

Original Research

Received 09 June 2026

Revised 21 July 2026

Accepted 04 Aug 2026

Natural Resources for Human Health 2026, Vol. 6 (15s): 468–478

KEYWORDS:

inclusive leadership; employee performance; organizational culture; affective commitment; public sector; BerAKHLAK; PLS-SEM

Inclusive Leadership and Employee Performance in the Public Sector: A Dual-Mediation Model of Organizational Culture and Affective Commitment

Erin Kurniawan Elizon¹, Dedy Takdir Dedy Syaifuddin¹, Yusuf¹, Laode Asfahyadin Aliddin¹

¹Doctoral Program in Management Science, Postgraduate Program, Universitas Halu Oleo, Kendari, Southeast Sulawesi, Indonesia

ABSTRACT: This study examines how inclusive leadership translates into civil-servant performance through two complementary mechanisms: organizational culture and affective commitment. A quantitative explanatory survey was conducted among 113 civil servants at the Department of Cipta Karya, Construction Development and Spatial Planning of Southeast Sulawesi Province, Indonesia. Data were collected using a five-point Likert questionnaire and analyzed with partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) in SmartPLS 4.1.3. The measurement model demonstrated satisfactory convergent validity and composite reliability. Inclusive leadership had no significant direct effect on employee performance ($\beta = -0.017$, $p = 0.762$), but significantly predicted the BerAKHLAK organizational culture ($\beta = 0.629$, $p < 0.001$) and affective commitment ($\beta = 0.207$, $p = 0.032$). Organizational culture significantly predicted affective commitment ($\beta = 0.656$, $p < 0.001$) and employee performance ($\beta = 0.547$, $p < 0.001$), while affective commitment also improved performance ($\beta = 0.421$, $p < 0.001$). Mediation tests show that organizational culture significantly transmits the effect of inclusive leadership to performance ($\beta = 0.344$, $p < 0.001$), whereas affective commitment does not mediate that direct leadership–performance relationship ($\beta = 0.087$, $p = 0.055$). However, affective commitment significantly mediates the effect of organizational culture on performance ($\beta = 0.276$, $p < 0.001$). The findings reveal that, in a rule-bound public-sector setting, inclusive leadership becomes performance-relevant primarily when relational leadership practices are institutionalized as shared organizational values. The study extends inclusive-leadership research by distinguishing organizational and psychological mediation mechanisms in the Indonesian civil-service context.

1. INTRODUCTION

Public organizations face simultaneous pressures to improve service quality, accountability, adaptability, and collaboration while operating within formal rules and hierarchical structures. These conditions make leadership consequential but also constrain the extent to which a leader's interpersonal behavior can be translated immediately into measurable employee performance. Inclusive leadership is particularly relevant because it emphasizes employee participation, respect for difference, fair treatment, recognition of contributions, and the integration of diverse perspectives. Contemporary public-management research increasingly treats inclusion not merely as a diversity objective but as a behavioral leadership capability that can shape participation and performance in public organizations (Ashikali & Van Luttervelt, 2026; Ashikali, 2023; Bernards et al., 2025).

The foundational literature conceptualizes inclusive leadership as leader behavior that creates openness, accessibility, and availability while explicitly inviting and appreciating employee input (Nemhard & Edmondson, 2006; Carmeli et al., 2010). Inclusion also involves simultaneously satisfying employees' needs for belongingness and uniqueness (Shore et al., 2011), which

Randel et al. (2018) translated into a leadership framework centered on belongingness, value in uniqueness, fair treatment, recognition, and involvement. These behaviors can generate psychological safety, meaningful participation, and stronger leader–member relationships, all of which are important precursors to positive work outcomes (Edmondson, 1999; Shafaei & Nejati, 2024).

