

The Role of Empowering Leadership in Enhancing Organizational Agility in Organizations: A Case Study of a Sample of Algerian Economic Enterprises

دور القيادة التمكينية في تعزيز الرقابة التنظيمية بالمنظمة: دراسة حالة عينة من المؤسسات الاقتصادية الجزائرية

Samira HAROUN* ¹		Mahfoud ARABI ²	
Regional Laboratory, Entrepreneurship and Innovation, Akli Mohand Oulhadj University Bouira, Algeria samira.haroun@univ-bouira.dz		Laboratory of Development Policies and Prospective Studies, Akli Mohand Oulhadj University Bouira, Algeria. a.mahfoud@univ-bouira.dz	
Received: 06/04/2025		Accepted: 08/05/2025	Published: 01/06/2025

Abstract:

The study examined the relationship between empowering leadership and organizational agility in Algerian economic enterprises. Data were collected from 394 employees across four enterprises using a questionnaire and analyzed with SPSS software. Results indicated that, among empowering leadership components, providing support and resources had the highest mean (3.39), while creating meaning and purpose had the lowest (1.59). For organizational agility, collaboration and technology scored highest (3.35), whereas sensing and responding scored lowest (1.89), highlighting adaptation challenges. The analysis revealed a statistically significant positive relationship between empowering leadership and organizational agility ($r = 0.347, p \leq 0.05$). Demographic and professional factors showed no significant impact on organizational agility.

Keywords: Empowering leadership; Organizational agility; Work environment.

JEL Classification: M12, J24, D23

ملخص

هدفت الدراسة إلى فحص العلاقة بين القيادة التمكينية والرقابة التنظيمية في المؤسسات الاقتصادية الجزائرية، تم جمع البيانات من 394 موظفا في أربع مؤسسات باستخدام استبيان وتم تحليلها بواسطة برنامج SPSS، أشارت النتائج إلى أن أعلى متوسط بين مكونات القيادة التمكينية كان لتوفير الدعم والموارد (3.39)، بينما كان أدنى متوسط لخلق المعنى والهدف (1.59)، أما بالنسبة للرقابة التنظيمية فقد سجل التعاون والتكنولوجيا أعلى متوسط (3.35)، في حين سجل الاستشعار والاستجابة أدنى متوسط (1.89)، مما يبرز تحديات التكيف، أظهر التحليل وجود علاقة إيجابية ذات دلالة إحصائية بين القيادة التمكينية والرقابة التنظيمية ($r = 0.347, p \leq 0.05$), كما لم تظهر العوامل الديموغرافية والمهنية تأثيرا كبيرا على الرقابة التنظيمية.

كلمات مفتاحية: قيادة تمكينية؛ رقابة تنظيمية؛ بيئة العمل.

تصنيف JEL: M12؛ J24 ، D23

* Corresponding author.

¹ سميرة هارون، جامعة أكلي محند أولحاج البويرة، مخبر الإقليم المقاولاتية والابتكار، الجزائر.

² محفوظ عرابي، جامعة أكلي محند أولحاج البويرة، مخبر السياسات التنموية والدراسات الاستشرافية، الجزائر.

Introduction

In a world where everything's moving at warp speed and problems just keep piling on, it's the individuals the ones with the wild ideas, the creative sparks, and the hustle, who keep organizations breathing. Without them, forget it no new stuff gets off the ground, no adapting, no surviving. That's where empowering leadership swoops in like a breath of fresh air. It's all about trusting individuals, giving them space to do their thing, and letting employees have a real say in how stuff works. They're not just clocking in; they're helping call the shots, which fires up their imagination and keeps them all in. By zooming in on each person like that, it's what makes organizations quick on their feet able to dodge, weave, and roll with whatever economic mess or curveball gets thrown their way.

Truth is, we haven't dug deep enough into how this kind of leadership shakes things up for agility, especially in Algeria where the market's a bit of a rollercoaster. Most studies out there are stuck on the old-school "boss knows best" vibe and skip over how empowering leadership can make you fast and flexible. Therefore, this study's jumping in to connect the dots and toss out some down-to-earth ideas for enterprises that want to level up and keep their edge in this wild, nonstop world.

Research Problem: Amid the rapidly accelerating transformations in the economic environment, organizational agility emerges as a critical factor for ensuring the survival and superiority of organizations. Since this agility heavily depends on how human resources are led and directed, this study seeks to explore the role of empowering leadership in enhancing such agility. Hence arises the research problem, which is formulated in the following main question: **What is the role of empowering leadership in enhancing organizational agility within economic institutions?**

Sub-Questions: To answer the main question, it was divided into the following sub-questions:

- What is the degree of practicing empowering leadership in the institutions under study across its six dimensions (delegation of authority, enhancing autonomy, providing support and resources, encouraging initiative and creativity, building meaning and purpose, and enhancing self-confidence)?
- What is the level of organizational agility in the institutions under study across its five dimensions (flexibility, sensing and responding, speed, dynamic capabilities, cooperation and technology)?

- Is there a statistically significant correlation at the significance level ($\alpha=0.05$) between empowering leadership and organizational agility in the institutions under study?
- Are there statistically significant differences at the significance level ($\alpha=0.05$) in the level of organizational agility among the institutions under study attributable to the personal and professional variables of their employees?

Hypotheses of the Study : Based on the research problem and sub-questions, the following hypotheses can be formulated:

- Empowering leadership is practiced at a high level in the economic institutions under study.
- The level of organizational agility in the economic institutions under study is low.
- There is a statistically significant correlation at the significance level ($\alpha=0.05$) between empowering leadership and organizational agility in the institutions under study.
- There are statistically significant differences at the significance level ($\alpha=0.05$) in the level of organizational agility attributable to personal and professional variables.

