivational outcomes. Leadership practices, organisational culture, and job resources exert their influence on motivation only insofar as they are perceived as meaningful, autonomy-supportive, and competence-enhancing. Empowerment captures this interpretive process and explains how objective work conditions become subjectively motivating.

Accordingly, psychological empowerment is conceptualised as the cognitive bridge through which leadership and cultural conditions shape intrinsic motivation, which subsequently manifests behaviourally as employee engagement. This clarification avoids conceptual redundancy, strengthens theoretical precision, and supports a coherent causal sequence linking leadership, culture, job characteristics, empowerment, motivation, and engagement.

III. THEORETICAL SYNTHESIS AND PROPOSITIONS

Based on the findings of the previous analyses, employee motivation and engagement are shaped by four fundamental antecedents: leadership style, organisational culture, job characteristics, and psychological empowerment. These factors are highly interrelated and remain central to understanding how organisations can sustain high levels of employee performance. Leadership style and organisational culture have been long recognised as pivotal in shaping the conditions under which employees thrive, particularly by influencing the availability of job resources and the extent of empowerment (Tummers et al., 2021; Nguyen et al., 2022). Similarly, the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model demonstrates that job characteristics function as critical resources that fuel intrinsic motivation and engagement, especially when employees face heightened work demands (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Schaufeli, 2021). Recent studies further confirm that enriched job resources, such as autonomy and skill variety, significantly enhance intrinsic motivation and reduce disengagement (Kim & Beehr, 2022; Mazzetti et al., 2023). Building on this synthesis, the following conceptual framework visually integrates these relationships and clarifies the proposed causal sequencing among the construct.



Figure 1: Conceptual Framework of Empowerment-Driven Employee Motivation and Engagement

The proposed conceptual framework integrates leadership style, organisational culture, and job characteristics as foundational organisational antecedents that jointly shape employees' psychological empowerment. These antecedents operate at structural and relational levels, creating the contextual conditions under which employees interpret their work roles. Psychological empowerment is positioned as the central cognitive mechanism through which these organisational conditions are internalised, transforming objective job and organisational features into subjectively meaningful and motivating experiences.

Motivation is conceptualised as the immediate psychological outcome of empowerment, reflecting both intrinsic and extrinsic motivational orientations. Engagement is subsequently theorised as a behavioural and affective manifestation of motivation, expressed through

vigour, dedication, and absorption. In line with contemporary motivational theory, the framework conceptualises motivation and engagement not as parallel outcomes, but as sequential and interdependent processes. Engagement further functions as a proximal driver of positive organisational outcomes such as performance, commitment, and reduced turnover.

This integrative model advances existing literature by clarifying the causal ordering among constructs and by explicitly positioning psychological empowerment as the explanatory bridge linking organisational structures to employee engagement.

Propositions Development

Based on the theoretical synthesis of Self-Determination Theory, the Job Demands–Resources model, and empowerment theory, the following propositions are advanced:

a) Proposition 1

Transformational leadership is positively associated with psychological empowerment, such that leadership behaviours that promote vision, fairness, and individualised support enhance employees' perceptions of meaning, competence, autonomy, and impact.

b) Proposition 2

Supportive, empowering, and learning-oriented organisational cultures are positively related to psychological empowerment by fostering psychological safety, trust, and opportunities for growth.

c) Proposition 3

Enriched job characteristics, including autonomy, task variety, feedback, and skill utilisation, are positively associated with psychological empowerment by providing employees with resources that support autonomy and competence.

d) Proposition 4

Psychological empowerment is positively associated with employee motivation, such that empowered employees experience higher levels of intrinsic motivation and sustained motivational energy.

Overall, leadership style, organisational culture, job characteristics, and psychological empowerment form an interdependent foundation for employee motivation and engagement. Leadership and culture shape empowering environments that support autonomy, competence, and meaning at work, while also influencing how job resources are experienced by employees. Psychological empowerment functions as the central cognitive mechanism that enables employees to translate structural job conditions into intrinsic motivation and sustained engagement, highlighting that these antecedents operate synergistically rather than in isolation.

This study further underscores the mediating role of engagement in converting motivation into tangible organisational outcomes, including enhanced performance, stronger commitment, and reduced turnover. By integrating

leadership, culture, job design, and empowerment into a coherent framework, organisations can create conditions that sustain engagement and support long-term organisational effectiveness.

Despite its contributions, this conceptual analysis is limited by the absence of empirical testing and industry-specific differentiation. Future research should empirically examine the mediating and moderating roles of empowerment, leadership, and culture across diverse organisational contexts to refine and validate the proposed framework. Collectively, the model highlights employee motivation as a central organisational asset and demonstrates how coordinated leadership practices, supportive cultures, enriched job characteristics, and psychological empowerment can jointly enhance motivation and engagement.

IV. CONCLUSION

This study makes three key theoretical contributions to the employee motivation and engagement literature. First, it advances an integrative framework that synthesises leadership style, organisational culture, job characteristics, and psychological empowerment into a coherent model, addressing fragmentation in prior research by conceptualising these antecedents as interdependent organisational conditions shaping motivational processes (Albrecht et al., 2021; Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). By positioning psychological empowerment as the central cognitive mechanism linking organisational structures to motivation and engagement, this study responds to recent calls for mechanism-oriented models that move beyond direct-effects explanations in motivation research (Decuyper & Schaufeli, 2021; Saks, 2022; Mazzetti et al., 2023). Third, the study delineates theoretical boundary conditions, recognising that empowerment-driven pathways may vary across industries, organisational contexts, and cultural settings, particularly where norms of autonomy, authority, and relational exchange differ (Zhang & Akhtar, 2021; Saks, 2022).