Evidence nevertheless suggests that the relationship between inclusive leadership and performance is not uniformly direct. Public-sector studies show that inclusive leadership can support inclusive climates, workplace spirituality, engagement, and job performance, but the effect depends on organizational and relational mechanisms (Ashikali et al., 2021; Ke et al., 2022). Recent studies similarly show that inclusive leadership can influence performance through strengths use, work engagement, innovative behavior, and other intervening processes rather than through a simple direct path (Shafaei & Nejati, 2024; Eshete et al., 2025; Maatita & Astuti, 2026). This makes mediation mechanisms central to explaining when inclusive leadership actually becomes performance-relevant.

Two mechanisms are especially important in the Indonesian civil-service context. The first is organizational culture. Schein and Schein (2017) describe culture as shared assumptions and values that guide organizational behavior, while Denison and Mishra (1995) connect cultural traits with organizational effectiveness. For Indonesian civil servants, the national BerAKHLAK core values—service orientation, accountability, competence, harmony, loyalty, adaptability, and collaboration—provide an institutional framework through which leadership behavior can be translated into shared expectations. The second mechanism is affective commitment, defined as employees' emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer et al., 2002).

Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005) and Leader–Member Exchange theory (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) provide complementary explanations. Inclusive treatment can be interpreted as a relational investment that encourages reciprocity through positive attitudes and behaviors. High-quality leader–member relationships build trust and respect, while supportive organizational experiences can foster emotional attachment. Yet in public bureaucracies, interpersonal reciprocity may need to be institutionalized through shared values before it consistently shapes task performance. This suggests a distinction between an organizational mechanism (culture) and a psychological mechanism (affective commitment).

A particularly relevant benchmark is Srimulyani et al. (2023), who examined inclusive leadership, AKHLAK corporate culture, affective commitment, and employee performance in Indonesian state-owned enterprises. Their study reported important mediation effects and recommended extending the model to civil servants using the ASN BerAKHLAK values. The present study responds to that agenda by moving the model from a state-owned-enterprise setting to a provincial public agency and by testing the different functions of organizational culture and affective commitment in the same structural model. This contextual extension matters because civil-service performance is embedded in statutory responsibilities, public accountability, and standardized administrative values that differ from corporate employment arrangements.

Accordingly, this study investigates whether inclusive leadership improves civil-servant performance directly or primarily through organizational culture and affective commitment. The study contributes in three ways. First, it tests inclusive leadership in an Indonesian provincial-government agency, adding evidence from a non-Western public-sector setting. Second, it operationalizes organizational culture through the seven ASN BerAKHLAK values rather than the six-value corporate AKHLAK configuration. Third, it separates the organizational and psychological pathways, allowing the analysis to identify which mediator actually converts inclusive leadership into performance and whether affective commitment becomes more consequential after shared values are internalized.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES

2.1 Inclusive leadership and social exchange

Inclusive leadership treats employees as valued organizational members while recognizing individual differences. Nemhard and Edmondson (2006) emphasize explicit invitations to contribute, Carmeli et al. (2010) stress openness, availability, and accessibility, and Randel et al. (2018) integrate belongingness with value in uniqueness. These approaches converge on the idea that employees are more willing to invest effort when leaders reduce status barriers, recognize contributions, and make participation safe. Recent public-sector work further shows that inclusive leadership can be conceptualized through observable behaviors that enable full participation and integration of diverse perspectives (Ashikali & Van Luttervelt, 2026).

Social exchange provides the reciprocal logic for these effects. Employees who receive fair treatment, recognition, voice, and support are likely to reciprocate with stronger attachment and constructive work behavior (Blau, 1964; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). LMX theory adds a dyadic explanation: high-quality leader–member exchanges are characterized by trust, respect, and mutual obligation (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Inclusive leadership should therefore strengthen both shared cultural expectations and affective commitment, even when the direct effect on formal performance is constrained by bureaucratic systems.

2.2 Organizational culture as an institutional mechanism

Organizational culture transforms repeated leadership behaviors into shared meanings and behavioral standards. Leaders influence culture through what they attend to, reward, communicate, and model (Schein & Schein, 2017). In public organizations, this institutionalization is especially important because employee behavior is shaped not only by leader discretion but also by formal values, rules, professional standards, and public-service obligations. An inclusive leader who consistently invites participation and treats employees fairly can reinforce cultural norms of harmony, collaboration, adaptability, accountability, and service orientation.

