TECHNIUM
SOCIAL SCIENCES JOURNAL

Vol. 17, 2021

A new decade for social changes

www.techniumscience.com

Electronic copy available at: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3807629>

ISSN 2668-7798

9 772668 779000

Empowering Leadership of the Heads as Perceived by the Employees and Employees' Job satisfaction

Damianus Abun¹, Maynard O. Lucas², Theogenia Magallanes³, Mary Joy Encarnation⁴, Nathanael Flores⁵

^{1 2 4}Divine Word College of Laoag, Ilocos Norte, Philippines, ^{3 5}Saint Benedict College of Northern Luzon, Ilocos Sur, Philippines

anusabun@gmail.com¹

Abstract. The study aimed to determine the effect of empowering leadership and the job satisfaction of employees. To support the purpose, the literature was reviewed and theories were established to strengthen the title of the study. The study followed a research methodology and the research design was the descriptive assessment and correlational research design. To gather the data, validated questionnaires were used and descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. Weighted mean and Pearson r correlation was used to determine the level of different variables of empowering leadership and the correlation between empowering leadership and job satisfaction. The results indicate that empowering leadership of heads and job satisfaction of employees is not very high or high but a moderate extent and there is a significant correlation between empowering leadership and job satisfaction. Therefore, the hypothesis of the study is accepted.

Keywords. Empowering leadership, job satisfaction, the nature of the work, personal growth and development

I. Introduction

When things go wrong in any organization or business, the first person to be blamed would be the leadership before its employees (Nordgren, 2016). The stakeholder would blame the management or leadership, not the employees, even though employees and other external factors are contributing factors to the failure. Why are they blamed in the first place? The answer is simple. In the mind of many people, a leader is the captain of the business or organization. When the boat is sinking, the captain is to be blamed. When the business is bankrupt, the top management is to be blamed. The stakeholders will always ask who the leader is. Top management is always blamed for bankruptcies (D'Aveni, 1990). The captain of Titanic was blamed for the disaster because of Captain E.J. Smith. He ignored seven iceberg warnings from his crew and other ships because he wanted to reach New York in record time, he ignored distress signals and he did not slow down the ship (Ismay & Smith, 1912). The same with El Faro Cargo Ship. The captain was blamed for its sinking because the captain was misreading both the strength of the hurricane and his overestimation of the ship's strength. The captain had the opportunity to reroute the ship to avoid hurricanes but ignored the warnings of his mates to change the direction (Dooley, 2017). It was also the captain of the Sea Diamond Cruise Ship to

be blamed for its sinking of a Greek Island. The captain and the crews ignored the order to avoid the sea currents because the captain and the crews had no enough time to respond. They were charged with negligence and violating international maritime rules (Carassava, 2007).

The above stories point to the role of leadership. Leadership plays an important role in any business organization. Poor performance, productivity, quality are blamed on the leaders because it just shows that they are not able to maximize their assets to the maximum level for the attainment of the objectives. One of the key issues in leadership is empowerment. Empowerment is the opposite of authoritarian leadership in which the leader does not consult the group in decision-making. Disengaging employees in decision-making causes dissatisfaction on the part of employees. Though in a certain context, authoritarian leadership may work but in many instances, it does not work. Employees can be disgruntled when they cannot contribute their ideas to the management or organization (Cherry, 2019). The employees feel useless when they are not even considered by the management when solving problems of the organization. Such an environment does not benefit anything for the organization but only leads to the downfall of any business or organization. Studies have found that authoritarian leadership negatively affects the good performance of employees as compared to when employees less dependent on a leader (Wang, et.al. 2019). Jiang, et.al. (2017) also pointed out the negative effect of authoritarian leadership on psychological contract violation and organizational cynicism. Empowering leadership is always believing in his/her employees and allows them to join him/her in decision making. Involving employees in decision-making can increase employees' self-worth and commitment to the organization (Keller, 1995).

There are many aspects of leadership and empowerment depending on one's perspective about empowerment. But commonly, issues of leadership and empowerment may include the issue of vision, independence or autonomy, the delegation of authority or power-sharing, and the goal-orientation approach. An empowering leader has a clear vision where he/she is directing his employees, and he/she allows the employees to a certain extent to be autonomous in carrying out the vision and their responsibilities. He/she gives the employees the authority to decide on their own without much intervention from the leader. Performance evaluation is based on the assigned goals given to all employees to be achieved. These are the essential concern of leadership and empowerment has been a contributing factor to the success of the business organization. Empowerment is one way of how leadership or management increases the intrinsic task motivation of employees (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990).

There have been studies on empowerment and performance but no studies yet so far related to measuring the effect of empowering leadership toward job satisfaction in the school context. This is the main objective of the study. The output of the study will help the management to review their leadership approach to improve job satisfaction. It also contributes to the enrichment of the discussion on the role of leadership in enhancing the productivity of employees.

The paper would like to investigate the extent to which leadership of school organizations is empowering their employees or faculty to achieve the vision of the school. Discontentment of employees has been the motivating factor behind the reason why this study is conducted. The study would be divided into five parts. The first part is the introduction which discusses the rationale and the direction of this paper. The second part is the review of the related literature that will tackle the different theories of the study based on the literature review. The third part is the research methodology which includes the research design, population of the study, the locale of the study, data administration process, data gathering instruments, and statistical treatment of data. The fourth part is the empirical data and analysis in which the paper presents

the data gathered through questionnaires and analyzes the data. The fifth part is the discussion and the conclusion.

II. Literature Review

A literature review is a way of gathering ideas from previous researches related to the current topic (Baumeister & Leary, 1997). It helps to establish the foundation of the theories of the current study (Webster & Watson, 2002). It also provides a comprehensive idea about the current topic (Snyder, 2019). Thus, this part reviews the related literature which includes studies that have discussed theories of the current study.

The Theoretical and conceptual background

The Concept of leadership

As we have pointed out in the introduction of the study, that leadership plays an important role in obtaining organizational objectives. Blames would be thrown to the one who leads or manages the business organization. Bennis and Nanus (2007) had pointed out that it is the leaders that make the organization effective or ineffective. The performance of an organization reflects the leadership. Effective or ineffective organizations reflect effective or ineffective leadership. This is exactly what Tichy and Cohen (2007) when they say that winning is about leadership. Leadership is to lead the organization to succeed. Therefore, the one who is in the position of leadership needs to understand what leadership is. Someone who is in the position of leadership but does not know his/her role as a leader can be disastrous for the organization. Al Khajeh (2018) had proven it in his study on the relationship between leadership styles and organizational performance. He pointed out in his study that leadership is one of the determinant factors associated with success and failures in any organization. He contended that transformational, and democratic styles have contributed to the success of an organization. His study, besides many other studies, confirmed the fact of the importance of leadership to achieve organizational goals through his/her people. Organizational success is an indication of a leader's success in influencing his people to attain the goals. Northouse (2015) argued that leadership is a process by which a person influences others or followers to achieve the stated goals. In other words, a winning organization can only be achieved through people and good leadership. Leaders must know the art of leadership. The process of how to influence people to achieve organizational goals is the art of leadership. Leadership is a package, not only about skills or knowledge but is a combination of all, knowledge, character, values, and action. Tichy and Cohen (2007) argued that leaders not only have ideas or knowledge but they have the values, energy, and edge. They have the knowledge and the basic skills to carry out their job and to guide their followers but they have also the values to guide their decisions and energy to implement their decisions. Bennis and Nanus (2007) pointed out several important aspects of leadership and they are character, strong determination to realize the vision, the capacity to generate and sustain trust, result-oriented, not just creating optimism without action, enrolling people in their vision through their optimism. Without good moral character or moral values, a leader cannot be effective in performing his/her job. However, even if he/she has the character but without the strong determination to implement what has been decided, then he/she will fail. Strong determination should be accompanied by trust. To get the cooperation of his/her followers to perform their duties and responsibilities, leaders must be trusted and can trust and sustain the trust relationship with his/her followers.

Following the above concept, we argue that leadership cannot be effective without the cooperation of his/her followers. Getting the employees involved in the management process is the only way to create a winning organization. In other words, a leader can only win by creating

winning leaders down the line. Tichy and Cohen (2007) contended that a winning organization has leaders at all levels. Thus, the main responsibility of a leader then is to create or build leaders at all levels in the organization. Leadership is not only at the top of management but leadership must exist at all levels. Producing leaders at all levels make a difference between winners and losers. This is also what Maxwell (1995) had emphasized that the main duty and responsibility of a leader is to develop leaders around him. How to create or build leaders around him is the art of empowerment.