Objectives of the Study: This study aims to understand the relationship between empowering leadership and organizational agility in economic institutions, with a focus on providing practical insights to enhance competitiveness and achieve the following objectives:

- To identify the concepts of empowering leadership and organizational agility and their dimensions.
- To measure the level of empowering leadership and organizational agility in the institutions under study.
- To analyze the impact of empowering leadership on enhancing organizational agility.
- To provide recommendations for institutions to benefit from empowering leadership in improving their agility.

Research Methodology: To achieve the study's objectives, the descriptive-analytical approach was adopted to examine the relationship between empowering leadership and organizational agility. Statistical tools such as questionnaires and the SPSS program were used to analyze data and test hypotheses. These tools helped determine the attitudes of the study sample toward empowering leadership and analyze its relationship with organizational agility.

Previous Studies: Among the most important studies related to our research topic are the following:

(برسولي ونعروزة، 2019) This study aimed to shed light on the role of empowering leadership in developing creative behavior among employees in organizations, focusing on the theoretical background of empowering leadership, its requirements, and key definitions of creative behavior. It relied on a theoretical-analytical approach through a review of previous studies. The study concluded that empowering leadership serves as a means to enhance creative behavior.

Comparison with the current study: Both studies address empowering leadership as an independent variable influencing organizational performance. However, they differ in the dependent variable; this study focused on creative behavior, while our study examines organizational agility. Additionally, our study is distinguished by a descriptive-analytical methodology supported by quantitative tools such as questionnaires and data analysis, whereas this study relies more on theoretical analysis.

(القيح وعبد الرحيم اسعد، 2024) This study aimed to examine the impact of strategic human resource management practices on organizational agility in the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics, focusing on dimensions such as employee empowerment, training and development, compensation and incentives, recruitment and selection, and performance evaluation. The study adopted a descriptive-analytical approach, collecting data through a questionnaire distributed to 135 employees from a population of 207 employees, with 113 questionnaires analyzed using the SPSS program. The results showed a positive impact of employee empowerment (the most influential), training and development, and compensation and incentives on organizational agility, while no impact was recorded for recruitment and selection or performance evaluation. A recommendation was made to develop a performance evaluation policy linked to rewards.

In contrast, our current study focuses on empowering leadership as the main independent variable, while sharing an interest in organizational agility as the dependent variable. Our study also differs by narrowing the scope of the independent variable to empowering leadership rather than the comprehensiveness of strategic human resource management practices.

Structure of the Study: To ensure comprehensive treatment of the various aspects of the topic, the study was divided into the following sections:

- The nature of empowering leadership;
- Concepts and theoretical foundations of organizational agility;
- Research methodology and tools;
- Presentation and discussion of results.

1. The nature of empowering leadership

Flexible remote work policies have enabled a substantial shift in modern jobs by helping individuals take greater responsibility in decision-making and accomplishing common objectives. In this manner, empowering leadership is perceived as one of the strategic approaches that can be employed to improve efficiency and foster innovation at the individual and team levels. We will try to analyze the definitions and characteristics of this leadership style to appreciate its catalytic role in organizational success.

1.1. Concept of Empowering Leadership

The lineage of this concept can be supported and traced by definitions given by well-known scholars of this subject such as House.

Empowering leadership, as defined by (House, 1976) is the ability of a leader to help his or her subordinates to fulfil their self and organizational goals by actively supporting their effort to successfully navigate the motivational 'Path-Goal Theory' which they have drawn for themselves. This definition rests on the theoretical construct of the employees' motivation by providing direction and support. It initiates the discussion of leadership and motivation, but there is little explanation of the practical aspects regarding how power is given or shared.

Empowering leadership as defined by (Conger & Kanungo, 1988) is a process that increases an individual's self-efficacy by helping lower barriers and creating an initiative nurturing environment that allows autonomy in decision-making. This definition merges the psychological and organizational dimensions of empowerment, which is holistic in nature but may need greater explanation on the allocation of resources.

With an emphasis on the psychological aspect of empowering leadership, (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990) balanced the constituent elements by defining it as a process that increases an individual's sense of meaning, choice, competence, and impact. This definition illustrates the subjective perspective of employees and offers rich understanding of the internal drivers of behavior, albeit lacking on the structural side.

The link between empowering leadership and the capacity of a leader to foster a person's organizational learning through empowering the individual to grow both personally and professionally was made by (Senge, 1990) in his book *The Fifth Discipline*. He perceives empowerment as something that can be realized through change and creativity. This definition is helpful in understanding learning but can be difficult to apply in a high pressure results driven environment.

In a study conducted by (Manz & Sims, 2001), empowering leadership was defined as the process of building self-confidence and control by providing resources and information, paying

particular attention to super leadership that directs self-managed teams. This definition places attention on the material facets of empowerment and provides a clear practical approach but might ignore the deeper psychological elements.

In their study on the impact of leadership on performance, (Ahearne, Mathieu, & Rapp, 2005) considered empowering leadership as a behavior that enhances individuals' autonomy and competence through training, enabling them, and providing information. This definition captures the concreteness and behavioral side of the matter, thus offering a strong applied vision, but perhaps too readily dismisses the framework of intrinsic motivation.

Empowering leadership was defined by (عبد الفتاح, 2010) as a style that emphasizes the delegation of authority and the active participation of subordinates in decision-making aimed at accomplishing the organizational goals. This definition incorporates practical and organizational perspectives, and it aligns with Arab contexts which appreciate participation, but may be more balanced towards psychological factors.

From a meta-analysis concerning the study of empowerment, (Seibert, Wang, & Courtright, 2011) formulated the definition of empowering leadership as a process that heightens individual and group achievement through (shifts) psychological climates that provide autonomy, meaning, and competence support. This rationalized definition focuses on the broad scope of the impacts of empowerment on different levels within an organization and offers insights but may be difficult to apply because it was crafted from a detailed analysis.

In particular, (العساف, 2020) defined empowering leadership as a style where individuals are empowered by delegating authority, increasing involvement in decision-making, and creating an encouraging context for creativity and innovation in his study on leadership in Arab organizations. This definition is practical and organizationally-oriented while also being culturally relevant.

