

Measuring Empowering Leadership in Indonesia: A Rasch-based Validation Study

Unika Prihatsanti^{1*} and Annisa Puti Kusnadi²

¹Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Diponegoro, Jl. Prof. Soedarto, Tembalang, Semarang, 50275 Jawa Tengah, Indonesia

²Doctor of Psychology Program, Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Airlangga, Mulyorejo, Surabaya, East 60115 Java, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to adapt and validate an Indonesian version of the Perceived Empowering Leadership (PEL-I) scale to measure employees' perceptions of empowering leadership. A total of 316 employees from various types of organisations in Indonesia participated in the study and completed the PEL-I scale using a five-point Likert format. Data were analysed using the Rasch measurement model with Winsteps software to examine the scale's psychometric properties. The results indicated high measurement quality, with person reliability of 0.94 and item reliability of 0.95. The analysis supported a unidimensional measurement structure, with 50.9% of the raw variance explained by the measures, and demonstrated good model fit, as indicated by an outfit mean square value of 1.05 and a significant chi-square statistic. Differential item functioning analysis identified potential item bias in one item across gender, educational level, and organisational type. These findings provide empirical support for the validity and reliability of the Indonesian PEL scale. The adapted instrument offers a valuable tool for assessing empowering leadership in organisational settings and can serve as a baseline measure for leadership development and future research in the Indonesian context.

Keywords: Empowering leadership, Rasch model, scale adaptation, Indonesia, leadership development

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 09 November 2024

Accepted: 03 June 2026

Published: 30 June 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47836/pjssh.34.3.11>

E-mail addresses:

unikapri@live.undip.ac.id (Unika Prihatsanti)

annisaputik@gmail.com (Annisa Puti Kusnadi)

* Corresponding author

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, a growing body of research has focused on leadership behaviour. Leadership plays a crucial role in determining an organisation's success (Lazim et al., 2022). It is a process of influencing others to achieve common goals and improve organisational performance (Arifin & Hermawan, 2022).

The adoption of empowering leadership is vital in human resource practices because it can significantly improve employee performance by providing opportunities to enhance employees' capabilities. In addition, empowering leadership emphasises employee development (Lin et al., 2020). When employees are guided by empowering leaders, they are better able to build interpersonal relationships (Alotaibi et al., 2020). This, in turn, can lead to higher affective commitment to their work (Cesário & Chambel, 2017). Affective commitment develops when employees feel appreciated, liked, and trusted, which ultimately fosters a sense of responsibility toward the organisation. Therefore, when employees receive favourable treatment, they are more inclined to reciprocate and contribute positively to the organisation (Mahmoud, 2021). Empowering leadership has significant positive effects on employees' innovative performance (Cui & Yu, 2021), including fostering affective commitment, self-efficacy, and innovative behaviour (Amin et al., 2021). Furthermore, empowering leadership can enhance employees' motivation (Lee & Ding, 2020) and has been shown to boost intrinsic motivation (Syahrul, 2020). This effect is mediated by psychological empowerment (Syahrul, 2020). Empowering leadership also strengthens employees' sense of ownership and responsibility for their tasks, leading to greater organisational compliance and more prosocial behaviour (Lee et al., 2018).

