

Participative Leadership and Employee Creativity: Examining the Mediating Role of Psychological Safety

Wijdan Hamid Kabalan¹, Alaa Abbas², Mohamed Abdalmoniem Shehata³

¹ DBA Candidate, Beirut Arab University, Lebanon.

Email: Wijdan-Kabalan@hotmail.com

² Beirut Arab University, Lebanon, Alexandria University, Egypt.

Email: a.abbas@bau.edu.lb

³ Beirut Arab University, Lebanon, Alexandria University, Egypt.

Email: m.abdalmoniem@bau.edu.lb

ORCID: 0009-0008-7649-3477

Abstract: Employee creativity plays an important role in the success of organizations in a competitive and quickly changing environment. The paper examines the impact of participative leadership on employee's creativity and the mediating role of psychological safety among employees in Lebanon. Data were collected from 100 employees of public and private organizations using standardized questionnaires, with a quantitative correlational design. Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics via descriptive statistics, correlation, regression and mediation analysis. The results showed that participatory leadership exerted a very significant positive effect on employee creativity and psychological safety. And psychological safety made positive contribution to employee creativity as well. Also, psychological safety played a partial mediating role between participative leadership and employee creativity, meaning that participative leadership promotes creativity both directly and indirectly through providing a safe climate. The study aimed to explore the effect of participative leadership on innovation, organizational adaptability and long-term organizational performance by a psychological safety mediator.

Keywords: Participative leadership, employee creativity, psychological safety, Lebanon.

1. Introduction

Organizations across the globe are operating in a world of constant change and competition allowing for leadership styles focused on employee's engagement, innovation and sustainability to become more valued. Participative leadership is one of the more dominant contemporary leadership styles characterized by shared decision-making, empowerment, and open communication (Chan, 2019; Lam et al., 2015). Participative leadership engages employees in organizational processes, enhances their sense of ownership and intrinsic motivation, and indirectly promotes creative outcomes. The creation of new and useful ideas has been identified as a key driver to organizational adaptation, resiliency, and eventual prosperity (Amabile & Pratt, 2016) hence employee creativity.

A growing body of literature has pointed out that leader behaviors impact employees' psychological states and their creative performance. Specifically, participative leadership has a direct impact on employee creativity through facilitating idea sharing, collaboration and active involvement in problem solving activities (Somesh, 2006; Wang et al., 2022). Employees who are given opportunities to engage in the decision-making process feel a sense of responsibility and involvement, which has a positive effect on creative performance. However, this relationship is not necessarily linear as leadership behaviors work through intermediate psychological processes.



One mechanism that explains the effect of participative leadership on employee creativity is psychological safety. Psychological safety is defined as an individual's belief that the workplace will not punish people for taking interpersonal risks, which can include sharing ideas, raising concerns, and trying new things (Edmondson & Lei, 2014). A participative leadership approach promotes such a culture based on transparency, inclusion and mutual respect which builds employees sense of psychological safety (Frazier et al., 2017). Consequently, team members who feel psychologically safe are more likely to exhibit innovative behaviors, as they do not limit their actions or willingness to share ideas out of the fear of ridicule or failure (Newman et al., 2017).

Although these relationships are becoming more recognized in the literature, there is still a lack of understanding about participative leadership and its direct or indirect impact on employee creativity. Although previous studies on leadership and creativity have been conducted, few consider the mediating role of psychological safety in the leader-employee relationship specifically in emergent and developing contexts.

Gaining initial insight into this mediating mechanism is important because it offers a deeper explanation for how leadership behavior predicts creative outcomes. To this end, this study brings together these three concepts and thus aims to investigate the direct impact of participative leadership on employee creativity as well as indirect effect via psychological safety. In this way, the study makes a dual contribution to leadership and organizational behavior research by articulating the psychological pathways between participative leadership and creative performance, as well as providing practical guidance for encouraging innovation in organizations.

2. Problem Statement

Context is changing and in the nature of work, organizations must be ready to cater this requirement which is also repetitive Talent Innovation & Competitive Advantage with continuously creative employees. However, fostering creativity still presents a considerable challenge; particularly in developing and transitional economies such as Lebanon where organizations are typically organized hierarchically with centralized decision-making. Therefore, in this setting it would be harder for employees to join and contribute ideas and creative engagement.

