

Abstract

SHELTON, SAMUEL T. Employees, Supervisors, and Empowerment in the Public Sector: The Role of Employee Trust. (Under the direction of Elizabethann O'Sullivan.)

The purpose of this research was to examine the relationship between employee trust in the supervisor and a sense of employee empowerment.

Government services are identified with excessive rules and regulations, top-heavy bureaucracy, gross inefficiency, and unresponsive employees. Social service bureaucracies are perceived as big, inefficient, and expensive. Solutions, such as the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, attempt to give the states more discretion and decision-making authority in the delivery of social services. In turn, the states are expected to increase service flexibility. This effort is part of a larger reinventing government movement that attempts to reduce bureaucratic structure, make services more responsive to the citizen-customer, and empower the street-level bureaucrats to make decisions without unnecessary interference from supervisors.

Attempts at empowerment in the public sector have had mixed results, but the objectives of empowerment are sufficiently important to seek factors which might improve the success of its implementation in the public sector. It is hypothesized that trust is positively associated to the employee's perception of empowerment and that employees who perceive that they have a high level of trust in the supervisor will have a higher sense of empowerment than employees who have a low level of trust in the supervisor will have.

Empowerment is operationalized using indicators developed and validated by Spreitzer in 1995 based upon a conceptual definition of empowerment by Thomas and

Velthouse (1990). Empowerment has four elements: meaning (the value of the work), competence (ability to perform the task), self-determination (ability to initiate and regulate actions), and impact (ability to influence or determine organizational outcomes).

In spite of an interest in the concept of trust, there is no contemporary measure for trust within the supervisor-employee relationship. Both procedural justice (the perceived fairness of procedures and decisions for compensation, evaluation, rewards, and dispute resolution) and interactional justice (the perceptions that a supervisor implements the rules fairly and treats the employee with respect and honesty) have shown that they may create higher levels of trust. The constructs of procedural justice and interactional justice are used as surrogates to operationalize trust. Indicator statements developed and validated by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) are used. It is hypothesized that both procedural justice and interactional justice are positively associated to the employee's perception of empowerment. The indices for empowerment, procedural justice, and interactional justice were modified as necessary to better fit the public sector environment.

The sample included employees in four state departments of health and social services and in four North Carolina county departments of social services.

The analysis of the responses in the study shows that there is a link between employee trust in supervisors and employee perceptions of empowerment and that employee trust in the supervisor has a strong relationship with a sense of employee empowerment. The results demonstrate that as an organization attempts to implement employee empowerment it needs to pay attention to the level of employee trust in the supervisor as a means to improve implementation success.

Employees, Supervisors, and Empowerment in the Public Sector:
The Role of Employee Trust

By

Samuel Terrance Shelton

A dissertation submitted to the
Graduate Faculty of
North Carolina State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Public Administration

Raleigh

2002

APPROVED BY:

Dr. Elizabethann O'Sullivan
Chair of Advisory Committee

Dr. Dennis D. Daley

Dr. Rupert W. Nacoste

Dr. Traci V. Reid

BIOGRAPHY

Samuel Terrance Shelton was born to Clarence Wilton Shelton, Sr. and Lou Anna Ward Shelton on September 5, 1948 in Boynton Beach, Florida, the youngest of three sons. He graduated from Seacrest High School in 1966. He received a Bachelor of Arts degree in political science from Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia in 1970. He then attended The American University in Washington, District of Columbia where he graduated with a Masters of Public Administration degree in 1971. Just prior to graduation he accepted a position as Administrative Aide to the County Manager in Arlington, Virginia where he worked until 1974.

Mr. Shelton returned to Boynton Beach, Florida for two years before attending the University of Tennessee, Knoxville where received a Doctor of Education degree in educational administration with a specialty in university administration in 1978.

In 1980 Dr. Shelton accepted a position as District Court Administrator for the Sixth Judicial District with the Wisconsin Supreme Court. He spent almost nineteen years in that position coordinating the operations of the trial level courts in eleven Central Wisconsin counties and working with national, state, and local organizations for court management, the arts, and youth sports.

