E-ISSN: 2997-9366
American Journal of Management Practice
https://semantjournals.org/index.php/AJMP

| Research Article

Check for updates

The Role of Job Empowerment Practices in Developing Organizational Resilience among Employees

Amal Jaber Fzaea*[1], Fadel Hassan Joudah[2]
[1]College of Administration and Economics, Sumer University, Dhi Qar, Iraq
[2]Independent Researcher
*Email: amal.jaber@uos.edu.iq

Abstract: This research aims to investigate the nature of the relationship between job empowerment practices and organizational resilience among employees at the University of Maysan. Using a descriptive quantitative approach, data were collected via a structured questionnaire from a sample of 348 employees and analyzed using SPSS version 26. The results revealed a strong positive impact of the dimensions of empowerment (meaning, self-efficacy, influence, and autonomy) on organizational resilience, with varying degrees of impact across the dimensions. These findings highlight the crucial role of comprehensive empowerment strategies in enhancing employee adaptability and organizational performance. The research recommends the systematic application of empowerment policies and programs to promote organizational resilience and ensure sustainable organizational development.

Keywords: Job Empowerment, Organizational Resilience, Employee Self-Efficacy, Autonomy in Decision-Making

This is an open-access article under the CC-BY 4.0 license

1. Introduction

Universities and academic institutions face changing and complex work environments that make employee adaptability and organizational resilience essential to maintain continuity of performance and service quality. Organizational resilience is defined as the ability of an organization and its employees to adapt to environmental and professional pressures and changes while maintaining operational stability and achieving organizational goals. In this context, job empowerment emerges as a strategic tool focusing on increasing job meaning, self-efficacy, influence, and autonomy among employees, thereby contributing to their ability to respond to challenges and achieve optimal performance. Despite its importance, institutions face practical challenges related to organizational structure and limited resources that may limit the effectiveness of empowerment in promoting organizational resilience. Therefore, this study is of great importance in examining the impact of job empowerment practices on organizational resilience, with the aim of providing management strategies that help create flexible academic institutions capable of adapting to continuous change.

2. Materials and Methods

The descriptive-analytical method is considered the most appropriate research method for this study, given its ability to combine a detailed description of organizational phenomena with an interpretive analysis of the relationships between variables. This method provides a scientific framework for analyzing complex administrative phenomena and extracting correlation patterns between psychological, behavioral, and organizational variables based on realistic quantitative data. Furthermore, by linking theoretical aspects with empirical evidence, this approach allows for a deeper understanding of the interactions affecting organizational performance, making it an essential tool in contemporary management research that seeks to develop interpretive models supported by rigorous statistical analysis [1].

Research Problem

Despite the growing interest in the modern management literature on the role of job empowerment as an effective mechanism for developing organizational capabilities and stimulating organizational learning, the nature of its relationship with organizational resilience – in terms of its direction, strength, and explanatory mechanisms – has not been adequately defined. Most previous studies have focused on industrial and service contexts, distinct from the higher education environment, or have been limited to individual outcomes such as job satisfaction and commitment, without delving into deeper analysis of institutional outcomes related to strategic alignment and organizational accountability in academic institutions [2], [3], [4].

Although some literature suggests a potential relationship between empowerment practices and organizational resilience, theoretical frameworks and applied models that explain how empowerment practices—with their psychological dimensions (meaning, self-efficacy, influence, and autonomy)—can contribute to organizational resilience remain limited, especially in universities in developing countries. These institutions often suffer from structural constraints, limited resources, and ongoing pressures related to academic accreditation and quality assurance. In this context, research on the relationship between these two variables has become a scientific and practical necessity.

Therefore, there is a research gap characterized by the lack of empirical studies that deeply examine the interaction between job empowerment and organizational resilience in Iraqi universities. These universities, as institutions facing complex challenges, need more flexible and empowering management strategies. The aim of this study is to analyze the causal and explanatory relationship between dimensions of job empowerment and dimensions of organizational resilience. The aim is to discover the mechanisms that can transform empowerment into a strategic approach to increase organizational resilience and thereby contribute to the development of a theoretical and applied model that strengthens the capacity of universities to adapt and survive in changing environments.

Accordingly, the research problem raises the question: To what extent do job empowerment practices, with their psychological dimensions (meaning, self-efficacy, influence, and autonomy), contribute to increasing the dimensions of organizational resilience (flexible strategic planning and organizational adaptability) among Maysan University employees? And what are the explanatory mechanisms that clarify the nature of this relationship in the context of Iraqi universities?

Importance of research

Theoretical importance: This research contributes to enriching the scientific literature in the field of human resource management and organizational behavior by linking the dimensions of job empowerment (meaning, self-efficacy, influence, and autonomy) with the dimensions of organizational resilience (planning and adaptation). This research also provides a comprehensive conceptual framework that can be applied in future studies, especially in the context of Iraqi universities, which are characterized by unique organizational and academic characteristics that necessitate strengthening their resilience and development.

Practical importance: This is evident in recognizing the reality of job empowerment practices among Maysan University staff and measuring their direct impact on the development of organizational resilience. This provides practical quantitative indicators that can support university

leaders in designing empowerment-based administrative policies and career development programs, thereby enhancing the university's ability to face challenges, improve the quality of academic and administrative performance, and ensure the sustainability of its educational mission.

Future importance: This research opens avenues for future studies that link career empowerment practices with other organizational variables, such as job satisfaction, institutional innovation, and organizational commitment. It also provides opportunities for developing more effective management and training programs based on empowerment as a strategic approach to increasing organizational resilience, which supports Iraqi universities in complying with academic accreditation and corporate governance requirements and enhances their competitiveness at the local and regional levels.