The Concept of Empowerment and Empowering Leadership

Empowerment has been discussed by many authors like Bennis and Nanus (1985, 2007), House, (1988), Neilsen (1986), etc. Bennis and Nanus (1985, 2007) had discussed the nature of 21st-century leadership in which they talked about empowerment. For them, 21st-century leadership would change in its focus. Leadership would focus on developing leaders at all levels, leading by vision, sharing information at all levels, empowering and inspiring individuals, and facilitating teamwork, acting as a coach, creating an agenda for change. Leaders would not be the center of decision-making, and would not focus on directing and supervising, controlling, and would not act like a boss. While House (1988) discussed leadership behavior that enhances subordinate empowerment and satisfaction. Leaders' behavior should increase the motivation and capabilities of subordinates. Neilsen (1986) contended that empowerment is giving the resources they need and by doing that, the leadership help increases their sense of self-worth. His study had shown that psychological empowerment correlates to organizational performance.

Reading from their concepts, there is no common agreement when it comes to the meaning or definition of empowerment. Merriam – Webster would define empowerment as the “act or action or empowering someone or something, the granting of the power, right, or authority to perform various acts or duties”. Or “the state of being empowered to do something: the power, right, or authority to do something”. While the Cambridge dictionary would define empowerment as “the process of gaining freedom and power to do what you want or to control what happens to you”. Collins Dictionary defines empowerment as “the process of giving them power and status in a particular situation”. Those definitions that are offered by different dictionaries are enough for us to establish the definition of empowerment. In the context of our topic, empowerment is a process of giving power or authority to others or employees to be free from leadership controlling and independent in carrying out their duties and responsibilities. In the legal sense, empowerment means authorization (Thomas, 1990). In other words, through empowerment, the leader allows, consents, permits the employees to perform his duties and to make decisions on behalf of the leader.

Empowering leadership style then is a process of “sharing power to enhance employees' motivation and investment in their work” (Zhang & Zhou, 2014). This leadership style empowers employees psychologically to improve their work outcomes (Spreitzer, 1995). When they are empowered, their sense of self-worth is strengthened because they feel that their work is important. According to the study of Hao, et.al. (2018) empowering leadership has a positive correlation with task performance and creative performance, and passion for work. This is the effect when one is given the authority to perform his/her task independently without much intervention or control from the management side. Employees are more committed and engaged in their job when they are given the freedom to choose how to perform their job according to their way without strict supervision and controlling from the leader. Chen, et.al (2011) studied the effect of empowering leadership on the team members and found that empowering leadership positively affects cooperative and innovative behavior and their commitment. Other

studies have shown that empowering leadership has become an important factor in improving job performance (Humborstad, 2014) and employees have become more proactive, seeking continuous improvement on the quality of work and always searching for creative solutions to the problems they encounter in the workplace (Wellins, 1991). Lee, et.al (2018) found that empowering leaders are more effective in influencing creativity and citizenship behavior compared to those leaders who are focusing on task performance. They are also more trusted by employees compared to those leaders who are not empowering their employees. Finally, they are more effective in influencing the job performance of employees.

Element of empowerment

Based on the meaning of leadership and the concept of empowerment and the concept of empowering leadership that we have discussed, now we can identify from there on the elements of empowerment.

1. **Vision-Mission-oriented empowerment.** The first element of leadership and the basis of empowerment is vision and mission. Empowerment is a tool to achieve the stated vision and mission. Vision and mission serve as guides in decision making and to perform a job. Employees who understand the vision and mission of the organization do not need a leader who is strict and autocratic because vision and mission are already enough to guide their work. It serves as their guide in carrying out their duties and responsibilities. Therefore employees must be involved in designing the vision and mission. By involving the employees in writing the vision and mission, objectives, key result areas, performance indicators, and strategies (Morato, 2006), then the employees own the vision and mission. Thus, it becomes a collective vision, not the vision of the leader alone. By having a collective vision and mission, the employees know what to do, where to go, and know-how to get there, and they know what to expect of them. Collective vision and mission imply the delegation of authority. Therefore, an effective vision and mission allow the leadership to delegate authority to employees or those who can create a better outcome to make decisions. Having a clear vision and mission helps the management to save their time in controlling, supervising, monitoring, and avoiding unnecessary arguments about what to do and how to do it (Searle, Hayes & Weiss, 2018).

2. **Independence or Autonomy.** The understanding of autonomy or independence is simple. Looking into the root word of the term, "autonomy", the word is composed of two root words as *autos* which means self, and *nomos* which means rule, governance, or law. From such root words, we have the idea of autonomy which means self-governance or self-rule, self – determination, freedom of will, individuality, independence, and self-knowledge (Agich, 1993, 1994). It is the absence of external interference. In light of the purpose of this paper, autonomy simply means that an individual is given the freedom to determine or to govern himself/herself in carrying out his/her duties and responsibilities. In other words, the individual is given the capacity to make his/her own decision (Dryden, n.d) without the interference of higher authority or external influencers. It is the autonomy of action and thought of an individual without being dictated by external authorities other than himself/herself. By having autonomy, the person can shape his/her work according to his/her own best judgment. Saragih (2011) pointed out in her study that job autonomy is significantly related to job satisfaction and job performance. Also, Morgeson, et.al. (2005) found the same result that job autonomy affects job performance and job satisfaction of employees.

3. **Delegation of Authority.** Abun (2018) had expressed that a leader is not an all-knowing person and who can do everything at anytime and anywhere. There are many issues that he/she is going to face and these issues can consume his/her time and energy. He/she cannot be effective when he/she is facing these issues alone and therefore, there is a need to delegate

certain levels of authority to other people or people down the line to decide on behalf of the leader. Bennis and Nanus (2007) give us a meaning of delegation of authority. They argued that delegation of authority means the division of authority and power downwards to the subordinates. In this case, a leader entrusts his power and authority to other people to do things or decide on his/her behalf. This is the main concern of delegation of authority which is to release power and share the power to subordinates to make decisions on behalf of the leader. This is one way of how leaders motivate employees psychologically and give meaning to their presence in the organization that they have contributed something to the life of the organization (Abun, 2018). Kokemuller (2007) contended that delegation of authority occurs when a leader or manager assigns a certain task to workers to do on his/her behalf and provides guidelines to perform the task. Delegation is not giving away burdens but giving away his/her responsibility and therefore, he/she should know what to delegate, who is to be delegated, and what the specifics are. Bennis and Nanus (2007) determine the elements of delegation which include authority, responsibility, and accountability. It means that the delegated person has the power and right to allocate resources, make decisions, and order other people to carry out their duties and responsibilities on behalf of the leader. The delegated person has the responsibility to carry out his task as agreed upon with the one who gave him/her the responsibility, and therefore, it is not a blanket authority because the delegated person has to follow the stated requirements that he/she can only do. There are specific guidelines and the scope of the authority. The person who is given the authority must be accountable to the person who gave him the authority (Abun, 2018). Al-Jammal and Al-Khasawneh (2015) conducted a study to determine the effect of the delegation of authority on the employees' job performance and his study found that delegation of authority significantly affects the employees' job performance.

4. Individual Goal-Oriented empowerment

Empowerment is not just for the sake of giving authority and power to subordinate without any purpose. The purpose of empowerment is for the subordinate to have the authority and power to do things on their own and to decide on things that they know best to achieve the common goal of the organization. Therefore, the common goal must be cascaded down to different departments or units, and from the unit is individual employees. It means that from the common goal, the leadership should assign each department goal/unit goal and the unit goal is distributed to individual goals to be achieved. Individual goal theory would argue that when the department or the individuals are given an individual goal to achieve, it influences how the department operates, or how the individual thinks, feels, and acts (Stavrou, et.al. 2015). Goal-oriented is also called task-driven or result-driven by which the person focuses his/her efforts to achieve the given goal at hand. The individual goal helps direct the behavior toward achievement and success. An individual goal can explain the reason why employees engage in their work. It governs their reason and action in engaging their work. The individual goal would help the employees on how to master and to carry out their tasks. In other words, an individual goal is a form of intrinsic motivation that inspires employees from within to release their capability to perform the task given to them and to achieve the goal assigned to them (Ordóñez, et.al, 2009). Borlongan-Conway, et.al (2010) found in their study that goal orientation is positively correlated to creative performance.

