



ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 25-08-2026

Accepted: 27-09-2026

Published: 29-09-2026



Journal Access By QR

Journal homepage: <https://ssarpublishers.com/ssarjahss>

Abbreviated Key Title: SSAR J Arts Humanit Soc Sci

Volume 3, Issue 5, (Sep-Oct) 2026, Page 351-361 (Total PP.11)

E-mail: ssarpublishers@gmail.com

Values-Based Leadership and Employee Commitment in Contemporary Organizations: Challenges and Prospects in a Changing World

By

Authors: ¹Michael A. Siyanbola (PhD) & ²Oladimeji S. Ajayi

¹School of Leadership and Governance, International Leadership University, Kenya. Paul Esther Consulting, Nigeria.

²Paul Esther Consulting, Nigeria. James Hope University, Lagos, Nigeria.

ABSTRACT: Contemporary organizations operate amid technological disruption, generational turnover, globalization, and eroding institutional trust, conditions that have elevated values-based leadership (VBL) as a central lever for sustaining employee commitment. Synthesizing conceptual and empirical literatures on values-based, transformational, authentic, servant, and ethical leadership alongside Meyer and Allen's three-component model of organizational commitment, this integrative review develops an account of how leaders' consistent enactment of espoused values shapes employees' affective, normative, and continuance attachment to their organizations. Drawing on evidence spanning healthcare, humanitarian, public-sector, and financial-services contexts, including a deliberate concentration of Sub-Saharan African settings, the review identifies recurring mechanisms: trust, psychological safety, organizational identification, and perceived organizational support, linking values-based leadership to commitment outcomes. It further examines contemporary challenges (artificial intelligence and hybrid work, generational value divergence, political and economic volatility, and resource-constrained public and humanitarian sectors) and prospects (values-anchored artificial intelligence governance, indigenous ethical frameworks such as Ubuntu, and values-centric leadership assessment) shaping the field. A gap statement identifies the field's continuing reliance on Western, single-sector, cross-sectional quantitative designs and its limited integration of indigenous African leadership - philosophies with mainstream leadership theory, and the review proposes an integrative conceptual framework and future research agenda to address it.

KEYWORDS: Values-based leadership, Employee commitment, Organizational behavior, Ethical leadership, Ubuntu, Sub-Saharan Africa.

INTRODUCTION

Organizations in the mid-2020s operate under conditions that differ qualitatively from those that shaped twentieth-century management theory. Generative artificial intelligence is being embedded into decision-making, recruitment, and performance management at a pace that outstrips organizational governance capacity (Muriira et al., 2026); hybrid and distributed work arrangements have unsettled long-standing assumptions about supervision,

socialization, and loyalty (Fraccaroli et al., 2024); and a generational cohort entering the workforce with markedly different expectations about meaning, growth, and well-being is reshaping what employees are willing to tolerate from their employers (Deloitte, 2025). Layered onto these disruptions is a documented erosion of workplace trust: Gallup's (2026) global tracking describes a "great detachment" in which employees remain

formally employed while withdrawing discretionary effort, engagement, and loyalty. Organizations are therefore judged less by financial performance alone and more by whether their leaders' actions are perceived to align with the values the organization claims to hold (Simons, 2002).

This gap between espoused and enacted values sits at the center of a substantial and growing body of leadership scholarship organized around the construct of values-based leadership (VBL): an approach in which leaders guide organizational decisions and behavior according to enduring ethical commitments – integrity, honesty, fairness, accountability, compassion, and service – rather than by positional authority or transactional incentive alone (Copeland, 2014; Kraemer, 2025). Values-based leadership has been theorized as an integrative construct that draws together, without fully collapsing into, the more established paradigms of transformational, authentic, servant, and ethical leadership (Chang et al., 2021; Wæraas et al., 2024), and interest in it has intensified precisely because the environmental volatility described above raises the practical stakes of leaders' values consistency.

The outcome most consistently linked to values-based and adjacent ethical leadership styles in the literature is employee commitment. The psychological attachment binding an employee to an organization, most influentially modeled as a composite of affective (want to stay), continuance (need to stay), and normative (feel obligated to stay) components (Meyer & Allen, 1991, 1997). Commitment matters because it is reliably associated with retention, discretionary effort, and organizational citizenship behavior, and because its erosion, evident in the disengagement trends Gallup (2026) documents, carries measurable costs for organizational performance and continuity.