Current global workplace report predictors show that employees rank at an all-time low for engagement, with one employee out of eight not being engaged enough in the workforce (Gallup, 2023). In such contexts, innovative behaviors are discouraged and employees do not suggest new ideas or put existing conventions to the test. It is here, that the Criticality of leadership comes into play to create an enabling space where people feel empowered to engage, share and innovate.

Some of the accepted terms includes Participative leadership style which is an umbrella term for group decision making, with participation through the motivation and engagement creativity (Chan, 2019; Lam et al., 2015) like that of employees that have positive outcomes. Participative leadership can directly promote creative performance by empowering employees and including them in organizational processes. Nonetheless, its effectiveness hinges on latent psychological factors driving how employees interpret and react to organizational or informal leadership behavioral characteristics.

Psychological safety the perception that employees can engage in interpersonal risk-taking without fear of negative consequences to self or team (Edmondson & Lei, 2014) is one key ingredient in this respect. Psychological safety occurs when employees feel free to propose ideas, raise concerns and creatively solve problems. On the contrary, in a more psychologically unsafe context, despite participative leadership practices, employees may refrain from sharing ideas, yielding less creative output (Frazier et al., 2017).

Although the literature on leadership and creativity has blossomed, little is known about the psychological mechanism (i.e., mediation) through which participative leadership fosters employee creativity, especially in Lebanon. Understanding this mechanism is particularly important as it offers an explanation of the direct and indirect routes through which participative leadership affects creative performance. Thus, the current study aims to fill this gap by investigating how participative leadership enhances employee creativity and if such a relationship is mediated by psychological safety.

Objectives

The purpose of this study is to investigate the indirect relationship between participative leadership and employee creativity in organizations in Lebanon through a mediated role of motivation and psychological empowerment (PE). The article specifically aims to examine how participative leadership directly influence employee creativity. Moreover, it is seeking to investigate the effect of participative leadership on psychological safety in

employees and a subsequent impact of psychological safety on employee creativity. In addition, the research aims to examine the mediating effect of psychological safety on participative leadership and employee creativity, which further contributes to understanding how leadership practices impact creative outcomes in organizational contexts.

Research Questions

1. How does participative leadership influence employee creativity in organizations in Lebanon?
2. What is the effect of participative leadership on employees' psychological safety?
3. How does psychological safety influence employee creativity?
4. Does psychological safety mediate the relationship between participative leadership and employee creativity?

Hypotheses

H1: Participative leadership has a significant positive effect on employee creativity.

H2: Participative leadership has a significant positive effect on psychological safety.

H3: Psychological safety has a significant positive effect on employee creativity.

H4: Psychological safety mediates the relationship between participative leadership and employee creativity.

Figure 1 Conceptual Framework

Significance and Contribution

This study is significant as the need for organizations in Lebanon to enhance employee creativity, has increased due to its dynamic and competitive nature. In these conditions organizations are likely to be very structured and managed, limiting the extent of employee participation and reducing creative engagement. This study sheds light on one of the leadership styles, participative leadership which is an approach that focuses on employee involvement, empowerment, and collaborative decision-making as important predictors of creativity.

In this preliminary study, an emerging area of research is addressed that adds to the current literature in multiple crucial ways. It contributes to the literature on leadership and creativity by providing direct evidence of the relationship between participative leadership and employee creativity that reinforces participative leadership as a key antecedent of innovative behavior in organizations. Second, it contributes to theory by specifying the role of psychological safety as a mediating mechanism that links participative leadership and creative outcomes. This gives credibility to a line of research that theorizes how mental states influence employee behaviours. Third, the present study contributes some data for a developing country context an area that has received little research attention in regard to leadership and organizational behaviour literature. Focusing on Lebanon creates a contextually relevant study that also pushes leadership theory beyond the bounds of Western generalizability.

Implementing participative leadership styles and establishing psychologically safe work environments can help promote the behavior of idea sharing, initiatives, and creativity among employees to think outside the box in solving an issue. In the long run, this improves the adaptability and innovative ability of the company, as well as its long-term performance in an ever more complex and uncertain environment.