Today, many organisations are undergoing structural changes by moving

away from outdated management styles and adopting empowering leadership practices, which have the potential to enhance productivity and promote employees' psychological well-being (Suleman et al., 2021). Empowering leadership draws on several leadership approaches, including participative leadership, transformational/charismatic leadership, ethical leadership, self-leadership, leader-member exchange (LMX), shared leadership, and path-goal theory (Cheong et al., 2019). Empowering leadership is described as a leader's behaviour aimed at overcoming barriers in the workplace (Na-Nan & Arunyaphum, 2021). According to Arnold (as cited in Bharadwaja & Tripathi, 2021), empowering leadership is characterized by leaders who support and empower employees through mentoring, granting autonomy in decision-making, offering training opportunities, encouraging self-determined goals, providing emotional support, and sharing information. Recent research has highlighted the relative novelty of studies on empowering leadership in organisational contexts. The relationship between empowering leadership and human resource management practices is important for enhancing employee performance and achieving organisational objectives. Notably, empowering leadership has demonstrated effectiveness across cultural settings, including Indonesia (Noor & Saputra, 2022). Developing an Indonesian version of an empowering leadership measure is an essential first step before designing subsequent interventions; therefore, establishing the instrument's psychometric properties is crucial.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Empowering leadership has predominantly been conceptualized and validated within Western, individualistic contexts, where autonomy, self-direction, and individual initiative are highly valued. However, leadership research in non-Western and collectivistic cultures suggests that these assumptions may not fully capture how leadership is experienced and evaluated. In collectivist cultures, leadership effectiveness is often rooted in relational orientation and concern for collective well-being rather than individual autonomy alone (House et al., 2004). Alternative leadership frameworks, such as servant leadership, authentic leadership, and paternalistic leadership, may be especially relevant in this context. Servant leadership emphasises humility, service, and prioritisation of followers' collective needs, aligning closely with values of harmony (Eva et al., 2019; Greenleaf, 1977). Authentic leadership highlights ethical conduct and relational transparency, which may be particularly salient in cultures where leaders are expected to act as moral role models (Walumbwa et al., 2008). Paternalistic leadership, characterised by a combination of authority, benevolence, and moral integrity, has been shown to be especially relevant in Asian and high power-distance cultures. In such contexts, empowerment may be expressed not through explicit delegation of authority but through personal concern, guidance, and moral stewardship. Together, these perspectives provide a richer theoretical foundation for examining empowering leadership in

Indonesia and clarify how empowerment may operate through relational and moral mechanisms rather than through individual autonomy alone. Empowering leadership captures not only the delegation of authority but also the leader's behaviours that foster meaning, competence, and participative involvement.

Measurement of empowering leadership

Several studies have attempted to develop instruments for measuring empowering leadership. Arnold et al. (2000) created the Empowering Leadership Questionnaire (ELQ) and identified five dimensions of empowering leadership: leading by example, participative decision-making, coaching, informing, and showing individual concern. In contrast, Amundsen and Martinsen (2014) developed the Empowering Leadership Scale (ELS) and argued that the two core dimensions of empowering leadership are autonomy support and development support. Despite the development of various measurement tools, there is still no consensus on a universally accepted definition of empowering leadership behaviour (Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014).

In their review, Cheong et al. (2018) explained the measures commonly used in empowering leadership research and noted that the scale by Arnold et al. (2000) is the most frequently employed. This is supported by Lee et al. (2018), who stated that the scale developed by Arnold and Drasgow (2000) is widely recognized as a primary reference in the empowering leadership literature. Selecting an appropriate measure is

especially important with respect to the level of analysis. Prior studies (Elsetouhi et al., 2018; Gao et al., 2011) have operationalised empowering leadership using three key behaviours: coaching, participative decision-making, and informing, which are considered critical attributes of empowering leadership (Srivastava et al., 2006).

The empowering leadership dimensions proposed by Gao et al. (2011) are considered useful for capturing a context that encourages employee voice by strengthening trust between leaders and employees. To ensure valid measurement, Gao et al. (2011) employed three dimensions from the ELQ (Arnold et al., 2000): participative decision-making, coaching, and informing. These three dimensions demonstrated strong internal consistency ($\alpha = .92$, $.94$, and $.89$, respectively). Participative decision-making reflects leaders' efforts to solicit and consider employees' values,

opinions, and suggestions. Informing refers to leaders ensuring that employees understand relevant conditions in their work environment. Coaching involves face-to-face communication and a reciprocal process of influence during supervision. In terms of validity, the scale demonstrated adequate discriminant validity. Similarly, Elsetouhi et al. (2018) used the same three dimensions, arguing that they are particularly important for work empowerment in organisations. Their measure comprised 23 items: 11 items assessing coaching, 6 items assessing participative decision-making, and 6 items assessing informing. Reliability was high for all three subscales (coaching $\alpha = .958$; participative decision-making $\alpha = .912$; informing $\alpha = .948$).