This paper offers an integrative review of the relationship between values-based leadership and employee commitment as it is currently theorized and evidenced in the literature, with two distinguishing features. First, rather than treating values-based, transformational, authentic, servant, and ethical leadership as separate literatures, it synthesizes them around their shared mechanisms: trust, psychological safety, organizational identification, and perceived organizational

support, that link leader values-consistency to employee attachment. Second, it deliberately foregrounds evidence and organizational contexts from Sub-Saharan Africa, and Kenya in particular, a region whose fast-growing and comparatively young workforce is underrepresented in a literature still dominated by North American, European, and East Asian samples. It articulates an explicit gap statement, proposes an integrative conceptual framework linking values-based leadership to commitment through identified mediating mechanisms and contextual moderators, and closes with implications for theory, practice, and future research.

Literature Review

Conceptualizing Values-Based Leadership

Values-based leadership is most commonly defined as a leadership orientation in which decisions and behaviors are consistently guided by a stable set of ethical values rather than by situational expedience (Copeland, 2014). Kraemer (2025) operationalizes this orientation around four interlocking principles: self-reflection, balance, true self-confidence, and genuine humility, arguing that values-based leaders are distinguished less by which specific values they hold than by the consistency with which they act on them under pressure. This emphasis on consistency connects VBL directly to the construct of behavioral integrity, the perceived alignment between a leader's words and deeds, which Simons (2002) identifies as a primary driver of employee trust independent of the specific content of the values professed.

VBL is best understood as an integrative construct that overlaps substantially with, but is not reducible to, several more established leadership paradigms surveyed comprehensively by Northouse (2022). Transformational leadership emphasizes inspirational motivation and idealized influence in pursuit of collective goals (Bass & Riggio, 2006); authentic leadership emphasizes self-awareness, relational transparency, and an internalized moral perspective (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Walumbwa et al., 2008); servant leadership emphasizes the leader's prioritization of followers' growth and well-being over self-interest (Greenleaf, 1977; Eva et al., 2019); and ethical leadership emphasizes normatively appropriate conduct communicated through both personal action and explicit

reinforcement (Brown & Treviño, 2006). The content of the "values" invoked across these paradigms draws implicitly on broader theories of human values, most influentially Schwartz's (1992) model of universal value types, even where leadership scholars do not explicitly operationalize it. Chang et al. (2021) argue, from a role-theory perspective, that value-based leadership behavior emerges at the frontline of management as these paradigms converge around a shared behavioral core – consistent, other-regarding, ethically grounded conduct – even where the paradigms differ in theoretical emphasis or measurement tradition. Wæraas et al. (2024) similarly characterize values-based leadership as a still-consolidating field whose research agenda would benefit from clearer construct boundaries, while a companion institutional analysis (Wæraas et al., 2025) situates values-based leadership not merely as an individual leader trait but as an institutionally embedded practice sustained by organizational structures, symbols, and routines.

Employee Commitment: Theoretical Foundations

Meyer and Allen's (1991, 1997) three-component model remains the field's dominant framework for conceptualizing organizational commitment. Affective commitment reflects emotional attachment and identification with the organization; continuance commitment reflects a perceived cost of leaving; and normative commitment reflects a felt obligation to remain. The three components are only weakly correlated and predict different outcomes, which matters for values-based leadership research because leader values-consistency is theorized to act primarily on the affective and normative components rather than on continuance commitment, which is driven more by structural and economic constraints (Klein et al., 2021). Klein et al.'s (2021) re-examination of commitment's contemporary antecedents argues that in flexible, boundary-spanning, and increasingly transient employment relationships, commitment has become more voluntary and more target-specific – directed at a supervisor, team, or project as much as at the organization as a whole – raising the theoretical importance of leader-level constructs such as values-based leadership relative to organization-level constructs.

Two theoretical mechanisms link leadership behavior to commitment. Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) holds that employees reciprocate favorable treatment with loyalty and effort, a logic extended by perceived organizational support theory (Eisenberger et al., 1986), which frames commitment as a response to employees' belief that the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being. Psychological contract theory (Rousseau, 1995) frames commitment as contingent on the organization – embodied by its leaders – honoring implicit as well as explicit promises; Griep's (2025) recent analysis of psychological contract breach shows that breaches degrade trust along distinct trajectories that are difficult to fully repair even after the breach is addressed, underscoring the asymmetric cost of values-inconsistent leadership relative to the benefit of values-consistent leadership. Organizational justice – particularly the perceived fairness of decision-making procedures (Colquitt, 2001) – operates alongside these mechanisms as a further conduit through which leader behavior is translated into employee commitment.