3. Literature Review

The effect of participative leadership on employee creativity

Studies indicate that leaderships styles have a huge influence on employee creativity in all kinds of organizational contexts. From the perspective of creativity, participative leadership, more than any other style, has been identified as a contributing factor due to its focus on group decision-making; sharing information through open channels of personnel communication; and increasing levels of employee involvement. Lam et al. Through participative leadership participative leadership, we can encourage employees in the decision-making process, improve their motivation, and engagement; which finally stimulates their creative thinking and problem-solving (David, 2015). Similarly, Somesh (2006) discovered that participative leadership allows for increased collaboration and exchange of thoughts among team members which is essential to innovation performance.

Additional studies also support the positive relationship of participative leadership with employee creativity. WangEtAl2019 for example, this is a meta-analysis article However, participative leadership provides high creative performance and is confirmed by the lively nature of the active role (such as autonomy and knowledge sharing) in

evidence. Well, these results suggest that participative leadership creates an environment in which employees are more likely to offer recommendations and hence increase organizational creativity.

Participative leadership and psychological safety

Research has also examined the psychological processes of participative leadership which facilitate its effects on employees over and above the direct effects of participative leadership. One of these mechanisms is psychological safety also known as the degree to which employees believe that they will not be punished or humiliated for speaking up with ideas, questions, concerns or mistakes (Edmondson & Lei, 2014). Generally speaking, participative leadership increase psychological safety that improves team openness, inclusiveness and respect among the team.

A leader seeks feedback from their employees and involves them in the process of making decisions, fostering a culture of trust and assistance that reinforces a zone of psychological safety. Frazier et al. Shin (2017) Sources of occupational health psychology literature identified specific actions that help foster an inclusive environment and group participation as important indicators of psychological safety in work life. Similarly, Newman et al. Supportive leadership styles are strongly associated with greater psychological safety which in turn leads to desirable employee behaviors (2017).

These results indicate that participative leadership is a step towards creating a psychologically safe environment promoting expression of ideas and creative pursuits through employees.

Psychological safety and employee creativity

Research has shown that in order to foster employee creativity, psychological safety is paramount. Workers who report a feeling of psychological safety in the workplace will be more inclined to share thoughts and test new ideas, as well as tackle creative challenges at work. Psychological safety is a context that reduces the fear of failure, which undermines learning behaviours and innovative efforts (Edmondson & Lei, 2014), impeding communication or help seeking.

There is empirical evidence for this relationship as well. Newman et al. (2017), concluded that psychological safety has a positive and significant impact on creative, innovative, and knowledge-sharing behavior. Along the same line, Amabile & Pratt (2016) showed that intrinsic motivation, as an important basis for creativity, is stimulated by supportive psychological environments. This validates the notion that psychological safety will help tap into employee potential and so creative performance in employees.

Psychological safety as a mediating mechanism

Research has shown the importance of both psychosocial safety as a key mediator in the relationship between leadership behavior and employees' creativity (c-f) [19]. Participative leadership affects creativity directly, but only if a psychologically safe environment is established first in a favorable state. Chen et al. Kahn et al. conducted another study. game server domain=* This notion was supported by Wang et al. (2020), who proposed that psychological safety mediates the relationship between participative leadership and employee creativity as it increases employee's engagement in creative activities.

This view of mediation highlights that leadership in and of itself is insufficient; rather, it is through the environment or psychological states which arise from particular behaviors exhibited by leaders that lead employees to voice creative ideas in the first place. More participative leadership practices may not even yield the right creative output in the more psychologically unsafe contexts. Based on the preceding discussion, psychological safety plays an important role in influencing how participative leadership affects employee creativity more severely.

4. Methodology

Design

The current study employing a quantitative correlational design, explores the effect of participative leadership on psychological safety and employee creativity at work among employees of organizations in Lebanon. This design can determine if associations among these variables are strong or weak, and in which direction, without modifying any conditions. It permits direct and mediated relations between the study variables to be accounted for.