Leadership Styles and Job satisfaction

Discussion on job satisfaction is still very important because it is one of the management concerns that should not be neglected. Organizational performance and individual performance are interrelated. Job satisfaction has been argued as a reflection of employees' contentment over the environment or their work and the supervision of their work (Spector, 1997). Or Sharma

and Bhaskar (1991) argued that job satisfaction is an emotional state felt after experiencing the job. It is what one feels after one encounters the job. Feeling of satisfaction or dissatisfaction occurs when the employees experience a discrepancy between what they want from the job and what they experience in reality. It is a feeling felt after one's needs are fulfilled or when their expectations or desires are met (Ali, 2016). Therefore, measuring their job satisfaction is important to determine if they are happy or not happy with their work. It is important to measure to what extent employees are happy or not happy or satisfied or dissatisfied with their job. This is one of the core issues of the organization because neglecting such an issue would mean the downfall of the organization because employees are considered the most important assets of an organization. This is the reason why employees stay and go (Flowers & Hughes, 1973).

Studies have shown the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational performance. Brayfield & Crockett, (1955) had already studied the correlation between the two variables. Their study had already pointed out the role of job satisfaction in organizational performance. Later studies also support the early study on the influence of job satisfaction on organizational performance. For example, Bakotic (2016), Ouedraogo, and Leclerc (2013) conducted a study on job satisfaction and organizational performance and the result indicated that the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational performance is stronger than the connection between organizational performance and job satisfaction. These studies were confirmed further by a later study by Miah (2018) on the impact of employees' job satisfaction and organizational performance on the private sector. Without further narrating many studies on this particular concern, it is believed that job satisfaction is a crucial issue in managing an organization.

Job satisfaction is not just caused by the job or the work alone or by unfulfilled needs such as physiological and psychological needs but it is also caused by leadership styles. Different leadership styles cause different levels of job satisfaction as pointed out by Medley & Larochelle, (1995) and Haider, and Riaz (2010) that job satisfaction is more dependent on transformational and transactional leadership styles. Empowering leadership is one of the leadership styles that can increase job satisfaction and job performance as indicated by the study of Fuller, et.al (1999). A similar study and result were also pointed out by Furlonger (2000) on the influence of leadership empowerment on job satisfaction. Job satisfaction as a result of empowering leadership may include the ***work itself, management policies, personal growth and career development, management, and employee relationship, and empowerment*** (Dhamija, et.al., 2018). Satisfaction can be drawn ***from the work itself*** if the work is suitable for the employees and capable of doing it and has the necessary information for doing the work, gives new knowledge and skills, enhances dignity and respect, realizes employee's expectations, allows employees' creativity and appreciates employees' ideas and efforts. Satisfaction can also be a result ***of management policies***. In this case, the employees are satisfied when policies are resulting in a conducive work environment, oriented toward organizational development and employees' welfare, promoting career opportunities and growth, encouraging a learning climate, enhancing trust and openness between management and employees, and providing regular discussion on organizational efficiency. Job satisfaction is also correlated to ***personal growth and career development***. There is a need for management to provide schemes or policies for personal growth and development and communicates those policies to the employees, conduct activities that enhance employees' development, involve the employees in decision making, show interest in employees' development and encourage employees to acquire new skills. Satisfaction can also be the output of ***management and employee relationship***. In the sense that there is regular communication between management and employees related to HRM policies, permission given to the employees to participate in

decision making, communication of vision and mission to the employees and the objectives of the organization, and coordination between the management and HR department.

Conceptual Framework

Independent variables

Dependent Variables

Source: Bennis and Nanus (1985, 2007; Searle, Hayes & Weiss, 2018; Saragih, 2011; Abun, 2018; Kokemuller, 2007; Borlongan-Conway, et.al., 2010; Dhamija, et.al., 2018)

Figure1: Independent and dependent variables describe the influence of independent variables toward the dependent variable. In the sense that when the experimenter manipulates the independent variables, it may affect the dependent variable (McLeod, 2019). In this regard, the conceptual frameworks reflect the theory of the study. It depicts the correlation between the two variables in which empowering leadership affects job satisfaction.

Statement of the Problem

As reflected in the conceptual framework, the study wanted to find out the correlation between empowering leadership and job satisfaction. It specifically answers the following questions:

1. What is the empowering leadership style of heads of the College in terms of
 - a. Vision-oriented empowerment
 - b. Independence/autonomy
 - c. Delegation of Authority
 - d. Individual goal-oriented empowerment
2. What is the job satisfaction of employees in terms of

- a. the nature of work
 - b. Management policies
 - c. Personal growth and development
 - d. management and employees relationship
3. Is there a relationship between empowering leadership and job satisfaction?

Assumption of the Study

The study assumes that the theory of the study is correct, that empowering leadership affects the job satisfaction of employees. It is also assumed that empowering leadership and job satisfaction can be measured and the questionnaires are valid and the answers are objective.

Hypothesis

A study has found that there is a correlation between empowering leadership and job satisfaction as pointed out in the study of Haider, and Riaz (2010) and Furlonger (2000). Thus the current study hypothesizes that there is a correlation between empowering leadership style and job satisfaction of employees.

Scope and delimitation of the Study

The study limits its investigation on the relationship between empowering leadership styles along with vision-oriented empowerment, independence/autonomy, a delegation of authority, and individual-goal-oriented empowerment. The study covers only the employees of a Catholic College in Ilocos Norte. The study limits its investigation only to the variables identified in this study.

III. Research Methodology

The research methodology is the specific procedures on the study is carried out scientifically and usually, it is the basis for determining the quality and validity of the research (Leedy, 1974). Conducting quality research demands correct procedures or methodology in carrying its investigation. Therefore, good research must adopt a certain research design and should have the locale of the study where the study is conducted and its population. Further, it should have a clear procedure in gathering the data and the instruments in gathering the data, and finally, its statistical tools to analyze the data.

Research Design

This research is quantitative and therefore it used descriptive assessment and descriptive correlational research design. According to Baht (2020), descriptive research is a “research method that describes the characteristics of the population or the phenomena that are studied. It focuses more on the “what” of the research subject rather than the “why” of the research subject” (para. 1). This research designed is used to determine the level of empowering leadership styles of office heads or managers and their effect on the employees’ job satisfaction. Ariola (2006) as cited by Abun (2019), contends that descriptive research is to describe what appears in the data collected through questionnaires and statistical treatment. It is also used to describe profiles, frequency distribution, describe characteristics of people, situations, phenomena, or relationship variables. In short, it describes “what is” about the data. Concerning the current study, the descriptive correlational method was deployed. The study determines the level of moral leadership and its effect on the morality of employees.

The locale of the Study

The locale of the study was a Catholic College in Ilocos Norte. Ilocos Norte is a province adjacent to Ilocos Sur. Both provinces are located in the northern part of Luzon Island, Philippines.

Population

The population of the study was composed of all administrators and employees of the College. The total enumeration sampling was used and 130 employees including the heads were taken as respondents of the study.

Data Gathering instruments

Questionnaires are used in the data gathering. The Questionnaires on empowering leadership styles were designed by the researcher and the content validation was done by subject matter experts who have been in the position of leadership for 15 years and more and have PhDs in educational management. While questionnaires on job satisfaction were adapted from Quality of Work-Life Factors of Dhamija, et.al. (2018).

Data Gathering Procedures

Gathering data from a certain institution cannot be done without proper procedures. The procedure must be followed to avoid unethical behavior. Integrity in data gathering is an important key to quality research. Therefore, the researcher followed the procedures in gathering the data. The researcher sent letters to the President of the Colleges, requesting them to allow the researcher to flow his questionnaires in the college. The researcher personally met the Presidents and employees and requested them to answer the questionnaires.

The retrieval of questionnaires was arranged between the President's representative and the researcher with the help of employees and faculty of the college.

Statistical Treatment of Data

In the light of descriptive research, therefore descriptive and inferential statistics were used. The descriptive statistics were used to determine the weighted mean in determining the level of different empowering leadership styles of administrators as perceived by the employees and job satisfaction of employees and inferential statistics used Pearson r to measure the correlation between empowering leadership styles and the job satisfaction of employees.

The following ranges of values with their descriptive interpretation will be used:

Statistical Range	Descriptive Interpretation
4.21-5.00	Strongly agree/Very High
3.41-4.20	Agree/High
2.61-3.40	Somewhat agree?Moderate
1.81-2.60	Disagree/Low
1.00-1.80	Strongly disagree/Very Low

IV. Data and Analysis

This part presents the data gathered through questionnaires. The presentation follows the structure of the statement of the problems.