The Indonesian BerAKHLAK framework provides a context-specific cultural architecture. Its seven values establish expectations that are compatible with inclusive leadership: service orientation directs attention to citizens; accountability emphasizes responsible conduct; competence supports learning; harmony encourages respect; loyalty reinforces organizational identification; adaptability supports change; and collaboration promotes cross-unit cooperation. When these values become enacted rather than symbolic, they can coordinate employee behavior and improve performance. Culture may therefore serve as the organizational channel through which inclusive leadership becomes visible in everyday work routines (Denison & Mishra, 1995; Hartnell et al., 2011; Srimulyani et al., 2023).

2.3 Affective commitment as a psychological mechanism

Affective commitment reflects an employee's emotional attachment to and identification with the organization. It differs from continuance commitment, which is based on perceived costs of leaving, and normative commitment, which reflects obligation to remain (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Allen & Meyer, 1990). Meta-analytic evidence links affective commitment with desirable work outcomes, including performance, citizenship behavior, and reduced withdrawal (Meyer et al., 2002). Inclusive leadership can foster this attachment because recognition, fair treatment, and participation signal that employees are valued organizational members.

However, affective commitment may not automatically translate every leadership experience into higher formal performance. In rule-bound settings, emotional attachment may be necessary but insufficient unless organizational values clarify how attachment should be enacted in work behavior. This possibility motivates a dual-mediation model in which culture represents the institutional translation of leadership and affective commitment represents the internal psychological response. The two mechanisms can operate in parallel, but culture can also strengthen affective commitment by increasing value congruence and organizational identification (Kristof, 1996; Meyer et al., 2002).

2.4 Hypotheses

Based on the preceding arguments and prior evidence on inclusive leadership, organizational culture, commitment, and performance (Carmeli et al., 2010; Randel et al., 2018; Ashikali et al., 2021; Ke et al., 2022; Srimulyani et al., 2023), ten hypotheses were tested: H1 inclusive leadership positively affects employee performance; H2 inclusive leadership positively affects organizational culture; H3 inclusive leadership positively affects affective commitment; H4 organizational culture positively affects affective commitment; H5 organizational culture positively affects employee performance; H6 affective commitment positively affects employee performance; H7 organizational culture mediates the inclusive leadership–performance relationship; H8 affective commitment mediates the inclusive leadership–performance relationship; H9 organizational culture mediates the inclusive leadership–affective commitment relationship; and H10 affective commitment mediates the organizational culture–performance relationship.

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

3.1 Research design and setting

The study used a quantitative explanatory design to test causal relationships among inclusive leadership, organizational culture, affective commitment, and civil-servant performance. Data collection was conducted at the Department of Cipta Karya, Construction Development and Spatial Planning of Southeast Sulawesi Province, Indonesia, from March to May 2026. The agency is responsible for public infrastructure, construction-sector development, and spatial planning, making coordination, accountability, technical competence, and cross-unit collaboration central to employee performance.

3.2 Population, respondents, and data collection

The 2025 personnel records listed 114 employees. Because the population was relatively small and accessible, a census approach was used. The head of the department was excluded because the leadership construct required employees to evaluate leadership behavior, yielding 113 respondents. Primary data were collected through directly distributed questionnaires, while organizational documents were used for contextual and personnel information. All constructs were measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree/very poor) to 5 (strongly agree/very good). A preliminary instrument test involving 30 respondents indicated item correlations above 0.30 and Cronbach's alpha values above 0.60.

3.3 Measures

Inclusive leadership was measured using five dimensions adapted from Randel et al. (2018): fostering togetherness, value in uniqueness, fair treatment, recognition of contributions, and involvement in decision-making. Organizational culture was operationalized using the seven ASN BerAKHLAK core values: service orientation, accountability, competence, harmony, loyalty, adaptability, and collaboration. Affective commitment was measured through emotional attachment, sense of belonging/pride, willingness to contribute, and intention to remain, drawing on Meyer and Allen (1991, 1997). Employee performance was measured through quantity, quality, time, cost, work initiative, and cooperation, adapted to the public-service context.