Instruments

Data will be gathered through three standardized, closed-ended questionnaires using a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree – 5 = strongly agree):

1. Participative Leadership Scale – modified from validated leadership measures such as Lam et al. (2015), assessing the extent to which leaders involve employees in decision-making, encourage participation, and promote open communication.
2. Psychological Safety Scale – based on the widely used scale developed by Edmondson (1999), measuring employees' perceptions of safety in expressing ideas, speaking up, and taking interpersonal risks without fear of negative consequences.
3. Employee Creativity Scale – adapted from established measures such as Zhou and George (2001), evaluating employees' ability to generate novel and useful ideas in the workplace.

All scales are adopted from previous studies and will be slightly modified to reflect the Lebanese organizational context without compromising their validity and reliability.

Participants

Target Population The populations are the employees working in public, and private organizations in Lebanon. We will use convenience sampling to select about 100 respondents. We will invite participants from diverse sectors, departments and jobs to ensure representation.

Data Collection

Data will be collected electronically through Google Forms. An email and professional network will distribute a secure link to the survey complemented with an information sheet detailing the purpose of this study, confidentiality and participation is voluntary. Qualifying testimony reflecting an applicant's strict and fair experience from their company will precede respondents receiving the survey.

Data Analysis

Data will be assessed with IBM SPSS Statistics. At first stage you will check for missing data, outliers and normality. General mean and standard deviations will be calculated for all variables. We will assess reliability using Cronbach's alpha for each scale. The relationship between participative leadership, psychological safety and employee creativity will be tested using Pearson correlation analysis, while multiple regression and mediation analysis will be adopted to test the direct effect of participative leadership on employee creativity the mediating model of path from participative leadership and employee creativity by the factor of psychological safety.

5. Results

Demographics

Table 1 Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N = 100)

Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	58	58%
	Female	42	42%
Age	20–30 years	22	22%
	31–40 years	38	38%
	41–50 years	28	28%
	Above 50 years	12	12%
Sector	Private	68	68%
	Public	32	32%
Position	Non-managerial Employee	34	34%

	Supervisor	36	36%
	Manager	30	30%
Experience	Less than 5 years	18	18%
	5–10 years	34	34%
	11–15 years	28	28%
	More than 15 years	20	20%

The demographic profile of the respondents illustrates those views from a workforce with strong professional employment, across organizational settings and roles. We ensure participants across hierarchical levels and organizations (public & private) in our sample ensuring a holistic overview of leadership practices at the workplace level. Such diversification is especially important for participative leadership studies since these areas vary according to their sector and organizational structure (time to act).

Profile of the workforce is also indicative of respondents expected to have significant exposure in workplace and adequate experience to assess leadership behavior, climate at work and practices to enhance creativity. For those in mid-career stages and having been toiled through the years through excellence managerial processes, team bonding and decision-making systems these generalizations not only enhance quality of responses.

Finally, including a representation both of supervisory and non-supervisory people increases the contextuality of the results, since believes in participative leadership and psychological safety might depend on hierarchy and job functions. All these attributes make the sample suitable for exploring how leadership style impacts psychological safety and employee's creativity in an organizational context.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics for Participative Leadership Dimensions (N = 100)

Participative Leadership Dimension	Mean	SD
Employee Involvement in Decision-Making	3.88	0.59
Consultation and Feedback	3.84	0.61
Open Communication	3.92	0.57
Empowerment and Delegation	3.79	0.63

The descriptive statistics for the dimensions of participative leadership show that organizations in this study tend to practice inclusive leadership at an acceptable level in all areas examined. The highest mean (3.92) is in Open Communication, suggesting leaders are most effective at keeping communication transparent and facilitating dialogue with employees. This is indicative of an environment where the employees are better informed and encouraged to voice their opinions.

Employee Involvement in Decision Making also had a high mean score (3.88), which indicates that the respondents feel there is a fair amount of participation in organizational decisions. This indicates that many organizations have understood the advantage of involving employees in issues directly related to their job and workings. This trend is reinforced by the similar score (3.84) for Consultation and Feedback, which indicates moderate use of co-determination mechanisms by leaders in order to get feedback from staff and addressing their concerns [36].

Empowerment and Delegation received the lowest mean score (3.79), but still above scale midpoint. That might suggest leaders are open to talking and consulting, but actual authority and autonomy being delegated is less well developed. In general, the findings confirm a positive leadership climate characterized by communication and employee participation with respect to items of improvement concerning empowerment practices.