Table 1 presents several studies that have tested or validated different measures of empowering leadership. Seven studies explicitly focused on individuals, two

Table 1
Measures of empowering leadership

Author(s)	Publication Year	Construct	Level of Analysis
Ahearne et al.	2005	Single composite score	Individual
Amundsen & Martinsen	2014	Second-order term (two-factor model)	Individual
Arnold et al.	2000	Second-order term	Individual & Team
Kirkman & Rosen	1997	Single composite score	Team
Konczak et al.	2000	Second-order term (six-factor model)	Individual
Vecchio et al.	2010	Single composite score	Individual
Yun et al.	2006	Single composite score	Individual & Team
Zhang & Bartol	2010	Second-order term	Individual
Wortler et al.	2022	Five-factor model	Individual
Na-Nan et al.	2020	Five-factor model	Individual
Srivastava et al.	2006	Single second-order factor solution	Team

Source: authors' own work

focused on teams, and two examined both individuals and teams. Although these measures share some conceptual overlap, they differ in dimensions, items, and source references. By presenting these measures, the researchers aim to identify an instrument that aligns with the level of analysis specified by the theory, model, and hypotheses. Table 1 summarizes key components: (1) author(s), as the primary study identifier; (2) publication year, indicating when the study was conducted; (3) construct, clarifying what the instrument measures; and (4) level of analysis, which are essential for ensuring that construct measurement and data-analysis techniques align with the stated level of analysis so that conclusions are not misleading or artifactual (Yammarino et al., 2005).

Arnold and Drasgow (2000) focused on both individual- and group-level processes, which fits the Indonesian research context given its collectivist culture that emphasises harmonious and interdependent relationships (Durgel et al., 2013). In collectivist societies, individuals are integrated into strong in-groups that provide mutual support across the life course, including in organisational settings (Hofstede, 2011). Accordingly, a key cultural consideration is the relationship between individuals and groups, specifically, how members depend on and support one another within the group. In contrast, Kirkman and Rosen (1997) emphasised external leader behaviours, focusing primarily on the leader's actions. To the best of the authors' knowledge, this measurement approach has not been applied in Indonesia.

In the present study, the researchers selected the ELS consistent with the classification in Gao et al. (2011), drawing on Arnold and Drasgow (2000).

This study and Gao et al. (2011) share similarities in measuring empowering leadership through the coaching, informing, and participative decision-making dimensions. The participant profiles are also comparable, as both studies surveyed employees in large companies. However, the present study included employees from three types of large organisations commonly preferred in Indonesia (i.e., government agencies, private companies, and state-owned enterprises), whereas Gao et al. (2011) examined a single company. The present study also aligns with Elsetouhi et al. (2018), who used the ELQ developed by Arnold et al. (2000) and focused on the coaching, informing, and participative decision-making dimensions. Both studies employed employee samples; however, Elsetouhi et al. (2018) examined frontline employees at a large travel agency in Egypt who had long tenures. Across the Indonesian adaptation and other versions of the ELQ, a key similarity is that employees indicate how frequently statements describing empowering leadership behaviours apply to their leader. A key difference is the language used.

Most ELQ validations have relied on confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). However, CFA has been criticised for discriminant validity issues, sample-dependent difficulty, and the assumption that all respondents share the same measurement

error. The main objective of this study is to adapt and validate the ELQ for the Indonesian cultural context. Accordingly, this study applies Item Response Theory (IRT). This research is important because, to date, no instrument has been specifically adapted to measure or assess empowering leadership in Indonesian organisational contexts. The ELQ may also serve as a basis for selection and for developing empowering leadership capabilities. Indonesian culture differs from that of other ASEAN countries, even where collectivist orientations may be shared. Cultural differences may also emerge across organisational or company contexts.

The Rasch Model

The Rasch model is a probabilistic measurement approach within IRT that transforms ordinal data into interval-level measures (Bond & Fox, 2015). This principle assumes that item parameters are estimated independently of the sample and that person parameters are estimated independently of the items used, if model assumptions are met. In the Rasch framework, both item difficulty and person ability are located on a common logit scale, allowing meaningful comparisons between individuals and items. The probability of a particular response is determined by the interaction between a person's latent trait level and the difficulty of the item.

One advantage of the Rasch model is its ability to handle missing data by estimating person ability and item difficulty from the available response patterns.