From the provided definitions, it is evident that empowering leadership is a multidimensional style of leadership designed to assist individuals and teams within an organization by fostering self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation, together with a supportive educational and organizational framework that cultivates initiative, creativity, and autonomy in decision-making. It also involves the delegation of authority, distribution of responsibilities, access to information, requisite training, and building trust to enhance performance capabilities and primarily, the psychological climate allowing the construction of meaning and influence at the individual and group levels. This model accommodates cultural and organizational factors which allow for application in many environments where there is an attempt by leaders to integrate personal aspirations with organizational goals.

1.2. Paying Attention to the Aspects of Empowering Leadership

Empowering leadership refers to that type of leadership, which enables and increases the autonomy and ability of a person within an organization. A number of researchers in management or organizational psychology including Arnold, and Conger Kanter has studied it. From various studies, it is possible to distinguish from the literature six defining aspects of empowering leadership.

Delegation of Authority: Delegating authority as such is concerned with giving subordinates the ability to make decisions and manage a given task on their own, (Kanter, 1977) stressed this point in her book *Men and Women of the Corporation* and argued that this dimension is the essence of empowerment because it allows individuals to have “power” within the organization. Its importance stems from enhancing employees’ feelings of responsibility and ownership, expanding their performance, and boosting organizational commitment. However, it requires a high level of trust from the leader and great competence among employees to avoid chaos or poor execution.

Fostering Autonomy: Fostering autonomy is empowering a person to function without the need for constant supervision. (Conger & Kanungo, 1988) showcased its impact on self-efficacy in *The Empowerment Process: Integrating Theory and Practice* as the underpinning of leadership. Fostering autonomy is critical for developing self-reliance and enhancing problem-solving capabilities, which increases organizational efficiency. Encouraging autonomy may be challenging in hierarchical cultures but flourishes in collaborative, fluid systems.

providing support and resources: providing support and resources involves giving employees the training and tools needed for competent task execution. (Kanter, 1977) spoke to the importance of “access to resources”, whilst (Arnold, Arad, Rhoades, & Drasgow, 2000) underlined the need for such “resource furnishing leadership.” Without a doubt, providing adequate resources alleviates frustration and enhances productivity. Although, in resource-constrained settings, support becomes very difficult to maintain.

Fostering Initiative and Creativity: As defined by (Arnold, Arad, Rhoades, & Drasgow, 2000), fostering initiative and creativity is centered on stimulating thinking towards the development of new ideas. colleagues accentuated it as a critical element of improving participation in decision-making. The primary purpose of fostering initiative and creativity is to promote innovation and improve processes in order to enhance competitive advantage within the organization. In most cases, it will meet resistance within conservative sectors, but in fields such as technology that depend heavily on creativity, it becomes crucial.

Creating Meaning and Purpose: Creating meaning and purpose looks to connect the individual's work with the **organizational** objectives. (Conger & Kanungo, 1988) associated it with intrinsic motivation while Arnold linked it also to the integration of value into work by employees. Its importance lies in increasing the impact of tasks performed by employees, which contributes to loyalty and satisfaction. Leaders may weaken it if they lack genuineness, and the communication skills required for exercising vision may be too advanced.

Building Self-efficacy: Building self-efficacy seeks to enhance the employees' belief in their abilities according to (Conger & Kanungo, 1988) who referred to the Social Learning Theory of Bandura (1977). It is important because it helps to increase the level of performance at the individual and group levels by providing the courage to confront challenges. It can also lead to such outcomes when there is consistent feedback, which makes the employee feel looked after.

Under empowering leadership, one can autonomously implement decisions they have made. Encompassed within this construct are the following fundamental dimensions: delegation of authority, encouraging autonomy, providing support and resources, fostering initiative and creativity, creating meaning and purpose, and building self-confidence

2. Organisational Agility Concepts and Its Theoretical Foundations

The idea of organisational agility comes as a response to the increasing attempts by organisations to improve their performance related to change management, innovations, and inconsistencies over time. It is described as a strategic backbone that demonstrates the level at which the organisation is capable of leveraging opportunities and defending itself against external risks. In this regard, we shall expound on the notion of agility in organisations alongside its multi-faceted aspects aiding in effective and sustainable performance.

2.1. Concept of Organisational Agility

The term organisational agility regards the management of an enterprise system to assist in responding swiftly to changes in the business environment. The concepts of organisational agility have two interrelated parts; learning and understanding which stems from enduring historical accuracy. Below are key definitions:

Attuned to the notion of business and geographical, the agility models have been developed from within and without and were treated as a subunit model. Agility, as a sub-concept of flexibility, focuses on the rapidness of response to market assert. The goal of these models is to define and explain drivers and factors shaping organisational change capability (Goldman, Nagel, & Preiss, 1995). Focus and specialization in the nature of dynamic organisational change capability refer to a framework for girdle directs and binds.

Dove defined organisational agility as the ability to sense and respond to changes in the environment using value-knowledge systems and learning systems, as explained in his book, *Response Ability: The Language, Structure, and Culture of the Agile Enterprise* authored by (Dove, 2001). He included practical elements of sensing and adaptation, which makes agility a dynamic process. The cited definition seems overly technical, with little focus on a human dimension, although it captures the essence of learning.

As defined in the *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics* by (Sherehiy, Karwowski, & Layer, 2007), organisational agility is the flexibility and swift response to internal and external changes while maintaining high performance in turbulent conditions. They emphasized the comprehensive nature of processes alongside human resources to define agility. This definition is particularly beneficial as it provides a blend of balance with all perspectives that incorporate adaptability, speed, learning, and innovation along with sustainable success organisationally.

(Teece, Peteraf, & Leih, 2016) analysed organisational agility through the lens of “dynamic capabilities” as the ability to identify opportunities and threats, proactively decide, and effectively allocate resources to take advantage of changes. Teece interconnected agility with strategy and innovation. His definition primarily focuses on decision-making and innovation as primary engines of agility; it is plausible to assert that it applies most appropriately to large, resource-rich organisations.