Problem 1: What is the empowering leadership style of Administrators of the College in terms of

a. Vision-oriented empowerment

b. Independence/autonomy

c. Delegation of Authority

d. Individual goal-oriented empowerment

Table 1. Empowering leadership Style of Administrators of the College in terms of the Vision

<i>Indicators</i>	Mean	DR
1. Employees are invited and involved in creating the vision and mission of the organization.	2.94	SWA
2. The vision and mission of the institution are clear to the employees.	3.04	SWA
3. There is a communication of vision and mission to all employees.	3.05	SWA
4. There is a disclosure of strategy to achieve the vision and mission.	2.92	SWA
5. Constant update of the attainment of vision and mission to the employees.	2.83	SWA
6. Encourage employees to initiate activities in line with the vision-mission.	2.96	SWA
7. Employees are allowed to make their decisions based on the vision and mission.	2.95	SWA
8. There is a regular assessment of the work together with the employees in line with the vision and mission.	2.92	SWA
Composite Mean	2.95	SWA

Source: Bennis and Nanus (1985, 2007); Searle, Hayes & Weiss, (2018)

Legend:

<i>Statistical Range</i>	<i>Descriptive Interpretation</i>
4.21-5.00	Strongly agree/Very High
3.41-4.20	Agree/High
2.61-3.40	Somewhat agree /Moderate
1.81-2.60	Disagree/Low
1.00-1.80	Strongly disagree/Very Low

As gleaned from the data, it reveals that as a whole, empowering leadership of the heads of the College in terms of the vision obtained a composite mean of 2.95 which is interpreted as “somewhat agree or Moderate”. Such composite mean indicates that empowering leadership of heads is not very high or high and it is also not low or very low but to a moderate extent. Even if the items are taken separately, they all fall within the same level of mean-range which is “somewhat agree or moderate” such as: “employees are involved in creating the vision and mission of the organization(2.94), the vision and mission of the institution are clear to the employees (3.04), there is a communication of vision and mission to all employees (3.05), there is a disclosure of strategy to achieve the vision and mission (3.92), constant update of the attainment of vision and mission to the employees (2.83), encouraging employees to initiate activities in line with the vision-mission (2.96), allowing employees to make their decisions based on the vision and mission (2.95), and regular assessment of the work together with the employees in line with the vision and mission” (2.92).

The mean rating suggests that the heads have not been extending very high effort in making the employees participate in writing the vision and mission and own it. It reveals that the employees and heads are not on the same page and such a situation may affect the efficiency of both, employees and the heads (Lavoie, 2017). Further, when the employees are not able to see the direction of the organization, they may not be inspired to pursue the objective of the organization and consequently affect their job satisfaction (Mahmood & Rehman, 2015).

Table 2. Empowering leadership Style of heads of the College in terms of Independence/Autonomy

<i>Indicators</i>	Mean	DR
1. The management allows the employees to perform their work on their own based on what they know best.	3.05	SWA
2. The management encourages self-thinking and creativity at work.	3.02	SWA
3. The management does not intervene too much in the work of employees.	3.02	SWA
4. The management motivates employees to determine or govern themselves.	2.95	SWA
5. The employees are allowed to make their own decisions.	2.95	SWA
6. The management appreciates ideas and recognizes employees' efforts.	2.91	SWA
7. The employees are given easy access to the institution's resources to perform their job.	2.98	SWA
8. The management minimizes supervision and control of the work of employees.	3.03	SWA
Composite Mean	2.99	SWA

Source: Bennis and Nanus (1985, 2007); Searle, Hayes & Weiss, (2018)

Legend:

<i>Statistical Range</i>	<i>Descriptive Interpretation</i>
4.21-5.00	Strongly agree/Very High
3.41-4.20	Agree/High
2.61-3.40	Somewhat agree /Moderate
1.81-2.60	Disagree/Low
1.00-1.80	Strongly disagree/Very Low

It is the same case with independence or autonomy. As garnered from the data, it shows that as a whole, empowering leadership of heads along independence or autonomy gains a composite mean of 2.99 which means "somewhat agree or moderate extent". It implies that empowering leadership of heads in terms of independence or autonomy is not very high or high and it is also not low or very low but to a moderate extent. Even when the questions are taken singly, they all are rated within the same level of mean-range interpretation which is "somewhat agree or moderate extent" such as: "allowing the employees to perform their work on their own based on what they know best (3.05), encouraging self-thinking and creativity at work (3.02), not intervening too much in the work of employees (3.02), motivating employees to determine or to govern themselves (2.95), allowing employees to make their own decisions (2.95), appreciating ideas and recognizes employees' effort (2.91), giving easy access to the institution's resources to perform their job (2.98), and minimizing supervision and control on the work of employees" (3.03).

Rating of "somewhat agree or Moderate extent" demonstrates that heads have not been very highly empowering employees' independence or autonomy to carry out their duties and responsibilities. In this case, the employees have not been very highly independent or

autonomous in their duties and responsibilities. Harris (2019) pointed out that lack of autonomy can lead to poor performance and may affect the employee's happiness.

Table 3. Empowering leadership Style of Heads of the College in terms of Delegation of Authority

<i>Indicators</i>	Mean	DR
1. Employees are given the authority to arrange their work.	3.08	SWA
2. Employees are given the authority to accomplish the assigned task.	3.15	SWA
3. Employees are given the authority to decide on the execution of their work.	3.02	SWA
4. Employees are given the authority to make decisions.	2.96	SWA
5. When the employees are delegated to do a certain task, they are given easy access to the resources needed to accomplish the task.	3.01	SWA
6. When the employees are delegated to do a certain task, they are given guidelines on how to perform their task.	3.05	SWA
7. The delegated person is aware of the limits of his/her authority.	3.05	SWA
8. The delegated person knows that he/she is accountable to the person who gives him/her the authority.	3.00	SWA
Composite Mean	3.04	SWA

Source: Bennis and Nanus (1985, 2007); Searle, Hayes & Weiss, (2018)

Legend:

<i>Statistical Range</i>	<i>Descriptive Interpretation</i>
4.21-5.00	Strongly agree/Very High
3.41-4.20	Agree/High
2.61-3.40	Somewhat agree /Moderate
1.81-2.60	Disagree/Low
1.00-1.80	Strongly disagree/Very Low

As shown on the table, the data shows that as a whole empowering leadership of heads along a delegation of authority received a composite mean of 3.04 which is interpreted as "somewhat agree/moderate extent". This implies that the empowering leadership of heads in terms of the delegation of authority is not very high or high and it is not also very low or low but to a moderate extent. Even if the items are taken separately, they all signify the same level of interpretation which is "somewhat agree or moderate extent" such as: "giving employees the authority to arrange their work (3.08), giving the employees the authority to accomplish the assigned task (3.15), giving the employees the authority to decide on the execution of their work (3.02), giving the employees the authority to make decisions (2.96), giving the employees easy access to the resources needed to accomplish the task (3.01), giving guidelines on how to perform their task (3.05) and the delegated person is aware of the limit of his/her authority (3.05) and knows that he/she is accountable to the person who gives him/her the authority (3.00).

The evaluation specifies that the heads have not been very highly or highly delegating their authority to their employees to carry out their duties and responsibilities and to make decisions. Corporate Finance Institute (2021) argued that though there are advantages of centralization such as a clear chain of command, focused vision, reduced costs, quick implementation of decisions, and improved quality of work, however, it creates bureaucratic leadership, delays the

work, and reduces employees loyalty. Sotrin (2017) suggests that a good leader should know how to delegate his/her authority to subordinates and be able to shift from doing to leading.

Table 4. Empowering leadership Style of Heads of the College in terms of Individual Goal

<i>Indicators</i>	Mean	DR
1. The individual employee is given a specific goal to accomplish.	3.14	SWA
2. The goals that are given to the employees are clearly defined.	3.08	SWA
3. Specific key result areas to be accomplished are identified.	3.09	SWA
4. The goals to be accomplished by the employees are determined by a certain percentage of accomplishment.	3.02	SWA
5. Employees are evaluated based on what they have accomplished.	3.05	SWA
6. Performance evaluation is based on the task given to the employees to accomplish the goal.	3.05	SWA
7. The performers are recognized and rewarded.	2.92	SWA
8. There are awarding ceremonies to recognize employees who are performing excellently in their job.	2.92	SWA
Composite Mean	3.03	SWA

Source: Bennis and Nanus (1985, 2007); Searle, Hayes & Weiss, (2018)

Legend:

<i>Statistical Range</i>	<i>Descriptive Interpretation</i>
4.21-5.00	Strongly agree/Very High
3.41-4.20	Agree/High
2.61-3.40	Somewhat agree /Moderate
1.81-2.60	Disagree/Low
1.00-1.80	Strongly disagree/Very Low

Empowerment can be done by giving individual goals to accomplish. Concerning this aspect, the data tells that as a whole, the heads gain a composite mean of 3.03 which is understood as "somewhat agree or moderate extent". This level of evaluation points out that empowering leadership of heads in terms of giving individual goals to employees to accomplish is not very high or high and it is not also very low or low but to a moderate extent. Even if the items are taken separately, they all are rated with the same level of mean rating which is interpreted as "somewhat agree or moderate extent" such as: "giving a specific goal to accomplish (3.14), the goals are clearly defined (3.08), specific key result areas are identified (3.09), the goals are determined in a certain percentage of accomplishment (3.02), performance evaluation is based on the accomplishment (3.05), and based on the task given to the employees to accomplish the goal (3.05), performance is recognized and rewarded (2.92) and awarding ceremonies to recognize employees who perform the excellent job (2.92).