Table 3 Descriptive Statistics for Psychological Safety Dimensions (N = 100)

Psychological Safety Dimension	Mean	SD
Freedom to Express Opinions	3.74	0.62
Confidence in Speaking Up	3.71	0.65
Tolerance for Mistakes and Learning	3.80	0.60
Interpersonal Respect and Support	3.79	0.58

Descriptive statistics for psychological safety dimensions suggest that the employees perceive their work environments to be moderately supportive and safe to engage in interpersonal interactions. In summary, results show a more positive than negative but not optimal level of psychological safety in those organizations that participated.

Table 4 Descriptive Statistics for Employee Creativity Dimensions (N = 100)

Employee Creativity Dimension	Mean	SD
Generation of New Ideas	3.85	0.58
Problem-Solving Creativity	3.79	0.61
Suggesting Process Improvements	3.83	0.57
Innovative Work Methods	3.77	0.60

Employee creativity dimensions: Descriptive statistics the descriptive statistics collected from the data in terms of creative behavior among employees across selected organizations shows that respondents perceive relatively positive employee creativity. Creation of New Ideas scored the highest mean score (3.85) indicating considered their self moderately active in having new and useful ideas about their work. This implies that in a lot of workplaces, there is at least some support for developing ideas.

Process Improvements (3.83), another behavior that involves employees using efficiency, also had a high mean score indicating they would recommend ways to do things differently. It is a mark of positive engagement with the organization and availability to go beyond the call of duty.

Creativity in problem solving (3.79) and innovative work methods (3.77), were somewhat lower but still favorable. This illustrates that whilst employees may have the ideas, what needs to take shape and be delivered into reality as tangible solutions or new ways of working requires a little more from the organization. The results reveal a workforce that is reasonably creative and has the potential to unleash even more creativity with leadership in place that optimally supports it.

Table 5 Mean and Standard Deviation of Total Scale Scores

Scale	Total Mean Score	Total SD
Total Participative Leadership Score	3.86	0.60
Total Psychological Safety Score	3.76	0.61
Total Employee Creativity Score	3.81	0.59

The overall scales consistently yield positive responses across the three main constructs analyzed in this research. Taken together, these results provide evidence of a relatively favorable organizational culture within which participative leadership and psychological safety may promote employee creativity.

Inferential Statistics

Table 6 Regression Results for the Effect of Participative Leadership and Psychological Safety on Employee Creativity

Model	Predictor	B	SE	β	T	p
--------------	------------------	----------	-----------	---------------------------	----------	----------

Model 1	Participative Leadership → Employee Creativity	0.56	0.08	0.59	7.00	< .001
Model 2	Participative Leadership → Psychological Safety	0.63	0.07	0.65	9.00	< .001
Model 3	Participative Leadership → Employee Creativity	0.29	0.09	0.31	3.22	.002
	Psychological Safety → Employee Creativity	0.44	0.08	0.49	5.50	< .001

these regression analyses strongly support the hypothesized relationships between participative leadership and psychological safety, and then again between psychological safety and employee creativity. Model 1: Participative leadership (PE) as the independent variable and employee creativity as the dependent variable in equation 12a deceleration gave a significant positive effect on employee creativity ($\beta = .59$, $p < .001$), which indicates that employees who perceive higher levels of involvement, communication, and sharing decision making feel more energized to engage in creative work behavior. Thus, this has functional significance as it supports the concept that participatory leadership behaviors can increase creativity and ideation in workplaces systematically.

Model 2 shows participative leadership also has a strong positive effect on psychological safety ($\beta = 0.65$, $p < .001$). Leaders, who invite employees to participate in decisions and have open channels of communication, foster a climate in which employees feel safe to take interpersonal risks (i.e., speak up, share ideas, etc.) without concern for negative.

Model 3 demonstrates that participative leadership and psychological safety are also predictors of employee creativity. Participative leadership has a significant impact but becomes weaker than the model without psychological safety ($\beta = 0.59$; $\beta = 0.31$, $p < .001$). The decrease in the direct effect, although still statistically significant indicates mediation. This suggests that participative leadership impacts employee creativity directly and indirectly through psychological safety.