This study advances employee motivation and engagement theory by specifying an empowerment-driven causal architecture in which leadership style, organisational culture, and job characteristics operate as structurally distinct yet functionally interdependent antecedents. Rather than exerting direct effects, leadership practices and cultural norms shape engagement by conditioning the extent to which employees experience autonomy, competence, and meaning, thereby activating psychological empowerment as the central interpretive mechanism. Job characteristics provide necessary motivational resources, but their effects remain latent unless cognitively internalised through empowerment, positioning motivation as the proximal psychological outcome and engagement as its behavioural manifestation.

As a conceptual model, the framework's explanatory power is bounded by assumptions of relatively stable organisational conditions and empowerment-supportive environments. In contexts characterised by high uncertainty, rigid hierarchies, or limited discretion, empowerment mechanisms may operate differently or be attenuated. These boundary conditions delineate where the proposed causal

logic is most likely to hold and provide a clear agenda for future inquiry.

Building on this foundation, future research should pursue programmatic inquiry aligned with the framework's causal sequencing. Longitudinal mediation designs are required to validate empowerment as a temporal mechanism linking leadership, job characteristics, and engagement over time. Cross-cultural and cross-industry studies can test whether empowerment-driven pathways are contingent on institutional norms of authority and autonomy. Multi-level and dynamic designs further allow examination of how fluctuations in leadership behaviour and job resources activate short-term empowerment states, clarifying when empowerment translates into sustained engagement rather than episodic involvement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to express their sincere appreciation to Kenny S.L. Cheah for his invaluable guidance, insightful feedback, and continuous support throughout the development of this study, which significantly contributed to the conceptualisation and refinement of this work. The authors also extend their heartfelt gratitude to Elizabeth Dorothy Choo, the author's daughter, for her unwavering support, patience, and encouragement, which served as a constant source of motivation throughout the research process. This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

REFERENCES

- Albrecht, S. L., Bakker, A. B., Gruman, J. A., Macey, W. H., & Saks, A. M. (2021). Employee engagement, human resource management practices and competitive advantage. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 8(2), 111–129.
- Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2018). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 69, 201–222.
- Bakker, A. B., & Albrecht, S. L. (2018). Work engagement: Current trends. *Career Development International*, 23(1), 4–11.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: State of the art and recent developments. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2023). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 28(1), 1–14.
- Bass, B. M. (1999). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Buil, I., Martínez, E., & Matute, J. (2019). Transformational leadership and employee creativity: The mediating role of creative self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Business Research*, 100, 106–115.
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2011). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework* (3rd ed.). Wiley.
- Choi, S. B., & Pak, A. (2020). The influence of psychological safety on employee engagement and innovative behaviour. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 27(2), 173–186.
- Decuypere, A., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2021). Leadership and work engagement: Exploring explanatory mechanisms. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 36(1), 69–84.
- Edmondson, A. (2018). *The fearless organization: Creating psychological safety in the workplace for learning, innovation, and growth*. Wiley.
- Golden, T. D. (2020). Remote work and the future of work. *Organizational Dynamics*, 49(2), 100741.
- Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2008). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 46(5), 471–489.
- Iqbal, M., Usman, M., & Hanif, A. (2021). High-performance work systems and employee engagement: The role of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 36(4), 234–248.
- Jansen, P. G. W., Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2020). Motivating employees: The role of leadership in enhancing work engagement. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 41(1), 88–99.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724.
- Kim, M., & Beehr, T. A. (2022). Empowering leadership and intrinsic motivation: Examining mediating and moderating mechanisms. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 29(3), 345–360.
- Kundu, S. K., & Gahlot, M. (2017). Organizational culture and employee engagement: Exploring the relationship in the context of Indian firms. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 25(3), 542–559.
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Liao, C. (2000). Perceived empowerment and employees' organizational commitment: Implications for social exchange theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 407–416.
- Liden, R. C., Panaccio, A., Meuser, J. D., Hu, J., & Wright, Z. (2020). Servant leadership and employee outcomes: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 41(6), 599–614.
- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2021). Employee engagement revisited. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 42(1), 1–10.
- Madsen, S. R., O'Neil, R., & Alpert, F. (2020). Exploring the role of organizational culture in the development of innovative behaviour: The importance of creating psychological safety. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 27(1), 5–20.
- Mazzetti, G., Schaufeli, W. B., & Guglielmi, D. (2023). Are work engagement and motivation the same? Conceptual, theoretical, and empirical distinctions. *Human Resource Management Review*, 33(2), 100915.
- Nguyen, T. T., Malik, A., & Budhwar, P. (2022). Leadership, empowerment, and employee engagement across contexts: A multilevel perspective. *Personnel Review*, 51(4), 1243–1261.

- Saks, A. M. (2022). Caring human resources management and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management Review*, 32(3), 100835.
- Schaufeli, W. B. (2021). Engaging leadership: How to promote work engagement? *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 8(3), 365–376.
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Seibert, S. E., Wang, G., & Courtright, S. H. (2011). Antecedents and consequences of psychological and team empowerment in organizations: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(5), 981–1003.
- Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5), 1442–1465.
- Spreitzer, G. M., Kizilos, M. A., & Nason, S. W. (2020). A dimensional analysis of the relationship between job resources and empowerment. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 41(5), 501–516.
- 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.
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2011). Do transformational leaders enhance their followers' daily work engagement? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(1), 121–131.
- Zhang, Y., & Akhtar, S. (2021). Empowerment and motivation across cultures: A comparative study. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32(14), 3052–3075.