(الحمود, 2019) contextualised agility by defining it as the organisational ability to respond to change processes within the environment swiftly, effectively, and flexibly by transforming processes, fostering collaboration among people, and utilising technology specifically with regard to the Arab world, focusing on technology as an enabler. This definition portrays a telltale sign of the need for most Arab organisations to embrace and adapt to a digital transformation.

Based on these definitions, we can deduce that organisational agility is the capability to swiftly, accurately, and efficiently sense and respond to surprising internal or external changes through the reconfiguration of processes and structures, harnessed by ever-changing effective learning systems, to meet high performance in a volatile environment through enhanced human resources and operations. This ability encompasses a combination of rapid strategic decision-making with opportunistic resource allocation to stimulate innovation while paying attention to the cultural and technological context to increase collaboration and adaptability. We particularly emphasise agility as an intersection of flexibility, speed, learning, and innovation for enduring success at the organisational level.

2.2. Dimensions of Organizational Agility

In order to address challenges and take advantage of new opportunities in the ever-evolving organisational environments, agility has become an organisational imperative. This is discussed further in the rest of this section which highlights what leading scholars consider the most important aspects of this phenomenon.

Flexibility: (Goldman, Nagel, & Preiss, 1995) describe flexibility as the capability of the organisation to constructively cope with new and unforeseen changes in the market or external environment by swiftly changing and maintaining processes and structures without losing efficiency. Flexibility is crucial for an organisation to cope with competition and gain new business. Fostering collaboration with partners is another reason why Goldman cited flexibility. This is the core of agility, although flexibility requires a lot of planning and infrastructure to be useful.

Sensing and Responding: (Dove, 2001) defined sensing and responding as the monitoring of changes taking place in the environment and the ability to respond through flexible and reconfigurable systems, knowledge as an adaptation tool. Its importance is to minimise the lapse between detection of change and response to the change to stay in front of competition. Dove emphasises its contribution towards creating a responsive organisation. This dimension offers an advantage that is not static but changes continuously, although it may be dependent on technology, employee competencies, and skills.

Speed: (Sherehiy, Karwowski, & Layer, 2007) defined speed as the executing changes and responses that are undertaken within a short period of time, attending to internal and external disturbances while still performing at peak. Its importance is in allowing the organisation to perform well under volatile conditions. Sherehiy noted that speed adds to competitive efficiency when coupled with flexibility. This dimension is vital in unstable markets, but could bring about reckless decision-making without adequate control mechanisms.

Dynamic Capabilities: Dynamic capabilities are defined, per Teece's framework, as an organisation's ability to sense opportunities and threats, quickly decide on a strategic action, and optimally redistribute resources to take advantage of such changes (Teece, Peteraf, & Leih, 2016). Such capabilities are critical in intertwining agility, innovation, and strategy simultaneously to enable the organisation to gain a sustained competitive advantage. This dimension broadens the scope of strategy in an organisation, although it appears to be more applicable to larger organisations that have adequate resources.

Collaboration and Technology: As stated in the Arab organisational context, collaboration and technology represent the capacity to improve processes and enhance adaptability by using modern technology and cooperation across functions (2019, الحمود). Its importance is clear in helping agility in the era of digital transformation, where technology can literally speed up

responses and communication. This dimension addresses the requirements of the current age, however, it may encounter obstacles in the absence of basic technological infrastructure or a collaborative culture.

Organisational agility as a whole includes five foundational dimensions: Flexibility, sensing and responding, speed, dynamic capabilities, collaboration, and technology. These dimensions stem from the works of various researchers and have captured the spirit of organisational agility developed throughout their works.

3. Research methodology and tools

The questionnaire was adopted as the primary tool for collecting primary data to achieve the study's objectives, given its ability to save time and effort. Its questions were designed with closed-ended responses, making it easier for sample individuals to answer and ensuring rapid analysis.

3.1. Study Population and Sample

The study population consisted of all employees at various administrative levels in the following institutions: "**Biopharm** " the unit for producing liquid and dry pharmaceutical materials, **Ain Bessam Mills**" a subsidiary of the public holding company Agrodiv, specializing in grinding soft wheat to produce flour for household and industrial use, "**Algérie Télécom**" Bouira branch, **Algérienne Des Eaux**" "ADE" Bouira unit.

Due to the large size of the population and the difficulty of conducting a comprehensive survey, 125 questionnaires were distributed to each institution, totaling 500 questionnaires. A total of 406 questionnaires were retrieved, of which 12 were excluded due to their unsuitability for statistical analysis. Thus, the number of valid questionnaires used in the study was 394, distributed across the economic institutions under investigation, as shown in the table below:

Table 1. Distribution of the Sample by Affiliation Institution.

DATA	Biopharm	Ain Bessam Mills	Algérie Télécom	ADE	TOTAL
Number of Distributed Questionnaires	125	125	125	125	500
Number of Retrieved Questionnaires	112	98	104	92	406
Number of Invalid Questionnaires	4	5	2	1	12
Number of Valid Questionnaires	108	93	102	91	394

Source: Prepared by the researchers.

From the above table, it is evident that the questionnaire return rate was high, with 406 out of 500 distributed questionnaires retrieved, representing 81.2%, reflecting good participant engagement. "Biopharm" recorded the highest return rate at 89.6%, while the lowest rate was

observed at "ADE" with 73.6%. Among the retrieved questionnaires, 12 were excluded due to their unsuitability, representing only 3%, indicating the high quality of the retrieved data. The final number of valid questionnaires was 394, distributed across the institutions under study, with "Biopharm" having the highest number of valid questionnaires (108), and followed by "Algérie Télécom" (102), then "Ain Bessam Mills" (93), and finally "ADE" (91). These results reflect a balanced representation of the study population, enhancing the credibility of the statistical analysis based on this sample. Additionally, the study sample included the characteristics outlined in the following table:

Table 2. Distribution of the Sample by Personal and Professional Characteristics.