The Values-Based Leadership–Commitment Nexus: Empirical Evidence

A substantial body of recent empirical work links ethical, authentic, servant, and transformational leadership – each a proximate expression of values-based leadership – to employee commitment through identifiable mediating mechanisms. Huang et al. (2022) find that ethical leadership predicts organizational commitment through trust and organizational identification; Serang et al. (2024) report a similar pattern linking ethical leadership to both commitment and broader employee behavior; and Barbar et al. (2025), studying public healthcare organizations, find that ethical leadership operates on employee outcomes through psychological meaningfulness, a mechanism with particular relevance to mission-driven and public-service contexts. Makumbe (2025), studying public entities, shows that ethical leadership's effect on organizational citizenship behavior and commitment is mediated by perceived organizational support, directly connecting the ethical-leadership literature to the social-exchange mechanisms described above.

Authentic leadership research shows a comparable pattern, with trust again emerging as a critical moderating or mediating condition. In a Kenyan public financial management context, Gacheru et al. (2023) find that workplace trust moderates the relationship between authentic leadership and employee commitment among managers, such that authentic leadership behaviors translate into commitment only where a baseline of trust already exists – a finding with direct relevance to public and quasi-public organizations operating under scrutiny or resource constraint. Servant leadership research shows convergent results: Godbersen et al. (2024) find that servant leadership predicts both organizational commitment and commitment to one's immediate supervisor, suggesting that values-based leadership behaviors operate simultaneously at the dyadic and organizational levels. Trust and justice perceptions more broadly are shown to jointly foster commitment (González-Cánovas et al., 2024), and Rai and Koodamara (2025) demonstrate, in a moderated-mediation model, that trust in the leader is a necessary conduit through which leadership behavior translates into organizational commitment rather than a parallel or redundant predictor.

Transformational leadership research adds a further layer, with Kaban and Wimko (2024) showing that its effect on commitment is intervened by work–life balance and workplace social support, and Khuzwayo et al. (2023) showing, in a South African customer-service context, that organizational justice mediates the transformational leadership–commitment relationship. Directly on point for the present synthesis, Posner and Han (2024), in an extended global-manager study, find that value clarity – the degree to which leaders can articulate and consistently apply their personal values – predicts commitment-relevant outcomes across highly diverse national and organizational contexts, while Al-Subaey and Durrah (2026) find that the values-based leadership–engagement relationship is itself moderated by an organization's demonstrated sustainable social responsibility, suggesting that values-based leadership's effects are contingent on, rather than independent of, the broader values environment in which it is enacted.

Sectoral and Contextual Illustrations

The mechanisms identified above manifest differently across organizational sectors, particularly where resource constraints, regulatory scrutiny, or mission orientation reshape what "values-based" leadership demands of leaders in practice. In faith-based and mission-driven healthcare organizations, Susilowati et al. (2025) find that religiously grounded values-based leadership functions as a competitive strategy in Christian hospitals, converting mission commitment into a source of organizational distinctiveness and, by extension, employee attachment – an argument consistent with sector-specific commitments observed in mission hospitals across East Africa. In Kenya's banking sector, sustainability and purpose-linked reporting by major financial institutions (e.g., KCB Group, 2023) illustrates how values-based commitments are increasingly formalized as governance instruments in a sector simultaneously undergoing rapid digital transformation, a combination that places particular pressure on leaders to demonstrate values-consistency even as automation reshapes roles and the nature of supervisory relationships.

Kenya's humanitarian and refugee-response sector illustrate a distinct set of tensions. The Refugees Act, 2021 and the subsequent Shirika Plan (Government of Kenya, 2025) shifted national policy from an encampment model toward socio-economic integration, a transition the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has characterized as a landmark reorientation of refugee governance in the region (UNHCR, 2025). Humanitarian organizations operating through this transition must reconcile donor accountability requirements, host-community expectations, and beneficiary dignity, placing values-based leadership under sustained external pressure rather than allowing it to operate as a purely internal organizational choice. Kenya's public integrity institutions present a related dynamic: bodies such as the Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission operate under an explicit strategic mandate to sustain public trust amid political scrutiny and resource limitation (Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission, 2023), conditions under which values-based leadership functions simultaneously as an internal management practice and an external legitimacy claim.