Dr. Shelton was accepted into the North Carolina State University Doctor of Philosophy in public administration program in 1999. During his time there, he was a discussion leader for several American Government courses and taught course in Introduction to American Government, Law and Justice, and the Justice System. He was admitted to candidacy in September, 2001, and successfully defended his dissertation on the relationship between employee trust in the supervisor and a sense of empowerment in

the public sector in August, 2002. Dr. Shelton received his Doctor of Philosophy degree in December, 2002.

Dr. Shelton is currently an Assistant Professor of political science and public administration at Troy State University in Troy, Alabama where he teaches courses in American Government, public administration, public policy, public personnel, Constitutional law, and the Supreme Court.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	vi
Chapter 1: Empowerment, Trust, and the Public Sector.....	1
1.1. Purpose of the Study	1
1.2. Organization of the Study	2
1.3. Introduction.....	3
1.4. Empowerment as a Management Tool	5
1.5. Limitations of Empowerment	8
1.6. Trust as a Management Tool.....	12
1.7. Trust as a Foundation for Empowerment.....	16
1.8. Empowerment in the Public Sector.....	17
1.9. Reinventing Government and Empowerment in Operation: The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act.....	21
1.10. Summary	26
Chapter 2: Empowerment and Trust: The Empirical Evidence	28
2.1. Introduction.....	28
2.2. Research on Empowerment	28
2.3. Research on Trust	37
2.4. Trust and Empowerment.....	42
2.5. Hypotheses.....	45
Chapter 3: Methodology and Sample	46
3.1. Introduction.....	46
3.2. Sample.....	46
3.3. Measures of Empowerment	53
3.4. Measures of Trust	59
3.5. Questionnaire Development and Administration.....	65
3.6. Construct and Reliability Analysis	68
3.7. Correlation Analysis	72
3.8. Use of Multiple Regression	73
3.9. State Demographics	77
3.10. North Carolina County Demographics	78
3.11. Comparison of State and North Carolina County Demographics.....	80
Chapter 4: Regression Analysis and Discussion.....	81
4.1. State Results.....	81

Table of Contents (continued)

	Page
4.1.1. Empowerment	81
4.1.2. Empowerment and Procedural Justice	82
4.1.3. Empowerment and Interactional Justice	85
4.1.4. Empowerment and Trust.....	87
4.2. North Carolina County Results	90
4.2.1. Empowerment	90
4.2.2. Empowerment and Procedural Justice	91
4.2.3. Empowerment and Interactional Justice	94
4.2.4. Empowerment and Trust.....	97
4.3. Comparison of State and North Carolina County Results	100
4.4. Hypotheses Summary	101
 Chapter 5: Implications for Public Management, Limitations, and Suggestions for Future Research.....	 103
5.1. Introduction.....	103
5.2. Implications for Public Management.....	104
5.3. Limitations of the Study.....	108
5.4. Suggestions for Future Research	110
 References.....	 114
 Appendices.....	 145
Appendix 1: Federalism and the Personal Responsibility and Work Reconciliation Act of 1966	146
Appendix 2: Quantitative and Case Studies: Empowerment as Variable.....	151
Appendix 3: State Participation Status	211
Appendix 4: Quantitative and Case Studies: Procedural and Interactional Justice Using Niehoff and Moorman (1993)	214
Appendix 5: Employee Trust and Empowerment Questionnaire	219
Appendix 6: “Invitation to Participate” Email.....	226
Appendix 7: “Webpage Notification” Email	227
Appendix 8: Pearson Correlation Coefficients	228

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 2.1 Empowerment Components Regressed on Job Characteristics, Leader-Member Exchange, and Team-Member Exchange.....	34
Table 3.1 State Sample Participation	49
Table 3.2 Chi-Square Analysis of Vermont and Other States Respondent Demographics	50
Table 3.3 North Carolina County Sample Participation	52
Table 3.4 Chi-Square Analysis of North Carolina County Respondent Demographics...	53
Table 3.5 Indicator Statements for Empowerment Used by Spreitzer.....	54
Table 3.6 Indicator Statements for Procedural Justice Used by Niehoff and Moorman ..	61
Table 3.7 Indicator Statements for Interactional Justice Used by Niehoff and Moorman.....	63
Table 3.8 Variables, Measures and Possible Values in the Questionnaire	67
Table 3.9 Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results: Empowerment Components.....	69
Table 3.10 Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results: Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice, and Regulatory Environment	71
Table 3.11 Profile of State Study Sample.....	77
Table 3.12 Profile of North Carolina County Study Sample	79
Table 4.1 Means and Standard Deviations of Empowerment Components and Total	81
Table 4.2 Regression Estimates: Empowerment Components and Total by Procedural Justice.....	83
Table 4.3 Regression Estimates: Empowerment Components and Total by Interactional Justice.....	86
Table 4.4 Regression Estimates: Empowerment Components and Total by Trust.....	88
Table 4.5 Means and Standard Deviations of Empowerment Components and Total	91