Rather than treating missing responses as zero or excluding cases entirely, the model uses systematic response patterns to generate parameter estimates. This approach preserves measurement precision and can produce more accurate estimates than methods that treat missing data as incorrect or as a fixed value. In Rasch analysis, cases with missing responses can still be included in the estimation process (Sumintono & Widhiarso, 2013). Rasch modelling also provides standard error of measurement estimates for the instrument, which can improve the accuracy of subsequent calculations. Instrument-level analyses were conducted using Winsteps software (Linacre, 2011), version 3.73. When data fit the Rasch model, mean-square fit statistics are expected to be close to 1.0, while Z-standardised values are expected to be near 0.0. Boone et al. (2014) recommend reviewing items that do not meet specific fit criteria, including Point-Measure Correlation (x): $0.40 < x < 0.85$, Outfit Mean Square (y): $0.50 < y < 1.50$, and Outfit Z-Standard (z): $-2.0 < z < +2.0$. Items failing to meet these criteria may be considered misfitting, suggesting they do not adequately measure the intended construct. If all criteria cannot be satisfied, priority should be given to the outfit mean-square statistic (Sumintono & Widhiarso, 2013). The Rasch model has been shown to support objective measurement by producing estimates that are less influenced by sample characteristics, rater effects, or instrument characteristics (Sumintono & Widhiarso, 2013). In addition, it enables

detailed evaluation of item functioning, response-category performance, and unidimensionality, thereby strengthening evidence for the validity and reliability of the measurement instrument.

METHODS

In this study, a multi-stage process was employed to develop a measurement instrument using the Rasch model. The first stage involved verifying the assumptions of unidimensionality and local independence of measurement. The second stage involved evaluating the fit of individual items to the model, with items exhibiting poor fit being excluded from the analysis. The analysis was repeated until all remaining items demonstrated good fit to the model. In the third stage, if the number of retained items still exceeded the target number, items were selected based on predefined criteria. Finally, the evaluation process involved iterative analyses that were repeated until an optimal instrument composition was achieved, meeting all required criteria.

Participants

This research involved 316 participants who voluntarily took part in the study. Participants were classified into three categories based on their organisational affiliation: government, private, and state-owned enterprises. Before participation, informed consent was obtained from all participants to ensure their willingness to take part in the study and to grant permission for data publication.

Indonesian Version of the Perceived Empowering Leadership Questionnaire

The ELQ (Elsetouhi et al., 2018; Gao et al., 2011) was adapted into an Indonesian version (PEL-I) in accordance with the International Test Commission standards (2016). The questionnaire consisted of 23 items, distributed across three dimensions: coaching (11 items), informing (6 items), and participative decision-making (6 items). Item translation into Indonesian was conducted by two bilingual translators with expertise in psychology and organisational behaviour. The translated versions were reviewed and synthesised into a single preliminary version. A back-translation was then performed by an independent bilingual translator who was blind to the original instrument to verify semantic equivalence. Discrepancies between the original and back-translated versions were discussed and resolved. A discussion panel consisting of three experts from academic, practitioner, and psychometric backgrounds was convened to ensure that the questionnaire content aligned with its intended objectives and to finalise the PEL-I version. Validation results were obtained through completion of a rating scale in an evaluation form based on Sperber (2004), focusing on levels of comparability and similarity. Additionally, a pilot study (readability test) was conducted with 12 employees from diverse organisational backgrounds to confirm the readiness of the scale for further testing.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The testing of the ELS involved 326 subjects. After data cleaning, 10 outliers were identified. As a result, the dataset available for analysis included 316 subjects.

Table 2 shows that items on the ELS have an average item logit value of 0.00 and a standard deviation of 0.39 logits. The person reliability value (0.94) and item reliability value (0.95) indicate strong internal consistency of the instrument. The interaction between persons and items is also strong, as evidenced by a high Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.96. This suggests that the items effectively measure empowering leadership. The outfit mean-square value for persons and items is 1.05, supported by

a significant chi-square value, indicating a good fit of the data to the model (Boone et al., 2014).

Dimensionality

The dimensionality analysis aimed to determine whether the scale was unidimensional. The ELS demonstrated good unidimensionality, with a raw variance explained of 50.9%, exceeding the recommended threshold of 40% (Fisher, 2007). The minimum requirement of 20% for unidimensionality was also met. Furthermore, the unexplained variance did not exceed 15%, indicating that the instrument demonstrated a satisfactory level of item independence (Bond & Fox, 2015).