Challenges to Values-Based Leadership in a Changing World

Technological Disruption and the Artificial Intelligence Transition

The rapid diffusion of generative artificial intelligence into organizational decision-making is reshaping the conditions under which values-based leadership must operate. Muriira et al. (2026) document the accelerating integration of AI-augmented, data-driven decision-making across business functions globally, a shift that raises new questions about accountability when decisions are jointly produced by human leaders and algorithmic systems. Kim and Kim (2026) show that employees' willingness to adopt and trust generative AI tools in organizational settings is shaped by perceived risk and habitual use patterns as much as by formal policy, meaning that leaders cannot simply mandate AI adoption without attending to the trust dynamics that also underlie values-based leadership more broadly. Heim et al. (2026), in a systematic review of responsible leadership, argue that existing leadership frameworks are not yet adequate to the accountability demands AI-augmented decision-making introduces, and call for theoretical frameworks – values-based leadership prominent among them – capable of anchoring leader accountability as decision authority becomes increasingly distributed between people and systems.

Hybrid and Distributed Work

The normalization of hybrid and remote work arrangements, accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic and since sustained as a durable feature of organizational life, has altered the visibility of leader behavior on which employee trust judgments depend. Contreras et al. (2020) identify e-leadership and teleworking as conditions under which the behavioral cues employees traditionally use to assess leader values-consistency – informal observation, incidental interaction, physical presence during difficult decisions – become scarcer, placing greater interpretive weight on the comparatively few interactions that do occur. Fraccaroli et al. (2024), reviewing work design in the contemporary economy, argue that hybrid arrangements have not merely relocated work but have restructured the psychological contract itself,

requiring leaders to establish values-consistency through more deliberate and explicit means than physical co-presence previously allowed.

Generational Value Divergence

The workforce cohort now entering organizations carries expectations that diverge in documented ways from those of prior generations. Deloitte's (2025) global survey of Gen Z and Millennial employees finds that this cohort explicitly prioritizes meaning, personal growth, and well-being alongside compensation, and reports willingness to leave employers whose leadership does not visibly reflect the employee's own values. This generational shift intensifies, rather than creates, the demand for values-based leadership, but it also raises the practical difficulty of leading a workforce whose members may hold heterogeneous personal value sets, requiring leaders to distinguish between the values consistency that builds trust across a diverse workforce and value uniformity, which is neither achievable nor desirable in pluralistic organizations.

Eroding Institutional Trust

Gallup's (2026) global tracking data describe a broad-based "great detachment," in which formal employment continues even as engagement, discretionary effort, and institutional trust decline. This trend is consistent with Griep's (2025) finding that psychological contract breaches produce durable, difficult-to-reverse trust deficits, and with Simons's (2002) earlier identification of behavioral integrity gaps as a primary driver of employee cynicism. Together, this literature suggests that the cost of values-inconsistent leadership has risen even as the technological and generational pressures described above have made values-consistency harder to sustain and to demonstrate.

Resource-Constrained and High-Volatility Sectors

The challenges above are amplified in sectors operating under acute resource constraint, political volatility, or donor dependency – conditions disproportionately concentrated in public, humanitarian, and Global South organizational contexts. The World Economic Forum's (2025) Future of Jobs Report documents substantial projected labor-market disruption concentrated in

economies with the least institutional capacity to manage it, while Kenya's ongoing refugee-policy transition (Government of Kenya, 2025) and its public integrity institutions' operation under sustained political and public scrutiny (Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission, 2023) illustrate organizational settings in which values-based leadership must be sustained with comparatively limited institutional and financial support, and under public accountability pressures largely absent from the private-sector, high-income-country contexts that dominate the empirical literature.