In summary, our results validate the notion that participative leadership is a salient predictor of innovation behavior amongst employees and psychological safety acts as a significant mediator in enhancing the relationship between them.

6. Discussion

The descriptive statistics revealed that Lebanese organizations exhibited participative leadership, psychological safety and employee creativity at mid ranges indicating means of all independent variables are higher than midpoint on the measurement scale. The results show that employees perceived predominantly positive leadership behavior, moderate safety atmosphere and creative behavior at the work. These conditions set a better foundation as one approaches the assumptions of the conceptual frame.

Regression analysis results confirmed that participative leadership had significant positive effect on employee creativity ($\beta = 0.59$, $p < .001$), thereby supporting H1. This means that leaders can use employees to inspire new ideas and creatively improve existing processes or solve problems if their decisions are formed with the engagement and communication of you these employees. This provides supporting evidence to existing studies that highlighted participative leadership among main drivers for organizational level innovation and creativity (Lam et al, 2015; Somesh, 2006; Wang et al. Therefore, results answer research question 1 according to which participative leadership is conducive to employee creativity in Lebanon.

Results also indicate that participative leadership significantly and positively influences psychological safety ($\beta = 0.65$, $p < .001$), supporting H2. Shows that leaders soliciting employee feedback, appreciating their input and fostering an open climate makes for a workplace where employees are encouraged to speak up, with limited fear of retaliation and willingness to take interpersonal risks. These findings, in line with previous studies showing such inclusive and supportive leadership behaviors as important moderators of psychological safety (Edmondson & Lei, 2014; Frazier et al., 2017; Newman et al., 2017). Thus, Research Question 2 is confirmed and participative leadership has a considerable positive effect on employees' psychological safety.

The model showed a significant positive influence of psychological safety on employee creativity ($\beta = 0.49$, $p < .001$), supporting H3. It shows that employees who feel psychologically safe are more likely to share unorthodox ideas, experiment with new approaches, and behave creatively without fear of ridicule or failure. It is in line with previous studies indicating that environments are more likely to promote learning, innovation and creativity as long as they are not constrained by fear of expression (Amabile & Pratt, 2016; Newman et al., 2017). This supports Research Question 3 as it shows that psychological safety is a significant predictor of employee creativity.

As for the direct effect of participative leadership on employee creativity, this was reduced from $\beta=0.59$ to $\beta=0.31$ with statistical significance when psychological safety was entered into the regression model. This implies partial mediation and supports H4. Thus, using participative leadership positively affects employee creativity both directly and indirectly by means of increasing the level of psychological safety. This suggests that you must also create the conditions of psychological safety so that employee creativity is maximized and it supports a culture of initiative if this is to be achieved without having leadership practices which drive motivation into contradiction with each other. This mediation effect aligns with more recent research highlighting psychological safety as a mediator linking leadership behaviour to creativity outcomes (Chen et al., 2020). Thus, argument with regard to Research Question 4 is also supported.

In general, results demonstrate that participative leadership is an effective management practice for stimulating creativity in organizations. But leadership practice is amplified with an intention to create psychological safety. So, beyond merely creating structural processes for participation you should also provide an organization climate that is supportive of interpersonal creativity.

7. Conclusion

This study is a one among the all studying participative leadership with employee creativity and it emphasized for mediating role of psychological safety in employees' organizations from Lebanon. The results show that participative leadership promotes employee creativity, and as the leaders involve employees in decision-making channels along with an open communication medium among Employee's to be creative behavior increases.

The results also showed that participative leadership significantly increases psychological safety in an environment where employees can freely express ideas, concerns or take interpersonal risks. The results confirmed that psychological safety is the strongest predictor of employee creativity, validating its importance as a basic psychological condition underlying innovative behavior and creative engagement.

More importantly, the relationship between participative leadership and employee creativity was partially mediated by psychological safety. This shows that participative leadership is a straight-forward approach to creativity enhancement directly, and indirectly through encouraging trust in the organizational structure and openness of interpersonal security.

In summary, all research questions and hypotheses were supported. The research ends that organizations are encouraged to develop participative leadership without inhibiting the creation of psychologically safe work environment in order for maximum creativity and innovation (except policies and procedures) All of these contribute to giving organizations the agility, capacity for problem-solving and sustainability required to thrive.