3.4 Data analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to profile respondents and summarize construct indicators. The structural model was estimated using PLS-SEM in SmartPLS version 4.1.3. PLS-SEM is suitable for prediction-oriented models involving multiple latent constructs and simultaneous assessment of measurement and structural models (Hair et al., 2022; Hair et al., 2019). Convergent validity was assessed through outer loadings and average variance extracted (AVE), internal consistency through composite reliability, and explanatory power through R^2 . Hypotheses were evaluated using bootstrapped path coefficients and p-values, with $p < 0.05$ as the significance criterion. The measurement assessment followed established PLS-SEM guidance, including the principles of convergent and discriminant validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Henseler et al., 2015).

Table 1. Respondent characteristics

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Gender	Male	73	64.60
Gender	Female	40	35.40
Age	22–31 years	21	18.58
Age	32–41 years	37	32.74
Age	42–51 years	51	45.13
Age	>51 years	4	3.54
Tenure	1–7 years	45	39.82
Tenure	8–14 years	19	16.81
Tenure	15–21 years	43	38.05
Tenure	22–28 years	6	5.31
Education	Senior high school	19	16.81

Education	Diploma	7	6.19
Education	Bachelor (S1)	69	61.06
Education	Master (S2)	18	15.93

Source: Primary data processed by the authors (2026).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Measurement model

All inclusive-leadership indicators loaded strongly on their construct (0.870–0.905). BerAKHLAK culture indicators ranged from 0.845 to 0.951, affective-commitment indicators from 0.864 to 0.935, and performance indicators from 0.696 to 0.910. Although work initiative showed the lowest loading (0.696), the construct-level AVE and composite reliability remained well above recommended thresholds. AVE values ranged from 0.756 to 0.829, exceeding the 0.50 criterion, while composite reliability ranged from 0.945 to 0.971. These results indicate satisfactory convergent validity and internal consistency (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Hair et al., 2022).

Table 2. Measurement model summary

Construct	Loading range	AVE	Composite reliability
Inclusive leadership	0.870–0.905	0.787	0.949
BerAKHLAK organizational culture	0.845–0.951	0.829	0.971
Affective commitment	0.864–0.935	0.811	0.945
Employee performance	0.696–0.910	0.756	0.948

Source: SmartPLS output based on primary data (2026).

4.2 Structural model and direct effects

The structural model explained 39.6% of the variance in BerAKHLAK organizational culture, 64.4% of the variance in affective commitment, and 81.8% of the variance in employee performance. The high R^2 for performance indicates that the combination of inclusive leadership, organizational culture, and affective commitment accounts for a substantial proportion of performance differences in this sample. Importantly, the pattern of direct effects demonstrates that leadership behavior alone is not sufficient to explain performance; the strongest direct predictor of performance was organizational culture ($\beta = 0.547$), followed by affective commitment ($\beta = 0.421$).

Table 3. Coefficient of determination

Endogenous construct	R^2
BerAKHLAK organizational culture	0.396
Affective commitment	0.644
Employee performance	0.818

Source: SmartPLS output based on primary data (2026).

Table 4. Direct-effect hypothesis testing

Hypothesis	Path	β	p-value	Decision
H1	Inclusive leadership → Employee performance	−0.017	0.762	Not supported

H2	Inclusive leadership → Organizational culture	0.629	<0.001	Supported
H3	Inclusive leadership → Affective commitment	0.207	0.032	Supported
H4	Organizational culture → Affective commitment	0.656	<0.001	Supported
H5	Organizational culture → Employee performance	0.547	<0.001	Supported
H6	Affective commitment → Employee performance	0.421	<0.001	Supported

Source: SmartPLS output based on primary data (2026).