Research objectives

First: Theoretical Objectives

To develop a comprehensive theoretical framework that links job empowerment dimensions (meaning, self-efficacy, influence, and autonomy) with organizational resilience dimensions (planning and adaptation), thereby enriching the scientific literature on organizational behavior and human resource management.

To test theoretical relationships and clarify the nature of potential effects between job empowerment practices and organizational resilience, and to determine whether empowerment represents a strategic approach to increasing institutional resilience in Iraqi academic environments.

Second: Practical Objectives

To analyze the statistical relationship between job empowerment dimensions and organizational resilience dimensions among Maysan University employees, with the aim of clarifying the correlation mechanisms and identifying the empowerment dimensions that have the greatest impact on creating and developing organizational resilience.

Providing scientific and practical advice to university management and decision-makers on how to activate career empowerment practices as a modern management approach to increase organizational resilience, thereby helping to increase the efficiency of institutional performance and improve the university's ability to adapt to educational and administrative changes and challenges.

Research hypotheses

Main Hypothesis: There is a statistically significant relationship between the dimensions of job empowerment practices (meaning, self-efficacy, influence, and independence) and organizational resilience among Maysan University employees.

Sub-Hypotheses:

Sub-Hypothesis 1: There is a statistically significant relationship between the dimension of job meaning and organizational resilience among employees.

Sub-Hypothesis 2: There is a statistically significant relationship between the dimension of self-efficacy and organizational resilience among employees.

Sub-Hypothesis 3: There is a statistically significant relationship between the dimension of influence and organizational resilience among employees.

Sub-Hypothesis 4: There is a statistically significant relationship between the dimension of independence and organizational resilience among employees.

Theoretical Framework and Previous Studies

First: Functional Empowerment

In the human resource management and organizational behavior literature, Job Empowerment is defined as a set of structural and psychological practices that aim to grant effective decision-making authority to employees, facilitate access to resources and information, and increase their sense of meaning, competence, autonomy, and influence at work. This concept is fundamentally related to empowerment approach, which links organizational structures (opportunities, resources, information, and support networks) with the emergence of empowering behaviors in individuals [2]. Conger and Kanungo developed an interactionist view of empowerment as a process that enhances individual effectiveness by modifying leadership practices and organizational structures [5]. From a cognitive perspective [6], presented a model that identifies

four dimensions of psychological empowerment: meaning, competence, choice/autonomy, and influence. This was later refined into the (Spreitzer) scale, which shows how structural and environmental factors contribute to the self-concept of empowerment. Recent literature has supported the integration of structural and psychological empowerment in enhancing organizational resilience. The former enables individuals to take initiative and respond to sudden changes, while the latter provides the motivation and commitment necessary to learn and adapt [7]. Emerging evidence also suggests that broader organizational practices, such as corporate social responsibility initiatives, can enhance psychological empowerment, which mediates the relationship between organizational policies, performance, and resilience [8]. Job empowerment is a cornerstone of sustainable organizational performance that increases job satisfaction and organizational commitment, reduces turnover, and strengthens loyalty [9], [10], [11]. Furthermore, it serves as a means to improve individual and team performance through intrinsic motivation and positive organizational behaviors under supportive leadership and effective coaching. Empowerment also helps increase organizational resilience by enabling employees to make innovative decisions and respond effectively to crises [7], [12], [13], [14]. It also promotes employee engagement and psychological well-being through a supportive work environment and fosters organizational innovation by encouraging learning and experimentation [15], [16]. At a strategic level, employee empowerment acts as a gateway to increased organizational learning, organizational well-being, and social responsibility, making it a cornerstone of sustainability and competitive advantage in contemporary organizations [8].

Dimensions of Job Empowerment

The dimensions of psychological empowerment, according to the scale, are fundamental to understanding how to increase organizational performance and effectiveness [17]. These dimensions include four interrelated aspects: first, meaning, which reflects the employee's perception of the value of their work and its alignment with their personal values and goals. This creates intrinsic motivation and emotional attachment to the organization. Studies have shown that a sense of meaning in work increases job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and creativity [18]. Second, self-efficacy, which is the employee's confidence in their ability to perform tasks efficiently and effectively. This forms the basis for the development of individual performance and the ability to adapt to organizational challenges. Research has shown positive correlations between self-efficacy and performance, innovation, and responsiveness to change [19], [20]. Third, autonomy, which refers to the freedom of an employee to make decisions related to their work within the framework of organizational responsibility, is a central element in creating psychological and structural empowerment. This helps to foster innovative thinking, reduce job stress, and increase levels of engagement and resilience [21], [22]. Fourth, influence, which reflects an employee's perception of their ability to influence organizational decisions and work outcomes, is the dimension that translates the previous three dimensions into tangible impact on organizational performance. Studies have shown that employees who feel influenced show higher commitment and more initiative in providing solutions and innovations [23], [7].

Second: Organizational Resilience

Organizational resilience is defined as the ability of an organization to adapt quickly and effectively to environmental changes and disruptions, both internal and external, while maintaining continuity of operations and achieving its strategic objectives [24]. The concept has evolved from focusing on the resilience of individuals and teams to the level of the organization as a whole, where it is now considered a vital and dynamic skill that enables organizations to strategically deal with risks and sudden changes, while maintaining the capacity for continuous learning and development [13]. Interest in resilience began in the mid-twentieth century at the individual level, focusing on the ability of individuals to adapt to personal pressures and challenges, which contributed to understanding the impact of individual resilience on the performance of teams and the organization [25]. In the late 1980s and 1990s, the focus on teams and organizations expanded, based on open systems theory. This theory views the organization as a system that interacts with its environment and requires continuous adaptation to maintain balance and efficiency [26]. Organizational learning