Prospects and Emerging Opportunities

Integrating Indigenous Ethical Philosophies with Mainstream Leadership Theory

A promising direction for the field lies in integrating indigenous ethical and leadership philosophies with the predominantly Western theoretical vocabulary of values-based leadership. Ubuntu – the Southern and Eastern African relational-humanist philosophy summarized in the maxim that a person becomes a person through other persons. This offers a distinctively collectivist and relational account of values-based leadership that complements, rather than merely translates, the individually anchored constructs of authenticity and integrity that dominate the mainstream literature. Chetty (2024) provides empirical evidence that Ubuntu leadership predicts employee engagement in a South African organizational sample, while Sachikonye (2024) develops a meta-theoretical account of Ubuntu's implications for responsible leadership across African organizational contexts more broadly. Integrating these frameworks with the leadership paradigms reviewed above offers a route toward a more globally representative theory of values-based leadership, one in which commitment is understood not only as an individual psychological state but also as an outcome of relational and communal obligation.

Values-Anchored Artificial Intelligence Governance

Rather than treating artificial intelligence solely as a challenge to values-based leadership, an emerging strand of scholarship frames it as an occasion to formalize values-based governance more explicitly than organizations have previously required. Heim

et al.'s (2026) responsible-leadership framework and Kim and Kim's (2026) trust-centered account of generative AI adoption both point toward a model in which leaders make values commitments explicit within AI governance structures themselves – for example, by specifying which decisions remain reserved for human judgment on ethical grounds – rather than leaving values-consistency to be inferred from leader behavior alone. This represents an opportunity to institutionalize values-based leadership in organizational structure rather than relying solely on individual leader disposition.

Values-Centric Leadership Assessment and Development

Ortiz-Marcos et al. (2026) propose a values-centric approach to leadership assessment intended to complement competency- and performance-based assessment traditions, offering organizations a mechanism to identify and develop values-consistent leadership capability systematically rather than relying on ad hoc judgment. Combined with Kraemer's (2025) four-principle framework as a practical development curriculum, this line of work suggests a path toward embedding values-based leadership into recruitment, promotion, and leadership-development systems rather than treating it as an individual disposition largely outside organizational control.

Psychological Safety as an Amplifying Mechanism

Edmondson's (2019) account of psychological safety – the shared belief that a team is safe for interpersonal risk-taking – offers a mechanism through which values-based leadership's effects on commitment can be amplified. Where leaders establish psychological safety alongside values-consistency, employees are more able to voice concerns, report ethical lapses, and engage in the discretionary behaviors that affective and normative commitment predict, suggesting that psychological safety functions less as a competing explanation for commitment outcomes than as a condition that determines how fully values-based leadership's potential effects are realized.

Gap Statement

Despite an expanding empirical literature linking values-based, ethical, authentic, servant, and transformational leadership to employee

commitment, three related gaps limit the field's current explanatory reach. First, a geographic and cultural concentration persists: the empirical base reviewed above, like the broader literature it represents, remains weighted toward North American, European, and East Asian organizational settings, with African evidence – where present – concentrated disproportionately in South Africa (e.g., Chetty, 2024; Khuzwayo et al., 2023; Sachikonye, 2024) relative to East African and other Sub-Saharan contexts, despite this region containing some of the world's youngest and most rapidly growing workforces. Second, theoretical fragmentation persists: values-based, ethical, authentic, servant, and transformational leadership continue to be studied largely as parallel literatures with distinct measurement traditions rather than as an integrated construct space, and indigenous ethical philosophies such as Ubuntu remain, at best, a specialized subliterate rather than an integrated component of mainstream leadership theorizing. Third, methodological concentration persists: the reviewed evidence base is dominated by cross-sectional quantitative designs testing bivariate or simple mediation relationships within single sectors, leaving comparatively little multi-sectoral or mixed-methods evidence capable of explaining why the values-based leadership–commitment relationship appears to strengthen, weaken, or operate through different mechanisms across sectors facing markedly different resource, regulatory, and trust conditions – for example, humanitarian, public-integrity, faith-based, and

financial-services contexts, each represented in the sectoral illustrations above.

This review addresses the first two gaps directly, through a cross-sectoral synthesis that deliberately foregrounds Kenyan and Sub-Saharan African organizational evidence alongside the dominant Western literature, and through an explicit integration of Ubuntu-based scholarship with mainstream values-based, ethical, authentic, and servant leadership constructs. It addresses the third gap indirectly, by proposing – in the framework that follows – a set of testable relationships intended to guide the comparative, multi-sectoral, and mixed-methods research the field currently lacks.