The composite mean of 3.03 reflects a perception of employees toward the heads that the heads have not been very highly or highly empowering their subordinates through assigning individual goals to be accomplished in their assigned work and the data also shows that the heads have not been very highly or highly recognizing the employees who perform an excellent job. Giving individuals a goal to accomplish is one way of giving the employees a space they need to accomplish things on their own, however, the goals that are given to the employees must connect to the company goals and monitor the progress (Gallo, 2011).

Table 5. Summary of Empowering Leadership Style of Heads of the College

ITEMS	Mean	DR
1. Vision – Mission Oriented Empowerment	2.95	SWA
2. Independence/ Autonomy- Oriented empowerment	2.99	SWA
3. Delegation of Authority – Oriented empowerment	3.04	SWA
4. Individual goal-oriented empowerment	3.03	SWA
Overall Mean	3.00	SWA

Source: Bennis and Nanus (1985, 2007); Searle, Hayes & Weiss, (2018)

Legend:

<i>Statistical Range</i>	<i>Descriptive Interpretation</i>	<i>Even when the item</i>
4.21-5.00	Strongly agree/Very High	
3.41-4.20	Agree/High	
2.61-3.40	Somewhat agree /Moderate	
1.81-2.60	Disagree/Low	
1.00-1.80	Strongly disagree/Very Low	

The summary table exhibits that as a whole empowering leadership style of heads obtained as the composite mean of 3.00 which is interpreted as "somewhat agree or moderate extent". This suggests that empowering leadership style of the head of the college is not very high or high and it is not also very low or low but to a moderate extent. Even when the variables are taken singly, they all are rated within the same interpretation as "somewhat agree or moderate extent" such as vision-mission oriented empowerment (2.95), independence/autonomy-oriented empowerment (2.99), a delegation of authority-oriented empowerment (3.04), and individual goal-oriented empowerment (3.03).

These ratings signify that the heads of the college have not been very highly or highly empowering their employees along the four dimensions identified in this study. There is a lack of empowerment in which the employees are not guided by the vision and mission in doing their job, not given the independence or autonomy in carrying out their duties and responsibilities, not given enough authority to make decisions on their own, and a lack of individual goal assigned to employees to accomplish. The research found that when employees are empowered, they tend to perform well, are committed to the organization, and are more satisfied (Lee, et.al. 2018).

Problem 2: What is the job satisfaction of employees in terms of

- a. the nature of work**
- b. Management policies**
- c. Personal growth and development**
- d. management and employees relationship**

Table 6. The Job Satisfaction of Employees in terms of the Nature of Work

Indicators	Mean	DR
1. I am interested in my work and the work is suitable for my background	3.73	A
2. The work improves my skills and knowledge	3.82	A
3. I can do the best for my work	3.82	A
4. Through the work, I can realize my aspirations	3.68	A
5. I have been provided the required information to perform my work	3.56	A
6. The management encourages self-thinking while at work	3.47	A
7. The work matches my experience, skills, and my physical ability.	3.66	A

8. The management gives importance to my ideas to do my work better.	3.50	A
9. Updates employees with new information about the organization.	3.45	A
10. The management respects my efforts and my initiatives.	3.46	A
Composite Mean	3.62	A

Source: Dhamija, et.al., (2018).

Legend:

<i>Statistical Range</i>	<i>Descriptive Interpretation</i>
4.21-5.00	Strongly agree/Very High
3.41-4.20	Agree/High
2.61-3.40	Somewhat agree /Moderate
1.81-2.60	Disagree/Low
1.00-1.80	Strongly disagree/Very Low

As shown on the table, the data disclosed that as a whole, the job satisfaction of employees along the nature of work obtained a composite mean of 3.62 which is interpreted as "agree or high". This proves that the job satisfaction of employees concerning the nature of their work is not very high but high and it is not also moderate, low, or very low. Even if the indicators are taken singly, all are evaluated within the same mean-range of interpretation as "agree or high" such as: "interested in the work and the work is suitable with the background (3.73), the work improves the skills and knowledge (3.82), doing the best for the work (3.82), realizing the aspirations through the work (3.68), having the required information to perform the work (3.56), encouraging self-thinking while at work (3.47), the work matches the experience, skills and physical ability (3.66), giving importance to the ideas to do the work better (3.50), updating employees with new information about the organization (3.45), and respecting the efforts and initiatives (3.46).

The result points out the fact that employees are highly satisfied with the work they do because their work is interesting and suitable with their background, realizes their aspirations, improves their skills and knowledge, matches their experience, skills, and physical ability. Employees are also satisfied not only because of the work itself but because of the treatment. The management provides them with enough information related to their work, gives importance to employees' ideas to do their work better, and respects individual efforts and initiatives. Many studies have found that job satisfaction improves job performance (Abdulkhaliq & Mohammadali, 2019, Fadlallah, 2015, Khan, et.al. 2012, Ezeanyim, et.al. 2019, Okeke, 2020)

Table 7. The Job Satisfaction of Employees in terms of Management Policies

<i>Indicators</i>	Mean	DR
1. The policies of the management create a conducive work environment.	3.30	SWA
2. Policies promote organizational development	3.28	SWA
3. Policies promote employees' welfare	3.18	SWA
4. Policies promote growth and career opportunities.	3.15	SWA
5. Management policies aim at practicing rigorous HR practices.	3.18	SWA
6. Policies encourage a learning climate for the employees.	3.18	SWA
7. Policies promote individual efficiency.	3.15	SWA
8. Policies consider overall organizational efficiency.	3.15	SWA
9. The management policies assist to improve employees' productivity.	3.14	SWA

10. Policies promote open communication between the management and employees.	2.95	SWA
Composite Mean	3.17	SWA

Source: Dhamija, et.al., (2018).

Legend:

<i>Statistical Range</i>	<i>Descriptive Interpretation</i>
4.21-5.00	Strongly agree/Very High
3.41-4.20	Agree/High
2.61-3.40	Somewhat agree /Moderate
1.81-2.60	Disagree/Low
1.00-1.80	Strongly disagree/Very Low

Policies that are supportive of employees' welfare and a good working environment are important factors in managing an organization. About management policies, the data displays that as a whole, employees' job satisfaction obtained a composite mean of 3.17 which means "somewhat agree or moderate extent". It suggests that job satisfaction of employees along management policies is not very high or high and it is also not very low or low but to a moderate extent. Even if the items are taken separately, all are rated within the same mean range of "somewhat agree or moderate extent" such as: "policies create conducive work environment (3.30), promote organizational development (3.28), promote employees' welfare (3.28), promote growth and career opportunities (3.15), aim at practicing rigorous HR practices (3.18), encourage learning climate for the employees(3.18), promote individual efficiency (3.15), consider overall organizational efficiency (3.14), provide assistance to improve employees' productivity and promote open communication between management and employees(2.95).

The finding denotes employees' satisfaction with management policies is moderate which means that management policies are not very highly or highly satisfying the employees. The data shows that employees are not very highly or highly satisfied with the management policies because those policies are not very highly or highly creating and promoting conducive working environment, organizational development, employees' welfare, growth, and career opportunities, learning climate, individual and organizational efficiency, employees' productivity and open communication. Mamoni (2018) contended that management is responsible to create a work environment that promotes happiness and excitement to work. Poor HR policies can create dissatisfaction, reduce productivity and work engagement, high turnover, and increase costs.