4.3 Mediation effects

The mediation results reveal a differentiated mechanism. BerAKHLAK organizational culture significantly mediated the relationship between inclusive leadership and employee performance ($\beta = 0.344$, $p < 0.001$). By contrast, affective commitment did not significantly mediate the inclusive leadership–performance relationship at the 5% level ($\beta = 0.087$, $p = 0.055$). Organizational culture significantly mediated the relationship between inclusive leadership and affective commitment ($\beta = 0.413$, $p < 0.001$), while affective commitment significantly mediated the relationship between organizational culture and performance ($\beta = 0.276$, $p < 0.001$). Thus, the data support an institutional pathway in which inclusive leadership first strengthens shared values; those values then reinforce emotional attachment and performance.

Table 5. Indirect-effect and mediation testing

Hypothesis	Indirect path	β	p-value	Decision
H7	Inclusive leadership → Culture → Performance	0.344	<0.001	Supported
H8	Inclusive leadership → Affective commitment → Performance	0.087	0.055	Not supported
H9	Inclusive leadership → Culture → Affective commitment	0.413	<0.001	Supported
H10	Culture → Affective commitment → Performance	0.276	<0.001	Supported

Source: SmartPLS output based on primary data (2026).

4.4 Discussion

The nonsignificant direct effect of inclusive leadership on performance (H1) is theoretically informative. Inclusive leadership may improve the quality of interaction, voice, and perceived inclusion without automatically changing formal output. In public agencies, employee performance is embedded in work procedures, targets, statutory responsibilities, and cross-unit coordination. Consequently, leader openness and recognition need an organizational translation mechanism before they consistently affect task outcomes. This finding is compatible with the broader literature showing that inclusive leadership often operates through mediators such as psychological safety, meaningful work, work engagement, workplace spirituality, strengths use, and innovative behavior (Carmeli et al., 2010; Ke et al., 2022; Shafaei & Nejati, 2024; Maatita & Astuti, 2026).

H2 was strongly supported: inclusive leadership predicted BerAKHLAK organizational culture ($\beta = 0.629$). This result underscores leaders' role as carriers and reinforcers of organizational values. When leaders invite input, recognize contributions, treat employees fairly, and involve them in decisions, they enact behaviors that are congruent with harmony, collaboration, accountability, and service orientation. Over time, repeated inclusive behavior can make formal values more credible because employees experience them in daily interactions rather than only as administrative slogans. This aligns with Schein and Schein's (2017) argument that leadership and culture are mutually constitutive and with evidence that inclusive leadership supports inclusive climates in public-sector teams (Ashikali et al., 2021).

Inclusive leadership also significantly increased affective commitment (H3), although the coefficient was smaller than its effect on culture. The result supports Social Exchange Theory: employees who receive respect, voice, fairness, and recognition are likely to reciprocate through stronger emotional attachment (Blau, 1964; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). It is also consistent

with LMX theory, in which high-quality relationships generate trust and mutual obligation (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). The smaller coefficient suggests, however, that emotional attachment in this public-sector setting is influenced by more than direct leader–employee interaction.

H4 and H5 show that BerAKHLAK culture is a central organizational mechanism. Culture had a strong effect on affective commitment ($\beta = 0.656$) and performance ($\beta = 0.547$). The seven core values give employees shared behavioral reference points that can reduce ambiguity and coordinate work across technical and administrative functions. In particular, the source data show loyalty as the strongest-loading cultural indicator, suggesting that organizational identification is deeply embedded in the culture construct. The results are consistent with research linking culture with effectiveness and with the specific Indonesian evidence on AKHLAK/BerAKHLAK values (Denison & Mishra, 1995; Hartnell et al., 2011; Srimulyani et al., 2023).

Affective commitment significantly predicted employee performance (H6). Employees who feel emotionally attached and possess a strong sense of belonging are more willing to contribute and sustain effort. This result supports the three-component commitment literature and meta-analytic evidence that affective commitment is associated with beneficial employee outcomes (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer et al., 2002). In the present model, sense of belonging had the strongest loading on affective commitment, reinforcing the relevance of belongingness as a bridge between inclusion and positive work behavior (Shore et al., 2011; Randel et al., 2018).