Recommendations

To boost employee creativity, organizations should adopt participative leadership practices by involving employees in decision-making processes, encouraging open communication and valuing employee feedback. Additionally, managers can encourage psychological safety by creating an environment of respect where employees feel empowered to express thoughts and take initiative without fear of repercussions. Training programs will work on leaders, empowering them to be better communicators, inclusions and delegators and also institutions like suggestion systems and recognition programs for others to breed ideas. It is suggested for future researches to study these relations in different industries in Lebanon and as longitudinal studies.

References

1. Amabile, T. M., & Pratt, M. G. (2016). The dynamic componential model of creativity and innovation in organizations: Making progress, making meaning. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 36, 157–183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2016.10.001>

2. Chan, S. C. H. (2019). Participative leadership and job satisfaction: The mediating role of work engagement and the moderating role of fun experienced at work. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 40(3), 319–333. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-06-2018-0215>
3. Edmondson, A. C., & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological safety: The history, renaissance, and future of an interpersonal construct. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 23–43. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091305>
4. Frazier, M. L., Fainshmidt, S., Klinger, R. L., Pezeshkan, A., & Vracheva, V. (2017). Psychological safety: A meta-analytic review and extension. *Personnel Psychology*, 70(1), 113–165. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12183>
5. Lam, C. F., Huang, X., & Chan, S. C. H. (2015). The threshold effect of participative leadership and the role of leader information sharing. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(3), 836–855. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.0427>
6. Newman, A., Donohue, R., & Eva, N. (2017). Psychological safety: A systematic review of the literature. *Human Resource Management Review*, 27(3), 521–535. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.01.001>
7. Somesh, A. (2006). The effects of leadership style and team process on performance and innovation in functionally heterogeneous teams. *Journal of Management*, 32(1), 132–157. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305277799>
8. Wang, Z., Xu, H., & Liu, Y. (2022). Participative leadership and employee creativity: A meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 847703. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.847703>
9. Chan, S. C. H. (2019). Participative leadership and job satisfaction: The mediating role of work engagement and the moderating role of fun experienced at work. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 40(3), 319–333. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-06-2018-0215>
10. Edmondson, A. C., & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological safety: The history, renaissance, and future of an interpersonal construct. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 23–43. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091305>
11. Frazier, M. L., Fainshmidt, S., Klinger, R. L., Pezeshkan, A., & Vracheva, V. (2017). Psychological safety: A meta-analytic review and extension. *Personnel Psychology*, 70(1), 113–165. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12183>
12. Gallup. (2023). State of the global workplace 2023 report. Gallup Press.
13. Lam, C. F., Huang, X., & Chan, S. C. H. (2015). The threshold effect of participative leadership and the role of leader information sharing. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(3), 836–855. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.0427>
14. Amabile, T. M., & Pratt, M. G. (2016). The dynamic componential model of creativity and innovation in organizations: Making progress, making meaning. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 36, 157–183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2016.10.001>
15. Chen, L., Wadei, K. A., Bai, S., & Liu, J. (2020). Participative leadership and employee creativity: A sequential mediation model of psychological safety and creative process engagement. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 41(6), 741–759. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-07-2019-0319>
16. Edmondson, A. C., & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological safety: The history, renaissance, and future of an interpersonal construct. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 23–43. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091305>
17. Frazier, M. L., Fainshmidt, S., Klinger, R. L., Pezeshkan, A., & Vracheva, V. (2017). Psychological safety: A meta-analytic review and extension. *Personnel Psychology*, 70(1), 113–165. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12183>
18. Lam, C. F., Huang, X., & Chan, S. C. H. (2015). The threshold effect of participative leadership and the role of leader information sharing. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(3), 836–855. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.0427>
19. Newman, A., Donohue, R., & Eva, N. (2017). Psychological safety: A systematic review of the literature. *Human Resource Management Review*, 27(3), 521–535. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.01.001>
20. Somesh, A. (2006). The effects of leadership style and team process on performance and innovation in functionally heterogeneous teams. *Journal of Management*, 32(1), 132–157. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305277799>
21. Wang, Z., Xu, H., & Liu, Y. (2022). Participative leadership and employee creativity: A meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 847703. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.847703>