Table 8. The Job Satisfaction of Employees in terms of Personal Growth and Development

<i>INDICATORS</i>	Mean	DR
1. There is the availability of schemes for personal growth and development.	3.59	A
2. There is a communication provided for the employees related to policies on personal growth and development	3.60	A
3. There are activities or programs provided for personal growth and development.	3.54	A
4. There is a rotation of work or job to learn new skills.	3.60	A

5. The management provides seminar and workshops for employees' development	3.62	A
6. There is employee involvement in the decision-making process	3.55	A
7. Opportunities provided for feedbacks and counseling facilities	3.54	A
8. There is an interest shown by the management in the development and growth of their subordinates.	3.50	A
Composite Mean	3.57	A

Source: Dhamija, et.al., (2018).

Legend:

<i>Statistical Range</i>	<i>Descriptive Interpretation</i>
4.21-5.00	Strongly agree/Very High
3.41-4.20	Agree/High
2.61-3.40	Somewhat agree /Moderate
1.81-2.60	Disagree/Low
1.00-1.80	Strongly disagree/Very Low

Organizational growth and development are not isolated from employees' personal growth and development of employees (Dobrai, et.al., 2014). Based on the data gathered, it indicates that as a whole employees' satisfaction along with personal growth and development gained a composite mean of 3.57 which is interpreted as "agree or high". It implies that employees' satisfaction in terms of personal growth and development is not very high but high and it is not also moderate, low, or very low. Even if the questionnaires are evaluated separately, they all indicate the same level of mean rating which is within the descriptive interpretation of "agree or high" such as: "availability of schemes for personal growth and development (3.59), communication is provided for the employees related to policies on personal growth and development(3.60), activities provided for personal growth and development (3.54), rotation of work to learn new skills (3.60), seminar and workshops for employees' development (3.62), involvement in the decision-making process (3.55), providing feedback and counseling facilities (3.54), the interest of management in the growth and development of their subordinates (3.50).

The finding demonstrates that as a whole the employees are highly satisfied with their personal growth and development because the management provides a scheme for personal growth, communication to employees related to policies on personal growth and development, rotation of work for learning new skills, seminar and workshops, participation in decision making, feedbacks and counseling facilities and apparent interest of management in personal growth and development of employees. Hameed and Waheed (2011) confirmed the correlation between employee development and organizational performance. Further, Hameed and Waheed (2011) recommended to the management to invest in the personal growth and development of employees.

Table 9. The Job Satisfaction of Employees in terms of Management and Employees Relationship

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>DR</i>
1. There is regular communication with the employees related to HRM policies.	2.98	SWA
2. Employees are allowed to participate in the discussion of HRM policies.	2.92	SWA
3. There is a communication of vision and mission to all employees.	3.02	SWA

4. There is a communication to employees concerning the social objectives of the institution	3.00	SWA
5. There is a disclosure of strategy to achieve the organizational goals.	2.92	SWA
6. Maintenance of communication network within the organization.	3.01	SWA
7. There is an implementation of employees' development plans.	3.05	SWA
8. There is coordination between the management and HR department.	2.94	SWA
9. There is cooperation between management and employees.	3.01	SWA
10. There is a good working relationship between management and employees.	2.94	SWA
Composite Mean	2.98	SWA

Source: Dhamija, et.al., (2018).

Legend:

<i>Statistical Range</i>	<i>Descriptive Interpretation</i>
4.21-5.00	Strongly agree/Very High
3.41-4.20	Agree/High
2.61-3.40	Somewhat agree /Moderate
1.81-2.60	Disagree/Low
1.00-1.80	Strongly disagree/Very Low

A good relationship between employees and management is important for the organization to succeed (Greer, 2020). In terms of management and employee relationship, the data shows a composite mean of 2.98 which is understood as “somewhat agree or moderate extent”. It signifies that employees’ job satisfaction along management and employee relationship is not very high or high and it is not also very low or low but to a moderate extent. Even if the items are rated singly, they are rated within the same level of mean rating with its descriptive interpretation of “somewhat agree or moderate extent” such as: “providing regular communication to the employees related to HRM policies (2.98), participating in the discussion of HRM policies (2.92), communicating the vision and mission to the employees (3.02), communication to the employees related to the social objectives of the institution (3.00), disclosing strategy to achieve organizational goals (2.92), maintaining communication network within the organization (3.01), implementing employees' development plan (3.05), coordination between the HR department and management (2.94), cooperation between management and employees 93.01) and good working relationship between management and employees (2.94). Such finding suggests that as a whole the employees are not very highly or highly satisfied with the relationship between management and employees. Moderate satisfaction proves that management has not been very highly or highly providing regular communication to the employees related to policies that affect them, involving the employees in the decision-making process, communicating the vision and mission to the employees, maintaining communication network within the organization, and implementing employees' development plan. Craig (2017) contended that a strong employee-employer relationship is important for the success of the organization. Thus he recommends to the management to invest in employee network and loyalty (Craig, 2017).

Table 10. Summary of Job Satisfaction of Employees

ITEMS	Mean	DR
1. The nature of work	3.62	A
2. Management policies	3.17	SWA

3. Personal growth and development	3.57	A
4. Management and employees relationship	2.98	SWA
Overall Mean	3.33	SWA

Source: Dhamija, et.al., (2018).

Legend:

<i>Statistical Range</i>	<i>Descriptive Interpretation</i>
4.21-5.00	Strongly agree/Very High
3.41-4.20	Agree/High
2.61-3.40	Somewhat agree /Moderate
1.81-2.60	Disagree/Low
1.00-1.80	Strongly disagree/Very Low

The summary table reveals that overall the job satisfaction of employees gained a composite mean of 3.33 which is interpreted as somewhat agree. This reflects the fact that overall the job satisfaction of employees is not very high or high and it is also not very low or low but to a moderate extent. Taking them singly, it shows that employees are highly satisfied along with the nature of work (3.62) and personal growth and development (3.57) and moderately satisfied along with management policies (3.17) and management and employee relationship (2.98).

The finding reveals that overall employees are not very or highly satisfied with their job but moderately. Such a result suggests that the management needs to improve the nature of work, policies, promote personal growth and development and create a working environment that promotes the employee-employer relationship. Many kinds of research have shown the negative effect of job dissatisfaction on the success of an organization such as Nwobia and Aljohani (2017), Shaikh, et.al. (2019), and Henne and Lock, 1985).

Problem3: Is there a relationship between empowering leadership and job satisfaction?

4. Table 11. Relationship between empowering leadership and job satisfaction.

		Nature of Work	Management Policies	Personnel growth and development	Management and employees relationship	Job Satisfaction - As a Whole
Vision – Mission Oriented Empowerment	Pearson Correlation	.459**	.654**	.806**	.793**	.796**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	130	130	130	130	130
Independence/ Autonomy-Oriented empowerment	Pearson Correlation	.620**	.748**	.748**	.590**	.791**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	130	130	130	130	130
Delegation of Authority – Oriented empowerment	Pearson Correlation	.608**	.589**	.638**	.505**	.685**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	130	130	130	130	130
Individual goal-oriented empowerment	Pearson Correlation	.120	.124	.177*	.182*	.178*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.174	.161	.044	.039	.043

	N	130	130	130	130	130
Empowering Leadership - As a Whole	Pearson Correlation	.576**	.672**	.754**	.658**	.779**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	130	130	130	130	130

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

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

The table on the Pearson r correlation reveals that as a whole there is a significant correlation at 0.01 level(2-tailed) between empowering leadership styles and employees' job satisfaction. Taking the variables separately, they all have a significant correlation at 0.01 level(2-tailed) and 0.05level(2-tailed). It suggests that empowering leadership such as vision-mission oriented empowerment, independence/autonomy oriented empowerment, the delegation of authority oriented empowerment, and individual goal-oriented empowerment are correlated to job satisfaction such as the nature of work, management policies, personal growth, and development, management, and employee relationship. It concludes that efforts to improve the job satisfaction of employees cannot be isolated from empowering the employees.