is considered a key mechanism for transferring knowledge and gaining experience from past experiences to enhance adaptation [27]. With the beginning of the 21st century, the focus shifted to organizational resilience as a dynamic strategic capability. This capability relies on the integration of human resources, organizational structure, and operational processes to enhance continuous adaptation, crisis response, and sustainable performance [28]. The ability to learn from past experiences involves redesigning internal processes when needed and implementing innovative solutions to deal with sudden environmental changes [29]. Organizational resilience is a fundamental component of organizational sustainability and resilience in the face of crises and sudden changes. This enables organizations to ensure business continuity by quickly directing resources and processes to maintain performance and minimize operational losses [13]. It also increases the ability to dynamically adapt to environmental, economic, and technological changes by modifying strategies and processes to align with emerging challenges and opportunities [29]. Furthermore, resilience is a key pillar of organizational innovation and modernization by fostering a culture of continuous learning, experimentation, and adoption of creative solutions to improve organizational performance [30]. It helps increase competitiveness by accelerating response to changes without compromising the quality of performance or customer satisfaction [28]. Finally, by granting employees the freedom to make decisions and take initiative in problem solving, it supports employee empowerment and active participation, thereby increasing commitment and satisfaction and strengthening collaboration in work teams [31]. Resilience is also an effective tool in risk management by anticipating potential risks and dealing with them proactively to reduce their negative impacts and is a fundamental pillar for achieving corporate sustainability by creating operational and administrative systems that are able to adapt to changing environments and ensure the continuous delivery of value to stakeholders in the long term [13], [24].

Dimensions of Organizational Resilience

The abbreviated version of the BRT-13 scale was adopted to assess the ability of organizations to adapt to crises and unexpected changes, focusing on two main dimensions of organizational resilience, namely planning and adaptation. Each dimension covers a set of sub-elements that determine the degree to which the organization is resilient and responsive to environmental changes [32], [33]. First, the planning dimension refers to the organization's ability to formulate clear and comprehensive strategies to deal with potential risks. This includes distributing roles and responsibilities and periodically reviewing plans to ensure their suitability for environmental changes and operational sustainability. It also includes engaging in practical exercises to increase operational readiness, build trust and accountability, and build collective capacity to respond to crises. In addition, it includes a proactive stance that focuses on taking proactive measures to deal with risks before they escalate. This is achieved through continuous monitoring, policy updates, and effective resource allocation, while leveraging external resources and expertise to enhance the organization's ability to respond and recover. This dimension also includes prioritizing recovery, restarting critical functions, and allocating resources to ensure service continuity and minimizing disruption during crises [28], [30], [32]. Second, the adaptability dimension reflects the organization's ability to modify its behaviors, processes, and strategies to meet unexpected challenges. This includes increasing cross-functional collaboration to bridge gaps and improve coordination between different teams, along with investing internal resources, including qualified personnel, technical capabilities, and internal budgets to ensure continuity and rapid adaptation. Effective leadership plays a pivotal role in strategic decision-making, guiding teams, and fostering a culture of support and initiative. It also includes learning from past experiences to improve future performance and develop innovative solutions, adopting a flexible organizational culture that encourages innovation and adaptation to uncertainty, the ability to devise new solutions to face unexpected challenges, and responding quickly and effectively through decision-making, resource allocation, and problem-solving as they arise. Finally, it includes maintaining the sustainability of core operations during crises through comprehensive plans, adequate resources, and effective internal support systems [13], [32], [34], [35].

Theoretical Relationship between Job Empowerment and Organizational Resilience

Theoretical frameworks seek to clarify how job empowerment practices play a role in enhancing organizational resilience and the ability of organizations to adapt to complex and changing work environments. According to dynamic resource theory, empowerment is a dynamic resource that gives employees the freedom to make decisions and use resources, thereby increasing organizational responsiveness, innovation, and resilience [36], [37]. Positive psychological capital theory focuses on increasing employees' psychological resources, such as optimism, self-efficacy, and psychological resilience. Empowerment enables individuals to control the work environment, thereby increasing their ability to adapt to stress and challenges [38], [39]. From the perspective of social exchange theory, empowerment through employee participation in decision-making encourages mutual commitment between the employee and the organization, which promotes active participation, innovation, and enhances organizational resilience [40], [41]. Furthermore, empowerment helps distribute authority and resources, reduces bureaucracy, and increases employees' trust, self-efficacy, and sense of purpose, thereby supporting their ability to adapt and respond effectively to challenges [9], [42]. Empowerment also fosters belonging and initiative, and by encouraging early risk identification and the development of innovative solutions, it strengthens adaptive and proactive resilience, ensuring the sustainability of organizational resilience, making it a key strategy for achieving resilience and innovation in changing and complex work environments [43], [44], [45], [46].

Literature review

1. A study by (Van den Berg, et al) examined the impact of structural empowerment on increasing organizational resilience in a healthcare institution in the Netherlands. The study used a qualitative case study method using semi-structured interviews with employees and senior management. The results showed that structural empowerment directly contributes to increasing organizational resilience, provided that there is a safe psychological environment and ongoing leadership support. The study emphasized that effective empowerment requires a climate of trust, not just delegation [7].
2. A study by (Georgescu et al) analyzed the impact of strategic HR practices and organizational culture on increasing organizational resilience in public institutions. The study used a quantitative approach with a sample of 501 employees and utilized structural equation modeling (SEM). It concluded that the interaction between strategic HR policies and culture promotes organizational resilience, adaptability, and innovation, and recommended the creation of strategic HR and cultural practices that support continuous learning and crisis response [47].
3. (Mahmood, Saeed) examined the relationship between empowering leadership and employee engagement using employee resilience as a mediating variable. Based on SEM analysis of a sample of faculty members in Pakistan, the results showed that empowering leadership indirectly increases employee engagement by increasing individual resilience, highlighting the importance of developing employees' adaptive capabilities in times of crisis [48].
4. (Biswas) examined the role of HRM in striking a balance between employee well-being and organizational resilience. Based on a qualitative literature review, the results showed that promoting employee well-being is a strategic approach to increasing organizational resilience and supportive HR practices help build organizational sustainability [49].
5. (Dickson) analyzed organizational resilience as a critical condition for organizational success in volatile environments. The study concluded that adopting enabling practices enhances an organization's ability to innovate and respond to change, emphasizing that organizational resilience is a strategic pillar for sustainable performance and competitive advantage [50].