Personal Characteristics	Details of Characteristics	Frequencies	Percentage %
Gender	Male	276	70,05
	Female	118	29,95
Age	From 20 to 30 years	45	11,43
	From 31 to 40 years	96	24,36
	From 41 to 50 years	144	36,55
	Over 51 years	109	27,66
Educational Level	High school or less	123	31,22
	University	253	64,21
	Postgraduate	18	4,57
Job Position	Managers	87	22,08
	Administrative Assistant	174	44,16
	Executive Assistant	133	33,76
Job Experience	Less than 5 years	37	9,39
	5 – 10 years	69	17,51
	10-15 years	107	27,16
	More than 15 years	181	45,94
The total		394	100,00

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS program results.

The results of the table indicate that the majority of the study sample are male, representing 70.05%, compared to 29.95% female, reflecting the dominance of males in the workplace within the economic enterprises under study. Regarding age, the most represented group is the age range of 41–50 years , accounting for 36.55% , followed by the group aged 51 years and above , with 27.66% . In contrast, the percentage of individuals in the study sample aged 20–30 years is the

lowest, at only 11.43%, indicating that the workforce tends to favor older age groups with extensive experience.

As for educational levels, the majority of employees hold a university degree, representing 64.21%, while individuals in the study sample with a secondary education level or lower account for 31.22%. The proportion of those with postgraduate studies is only 4.57%, reflecting the enterprises' reliance on university-educated talent to a large extent. In terms of occupational distribution, most participants hold administrative positions, with administrative staff representing the largest proportion at 44.16%, followed by operational staff at 33.76%, while managerial positions account for 22.08%.

Regarding professional experience, 45.94% of the study sample have more than 15 years of experience, while only 9.39% have less than 5 years of experience, reflecting a work environment characterized by stability and long service duration. Additionally, the percentage of employees with experience ranging between 10 and 15 years reaches 27.16%, indicating a relative balance between medium and long-term experience levels.

3.2. Validity and Reliability of the Study Tool

To ensure the reliability and accuracy of the research tool used in this study, validity and reliability tests were conducted on the questionnaire prior to data analysis. These tests aim to verify the questionnaire's ability to accurately measure the targeted concepts (validity) and the consistency of its results when measurements are repeated (reliability).

The validity of the questionnaire was assessed using face validity, where the tool was reviewed by a group of experts to evaluate the suitability of the items for the study topic, along with testing the internal consistency of the questions. Reliability, on the other hand, was tested using "Cronbach's Alpha coefficient", which measures the internal consistency of the items. This test is one of the most commonly used methods to determine the reliability of a research tool. The following table presents the results of the validity and reliability tests conducted, demonstrating the questionnaire's suitability for use in the applied study.

Table 3. Validity and Reliability of the Study Tool.

Variables	Number of Items	Spearman Correlation	Probability value (Sig*)	Cronbach's Alpha
Delegation of Authority	04	0,567	0,000	0,637
Encouraging Autonomy	04	0,823	0,000	0,785
Providing Support and Resources	04	0,799	0,000	0,736

Fostering Initiative and Creativity	04	0,861	0,000	0,754
Creating Meaning and Purpose	04	0,945	0,000	0,683
Building Self-Confidence	04	0,781		0,892
Empowering Leadership Axis	24	0,796	0,000	0,747
Flexibility	04	0,731	0,000	0,742
Sensing and Responding	04	0,617	0,000	0,696
Speed	04	0,894	0,000	0,824
Dynamic Capabilities	04	0,942	0,000	0,731
Collaboration and Technology	04	0,803	0,000	0,642
Organizational Agility Axis	20	0,797	0,000	0,727

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS program outputs.

The results of the analysis of the validity and reliability of the questionnaire indicate a good level of internal consistency and reliability, enhancing the suitability of the research tool for use in the study. Regarding the validity of the questionnaire, it was measured using Spearman's correlation coefficient, where all items showed a strong correlation with the axes they belong to. The correlation coefficient values ranged between 0.567 and 0.945, indicating that all items effectively contribute to measuring the targeted variables. As for the reliability of the questionnaire, it was measured using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, and all values fell within scientifically acceptable limits, ranging between 0.637 and 0.892, reflecting good reliability for the purposes for which it was designed.

4. Presentation and discussion of results

This section of the study aims to present and analyze the results of the questionnaire regarding the role of empowering leadership in enhancing organizational agility within a group of economic enterprises in Bouira Province. The sample included four institutions with different economic characteristics: "Biopharm" a unit for producing liquid and dry pharmaceutical materials, "Ain Bessam Mills" a subsidiary of the public holding company Agrodif, "Algérie Télécom" Bouira branch and "Algérienne Des Eaux" "ADE" Bouira unit.

The data were analyzed using appropriate statistical methods through quantitative tools that enabled the measurement of the relationship between empowering leadership and organizational agility in these institutions. This section presents the results of the descriptive analysis of the study variables, followed by hypothesis testing using appropriate statistical methods to explore the extent to which empowering leadership influences the enhancement of organizational agility in different work environments. The results will also be discussed in light of previous literature and

practical applications, with recommendations provided to enhance the effectiveness of empowering leadership in supporting the dynamism and flexibility of economic institutions in Bouira Province.

4.1. Presentation and Discussion of the First Hypothesis Results

The questionnaire data will be analyzed using appropriate statistical methods to test the extent to which empowering leadership is practiced in the enterprises under study. This is done by measuring the levels of implementation of its six dimensions: delegation of authority, encouraging autonomy, providing support and resources, fostering initiative and creativity, creating meaning and purpose, and building self-confidence. Additionally, potential differences between the enterprises in their adoption of this leadership approach will be explored. These results will be discussed in light of previous literature and effective management practices to determine the extent to which the studied enterprises align with the principles of empowering leadership. The results are illustrated in the following table:

Table 4. Sample Responses to Dimensions of Empowering Leadership.