Toward an Integrative Conceptual Framework

Synthesizing the literature reviewed above, values-based leadership can be modeled as operating on employee commitment through four converging mediating mechanisms – trust, psychological safety, organizational identification, and perceived organizational support – whose relative strength is shaped by contextual moderators including sector type, generational composition of the workforce, the resource and regulatory environment, and the cultural frame (including but not limited to Ubuntu-consistent relational norms) within which leadership is interpreted. Table 1 summarizes this integrative framework, linking each element to representative evidence from the review above.

Table 1

Integrative Framework Linking Values-Based Leadership to Employee Commitment

Framework element	Description	Representative evidence
Antecedents	Leader value clarity and behavioral integrity; organizational values infrastructure (governance, assessment, development systems); cultural frame (e.g., Ubuntu-consistent relational norms)	Simons (2002); Kraemer (2025); Ortiz-Marcos et al. (2026); Chetty (2024); Sachikonye (2024)
Mediating mechanisms	Trust in leader; psychological safety; organizational identification; perceived organizational support	Huang et al. (2022); Rai & Koodamara (2025); Edmondson (2019); Eisenberger et al. (1986)
Commitment outcomes	Affective, normative, and continuance commitment (differentially predicted)	Meyer & Allen (1991, 1997); Klein et al. (2021)

Contextual moderators	Sector type and resource environment; generational composition; technological disruption intensity; regulatory and public-accountability pressure	Gacheru et al. (2023); Deloitte (2025); Heim et al. (2026); Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission (2023)
-----------------------	---	--

This framework generates several propositions suitable for future empirical testing: that leader behavioral integrity predicts commitment primarily through trust and identification rather than directly; that the strength of these mediated paths is attenuated in low-trust or high-scrutiny sectors (public integrity, humanitarian response) unless psychological safety is independently established; that generational composition moderates which commitment component (affective versus normative) is most responsive to values-based leadership; and that Ubuntu-consistent relational norms, where present, may strengthen normative commitment pathways in ways not fully captured by leader-focused Western constructs alone.

Implications for Theory and Practice

Theoretically, this synthesis supports treating values-based leadership as an integrative rather than competing construct relative to transformational, authentic, servant, and ethical leadership, and supports incorporating indigenous relational-ethical frameworks such as Ubuntu as a generalizable theoretical resource rather than a culturally bounded curiosity. Doing so both broadens the field's geographic representativeness and offers a relational, rather than purely individual, account of how commitment is built and sustained.

For practice, the review's synthesis suggests several concrete implications. Leadership development programs should target behavioral integrity and value clarity directly, following frameworks such as Kraemer's (2025) four principles, rather than treating values-based leadership as an unteachable disposition. Organizations operating in low-trust or high-scrutiny sectors – public integrity bodies, humanitarian organizations, faith-based healthcare institutions – should treat psychological safety as a precondition for, rather than a byproduct of, values-based leadership's effect on commitment, given the moderating role trust plays in contexts such as Kenyan public financial management (Gacheru et al., 2023). Organizations adopting AI-augmented

decision-making should make values commitments explicit within governance structures themselves, following the logic of responsible-leadership frameworks (Heim et al., 2026), rather than assuming that existing values-based leadership practices will automatically extend to human–AI decision contexts. Finally, organizations serving multigenerational workforces should distinguish between building values-consistency, which supports commitment broadly, and enforcing value uniformity, which pluralistic and generationally diverse workforces are unlikely to accept (Deloitte, 2025).

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

This review is conceptual and integrative rather than systematic, and its sectoral illustrations, while grounded in the published and organizational literature cited throughout, are intended to be illustrative rather than exhaustive or statistically representative. The framework proposed above has not itself been empirically tested and should be treated as a set of propositions for future research rather than an established model. Future work should pursue a systematic or meta-analytic review capable of quantifying the relative strength of the mediating mechanisms identified here across sectors and regions; primary comparative research – ideally multi-country and multi-sector within Sub-Saharan Africa – capable of testing whether the values-based leadership–commitment relationship operates differently across the resource, regulatory, and cultural conditions this review has highlighted; and empirical work explicitly integrating Ubuntu and other indigenous ethical frameworks with established values-based, ethical, authentic, and servant leadership measures, rather than studying them in isolation from one another.