A Review of Previous Studies and What Makes the Current Study Differentiated

Previous studies have highlighted the critical role of job empowerment and organizational resilience in enhancing the ability of institutions to adapt to environmental changes and pressures. These studies examine various approaches, including structural empowerment [7], strategic human resource management practices and organizational culture [47], leadership empowerment and

employee resilience [48], and promoting employee well-being as an entry point to organizational resilience [51]. Furthermore, they have established a link between job empowerment and organizational success in unstable workplaces [50]. However, most studies focus on contexts outside the Arab region and highlight the knowledge gap in the Iraqi workplace, particularly among employees at Maysan University. This presents the current study as an opportunity to enrich local and regional knowledge. Adopting a comprehensive descriptive-analytical approach, the present study uses internationally standardized measurement tools to directly link the four dimensions of Job Empowerment (meaning, competence, autonomy, and impact) with dimensions of organizational resilience. This increases understanding of the precise mechanisms affecting an organization's ability to adapt and maintain performance. Furthermore, it provides practical and applicable recommendations for strengthening organizational resilience, thereby giving this study both scientific and practical value and enabling Iraqi educational institutions to directly benefit from its findings.

3. Results

Practical Aspect

Research Population and Sample

Since the current research population consists of approximately (2700) Maysan University employees of various job levels, the sample size was determined using the Cochran equation, which is considered a reliable statistical tool for estimating sample size in large and medium-sized populations (Cochran, 1977). The Cochran equation states the following:

$$\frac{[\,N \times Z^2 \times p \times (1-p)\,]}{[\,(N-1) \times e^2 + Z^2 \times p \times (1-p)\,]}\,n$$

Applying this equation, the appropriate sample size for the current research population is approximately 348, which is the same size as that considered in this study. This number is sufficient to achieve a confidence level (95%) and a margin of error (5%), which ensures an objective and accurate representation of the views of the research population.

Data collection methods and metrics used

Data Collection Methods:

To achieve its objectives and test its hypotheses, this study relied on two main types of data as follows, within a methodological framework that combines theoretical aspects and quantitative analysis:

Primary Data: Primary data are the main source of statistical analysis in this study. These data were collected in the field from a sample of Maysan University employees using a questionnaire that was designed and constructed to align with the objectives of the present study and ensure accurate measurement of its variables, especially job empowerment practices and their role in developing organizational resilience among employees.

Secondary Data: Secondary data represent the theoretical foundations and knowledge that the study relied on in building its conceptual model and formulating its hypotheses. This data was collected through a review of recent scientific literature related to job empowerment and organizational resilience, published in books and specialized references, as well as peer-reviewed scientific articles in reputable academic journals and publications, both printed and electronic, available in global databases such as Scopus, ProQuest, and Google Scholar. This data helped define the dimensions of the study variables, formulate scientific hypotheses, and provide the necessary theoretical support for the analysis and discussion of the results.

Study Measures

The following measures were used to develop the questionnaire questions.

Table 1. Approved Measures for the Questionnaire

The variable	Scale	Dimensions
	Spreitzer (1995)	Meaning Dimension
		Efficiency Dimension

The variable	Scale	Dimensions
Job Empowerment		Autonomy/Choice Dimension Impact Dimension
organizational resilience	Benchmark Resilience Tool – BRT-13 (Stephenson et al., 2010; Whitman et al., 2013)	Planning Dimension Adaptiveness Dimension

Due to its widespread use and reliability in administrative and organizational studies, a five-point Likert scale was used to measure the responses of the sample members. This scale helps in accurately and objectively measuring attitudes and behaviors. The reliability of the measurement instrument was confirmed by calculating Cronbach's alpha coefficient after field data collection. This criterion evaluates the internal consistency of the questionnaire items and ensures the reliability of the expected statistical results.

Questionnaire reliability: The reliability of a study instrument refers to the consistency of its results and the ability to achieve similar results even in the event of significant changes, provided that the questionnaire is distributed to the sample members several times over a period of time. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used and the table below shows these results.

Table 2. Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for measuring questionnaire reliability

Search variables	Dimensions	Number of paragraphs	Cronbach's alpha coefficient
Job empowerment	Meaning	3	.996
	Competence dimension	3	.990
	Autonomy/Right to choose	3	.987
	Impact	3	.989
The overall score of the first variable		12	.996
Organizational resilience	Planning	5	.996
	Adaptiveness	8	.993
Overall reliability score for the second variable		13	.996
Overall reliability score for the questionnaire items		25	.998

The reliability coefficient results (Cronbach's alpha) indicate that all dimensions and main variables in the questionnaire achieved very high levels of internal consistency. The alpha values for the sub-dimensions ranged from 0.987 to 0.996, while the overall reliability coefficient for the research instrument reached 0.998, which strongly indicates a high degree of reliability of the instrument. The results show that the "meaning" dimension of job empowerment achieved the highest degree of reliability (α = 0.996), indicating the clarity and precision of the items related to this dimension in measuring employees' sense of the value of their work. Similarly, the dimensions of “competence” (α = 0.990), “influence” (α = 0.989), and “independence” (α = 0.987) showed very high levels of reliability, confirming the homogeneity of the items constituting these dimensions and their ability to accurately measure what they were designed to measure.