The most important result concerns H7: organizational culture significantly mediated the inclusive leadership–performance relationship. Since the direct leadership–performance coefficient was nonsignificant while the indirect cultural path was significant, the results indicate that inclusive leadership becomes performance-relevant when it is embedded in shared organizational values. This differs from models that assume a leader’s interpersonal behavior should immediately produce higher output. In a public bureaucracy, culture can institutionalize inclusive practices, make them consistent across situations, and connect them with expected service behaviors. The finding therefore extends Srimulyani et al. (2023) by demonstrating a significant culture-mediated leadership–performance pathway in an ASN setting using the seven BerAKHLAK values.

H8 was not supported: affective commitment did not significantly mediate the effect of inclusive leadership on performance ($p = 0.055$). The near-threshold result should not be interpreted as evidence that affective commitment is unimportant, because its direct effect on performance was significant. Rather, the evidence indicates that emotional attachment generated directly by inclusive leadership is not, by itself, a sufficiently reliable channel for performance. Affective commitment appears to become more consequential after organizational values have been internalized. This interpretation is strengthened by H10, where affective commitment significantly mediated the culture–performance relationship.

H9 further clarifies the sequence: organizational culture significantly mediated inclusive leadership’s effect on affective commitment. Inclusive leadership can therefore shape emotional attachment both directly and indirectly by building a work environment whose values employees recognize and identify with. This pattern is compatible with person–organization fit theory, which proposes that value congruence contributes to positive attitudes and attachment (Kristof, 1996). Inclusive leadership may create positive relational experiences, but a coherent culture makes those experiences organizational rather than merely interpersonal.

Finally, H10 confirms that affective commitment mediates the effect of BerAKHLAK culture on performance. This establishes a psychologically meaningful second-stage mechanism: shared values provide direction, while affective commitment supplies internal motivation and identification. Together, H7–H10 show that the two mediators are not interchangeable. Organizational culture is the primary translator of inclusive leadership into performance, whereas affective commitment is more effective as a psychological mechanism translating internalized culture into performance. This distinction is the central theoretical contribution of the study.

5. THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

Theoretically, the study refines the inclusive-leadership literature by showing that organizational and psychological mediation mechanisms perform different functions. The findings support Social Exchange Theory and LMX theory but add an institutional layer: reciprocity generated by inclusive leaders is more likely to influence formal public-sector performance when it is stabilized through shared organizational values. The model therefore links relational leadership, culture, and commitment rather than treating them as competing explanations. It also demonstrates that public-sector context matters; recent work on

inclusive leadership in public organizations emphasizes behavioral participation, formalization, and organizational conditions as important boundary elements (Ashikali & Van Luttervelt, 2026; Bernards et al., 2025).

Practically, managers should not rely on interpersonal inclusiveness alone. Participation, recognition, and fair treatment should be explicitly connected to BerAKHLAK routines: service standards, accountability practices, competence development, harmonious interaction, loyalty to public goals, adaptation to policy and technology, and cross-unit collaboration. Because culture mediated the leadership–performance relationship, agencies should align leadership development, performance management, internal communication, and recognition systems with these values. The relatively lower descriptive means for adaptability and collaboration in the source study also suggest useful priorities for strengthening cross-field problem solving, knowledge sharing, and responsiveness to change.

Affective commitment should be cultivated through meaningful recognition, participation, development opportunities, and communication that connects individual roles to organizational purpose. Yet managers should also ensure that emotional attachment is linked to concrete work expectations. The nonsignificant H8 result indicates that commitment generated by leadership is not automatically converted into performance; employees need a cultural framework that translates belonging into accountable behavior and measurable contribution.

6. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The study is cross-sectional and conducted in a single provincial agency, so causal interpretation and generalizability should be approached cautiously. All focal constructs were measured through respondent perceptions, which may create common-method concerns despite the satisfactory measurement properties; future studies can combine supervisor-rated performance, administrative indicators, and time-separated surveys (Podsakoff et al., 2003). The census design provides strong coverage of the focal organization but a modest absolute sample size. Replication across ministries, municipalities, public hospitals, and other infrastructure agencies would test whether the mediation pattern holds under different institutional conditions.

Future research should also examine additional mechanisms such as psychological safety, work engagement, competence, perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, and public-service motivation. Longitudinal or multilevel designs could distinguish individual perceptions of inclusive leadership from unit-level cultural strength. Comparative research may further test whether the seven-value ASN BerAKHLAK framework functions differently from corporate AKHLAK or from public-service value systems in other countries. Recent developments in public-sector inclusive-leadership measurement also provide opportunities to compare behavior-focused scales with established inclusion frameworks (Ashikali & Van Luttervelt, 2026; Merlini et al., 2025).

7. CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that inclusive leadership does not necessarily improve civil-servant performance through a simple direct route. In the investigated public agency, inclusive leadership had no significant direct effect on performance, but it strongly strengthened BerAKHLAK organizational culture and positively influenced affective commitment. Organizational culture, in turn, improved both affective commitment and performance, while affective commitment also enhanced performance. Most importantly, organizational culture significantly mediated the inclusive leadership–performance relationship, whereas affective commitment did not. Affective commitment instead mediated the culture–performance relationship. The evidence therefore identifies organizational culture as the principal institutional mechanism that converts inclusive leadership into performance and affective commitment as a downstream psychological mechanism that helps translate internalized values into contribution. For public-sector organizations, inclusive leadership is most consequential when it becomes embedded in shared values and everyday administrative practice.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors acknowledge the civil servants of the Department of Cipta Karya, Construction Development and Spatial Planning of Southeast Sulawesi Province who participated in the study.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Erin Kurniawan Elizon: Conceptualization, investigation, data collection, formal analysis, and writing—original draft. Dedy Takdir Dedy Syaifuddin: Supervision, conceptual review, and writing—review and editing. Yusuf: Methodological

supervision, validation, and writing—review and editing. Laode Asfahyadin Aliddin: Supervision, interpretation, and writing—review and editing.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

ETHICS STATEMENT

The study used an organizational survey of adult civil servants. Participation was voluntary and responses were analyzed in aggregate.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request, subject to organizational and confidentiality requirements.

REFERENCES

- [1] Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x>
- [2] Ashikali, T. (2023). Unraveling determinants of inclusive leadership in public organizations. *Public Personnel Management*, 52(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/00910260231180286>
- [3] Ashikali, T., Groeneveld, S., & Kuipers, B. (2021). The role of inclusive leadership in supporting an inclusive climate in diverse public sector teams. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 41(3), 497–519. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X19899722>
- [4] Ashikali, T. S., & Van Luttervelt, M. P. (2026). Promoting inclusive workplaces: Conceptualizing and measuring inclusive leadership in public organizations. *Public Administration Review*, Early View. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.70136>
Pasted markdown
- [5] Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108>
- [6] Bernards, B., Ashikali, T., & Fontein, F. (2025). Inclusive leadership in politicized organizational environments: The mediating roles of centralization and formalization. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 48(5), 1084–1113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2025.2515077>
- [7] Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: Wiley.
- [8] Carmeli, A., Reiter-Palmon, R., & Ziv, E. (2010). Inclusive leadership and employee involvement in creative tasks in the workplace: The mediating role of psychological safety. *Creativity Research Journal*, 22(3), 250–260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2010.504654>
- [9] Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874–900. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602>
- [10] Denison, D. R., & Mishra, A. K. (1995). Toward a theory of organizational culture and effectiveness. *Organization Science*, 6(2), 204–223. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.6.2.204>
- [11] Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999>
- [12] Eshete, S. K., Debela, K. L., & Kebede, T. A. (2025). Inclusive leadership and employees' workplace performance: The mediating role of employee engagement in five-star hotels in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 12, 101940. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101940>
- [13] Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800104>
- [14] Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader–member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219–247. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(95\)90036-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90036-5)
- [15] Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)* (3rd ed.). Sage.