Conclusion

As organizations navigate artificial intelligence adoption, hybrid work, generational turnover, and a documented erosion of institutional trust, the consistency between leaders stated and enacted values has become a central determinant of

employee commitment rather than a peripheral concern of organizational culture. This review has synthesized the theoretical and empirical literature connecting values-based leadership to employee commitment through trust, psychological safety, organizational identification, and perceived organizational support, illustrated that relationship across healthcare, humanitarian, public-integrity, and financial-services contexts with particular attention to Sub-Saharan Africa, and identified a persistent gap in the field's geographic, theoretical, and methodological scope. The integrative framework and research agenda proposed here are offered as a step toward a more globally representative and theoretically integrated account of how values-based leadership sustains employee commitment in a changing world.

REFERENCES

- Al-Subaey, F. S., & Durrah, O. (2026). Values-based leadership and workplace engagement: Unpacking the moderating role of sustainable social responsibility. *Administrative Sciences*, 16(6), Article 288. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci16060288>
- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 315–338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.001>
- Barbar, J., Abualigah, A., Dahleez, K., Abou-Al-Ross, S., & Aboramadan, M. (2025). Ethical leadership and public healthcare organizational and employee outcomes: The role of psychological meaningfulness. *Leadership in Health Services*, 38(1), 32–53. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LHS-04-2024-0039>
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Psychology Press.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Wiley.
- Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 595–616. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004>
- Chang, S. M., Budhwar, P., & Crawshaw, J. (2021). The emergence of value-based leadership behavior at the frontline of management: A role theory perspective and future research agenda. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, Article 635106. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.635106>
- Chetty, N. (2024). Ubuntu leadership as a predictor of employee engagement: A South African study. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22, Article a2462. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v22i0.2462>
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386–400. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386>
- Contreras, F., Baykal, E., & Abid, G. (2020). E-leadership and teleworking in times of COVID-19 and beyond: What can we expect? *Leadership*, 16(5), 533–549. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715020935965>
- Copeland, M. K. (2014). The emerging significance of values-based leadership: A literature review. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8(2), 105–135.
- Deloitte. (2025). *2025 Gen Z and millennial survey: Money, meaning, and well-being*. Deloitte Insights. <https://www.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/topics/talent/2025-gen-z-millennial-survey.html>
- Edmondson, A. C. (2019). *The fearless organization: Creating psychological safety in the workplace for learning, innovation, and growth*. Wiley.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>
- Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission. (2023). *Strategic plan 2023–2028: Sustaining the fight against corruption and economic crime in Kenya*. Government of Kenya.
- Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Servant leadership: A systematic review and call for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 30(1), 111–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.07.004>
- Fraccaroli, F., Zaniboni, S., & Truxillo, D. M. (2024). Challenges in the new economy: A new era for work design. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 11, 307–335.

- <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-081722-053704>
- Gacheru, W., Karimi, J., & Kangu, M. (2023). Workplace trust's moderating effect on the relationship between authentic leadership and employee commitment among managers in Kenyan public financial management reforms agencies. *Research Journal of Business and Finance*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.58721/rjbf.v2i1.204>
- Gallup. (2026). *State of the global workplace 2026: The human side of the AI revolution*. Gallup Press.
- Godbersen, H., Dudek, B., & Ruiz Fernández, S. (2024). The relationship between organizational commitment, commitment to supervisor and servant leadership. *Frontiers in Organizational Psychology*, 2, Article 1353959. <https://doi.org/10.3389/forgp.2024.1353959>
- González-Cánovas, A., Trillo, A., Bretones, F. D., & Fernández-Millán, J. M. (2024). Trust in leadership and perceptions of justice in fostering employee commitment. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, Article 1359581. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1359581>
- Government of Kenya. (2021). *The Refugees Act, 2021*. National Council for Law Reporting. <https://kenyalaw.org/akn/ke/act/2021/10/eng@2021-12-03>
- Government of Kenya. (2025). *Shirika Plan: For refugees and host communities*. Ministry of Interior and National Administration. <https://refugee.go.ke/sites/default/files/2025-04/SHIRIKA%20PLAN%20FOR%20REFUGES%20AND%20HOST%20COMMUNITIES.pdf>
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Paulist Press.
- Griep, Y. (2025). Breaking promises, breaking trust: How psychological contract breach relates to trust trajectories and performance. *European Management Journal*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2025.10.007>
- Heim, I., Laker, B., & Tabaeifard, S. J. (2026). Responsible leadership: A systematic literature review, theoretical framework, and future research directions. *Journal of Business Research*, 203, Article 115801. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2025.115801>
- Huang, Y., Li, P., & Zhang, J. (2022). Ethical leadership and employee organizational commitment: The role of trust and organizational identification. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 906792. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.906792>
- Kaban, L. M., & Wimko, R. (2024). Linking transformational leadership and employee commitment: Intervening role of work-life balance and workplace social support. *Jurnal Muara Ilmu Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 8(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.24912/jmie.v8i1.29592>
- KCB Group. (2023). *KCB Group sustainability report 2023: A sustainable future driven by growth and collective purposeful actions*. KCB Group Limited.
- Khuzwayo, A. B., Flotman, A.-P., & Mitonga-Monga, J. (2023). Transformational leadership, organisational justice, and employee commitment in a customer service organisation. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 49, Article a1979. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v49i0.1979>
- Kim, B., & Kim, D. (2026). Understanding the role of trust, perceived risk, and habit in organization members' generative AI use. *SAGE Open*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251410620>
- Klein, H. J., Cooper, J. T., Molloy, J. C., & Swanson, J. A. (2021). The experience of commitment in the contemporary workplace: An exploratory reexamination of commitment model antecedents. *Human Resource Management*, 60(6), 885–902. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.22101>
- Kraemer, H. M. J., Jr. (2025). *From values to action: The four principles of value-based leadership* (2nd ed.). Wiley.
- Makumbe, W. (2025). Linking ethical leadership to organisational citizenship behaviour and organisational commitment in public entities: The mediating role of perceived organisational support. *Journal of Management Development*, 44(6), 760–774. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-04-2025-0169>
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61–89. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(91\)90011-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z)

- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Sage.
- Muriira, V. K., Vasudevan, A., Ali, K. S., Nyakundi, K. S. P., Spéciose, N. N., & Gicheru, P. (2026). AI-augmented mobile and data-driven decision making in business: Mapping global research trends for decent work, economic growth, and innovation. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies*, 20(7), 123–137. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v20i07.61107>
- Northouse, P. G. (2022). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (9th ed.). Sage.
- Ortiz-Marcos, I., Fernández-Ferreras, F. J., García-Galán, R., & Crane, B. (2026). The state of leadership assessment in organizations: Introducing a values-centric approach. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 47(3), 572–592. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-07-2025-0581>
- Posner, B. Z., & Han, J. (2024). How values and value clarity still matter: An extended study of global managers. *The Journal of Values-Based Leadership*, 17(1), Article 7.
- Rai, S. S., & Koodamara, N. K. (2025). How does trust in leader influence organizational commitment? A test of a moderated mediation model. *Acta Psychologica*, 257, Article 105092. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.105092>
- Rousseau, D. M. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements*. Sage.
- Sachikonye, M. (2024). A meta-theory of ubuntu: Implications for responsible leadership in Africa. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 55(1), Article a4342. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajbm.v55i1.4342>
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1–65). Academic Press. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60281-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60281-6)
- Serang, S., Ramlawati, Suriyanti, Junaidi, & Nurimansjah, R. A. (2024). The role of ethical leadership on employees' behaviours and commitment to the organisation. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22, Article a2373. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v22i0.2373>
- Simons, T. (2002). Behavioral integrity: The perceived alignment between managers' words and deeds as a research focus. *Organization Science*, 13(1), 18–35. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.13.1.18.543>
- Susilowati, K., Suharti, L., & Sugiarto, A. (2025). Faith as competitive strategy: The value-based leadership advantage in Christian hospitals. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 28(1), Article a6180. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajems.v28i1.6180>
- UNHCR. (2025). *UNHCR hails launch of Kenya's landmark refugee inclusion plan*. <https://www.unhcr.org/news/press-releases/unhcr-s-grandi-hails-launch-kenya-s-landmark-refugee-inclusion-plan>
- Wæraas, A., Aadland, E., & Locatelli, G. (2024). Values-based leadership: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Public Leadership*, 20(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPL-06-2023-0035>
- Wæraas, A., Askeland, H., & Espedal, G. (2025). If these walls could talk: An institutional perspective on values-based leadership. *The Journal of Values-Based Leadership*, 18(2), Article 14.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*, 34(1), 89–126. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307308913>
- World Economic Forum. (2025). *The future of jobs report 2025*. World Economic Forum. <https://www.weforum.org/publications/the-future-of-jobs-report-2025/>