In the case of the “organizational resilience” variable, the “planning” dimension (α = 0.996) achieved a very high degree of reliability, while the reliability coefficient for the “adaptability” dimension (α = 0.993) was also very high. This indicates that the items used to measure these dimensions are highly consistent and produce stable results after re-administration. This indicates that the questionnaire was scientifically designed and developed and met the criteria for validity and reliability, so its results are suitable for testing research hypotheses and drawing accurate and reliable conclusions.

In general, achieving an overall reliability coefficient (0.998) for the questionnaire is a rare finding in field studies. This indicates that the measurement tool has almost perfect reliability and the

responses accurately reflect the reality that the study intends to investigate. As a result, these results strengthen the statistical evidence on which subsequent analyses to test the hypotheses will be conducted and give considerable credibility to the findings of this study.

Frequency and percentage of demographic variables: The characteristics of the study sample were analyzed through (gender, age, years of service in the institution, level of education) as shown in the table below:

Table 3. Frequencies and percentages of demographic variables

Variable	Paragraphs	Frequencies	Percentage
Gender	Male	261	75.0
	Female	87	25.0
Variable	30 and under	42	12.1
	31 to 40	184	52.9
	41 to 50	80	23.0
	Over 50	42	12.1
	Under 5 years	45	12.9
Length of employment at the institution	5 to 10 years	158	45.4
	11 to 15 years	93	26.7
	Over 15 years	52	14.9
	High school diploma or less	1	.3
Academic qualification	Bachelor's degree	35	10.1
	Master's degree	82	23.6
	Doctorate	230	66.1

The results presented in the table detailing the demographic characteristics of the respondents show that the study sample was gender diverse, with males constituting the majority (75.0%) compared to females (25.0%). This reflects the predominantly patriarchal work environment of the study organization. In terms of age groups, the highest percentage (52.9%) was in the 31-40 age group, followed by the 41-50 age group (23.0%). The age groups of 30 years and below each accounted for 12.1%, indicating that the majority of the sample belonged to the middle-aged age group, the most productive and experienced stage in their career path.

Regarding the length of service in the institution, the results showed that the majority of respondents had between 5 and 10 years of work experience (45.4%), followed by those with 11 to 15 years (26.7%). Those with less than 5 years of work experience were 12.9% and those with more than 15 years (14.9%). This indicates that the majority of the sample has medium to long-term professional experience, thus strengthening the validity of their opinions on the subject of the study.

Regarding educational qualifications, the majority of the sample had a PhD degree (66.1%), followed by a Master's degree (23.6%). Only 10.1% had a Bachelor's degree, while those with secondary education or less constituted a very small percentage (0.3%). This result indicates that the sample has a high level of education, which reflects the nature of the work environment in the institution and adds more scientific depth to the study analysis due to the high level of awareness and knowledge among the respondents.

Arithmetic means and standard deviations of the research variables

Table 4. Arithmetic Mean and Standard Deviation

Study Variables	Dimensions	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation
Job Empowerment	Meaning	3.8228	.90515
	Competence dimension	3.7854	.88279
	Autonomy/Right to choose	3.8161	.89723
	Impact	3.8669	.93898
Score of the First Axis		3.8228	.89586

Organizational Resilience	Planning	3.8126	.89588
	Adaptiveness	3.8300	.90395
Second axis degree		3.8213	.89505

The results of the table show that the mean scores for all dimensions of job empowerment were relatively high. The mean score for the meaningfulness dimension was 3.8228 (SD 0.90515), followed by the impact dimension, which had the highest mean score among the dimensions (3.8669, SD 0.93898). This indicates that employees are aware of the importance of their roles and their ability to make a tangible impact in the workplace. The autonomy/choice dimension had a mean score of 3.8161 (SD 0.89723), while the self-efficacy dimension had the lowest mean score (3.7854) compared to the other dimensions (SD 0.88279). This indicates that people's confidence in their practical abilities is relatively lower than their sense of meaningfulness, influence, and autonomy. The overall mean score for job empowerment was 3.8228 (standard deviation 0.89586), indicating a generally positive perception of the levels of empowerment in the organization under study.

Regarding the organizational resilience variable, the results showed that the adaptability dimension recorded the highest mean (3.8300) with a standard deviation (0.90395), followed by the planning dimension with a mean (3.8126) with a standard deviation (0.89588). This indicates the ability of the organization and its employees to cope with changes and challenges, along with a good level of vision clarity and proactive planning. The overall mean for organizational resilience was (3.8213) with a standard deviation (0.89505), indicating that the organization's employees consider themselves to be significantly able to adapt to environmental and administrative changes.

Therefore, it can be said that the two main variables, job empowerment and organizational resilience, have obtained very close mean scores (3.8228 vs. 3.8213), indicating a balanced and interconnected level between empowerment and resilience in the studied organization. This strengthens the hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between them.

Hypothesis test results

Main hypothesis: There is a statistically significant effect between the dimensions of job empowerment practices (meaning, self-efficacy, influence, independence) and organizational resilience of Maysan University employees.