Dimension	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation	Relative Weight	T-Value	Significance Level
Delegation of Authority	2,57	0,98	51,4	21,98	0,000
Encouraging Autonomy	2,29	0,73	45,8	18,09	0,000
Providing Support and Resources	3,39	0,94	67,8	24,98	0,000
Fostering Initiative and Creativity	2,18	0,52	43,6	16,76	0,000
Creating Meaning and Purpose	1,59	0,83	31,8	12,71	0,000
Building Self-Confidence	1,89	0,67	37,8	13,82	0,000

The tabulated T-value at a significance level of "0.05" and degrees of freedom "388" equals 1.966.

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS program outputs.

The study results indicate varying levels of practicing empowering leadership across its different dimensions. The data showed that providing support and resources was the most prominent dimension in the enterprises under study, with a mean score of 3.39 and a relative

weight of 67.8%, reflecting leaders' commitment to providing employees with essential resources. Respondents confirmed that their leaders ensure they are equipped with appropriate tools to perform their tasks efficiently, along with offering guidance and training when needed. This support contributes to improving performance and gives employees a sense of security in the workplace.

In contrast, the levels of delegating authority and encouraging autonomy were lower. The mean for delegating authority was 2.57 with a relative weight of 51.4%, indicating that employees do not have sufficient freedom to make task-related decisions without constantly referring to management. Although some leaders allow participation in decision-making and responsibility-sharing, actual practices remain limited, potentially slowing down organizational processes. As for encouraging autonomy, it recorded a mean of 2.29 and a relative weight of 45.8%, reflecting employees' lack of flexibility to organize their work as they see fit or choose methods for executing tasks freely. Several respondents noted that they always need prior approval, even for simple decisions, which limits their efficiency and reduces their sense of individual responsibility.

Regarding Fostering initiative and creativity, it scored a mean of 2.18 and a relative weight of 43.6%, indicating an insufficiently motivating environment for proposing new ideas. While some leaders encourage employees to suggest innovative solutions, actual support for implementing these ideas remains limited. Additionally, the lack of appropriate incentives reduces employees' motivation to take initiative, and the fear of failure may prevent them from experimenting with new work methods.

On the other hand, creating meaning and purpose was the least practiced dimension, with a mean of 1.59 and a relative weight of 31.8%, indicating a weak sense among employees of how their work aligns with the organization's vision and strategic goals. Many respondents stated that their leaders do not adequately explain how their roles contribute to institutional success, negatively affecting their level of commitment and job loyalty. Consequently, employees may feel that their tasks are merely routine activities without clear added value.

Finally, building self-confidence also scored low, with a mean of 1.89 and a relative weight of 37.8%. This reflects the insufficient moral support employees receive from their leaders. Many noted the absence of actual encouragement to face challenges confidently and the lack of positive feedback that boosts their confidence in themselves and their professional performance. The absence of this dimension may affect employees' ability to take responsibility and make decisive decisions.

Based on these results, it is clear that the enterprises under study need to improve their empowering leadership practices not only by providing material support but also by encouraging autonomy, fostering Initiative and creativity, and building self-confidence among employees.

Leaders should focus on linking individual tasks to the organization's overall vision, contributing to creating a more motivating and flexible work environment.

4.2. Presentation and Discussion of the Second Hypothesis Results

In this section, the results of testing the second hypothesis, which states that "the level of organizational agility in the economic enterprises under study is low," will be presented. This will be done by analyzing five key dimensions: flexibility, sensing and responding, speed, dynamic capabilities, collaboration and technology. These dimensions will be evaluated using appropriate statistical methods, allowing for an assessment of the enterprises' ability to adapt to changes, make quick decisions, and leverage technology and collaboration to achieve more effective organizational performance.

Following their presentation, the results will be analyzed and compared with established benchmarks for organizational agility in dynamic business environments to identify strengths and weaknesses in the studied enterprises. The relevant results are presented in Table X below:

Table 5. Sample Responses to Dimensions of Organizational Agility.

Dimension	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation	Relative Weight	T-Value	Significance Level
Flexibility	2,52	0,91	50,4	20,52	0,000
Sensing and Responding	1,89	0,67	37,8	12,73	0,000
Speed	2,37	0,97	47,4	19,04	0,000
Dynamic Capabilities	1,97	0,62	39,4	14,03	0,000
Collaboration and Technology	3,35	0,51	67	21,86	0,000

The tabulated T-value at a significance level of "0.05" and degrees of freedom "389" equals 1.96.

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS program outputs.

The results of analyzing the sample responses reveal variations in the level of organizational agility among the enterprises under study, showing a strong reliance on technology and collaboration to support institutional performance, contrasted with weaknesses in sensing and responding to changes and making decisions quickly.

Collaboration and Technology ranked first with the highest mean score (3.35) and a relative weight of (67%), reflecting the enterprises' focus on using modern technologies to support teamwork and enhance efficiency. These enterprises provide technological tools that facilitate

task performance and encourage collaboration between different departments to foster innovation. Additionally, the effective use of technology improves the speed and accuracy of decision-making, giving enterprises a competitive advantage in dynamic work environments.

Next, is flexibility, with a mean score of (2.52) and a relative weight of (50.4%), indicating a moderate ability to adapt to changes? This result shows that work teams can adjust their strategies when facing new challenges, and management supports the rapid redistribution of tasks and resources when needed. However, there is still a shortcoming in adopting new work methods immediately, which may limit the enterprises' ability to respond quickly to developments.

As for speed, it scored a mean of (2.37) and a relative weight of (47.4%), reflecting some delays in decision-making and implementing new strategies. Despite efforts made, work teams do not respond quickly enough to changing customer requirements, and routine procedures remain an obstacle to accelerating workflows, negatively affecting the competitive ability of enterprises.