Table 2
Statistical Summary of Persons and Items for the Empowering Leadership Scale

	Persons	Items
N	316	23
Measures (logit)		
Mean	1.08	0.00
Standard deviation (SD)	1.67	0.39
Standard error (SE)	0.09	0.08
Outfit Mean Square		
Mean	1.05	1.05
SD	0.88	0.28
Separation	3.87	4.30
Reliability	0.94	0.95
Cronbach's alpha	0.96	
Chi-square	14,177.53*	
Unidimensionality (raw variance)	50.9%	
Unexplained variance	5.2%	

Note. * $p < 0.01$

Source: Table created by the authors

Table 3
Categories of response choices on the empowering leadership scale

Response Category	Frequency	Percent	Average Measure	Outfit MNSQ	Step
1 (Strongly disagree)	274	4	-1.46	2.17	NONE
2 (Disagree)	810	11	-0.71	0.96	-2.29
3 (Neutral)	1,709	24	+0.23	0.91	-0.91
4 (Agree)	3,134	43	+1.32	0.79	+0.20
5 (Strongly agree)	1,341	18	+3.23	1.12	+3.00

Source: Summary of category structure based on the authors' analysis

Although empowering leadership is theoretically described through three dimensions, these are conceptualised as interrelated facets of a single higher-order construct. Therefore, a unidimensional Rasch model was considered appropriate under the assumption of essential unidimensionality, justifying the use of a unidimensional solution to estimate overall empowering leadership.

Rating scale analysis

Table 3 shows that the observed average measure increases consistently across response categories, from -1.46 to 3.23. This pattern indicates that many respondents selected higher rating categories. The outfit mean-square (MNSQ) values are considered acceptable when they fall within the range of 0.5–1.5. However, the value for response category 1 (Strongly disagree) exceeds this range (2.17), suggesting that this category may require consideration for potential simplification of the response options.

Item fit statistics

As shown in Table 4, item 23, which represents the participative decision-making dimension, does not meet the requirements

for acceptable item fit. This is indicated by its point-measure correlation value of -0.16 and an outfit mean-square value of 6.60 (Boone et al., 2014).

Differential item functioning analysis

Bias detection of items based on gender, education level, and organisation type for the ELS is presented in Table 5. The analysis results indicate that Item 23 deserves further consideration within the Indonesian organisational context. The Rasch analysis showed that this item demonstrated misfit and differential functioning across gender, education level, and organisation type, indicating inconsistency in how it was interpreted by respondents. Item 23, *“Leaders make decisions solely based on their own opinion,”* may reflect assumptions about individual autonomy that are less aligned with Indonesian organisational norms, which tend to emphasise hierarchical relationships and collective decision-making. Empowering leadership behaviours may be interpreted differently in collectivist cultures compared to the individualistic contexts in which the scale was originally developed.

Table 4
Psychometric attributes of the empowering leadership scale

Dimension	Item	Logit	ME	Infit	Outfit	Measure
1	1	0.32	0.08	0.90	0.93	0.74
	2	-0.19	0.08	0.86	0.91	0.74
	3	-0.22	0.08	0.76	0.71	0.79
	4	-0.22	0.08	0.94	0.95	0.72
	5	0.22	0.08	0.76	0.76	0.78
	6	0.40	0.08	0.90	0.93	0.73
	7	0.13	0.08	0.79	0.83	0.79
	8	0.01	0.08	0.90	0.85	0.77
	9	-0.35	0.09	0.87	0.81	0.76
	10	-0.25	0.08	0.71	0.68	0.79
	11	0.15	0.08	0.83	0.78	0.80
2	12	-0.35	0.09	0.85	0.81	0.75
	13	-0.44	0.09	0.88	0.73	0.77
	14	0.05	0.08	0.60	0.57	0.84
	15	-0.10	0.08	0.78	0.72	0.80
	16	-0.40	0.09	0.71	0.64	0.79
	17	0.03	0.08	0.74	0.70	0.79
3	18	-0.30	0.09	0.77	0.76	0.80
	19	-0.21	0.08	0.78	0.72	0.79
	20	0.16	0.08	0.92	0.94	0.72
	21	-0.25	0.08	0.92	0.89	0.74
	22	0.41	0.08	0.99	1.03	0.70
	23	1.39	0.08	4.25	6.60	-0.16

Note. 1 = Coaching; 2 = Informing; 3 = Participative Decision-making; ME = measurement error