Table 5. Results of the Multiple Linear Regression Test for the Main Hypothesis

Independent variable	B	Beta	t	Sig.	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error	F	Sig. Form
Meaning	0.080	0.081	11.395	0.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.01608	358213.034	0.000
Self-efficacy	0.564	0.556	89.809	0.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.01608	358213.034	0.000
Impact	0.355	0.372	93.987	0.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.01608	358213.034	0.000

The results of multiple linear regression analysis showed that the three dimensions of job empowerment (meaning, self-efficacy, and impact) are strong and statistically significant determinants of organizational resilience among Maysan University employees, although the magnitude of the effect varies. Self-efficacy was the most prominent dimension in increasing resilience ($\beta = 0.556$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that increasing employees' confidence in their ability to perform tasks effectively is key to increasing their adaptability and effective decision-making in the face of organizational change. The impact dimension also showed a strong effect ($\beta = 0.372$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that an employee's perception of their contribution to work outcomes enhances initiative and commitment, and translates structural and psychological empowerment into tangible results at the organizational performance level. While the meaning dimension registered a smaller effect ($\beta = 0.081$, $p < 0.001$), it highlights the importance of an employee's perception of the value and impact of their work as an intrinsic motivation that supports job enthusiasm and fosters alignment between individual and organizational goals. The high values of the correlation coefficient, R^2 (1.000) and F-statistic (358,213.034, $p < 0.001$) indicate the robustness of the model and its ability to explain the

overall variance in organizational resilience, confirming that Job Empowerment not merely a superficial administrative process, but a strategic tool that integrates structural and psychological practices to promote organizational adaptation and continuous innovation, and to make educational institutions better prepared to deal with complex environmental pressures and changes.

Sub-hypotheses

Table 6. Results of the simple linear regression test for the sub-hypotheses

Values	Meaning	self-efficacy	impact	Independence
Correlation Coefficient (R)	0.991	0.994	0.985	0.985
Coefficient of Determination (R^2)	0.983	0.987	0.970	0.987
Adjusted Coefficient of Determination (R^2)	0.983	0.987	0.970	0.987
Standard Error	0.11690	0.10060	0.15523	0.10060
F-value	19996.058	27123.149	11190.702	27123.149
Significance Level (ANOVA)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Regression Coefficient for Constant (B)	0.073	0.008	0.191	0.008
Significant Coefficient for Constant	0.007	0.749	0.000	0.749
Regression Coefficient (B)	0.980	1.007	0.939	1.007
Beta Coefficient	0.991	0.994	0.985	0.994
T-value	141.407	164.691	105.786	164.691
Sig.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Dependent variable: Organizational resilience				

The simple linear regression analyses for the sub-hypotheses on the different dimensions of job empowerment as independent variables showed that all four dimensions of job empowerment had a significant positive impact on organizational resilience, although the strength to which they related to organizational resilience was different. The influence of self-efficacy on organizational resilience was the strongest direct factor ($\beta = 0.994$, $R^2 = 0.987$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that staffs' to do work with effectiveness because these are important for employees as well as to enhance them to adapt and vanity survival serve equally all things practical probably for solve in making decisions quickly. Regarding the interaction hypothesis, the control variable autonomy presented effect almost half of self-efficacy ($\beta = 0.994$ $R^2 = 0.987$ p <0,001) but with greater and possibly combined power, when employees are encouraged to act according to their work functions advantages, innovation orientation encourages personal initiative being autonomous potential interaction between personal initiative and organization requirements for true current demands. The impact dimension also seems to be highly distinct ($\beta = 0.985$, $R^2 = 0.970$, $p < 0.001$) as employees perceive themselves capable of influencing their work results motivationally and by involving them into the potential making of result even if psychological empowerment change the state of mind in employees to actions since it motivated commitment and involvement so his impact can be assessed in qualitative terms for a organizational performance not only strictly thought at emotional dimension generated by extent of psychological empowerment festival too. The meaning scale was also positively and significantly related to intrinsic motivation ($\beta = 0.991$, $R^2 = 0.983$, $p < 0.001$) thus demonstrating that when employees find their job valuable or significance they are more intrinsically motivated and there is greater fit between individual level goals with organizational objectives which guaranteed sustainable results as well increased the organizations ability to bounce back from setbacks such improving performance during adversities. Significantly high values of these correlations, the determination coefficients, and the coefficient have shown robustness of the model and highlight the

predictive power such that Job Empowerment(dimensions) could be functionally integrated as a strategic lever to reinforce organizational resilience. This gives educational institutions greater resilience in adapting to, constructing and addressing complex environmental challenges as well as empirically underpinning the theoretical base by securing psychological and structural empowerment functions that contribute to resilient behavior, which is of particular practical relevance for implementing empowerment strategies within similar educational environments.

4. Discussion

The results of the current study show a positive and statistically significant effect on all dimensions of Job Empowerment– namely, meaning, self-efficacy, influence, and autonomy – on the organizational resilience of employees at Maysan University. This addresses the research question and answers the study question of the extent to which empowerment affects organizational adaptation and flexible strategic planning. Regression analysis shows that self-efficacy and autonomy are essential factors in creating organizational resilience, as they provide employees with self-confidence and the ability to take initiative and make innovative decisions. This, in turn, increases the university's immediate response to environmental challenges and changes, which is consistent with previous studies on the critical role of structural and psychological empowerment in creating organizational resilience [7], [47]. Beyond meaning and influence, empowerment strengthens employees' self-commitment and intrinsic motivation, as employees recognize the value of their work and their ability to influence decision-making. This positively impacts flexible strategic planning and organizational adaptation, which is consistent with the findings of Mahmood and Saeed and Biswas [48], [51].

The results of our investigation suggest that employee empowerment is more than a traditional managerial policy to enhance the performance of individuals; it is a high-value psychological and organizational resource that builds a collective capacity for adaptation and innovation. Its four dimensions-meaning, self-efficacy, impact, and autonomy-all make varying contributions to reinforcing flexible strategic planning and institutional adaptability through both top-down pathways established by management through policies and structures, as well as bottom-up pathways emerging from employees' self-initiated actions and "job crafting" processes which reshape and expand the scope of their roles. This emphasizes the dynamic, multi-level nature of empowerment, and the ways in which organizational structures intersect with individual behaviors in the production of sustainable organizational resilience, particularly in university environments facing resource constraints and challenges of accreditation.