Regarding dynamic capabilities, it recorded a mean score of (1.97) and a relative weight of (39.4%), indicating a weakness in developing employee skills and redesigning internal processes. Additionally, enterprises do not adopt a proactive approach to improving products and services, alongside limited learning from mistakes and reinforcing successful practices, reflecting the need to reassess organizational development strategies.

Finally, sensing and responding ranked last with the lowest mean score (1.89) and a relative weight of (37.8%), indicating a clear weakness in monitoring market changes and responding to them. Enterprises lack effective communication channels that enable them to quickly identify challenges and new opportunities, and management does not adequately utilize modern data and analytics in decision-making. This shortcoming limits the enterprises' ability to adapt quickly to environmental changes, potentially exposing them to future risks.

Based on these results, it appears that enterprises rely heavily on technology and collaboration to enhance performance but suffer from weaknesses in sensing changes, making quick decisions, and adapting to developments. To achieve a higher level of organizational agility, effective mechanisms for sensing and responding must be developed, decision-making processes accelerated, and dynamic capabilities strengthened through continuous training and redesigning internal processes to align with environmental changes.

4.3. Presentation and Discussion of the Third Hypothesis Results

In this section, the results of testing the third hypothesis, which states that "there is no statistically significant correlation at the significance level ($\alpha=0.05$) between empowering leadership and organizational agility in the enterprises under study," will be presented. This will be done by analyzing the relationship between the dimensions of empowering leadership:

delegation of authority, encouraging autonomy, providing support and resources, fostering initiative and creativity, creating meaning and purpose, and building self-confidence and the dimensions of organizational agility: flexibility, sensing and responding, speed, dynamic capabilities, and collaboration and technology . Appropriate statistical methods will be used to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between the two variables, and the results will be interpreted based on the extracted statistical significance, providing a deeper understanding of the impact of empowering leadership on organizational agility in the economic enterprises under study. The results are shown in the following table:

Table 6. Relationship between Empowering Leadership and Organizational Agility.

Dimensions of Empowering Leadership	Organizational Agility	
	Pearson Correlation Coefficient	Significance Level (Sig*)
Delegation of Authority	0,285	0,000
Encouraging Autonomy	0,309	0,000
Providing Support and Resources	0,498	0,000
Fostering Initiative and Creativity	0,356	0,000
Creating Meaning and Purpose	0,289	0,000
Building self-confidence	0,348	0,000
Overall Index	0,348	0,000

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS program outputs.

The results of the statistical analysis using Pearson's correlation coefficient revealed a positive and statistically significant relationship between empowering leadership and organizational agility, with variations in the strength of the correlation across different dimensions. Providing support and resources achieved the highest level of correlation (0.498), reflecting a moderate to strong relationship, as providing resources and appropriate guidance enhances the organizational ability to adapt and respond effectively to changes. Fostering initiative and creativity recorded a correlation coefficient of (0.356), and building self-confidence recorded (0.348), indicating a moderate relationship, where leaders' support for new ideas and employees' confidence boosts the organization's flexibility and responsiveness to changes. On the other hand, encouraging autonomy (0.309), creating meaning and purpose (0.289), and delegating authority (0.285) recorded weak to moderate correlation coefficients, indicating that these dimensions positively influence organizational agility but to a lesser extent compared to the other dimensions. At the overall index level, the relationship between empowering leadership and organizational agility

was (0.347), reflecting a moderate correlation. This suggests that enhancing empowering leadership contributes to improving organizational flexibility and responsiveness to changes, but stronger activation of certain dimensions may be needed to achieve higher levels of organizational agility.

4.4. Presentation and Discussion of the Fourth Hypothesis Results

In this section, the results of testing the fourth hypothesis, which states that there are statistically significant differences at the significance level ($\alpha=0.05$) in the level of organizational agility attributed to personal and professional variables, will be presented. This test aims to analyze the extent to which personal and professional factors influence the level of organizational agility in the enterprises under study. The t-test and one-way ANOVA will be used to determine whether there are significant differences between different groups based on these variables. The results are illustrated in the following two tables:

Table 7. Independent Samples t-Test.

Gender	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Calculated T-Value	Significance Level
Male	276	2,459	0,537	1,731	0,109
Female	118	2,381	0,631		

The tabulated T-value at a significance level of "0.05" and degrees of freedom "392" equals 1.966.

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS program outputs.

The results of the independent samples T-test to measure differences in the level of organizational agility between males and females in the study sample revealed no statistically significant differences at the significance level ($\alpha=0.05$) between genders. The mean organizational agility score for males was 2.459 with a standard deviation of 0.537, while for females; it was 2.381 with a standard deviation of 0.631. The calculated T-value was 1.731, with a significance level of 0.109, which is higher than 0.05, indicating that the differences between genders are not statistically significant.

Based on these results, we conclude that the level of organizational agility does not differ significantly between males and females, reflecting a similar perception and response to organizational agility practices within the institutions under study.

Table 7. One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

Variable	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F-Value	Significance Level
Age	Between Groups	0,986	4	0,238	2,095	0,171
	Within Groups	62,122	299	0,195		
	Total	63,108	393			
Educational Level	Between Groups	0,874	3	0,193	1,742	0,642
	Within Groups	62,234	300	0,187		
	Total	63,108	293			
Job Position	Between Groups	0,918	3	0,354	2,019	0,105
	Within Groups	62,19	300	0,098		
	Total	63,108	393			
Job Experience	Between Groups	0,594	4	0,941	1,693	0,078
	Within Groups	62,514	299	0,238		
	Total	63,108	393			

The tabulated F-value at a significance level of "0.05" and degrees of freedom "4, 299" equals 2.402.

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS program outputs.