- [16] Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 31(1), 2–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203>
- [17] Hartnell, C. A., Ou, A. Y., & Kinicki, A. (2011). Organizational culture and organizational effectiveness: A meta-analytic investigation of the competing values framework's theoretical suppositions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(4), 677–694. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021987>
- [18] Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43, 115–135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8>
- [19] Hollander, E. P. (2009). *Inclusive Leadership: The Essential Leader–Follower Relationship*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203877038>
- [20] Jin, M., Lee, J., & Lee, M. (2017). Does leadership matter in diversity management? Assessing the relative impact of diversity policy and inclusive leadership in the public sector. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 38(2), 303–319. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-07-2015-0151>
- [21] Ke, J., Zhang, J., & Zheng, L. (2022). Inclusive leadership, workplace spirituality, and job performance in the public sector: A multi-level double-moderated mediation model of leader-member exchange and perceived dissimilarity. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 45(3), 672–705. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2022.2069138>
- [22] Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person–organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49(1), 1–49. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb01790.x>
- [23] Liu, Y., Fang, Y., Hu, L., et al. (2024). Inclusive leadership and employee workplace well-being: The role of vigor and supervisor developmental feedback. *BMC Psychology*, 12, 540. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-02029-5>
- [24] Maatita, R. S. R., & Astuti, R. J. (2026). The effect of inclusive leadership on employee performance mediated through innovative behavior and work engagement. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.37641/jimkes.v14i1.5030>
- [25] Merlini, K. P., Moon, N. A., McKenzie-James, A. A., Caylor, J. R., Redmond, A., Nguyen, D., et al. (2025). An unmet goal? A scale development and model test of the role of inclusive leadership. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 40, 333–357. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-024-09955-6>
- [26] 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)
- [27] Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Application*. Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452231556>
- [28] Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(1), 20–52. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842>
- [29] Nembhard, I. M., & Edmondson, A. C. (2006). Making it safe: The effects of leader inclusiveness and professional status on psychological safety and improvement efforts in health care teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51(4), 941–966. <https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.51.4.941>
- [30] Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>
- [31] Randel, A. E., Galvin, B. M., Shore, L. M., Ehrhart, K. H., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., & Kedharnath, U. (2018). Inclusive leadership: Realizing positive outcomes through belongingness and being valued for uniqueness. *Human Resource Management Review*, 28(2), 190–203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.07.002>
- [32] Schein, E. H., & Schein, P. A. (2017). *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (5th ed.). Wiley.
- [33] Shafaei, A., & Nejati, M. (2024). Creating meaningful work for employees: The role of inclusive leadership. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 35(2), 189–211. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21512>
- [34] Shore, L. M., Randel, A. E., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., Ehrhart, K. H., & Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and diversity in work groups: A review and model for future research. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1262–1289. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310385943>
- [35] Srimulyani, V. A., et al. (2023). Mediation of ‘AKHLAK’ corporate culture and affective commitment on the effect of inclusive leadership on employee performance. *Sustainable Futures*, 6, 100138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sfr.2023.100138>

- [36] Wiyono, M. W., Kustiani, L., & Supriadi, B. (2024). The value of inclusive leadership, corporate culture, and employee performance in the public sector in Lumajang Regency of Indonesia. *International Journal of Research in Social Science and Humanities*, 5(10). <https://doi.org/10.47505/IJRSS.2024.5.10>
- [37] Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256287>
- [38] 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>
- [39] Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands–resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- [40] Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71–92. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326>
- [41] Government of Indonesia. (2019). Government Regulation No. 30 of 2019 concerning Civil Servant Performance Assessment. <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/107573/pp-no-30-tahun-2019>
- [42] Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform of the Republic of Indonesia. (2021). Circular Letter No. 20 of 2021 on Implementation of Core Values and Employer Branding for the State Civil Apparatus. <https://jdih.menpan.go.id/puu-1288-Surat%20Edaran%20Menpan.html>