In collectivist settings, leadership is often embedded in norms of hierarchy, harmony, and relational obligation, which can shape how empowerment is perceived. For instance, items emphasising independent opinion may be understood not as empowering but as a leader's withdrawal of responsibility, particularly when subordinates expect direction as a form of care and competence. These findings are consistent with the results presented in Table 3. Empowering leadership entails a relational dynamic between leaders and subordinates, wherein employees

perceive the leader's capacity to mentor, share information, and involve them in the decision-making process. However, Item 23 may fail to accurately capture this cultural context, potentially leading to measurement bias. In this setting, empowerment is often experienced indirectly through inclusion in collective interests rather than through explicit individual discretion. Given the combined empirical evidence and contextual considerations, revising or removing Item 23 appears more appropriate than minor rewording.

Table 5
Differential item functioning in the perceived empowering leadership scale

Item	Probability		
	Gender	Education Level	Organisation Type
1	0.5230	0.9178	0.3478
2	0.5230	0.6513	0.7038
3	0.1205	0.3902	0.8022
4	0.7167	0.8073	0.9544
5	0.6282	0.8556	0.9815
6	1.0000	0.3296	0.3775
7	0.4692	0.3905	0.9604
8	0.6578	0.4560	0.4814
9	0.0708	0.7400	0.8864
10	0.2048	0.4960	0.9658
11	0.4410	0.2646	0.6342
12	0.4789	0.8777	0.9614
13	0.4789	0.7388	0.6871
14	0.5915	0.7404	0.6466
15	1.0000	0.7291	0.5225
16	0.4797	0.9225	0.6050
17	0.4028	0.8906	0.3198
18	1.0000	0.8645	0.7743
19	1.0000	0.9771	0.0507
20	0.5270	0.5229	0.3272
21	0.1023	0.2419	0.4566
22	0.2044	0.0137	0.9481
23	0.0032	0.0006	0.0004

Source: Authors' own work

CONCLUSION

Many companies and organisations are currently implementing empowering leadership, as they recognise its potential to enhance organisational productivity and employee psychological well-being. Empowering leadership is characterised by a range of leadership behaviours aimed at overcoming work-related obstacles. These behaviours include supporting employees, empowering employees through mentoring, granting decision autonomy, providing

training, focusing on self-determined goals, offering emotional support, and sharing information. The findings of this study indicate that the items used to measure perceived empowering leadership among employees were reliable and valid, although some modifications to the items were necessary. Likewise, the five response options can be employed, although consideration may be given to simplifying them to four options.

Implications of the Study

The findings of this study have several practical implications for the use of the PEL-I in Indonesia. *First*, the instrument can be used to improve job satisfaction by identifying empowering leadership behaviours related to autonomy support, meaningful work involvement, and recognition, which are critical predictors of employee satisfaction.

Second, in the context of leadership development, the PEL-I can be used as a diagnostic tool to identify specific strengths and areas for improvement in empowering leadership behaviours. By identifying strengths and weaknesses, organisations can develop more effective programs to enhance leadership skills. For example, leaders scoring lower on autonomy support may benefit from targeted training modules focusing on delegation skills.

Third, in terms of enhancing team performance, the PEL-I can help organisations identify how leadership behaviours affect team outcomes. This enables organisations to take appropriate steps to improve team performance. For instance, organisations may design team-building activities that promote open dialogue, psychological safety, and shared goal setting when weaknesses are identified in empowering leadership practices.

Fourth, with respect to decision-making, the use of the PEL-I enables organisations to make more informed decisions regarding leadership development and human resource utilisation, thereby improving efficiency and effectiveness in resource allocation.

Overall, in the Indonesian context, the use of the PEL-I can help organisations improve leadership quality and performance and increase competitiveness in the global market.