The results of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) showed no statistically significant differences at the significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the sample responses regarding the level of organizational agility based on personal and professional variables (age, educational level, job position, and experience). All calculated F-values were lower than the tabulated value (2.402), and the significance levels for all variables were greater than 0.05, indicating no significant differences between the different categories. Based on these results, it is clear that personal and professional variables do not significantly influence employees' perception of organizational agility, which may suggest the impact of other more important factors, such as the nature of the organizational

structure and institutional culture, in enhancing organizational agility within the work environment.

Conclusion

This study aimed to answer the central question: "What is the role of empowering leadership in enhancing organizational agility among employees in Algerian economic enterprises?" To achieve this, we began by clarifying the theoretical concepts of empowering leadership and organizational agility, reviewing their basic dimensions, and then moved to the practical aspect by distributing a questionnaire to a sample of 394 employees from various Algerian economic enterprises. The study reached the following conclusions:

- Empowering leadership is a leadership style aimed at empowering individuals and teams within the organization by enhancing self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, and autonomy in decision-making;
- Organizational agility reflects the ability of organizations to quickly adapt to unexpected changes through flexibility in reshaping processes and structures, supported by dynamic and adaptable learning systems;
- The level of practicing empowering leadership varied across its dimensions, with the dimension of providing support and resources scoring the highest (mean = 3.39) while creating meaning and purpose ranked last (mean = 1.59). However, the results indicate that the enterprises under study practice empowering leadership at a moderate level.
- The level of organizational agility in the studied institutions was high in the dimension of collaboration and technology (mean = 3.35), while sensing and responding ranked lowest (mean = 1.89), reflecting a weakness in the institutions' ability to monitor changes and respond to them.
- Correlation analysis revealed a positive and statistically significant relationship between empowering leadership and organizational agility, with an average correlation coefficient of 0.347 at a significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$), confirming the validity of the third hypothesis, which states: "There is a statistically significant relationship between empowering leadership and organizational agility."
- The results showed no statistically significant differences in the sample responses regarding organizational agility related to personal and professional variables (gender,

age, educational level, job position, and experience), as all significance levels were greater than ($\alpha = 0.05$), confirming the validity of the fourth hypothesis, which states: "There are no statistically significant differences attributable to personal and professional variables."

- Based on these findings, the following recommendations can be proposed:
- Encourage institutions to enhance empowering leadership practices by increasing the delegation of authority and promoting autonomy to enable employees to make independent decisions.
- Develop effective mechanisms for sensing and responding to environmental changes by providing modern communication channels and using data to support decision-making.
- Strengthen collaboration between departments and invest in modern technology to improve organizational efficiency and accelerate processes.
- Organize continuous training programs to develop skills and redesign internal processes in alignment with environmental changes.

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 Behavior on Customer Satisfaction and Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(05), pp. 945-955.
- Arnold, J., Arad, S., Rhoades, J., & Drasgow, F. (2000). Development and Application of a Model of Empowering Leadership. *Group & Organization Management*, 25(04), pp. 357-382.
- Conger, J., & Kanungo, R. (1988). The Empowerment Process: Integrating Theory and Practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(03), pp. 471-482.
- Dove, R. (2001). *Response Ability: The Language, Structure, and Culture of the Agile Enterprise*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Goldman, S., Nagel, R., & Preiss, K. (1995). *Agile Competitors and Virtual Organizations: Strategies for Enriching the Customer*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- House, R. (1976). A theory of charismatic leadership . In *Leadership and Performance*. USA: Free Press.
- Kanter, R. (1977). *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kucharzki, D. (2005). Empowering leadership: A review and synthesis . *Leadership Quarterly*. Elsevier, 16(03), pp. 379-399.

- Manz, C., & Sims, H. (2001). *The New Superleadership: Leading Others to Lead Themselves*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Seibert, S., Wang, G., & Courtright, S. (2011). Antecedents and Consequences of Psychological and Team Empowerment in Organizations: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96-05, pp. 981-1003.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Sherehiy, B., Karwowski, W., & Layer, J. (2007). A Review of Enterprise Agility: Concepts, Frameworks, and Attributes. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 37(05), pp. 445-460.
- Spencer, L. (2010). Empowerment in the workplace: A comprehensive approach. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(05), pp. 705-725.
- Teece, D., Peteraf, M., & Leih, S. (2016). Dynamic Capabilities and Organizational Agility: Risk, Uncertainty, and Strategy in the Innovation Economy. *California Management Review*, 58(04), pp. 13-35.
- Thomas, K., & Velthouse, B. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An interpretive model of intrinsic task motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 15(04), pp. 666-681.
- Zhang, X., & Bartol, k. (2010). Linking Empowering Leadership and Employee Creativity: The Influence of Psychological Empowerment, Intrinsic Motivation, and Creative Process Engagement. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(01), pp. 107-128.
- Zwell, S. (1995). Empowerment: The key to organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 16(03), pp. 22-26.
- الحمود, ع. (2019). الرشاقة التنظيمية ودورها في تعزيز الأداء التنظيمي في ظل التحول الرقمي. *مجلة العلوم الإدارية والاقتصادية*, 15(03), pp. 88-105.
- العساف, م. (2020). القيادة التمكينية ودورها في تعزيز الابتكار في المنظمات العربية. *مجلة الإدارة والتنمية*, 41(03), pp. 145-123.
- القيح, إ. & عبد الرحيم اسعد, س. (2024). تأثير ممارسات إدارة الموارد البشرية الاستراتيجية على الرشاقة التنظيمية " حالة دراسية: الجهاز المركزي للإحصاء الفلسطيني ". *مجلة نماء للاقتصاد والتجارة*, 08(01), pp. 134-161.
- برسولي, ف. & نعرورة, ب. (2019). القيادة التمكينية ودورها في تنمية السلوك الإبداعي لدى العاملين بالمنظمة. *مجلة الاجتهاد للدراسات القانونية والاقتصادية*, 08(05), pp. 433-460.
- عبد الفتاح, م. (2010). القيادة التمكينية وأثرها على الأداء الوظيفي. *مجلة الدراسات الإدارية*-32(02), pp. 45-67.