Result and Discussion

The study wanted to find out the effect of empowering leadership on the job satisfaction of employees. As we have seen in the result of the study, it is found that there is a significant relationship between empowering leadership and employees' job satisfaction. Such results signify that enhancing the job satisfaction of employees is not only about monetary rewards and other kinds of recognition but is also about empowerment. Employees are satisfied when they are trusted and empowered to do things on their own. The employees are empowered when the management shares with the employees the vision and mission of the organization and allows them to own it and carry out their tasks according to the vision and mission that they own. Thus, together with owning the vision and mission is the autonomy in which the management allowed the employees to be guided by the vision and mission and carry out their own work without strict supervision from the management. In this regard, the management allows the independence or autonomy of employees to do their job. Autonomy or independence is important in which the management trusts their subordinates that they can do the job without them. Trust is important element in the delegation of authority. According to L.A. Allen as cited by Vaishnavi (2019) delegation of authority means sharing responsibility given to him/her to the employees so that he/she can do other tasks effectively. The delegation of authority means that the manager trust his/her subordinates to carry out their responsibility. A study on the effect of the delegation of authority to the employees showed that delegation affects effectiveness, efficiency, and performance (Hammadat, et.al. 2015). Besides delegating authority to subordinates, empowering employees can also be done through giving or assigning them a specific goal to be accomplished. Employees should be given a measurable objective to be accomplished. It should be the standard for evaluating employees' performance. A study had shown a positive result on the effect of management by objectives and performance evaluation based on the objectives accomplished by the employees. The study found that performance evaluation based on the result increased employee satisfaction (Rahman & Islam, 2010).

The result of the study requires that improving job satisfaction of employees cannot be done solely on the monetary benefits but empowerment is a necessary component to be considered. Thus, the management needs to revise its strategy and focus on improving the job satisfaction of employees. Improving the job satisfaction of faculty can bring positive outcomes on teachers'

performance (Baluyos, et.al. 2019). It is also confirmed that school performance cannot be separated from teachers' performance (Lamas, 2015, cited by Abun, 2021) and students' performance is the output of teachers' performance (Salamat, et.al., 2013).

Conclusion

Based on the results of the study as reflected in the data, the study concludes that as a whole empowering leadership of the administrators or office heads obtained an overall mean rating of 3.00 which is described as "somewhat agree or moderate extent. Such rating indicates that their empowering leadership is not very high or high and it is not also low or very low but to a moderate extent. Even different elements of empowering leadership obtained the same level of interpretation as "somewhat agree or moderate extent. The job satisfaction of employees, overall, gained a composite mean of 3.33 which is also described as "somewhat agree or moderate extent". In other words, the job satisfaction of employees is not very high or high and it is also not very low or low but to a moderate extent. Based on the Pearson r correlation, it shows that there is a significant correlation between empowering leadership and the job satisfaction of employees. This implies that improving the job satisfaction of employees is not isolated from empowering the employees.

The result of the study enriches the discussion on how to improve the quality of education. It suggests that empowering faculty in exercising their duties and responsibilities is an important factor to enhance job satisfaction or teaching performance. Their job satisfaction is an essential element in improving their teaching performance and consequently enhancing students' performance and school performance. The study recognizes its limitation. The variables measured in the study and the population of the study are limited. There is a need for future studies to include more variables measuring empowerment and more schools and population to cover.

References

1. Abdulkhalik, S.S. & Mohammadali, Z. (2019). The Impact of Job Satisfaction On Employees' Performance: A Case Study of Al Hayat Company - Pepsi Employees In Erbil, Kurdistan Region-Iraq. *Management and Economics Review*, 4(2), 163-176.
2. Abun, D. (2018). *Leader-Manager who Cares*. Mauritius: Lambert Academic Publishing
3. Abun, D. Menor, R.I., Catbagan, N.C., Magallanes, T. & Ranay, F.B. (2021). Organizational Climate and Work Engagement of Employees of Divine Word Colleges in Ilocos Region, Philippines. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 10(1), 107-121.
4. Abun, D., Magallanes, Th., Encarnacion, M.J. Alkalde, F., & Somera, K.A. (2019). Investigation of Cognitive and Affective Attitude of Students toward Environment and Their Environmental Behavioural Intention to Join Environmental Movement and Energy Conservation. *The International Journal of Business Management and Technology*, 3(6).
5. Agich, G. (1994). *Philosophy, Psychiatry, & Psychology*, 1(4), 267-269.
6. Agich, G. J. 1993. *Autonomy and long-term care*. New York: Oxford University Press.
7. Al Khajeh, E.H. (2018). Impact of Leadership Styles on Organizational Performance. *Journal of Human Resources Management Research*, Vol. 2018, Article ID 687849. <https://doi.org/10.5171/2018.687849>
8. Ali, W. (2016). Understanding the Concept of Job Satisfaction, Measurements, Theories, and its Significance in the Recent Organizational Environment: A Theoretical Framework. *Archives of Business Research*, 4(1), 100-111
9. Al-Jammal, H.R. & Al-Khasawneh, A.L. (2015). The impact of the delegation of authority on employees' performance at great Irbid municipality: case study. *International Journal of Human Resources Studies*, 5(3).

10. Ariola, M.M. (2006). Principles and Methods of Research. Manila: Rex Book Store
11. Baht, A. (2020). Descriptive Research: Definition, Characteristics, Methods, Examples, and Advantages. Question Pro. Retrieved from <https://www.questionpro.com/blog/descriptive-research/>
12. Baluyos, G.R., Rivera, H.L. & Baluyos, E.L. (2019). Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Performance. Open Journal of Social Sciences, 7, 206-221. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2019.78015>.
13. Bakotić, D. (2016) Relationship between job satisfaction and organizational performance, Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja, 29:1, 118-130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2016.1163946>
14. Baumeister, R.F., & Leary, M.R. Writing Narrative Literature Reviews. Review of General Psychology, 1, 311-320. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.1.3.311>
15. Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (2007). Leaders: Strategies for Taking Charge. New York: HarperCollins
16. Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders. New York: Harper & Row
17. Borlongan-Conway, M.D., Da Silva, N. & Tokunaga, H. (2010). Employee Goal Orientation to Creative Performance. San Jose State University: Faculty Publication.
18. Carassava, A. (2007). Cruise Ship Captain Blames Current for sinking. CNN International.Com. Retrieved from <http://edition.cnn.com/2007/WORLD/europe/04/08/greece.cruiseship/index.html>
19. Brayfield, A. H., & Crockett, W. H. (1955). Employee attitudes and employee performance. Psychological Bulletin, 52, 396–424. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0045899>
20. Chen, G., Sharma, P.N., Edinger, S.K., Shapiro, D.L., and Farh, J.-L. (2011) Motivation and Demotivating Forces in Teams: Cross-Level Influence of Empowering Leadership and Relationship Conflict. Journal of Applied Psychology, 96, 541-557. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0021886>
21. Corporate Finance Institute (2021). What is Centralization? Retrieved from <https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com>
22. Craig, W. (2017). Why a Strong Employee/Employer Relationship is Important. Forbes. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com>
23. D'Aveni, R.A. (1990). Top Managerial Prestige and Organizational Bankruptcy. INFORMS. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2635058?seq=1>
24. Dhamija, P., Gupta, S., & Bag, S. (2018). Measuring of Job satisfaction: The Use of Quality of Work Life Factors. Benchmarking: An International Journal, <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-06-2018-0155>
25. Dobrai, K., Farcas, F. & Kurucz, Z. (2014). The Relationship between Individual and Organizational development – Finding of a Large Sample Research. Semantic Scholar. Retrieved from <https://www.semanticscholar.org>
26. Dooley, E. (2017). El faro Captain Partly Responsible for Ship's Sinking: NTSB. ABC news. Retrieved from <https://abcnews.go.com/US/el-faro-captain-partially-responsible-ships-sinking-ntsb/story?id=51748692>
27. Dryden, J. (n.d). Autonomy. Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy. Retrieved from <https://www.iep.utm.edu/autonomy/>
28. Ezeanyim, Ezinwa, E., Ufoaroh, Therasas, E. & Ajakpo. (2019). The Impact of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance in Selected Public Enterprise in Awka, Anambra State. Global Journal of Management and Business Research: Administration and Management, 19(7).