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

This study has several limitations. First, self-reported measures are susceptible to common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003; 2012), which may affect the accuracy of the findings. To mitigate this issue, procedural remedies were implemented during data collection, including ensuring respondent anonymity, emphasising the absence of right or wrong answers, and clarifying the academic purpose of the study. Second, this study employed a cross-sectional design, which limits its ability to establish causal relationships. Third, the data analysis did not undergo cross-validation. Therefore, future studies are encouraged to validate the PEL-I scale using Rasch model analysis and to examine its relationships with other variables across different populations or organisational contexts. Future research is also encouraged to adopt longitudinal or multi-wave designs to capture temporal dynamics and provide stronger causal evidence. Moreover, incorporating multi-source data, such as supervisor ratings, may help reduce common method bias. To support the use of the PEL-I as a decision-making tool for leadership development, further studies should employ intervention-based designs to evaluate its sensitivity to developmental change. Lastly, future

research may build on the findings of this study to develop and evaluate psychological interventions aimed at enhancing leaders' capabilities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to thank Universitas Diponegoro for providing institutional support for this research. Appreciation is also extended to all respondents who participated in the study and to colleagues who provided valuable insights during the research and manuscript preparation process

REFERENCES

- Ahearne, M., Mathieu, J., & Rapp, A. (2005). To empower or not to empower your sales force? An Empirical examination of the influence of leadership empowerment behaviour on customer satisfaction and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(5), 945-95. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.945>
- Alotaibi, S. M., Amin, M., & Winterton, J. (2020). Does emotional intelligence and empowering leadership affect psychological empowerment and work engagement? *Leadership & Organisation Development Journal, 41*(8), 971-991. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-07-2020-0313>
- Amin, S., Mukminin, A., Setiawati, R., & Fitriaty, F. (2021). Empowering leadership and human resources through stimulating innovative behaviours in higher education. *Zbornik Radova Ekonomskog Fakulteta u Rijeci, 39*(2), 381-399. <https://doi.org/10.18045/zbfri.2021.2.381>
- Amundsen, S., & Martinsen, Ø. L. (2014). Empowering leadership: Construct clarification, conceptualisation, and validation of a new scale. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(3), 487-511. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.009>
- Arifin, A. L., & Hermawan, E. (2022). Portraying Cendekia leadership from the perspective of Ki Hajar Dewantara's trilogy. *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan, 14*(1), 811-820. <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v14i1.1821>
- Arnold, J. A., Arad, S., Rhoades, J. A., & Drasgow, F. (2000). The empowering leadership questionnaire: The construction and validation of a new scale for measuring leader behaviours. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 21*(3), 249-269. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1379\(200005\)21:3](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(200005)21:3)
- Bharadwaja, M., & Tripathi, N. (2021). Linking empowering leadership and job attitudes: The role of psychological empowerment. *Journal of Asia Business Studies, 15*(1), 110-127. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JABS-03-2020-0098>
- Bond, T. G., & Fox, C. M. (2015). *Applying the Rasch model: Fundamental measurement in the human sciences* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Boone, W. J., Staver, J. R., & Yale, M. S. (2014). *Rasch analysis in the human sciences*. Springer.
- Cesário, F., & Chambel, M. J. (2017). Linking organisational commitment and work engagement to employee performance. *Knowledge and Process Management, 24*(2), 152-158. <https://doi.org/10.1002/kpm.1542>
- Cheong, M., Yammarino, F. J., Dionne, S. D., Spain, S. M., & Tsai, C. Y. (2019). A review of the effectiveness of empowering leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 30*(1), 34-58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.08.005>
- Cui, Y., & Yu, G. (2021). A cross-level examination of team-directed empowering leadership and subordinates' innovative performance: An AMO theory perspective. *International Journal of Manpower, 42*(7), 1257-1278. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-03-2020-0099>
- Durgel, E. S., Vijver, F. J. R. van de, & Yagmurlu, B. (2013). Self-reported maternal expectations and child-rearing practices: Disentangling the