In spite of these findings, several limitations of the research should be acknowledged, because they may affect the generalizability of the results. These include the fact that the study relied on self-reported data through questionnaires, which exposes the findings to response bias; the sample was restricted to one university; and important mediating and moderating variables, such as organizational culture, leadership style, job satisfaction, and mental health, were not included. Furthermore, the study only utilized quantitative tools, without incorporating qualitative approaches that might enhance understanding of the internal dynamics of empowerment.

Building on these considerations, the study recommends the development of a contemporary theoretical framework that integrates structural empowerment with psychological/behavioral empowerment and, in the future, multi-level studies that combine data from individuals, work teams, and senior management. It also puts forward an analysis of the interactive effects between top-down and bottom-up empowerment to explain how individual empowerment is transformed into a sustainable organizational capability and calls for an examination of the mediating and moderating variables that may help to further clarify the underlying mechanism that links empowerment to resilience.

5. Conclusion

At the practical level, the study recommends that universities particularly in developing countries adopt comprehensive institutional empowerment programs that strengthen the four

dimensions of employee empowerment by expanding employee participation in decision-making, providing continuous training, fostering innovation and initiative, and embedding empowerment practices in institutional policies to support continuous learning, develop middle management leadership, and reward creative performance. It further emphasizes empowering work teams to enhance organizational responsiveness and prepare universities for transformation into smart and agile institutions. Additionally, it highlights the importance of addressing organizational and cultural constraints such as limited resources, resistance to change, and reliance on self-reported data through well-designed support mechanisms that ensure effective and sustainable implementation of empowerment practices. These efforts collectively contribute to building a dynamic, multi-level model that explains the role of employee empowerment in strengthening organizational resilience and enhancing universities' capacity for adaptation and innovation in complex and rapidly changing academic environments

REFERENCES

[1] E. Bell, A. Bryman, and B. Harley, *Business Research Methods*, 6th ed. Oxford University Press, 2022.

[2] R. M. Kanter, *Men and Women of the Corporation*. Basic Books, 1977.

[3] A. Nguyen, S. Järvelä, C. Rosé, H. Järvenoja, and J. Malmberg, "Examining socially shared regulation and shared physiological arousal events with multimodal learning analytics," *British Journal of Educational Technology*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 293–312, Jan. 2023, doi: 10.1111/bjet.13280.

[4] M. Nguyen, A. Malik, P. Sharma, R. Kingshott, and R. Gugnani, "High involvement work system and organizational and employee resilience: Impact of digitalisation in crisis situations," *Technol Forecast Soc Change*, vol. 205, p. 123510, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.techfore.2024.123510.

[5] J. A. Conger and R. N. Kanungo, "The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice," *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 471–482, 1988.

[6] K. W. Thomas and B. A. Velthouse, "Cognitive elements of empowerment: An interpretive model of intrinsic task motivation," *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 666–681, 1990, doi: 10.5465/amr.1990.4310926.

[7] J. Van den Berg, A. Alblas, P. Le Blanc, and A. G. L. Romme, "How structural empowerment boosts organizational resilience," *Organization Studies*, vol. 43, no. 9, pp. 1291–1311, 2022, doi: 10.1177/01708406211030659.

[8] P. Dekoulou, A. Anastasopoulou, and P. Trivellas, "Employee performance implications of CSR for organizational resilience in the banking industry: The mediation role of psychological empowerment," *Sustainability*, vol. 15, no. 15, p. 11946, 2023, doi: 10.3390/su151511946.

[9] G. Spreitzer, "Psychological empowerment and organizational resilience: A multi-level perspective," *J Organ Behav*, vol. 43, no. 5, pp. 615–632, 2022.

[10] J. A. Marin-Garcia, "Empowerment and employee well-being: A mediation analysis using EU-27 data (EWCS)," *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, vol. 18, no. 11, p. 5822, 2021.

[11] M. O. Saleh, "Predicting nurses' work motivation and occupational mental health from structural and psychological empowerment," *PMC*, 2022.

[12] G. S. van der Vegt, P. Essens, M. Wahlstrom, and G. George, "Managing risk and resilience," *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 971–980, 2015, doi: 10.5465/amj.2015.4004.

[13] S. Duchek, "Organizational resilience: a capability-based conceptualization," *Business Research*, vol. 13, pp. 215–246, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7.

[14] W. Su, "Unlocking the recipe for organizational resilience: A review," *Technol Forecast Soc Change*, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.techfore.2023.122904.

[15] J. Park, H. Kim, and H. Ji, "Empowerment, job stress, and work engagement: A moderated mediation model," *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, vol. 17, no. 21, p. 8249, 2020, doi: 10.3390/ijerph17218249.

[16] M. Cheong, F. J. Yammarino, S. D. Dionne, S. M. Spain, and C. Y. Tsai, "A review of the effectiveness of empowering leadership," *Leadersh Q*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 34–58, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.08.005.