29. Fadlallah, A.W.A. (2015). Impact of Job Satisfaction on Employees Performance an Application on Faculty of Science and Humanity Studies University of Salman Bin Abdul-Aziz-Al Aflaj. *International Journal of Innovation and Research in Educational Sciences*, 2(1), 2349-5219.
30. Flowers, V.S. & Hughes, Ch.L. (1973). Why Employees Stay. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/1973/07/why-employees-stay>
31. Fuller, J.B., Jones, L., Bridger, D., & Brown, V. (1999). The Effect of Psychological Empowerment on Transformational leadership and Job Satisfaction. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 139, Issue 3, pp. 389-391
31. Furlonger, K.B.B. (2000). Leadership and Job satisfaction Among Aviation Fire Fighters in Australia. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(1).
32. Gallo, A. (2011). Making Sure Your Employees Succeed. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org>
32. Greer, J. (2020). The 7 Top Benefits of Great Employee Relations. *Influencive*. Retrieved from <https://www.influencive.com>
33. Haider, M.H. & Riaz, A. (2010). Role of transformational and transactional leadership with job satisfaction and career satisfaction. *Business and Economic Horizons*, 10(1), 29-38.
34. Hammadat, M. Al-Jammal, H.R., Khasawneh, A.L. & Hassan, M. (2015). The Impact of the Delegation of Authority on Employees' Performance at Great Irbid Municipality: Case Study. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies* 5(3):48-69. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v5i3.8062>
35. Hao, P., He, W. & Long, L. (2018). Why and When Empowering Leadership Has Different Effects on Employee Work Performance: The Pivotal Roles of Passion for Work and Role Breadth Self-Efficacy. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 25(1), 85-100.
36. Harris, L. (2019). Why Job Autonomy is Vital for Success- and How to Encourage It. *CIPHR*. Retrieved from <https://www.ciphr.com/advice/employee-autonomy/>
37. Henne, D. & Locke, E.A. (1985). Job Dissatisfaction: What are the Consequences? *International Journal of Psychology*, 20(2), 221-240.
38. Humborstad, S.W., Nerstad, C.G.L. and Dysvik, A. (2014) Empowering Leadership, Employee Goal Orientations, and Work Performance: A Competing Hypothesis Approach. *Personnel Review*, 43, 246-271. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/PR-01-2012-0008>
39. House, R. Power, and Personality in Complex Organizations. In L.L. Cummings & B.M. Staw (Eds). *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 10, 305-357. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press
40. Ismay, J.B. & Smith, E.J. (1912). Titanic Captain Blamed for Wreck. *Encyclopedia Titanica*. Retrieved from <https://www.encyclopedia-titanica.org/titanic-captain-blamed-for-wreck.html>
41. Jiang, H., Chen, Y., Sun, P., & Yang, J. (2017). The Relationship between Authoritarian Leadership and Employees' Deviant Workplace Behaviors: The Mediating Effects of Psychological Contract Violation and Organizational Cynicism. *Frontiers Psychology*, 8, (732).
42. Keller, T. (1995). Leadership and Empowerment: A Social Exchange Perspective. *Human Relations*, 48 (2), 127-146.
43. Khan, A.H., Nawaz, M.M., Aleem, M. & Hamed, W. (2012). Impact of job satisfaction on employee performance: An empirical study of autonomous Medical Institutions of Pakistan. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6 (7), 2697-2705.
44. Kokemuller, N. (2007). The Difference between Empowerment and Delegation. Retrieved from <https://yourbusines.azcentral.com>
45. Lamas, H. A. (2015). School Performance. *Propósitos y Representaciones*, 3(1), 313-386.

46. Lavoie, A. (2017). How to Engage Employees Through Your Company Vision Statement. Entrepreneur. Retrieved from <https://www.entrepreneur.com/article/290803>
47. Lee, A., Willis, S., & Tian, A.W. (2018). When Empowering Employees Works and When It Doesn't. Harvard Business Review. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2018/03/when-empowering-employees-works-and-when-it-doesnt>
48. Leedy, P.D. (1974). Practical Research: Planning and Design. New York: Macmillan.
49. Mahmood, S., & Rehman, A.U. (2015). International Journal of Economics & Management Science, 5(2), <https://doi.org/10.4172/2162-6359.1000315>
50. Mamoni, J. (2018). The Alarming Impact of Poor HR Policies on Companies and Employees. BBN Times. Retrieved from <https://www.bbntimes.com>
51. Maxwell, J.C. (1995) Developing Leaders around You. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers.
52. Medley, F & Larochelle, D. R. Transformational leadership and job satisfaction. Nursing Management, 26 (9).
53. McLeod, S. (2019). What are Independent and Dependent Variables? Simply Psychology. Retrieved from <https://www.simplypsychology.org>.
54. Miah, M. (2018). The impact of employee job satisfaction toward organizational performance: A study of private-sector employees in Kuching, East Malaysia. International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, 8(12).
55. Morato, A. E. (2006). Strategic Planning and Management. Singapore: Prentice-Hall
56. Morgeson, F. P., Delaney-Klinger, K., & Hemingway, M. A. (2005). The Importance of Job Autonomy, Cognitive Ability, and Job-Related Skill for Predicting Role Breadth and Job Performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 90(2), 399–406. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.2.399>
57. Neilsen, E.H. (1986) Empowerment Strategies: Balancing Authority and Responsibility. In: Srivastva, S. and Associates, Eds., Executive Power, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 78-110.
58. Nordgren, L. (2016). Why is leadership always emphasized the success or failure of an organization? Retrieved from: <https://www.researchgate.net>.
59. Northouse, P.G. (2015). Leadership: Theory and Practice, 7th Edition. New York: SAGE Publications
60. Nwobia, I.E. & Aljohani, M.S. (2017). The Effect of Job Dissatisfaction and Workplace Bullying on Turnover Intention: Organization Climate and Group Cohesion as Moderators. International Journal of Marketing Studies, 9(3), 136. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijms.v9n3p136>
61. Okeke, M. (2020). Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance in Selected Bakeries in Anambra State. Econspeak: A Journal of Advances in Management IT & Social Sciences, 8(10).
62. Ordóñez, L., Schweitzer, M., Galinsky, A., & Bazerman, M. (2009). Goals are gone wild: The systematic side effects of over-prescribing goal setting. HBS Working Paper, 09-083. Retrieved from http://opimweb.wharton.upenn.edu/documents/research/Goals_Gone_Wild.pdf
63. Ouedraogo, A. & Leclerc, A. (2013). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Performance: Evidence from the Canadian Credit Union. Journal of Organizational Culture, Communication, and Conflict, 17(1), 35-50
64. Saragih, S. (2011). The Effect of Job Autonomy on the Work Outcomes. International Journal of Business Studies, 4(3).
65. Rahman, A. & Islam, H. (2020). The Effect of Management by Objectives on Performance Appraisal and Employee Satisfaction in Commercial Bank. European Journal of Business Management and Research 12(20):15-25. <https://doi.org/10.7176/EJBM/12-20-02>

66. Salamat, N., Samsu, N.J. & Kamalu, N.S.M. (2013). The Impact of Organizational Climate on teachers' Job Performance. *Educational Research*, 2(1).
67. Searle, B., Hayes, B., & Weiss, K. (2018). Vision Statement as Empowerment Tools. *Academic Briefing: Expert Advice for Higher Ed Leaders*. Retrieved from <https://www.academicbriefing.com>
68. Shaikh, S.H., Shaikh, H., & Shaikh, S. (2019). The Impact of Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction on Herzberg Theory: A Case Study of Meezan Bank Limited and National Bank Limited. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 10(6), <https://doi.org/10.30845/ijbss.v10n6p16>
69. Sharma, B.R. & S Bhaskar, S. (1991). Determinants of Job Satisfaction among Engineers in a Public Sector Undertaking. *ASCI Journal of Management*, 20(4), 1991, pp. 217-233.
70. Snyder, H. (2019). Literature Review as a Research Methodology: An Overview and Guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333-339.
71. Sotrin, J. (2017). To Be A Great Leader, You Have to Learn How to Delegate Well. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org>
72. Spector, P.E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE
73. Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5), 1442–1465. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256865>
74. Stavrou, N.A.M., Psychountaki, M., Georgiadis, E., Karteroliotis, K., & Zrevas, Y. (2015). Flow Theory-Goal Orientation Theory: Positive Experience is related to Athletes' Goal orientation. *Front. Psychol.* 6:1499. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01499>
75. 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
76. Tichy N.M. & Cohen E. (2007). *The Leadership Engine*. New York: HarperCollins
77. Vaishnavi, N. (2019). Delegation of Authority. *Business and Management Ideas*. Retrieved from <https://www.businessmanagementideas.com>
78. Wang, Z, Liu, Y., & Liu, S. (2019). Authoritarian leadership and task performance: the effects of leader-member exchange and dependence on leader. *Front. Bus. Res. China* 13(19). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s11782-019-0066-x>
79. Webster, J., & Watson, R.T. (2002). Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: Writing a literature review. *Management Information Systems Quarterly*, 26(3).
80. Wellins, R.S., Byham, W. and Wilson, J. (1991) *Empowered Teams: Creating Self-Directed Work Groups That Improve Quality, Productivity, and Participation*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
81. Zhang, X. M., & Zhou, J. (2014). Empowering leadership, uncertainty avoidance, trust, and employee creativity: Interaction effects, and a mediating mechanism. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 124, 160-164.