- associations with ethnicity, immigration, and educational background. *International Journal of Behavioural Development*, 37(1), 35-42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025412456145>
- Elsetouhi, A. M., Hammad, A. A., Nagm, A. E. A., & Elbaz, A. M. (2018). Perceived leader behavioural integrity and employee voice in SMEs travel agents: The mediating role of empowering leader behaviours. *Tourism Management*, 65, 100-115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2017.09.022>
- Fisher, W. P., Jr. (2007). Rating scale instrument quality criteria. *Rasch Measurement Transactions*, 21(1), Article 1095.
- Gao, L., Janssen, O., & Shi, K. (2011). Leader trust and employee voice: The moderating role of empowering leader behaviours. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(4), 787-798. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.05.015>
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Paulist Press.
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalising cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), Article 8. <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organisations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Sage.
- Kirkman, B. L., & Rosen, B. (1997). A model of work team empowerment. *Research in Organisational Change and Development*, 10, 131-167.
- Konczak, L.J., Stelly, D.J. and Trusty, M.L. (2000). Defining and measuring empowering leader behaviours: development of an upward feedback instrument. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 60(2), 301-313.
- Lazim, S. H. I. M., Arifin, K., Abas, A., Khairil, M., Ali, M. N., Lampe, I., Samad, M. A., Mahfudz, M., & Ciyu, M. B. (2022). A systematic literature review on leadership practices for safety in the education sector. *Sustainability*, 14(14), Article 8262. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14148262>
- Lee, A., Willis, S., & Tian, A. W. (2018). Empowering leadership: A meta-analytic examination of incremental contribution, mediation, and moderation. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 39(3), 306-325. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2220>
- Lee, M. C. C., & Ding, A. Y. L. (2020). Comparing empowering, transformational, and transactional leadership on supervisory coaching and job performance: A multilevel perspective. *PsyCh Journal*, 9(5), 668-681. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pchj.345>
- Linacre, J.M. (2011). *A User's Guide to Winsteps Rasch Model Computer Programs*. Chicago, 601-602.
- Na-Nan, K., & Arunyaphum, A. (2021). Effect of employees' work engagement and knowledge sharing as mediators of empowering leadership and innovative work behaviour. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 53(4), 313-330. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-08-2020-0100>
- Na-Nan, K., Kanthong, S., & Khummueng, K. (2020). Development of an empowering leadership scale for salespeople: Validation and reliability. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 52(3), 209-220. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-0202020-0025>
- Noor, J., & Saputra, D. P. (2022). Influence of empowering leadership on employee performance in banks in Indonesia: The mediating role of trust in managers. *Matrik: Jurnal Manajemen, Strategi Bisnis dan Kewirausahaan*, 16(1), 127-139. <https://doi.org/10.24843/MATRIK:JMBK.2022.v16.i01.p10>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioural research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>

- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63(1), 539-569. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100452>
- Sperber, A. D. (2004). Translation and validation of study instruments for cross-cultural research. *Gastroenterology*, 126 (1), S124-S128. <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2003.10.016>
- Srivastava, A., Bartol, K. M., & Locke, E. A. (2006). Empowering leadership in management teams: Effects on knowledge sharing, efficacy, and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(6), 1239-1251. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2006.23478718>
- Suleman, Q., Syed, M. A., Shehzad, S., Hussain, I., Khattak, A. Z., Khan, I. U., Amjid, M., & Khan, I. (2021). Leadership empowering behaviour as a predictor of employees' psychological wellbeing: Evidence from a cross-sectional study among secondary school teachers in Kohat Division, Pakistan. *PLoS ONE*, 16(7), Article e0254576. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0254576>
- Sumintono, B., & Widhiarso, W. (2013). *Aplikasi model Rasch untuk penelitian ilmu-ilmu sosial*. Trim Komunikata Publishing House.
- Syahrul, K. (2020). The effect of empowering leadership on intrinsic motivation: The role of psychological empowerment as a mediator. *Journal of Leadership in Organisations*, 2(2), 151-170. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jlo.56135>
- Vecchio, R.P., Justin, J.E., & Pearce, C.G. (2010). Empowering leadership: An examination of mediating mechanisms within a hierarchical structure. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 530-542. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.03.014>
- Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*, 34(1), 89-126. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307308913>
- Wortler, B., Yperen, N.W.V., & Barelds, D.P.H. (2022). The link between empowering leadership and employee's perceptions of the effectiveness of blended working. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 63, 208-218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sjop.12796>
- Yammarino, F.J., Dionne, S.D., Chun, J.U., & Dansereau, F. (2025). Leadership and levels of analysis: A state of the science review. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(6), 879-919. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.09.002>
- Yun, S., Cox, J., & Sims, H.P. (2006). The forgotten follower: A contingency model of leadership and follower self-leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(4), 374-388. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610663141>
- Zhang, X., & Bartol, K.M. (2010). Linking empowering leadership and employee creativity: The influence of psychological empowerment, intrinsic motivation, and creative process engagement. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(1), 107-128. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2010.48037118>