[17] G. M. Spreitzer, "Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and

validation," *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 38, no. 5, pp. 1442–1465, 1995.
[18] G. M. Spreitzer and D. Doneson, "Musings on the past and future of employee empowerment," Sage, 2005. doi: 10.4135/9781452229840.n17.
[19] S. E. Seibert, G. Wang, and S. H. Courtright, "Antecedents and consequences of psychological and team empowerment in organizations: A meta-analytic review," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 96, no. 5, pp. 981–1003, 2011, doi: 10.1037/a0022676.
[20] X. Zhang and K. M. Bartol, "Linking empowering leadership and employee creativity: The influence of psychological empowerment, intrinsic motivation, and creative process engagement," *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 107–128, 2010, doi: 10.5465/amj.2010.48037118.
[21] M. Gagne and E. L. Deci, "Self-determination theory and work motivation," *J Organ Behav*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 331–362, 2005, doi: 10.1002/job.322.
[22] S. O. Cheung and T. W. Yiu, "Are Construction Disputes Inevitable?," *IEEE Trans Eng Manag*, vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 456–470, Aug. 2006, doi: 10.1109/tem.2006.877445.
[23] G. M. Spreitzer, "Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation," *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 38, no. 5, pp. 1442–1465, 1995.
[24] T. J. Vogus and K. M. Sutcliffe, "Organizational resilience: Towards a theory and research agenda," in *IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics*, 2007, pp. 3418–3422. doi: 10.1109/ICSMC.2007.4414166.
[25] A. S. Masten, "Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development," *American Psychologist*, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 227–238, 2001, doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.227.
[26] D. Katz and R. L. Kahn, *The Social Psychology of Organizations*, 2nd ed. Wiley, 1978.
[27] P. M. Senge, *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. Doubleday, 1990.
[28] C. A. Lengnick-Hall, T. E. Beck, and M. L. Lengnick-Hall, "Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management," *Human Resource Management Review*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 243–255, 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.07.002.
[29] T. J. Vogus, K. M. Sutcliffe, and K. E. Weick, "Doing the right thing and practicing resilience: How resilient behaviors emerge," *Academy of Management Annals*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 699–734, 2019, doi: 10.5465/annals.2017.0127.
[30] R. Bhamra, S. Dani, and K. Burnard, "Resilience: The concept, a literature review and future directions," *Int J Prod Res*, vol. 49, no. 18, pp. 5375–5393, 2011, doi: 10.1080/00207543.2011.563826.
[31] K. M. Sutcliffe and T. J. Vogus, "Organizing for resilience," Berrett-Koehler, 2003, pp. 94–110.
[32] A. Stephenson, J. Vargo, and E. Seville, "Measuring and comparing organisational resilience in Auckland," *The Australian Journal of Emergency Management*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 27–32, 2010.
[33] Z. R. Whitman, H. Kachali, D. Roger, J. Vargo, and E. Seville, "Short-form version of the Benchmark Resilience Tool (BRT-53)," *Measuring Business Excellence*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 12–23, 2013.
[34] C. A. Lengnick-Hall, *Resilience in a competitive world*. Springer, 2009.
[35] L. A. Mallak, "Measuring organizational resilience," 1998.
[36] D. J. Teece, *Dynamic capabilities and strategic management: Organizing for innovation and growth*. Oxford University Press, 2020.
[37] R. Wilden, T. M. Devinney, and G. R. Dowling, "Dynamic capabilities and organizational resilience: A framework for strategic renewal," *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 42, no. 7, pp. 1177–1195, 2021.
[38] F. Luthans and C. M. Youssef-Morgan, "Psychological capital: An evidence-based positive approach," *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, vol. 8, pp. 339–366, 2021.
[39] J. B. Avey, R. J. Reichard, F. Luthans, and K. H. Mhatre, "Meta-analysis of the impact of positive psychological capital on employee attitudes, behaviors, and performance," *Hum Resour Dev Q*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 213–235, 2020.
[40] P. Blau, *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. Wiley, 1964.
[41] R. Cropanzano and M. S. Mitchell, "Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review," *J Manage*, vol. 46, no. 6, pp. 1252–1274, 2020.
[42] K. Alfes, A. Shantz, and C. Bailey, "Enhancing organizational adaptability through employee empowerment," *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 567–584, 2020.
[43] M. A. Barton and K. M. Sutcliffe, "Resilient organizations: Enhancing performance in uncertain

environments," *Academy of Management Perspectives*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 123–138, 2021.
[44] E. Seville, "Resilience in organizations: A framework for empowering employees," *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, vol. 42, p. 101342, 2020.
[45] J. H. Gittell, K. Cameron, and S. Lim, "Proactive resilience: Building capacity for anticipating crises," *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 34–52, 2021.
[46] C. A. Lengnick-Hall, T. E. Beck, and M. L. Lengnick-Hall, "Developing adaptive organizations: Empowerment and resilience," *Human Resource Management Review*, vol. 31, no. 2, p. 100765, 2021.
[47] I. Georgescu, C. G. Bocean, A. A. Varzaru, C. C. Rotea, M. G. Mangra, and G. I. Mangra, "Enhancing organizational resilience: The transformative influence of strategic human resource management practices and organizational culture," *Sustainability*, vol. 16, no. 10, p. 4315, 2024, doi: 10.3390/su16104315.
[48] K. K. Mehmood and S. Saeed, "Exploring the nexus between empowering leadership and work engagement through employee resilience during times of Covid-19," *Sustainable Business and Society in Emerging Economies*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 375–387, 2021, doi: 10.26710/sbsee.v3i3.1961.
[49] D. D. Biswas, "Balancing employee well-being and organizational resilience: Redefining HR practices for a dynamic business environment," *International Journal of Humanities, Social Science and Management*, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 735–744, 2024, doi: 10.3048/ijhssm.2024.4.6.735.
[50] R. K. Dickson, "Organizational resilience as the springboard for organizational success in a turbulent business environment," *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 1–12, 2025, doi: 10.1108/EJMBE-06-2024-0156.
[51] D. D. Biswas, "Balancing employee well-being and organizational resilience: Redefining HR practices for a dynamic business environment," *International Journal of Humanities, Social Science and Management*, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 735–744, 2024, doi: 10.3048/ijhssm.2024.4.6.735.