List of Tables (continued)

	Page
Table 4.6 Regression Estimates: Empowerment Components and Total by Procedural Justice.....	92
Table 4.7 Regression Estimates: Empowerment Components and Total by Interactional Justice	95
Table 4.8 Regression Estimates: Empowerment Components and Total by Trust.....	98
Table 4.9 Confirmation of Hypotheses through Analysis of State and North Carolina County Data	102
Table 8.1 Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Empowerment Components for State Data	228
Table 8.2 Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Empowerment Components for North Carolina County Data	228
Table 8.3 Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Variables for State Data.....	229
Table 8.4 Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Variables for North Carolina County Data	230

Chapter 1

Empowerment, Trust, and the Public Sector

1.1. Purpose of the Study

This study examines an anticipated link between employee trust in supervisors and employee perceptions of empowerment. Some researchers have shown that managers must trust their employees before they will attempt to empower them (Mayer et.al., 1995; Mishra and Spreitzer, 1994), but little attention has been given to whether trust is a prerequisite for employees to possess a sense of empowerment. An understanding of the relationship between trust and employee perceptions of empowerment is particularly important when organizations attempt significant change (Beugré, 1998; Thomas, 1998; Skarlicki and Folger, 1997). When an organization, whether public or private, attempts to implement empowerment, the strength of the “pre-empowerment” relationship between employee and supervisor may realistically influence whether employees believe they are empowered (Porter, et.al., 1975). The level of employee trust in the supervisor may determine whether the empowerment effort and other attempts at organizational change are successful.

Employees who trust the procedures used to make the determinations in the first place should be more accepting of management decisions that directly affect them and their performance (Wilkinson, 1995). This means that how decisions are made becomes paramount. If people do not trust the methods, they cannot have faith in the results (Folger and Greenberg, 1985).

1.2. Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the constructs of employee empowerment and trust in the supervisor. Empowerment is examined as a management tool with particular attention to its role and limitations in the public sector. Trust and its relationship with empowerment are also discussed.

Chapter 2 examines the qualitative and quantitative research on empowerment and the relationship between trust and empowerment, especially in the public sector. Particular attention is given to Thomas and Velthouse's (1990) conceptualization of empowerment as a psychological construct with four core components: competence, impact, meaning, and self-determination. The chapter also looks at the role of trust in the supervisor. Operationalization of trust has been difficult and the alternative use of interactional justice and procedural justice is discussed. The hypotheses are summarized in this chapter.

Chapter 3 outlines the survey methodology, sample population, and survey instrument. Thomas and Velthouse's four components of empowerment are operationalized using the 12 statements developed by Spreitzer (1995a, 1996). Trust is operationalized using 15 statements developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) to measure interactional justice and procedural justice. The results of the supporting factor analysis, reliability analysis, correlation, and the demographic information are included in this chapter.

Chapter 4 examines the regression analysis for the four empowerment components, total empowerment, interactional justice, procedural justice, and trust. The results of the hypotheses testing are presented in this chapter.

Chapter 5 discusses the implications of these results for management in the public sector with recommendations for future research.

1.3. Introduction

During the past 20 years there have been continuous efforts to improve government services, especially state and local social services. Most efforts at public reform, including elements of the reinventing government movement, have been "borrowed" from the private sector. Inherent in many of these reforms has been the effort to reduce the traditional, bureaucratic hierarchy, to empower employees through team-building and active participation in decision-making, and to allow employees at the lowest "street-level" to make decisions.

The construct of employee empowerment has been given a great deal of attention by academics and practitioners alike (Koberg, et.al., 1999). Empowerment as a theoretical concept has had a strong influence on managerial effectiveness, organizational effectiveness, and organizational innovation (Spreitzer, 1995a; Conger and Kanungo, 1988). The public and private sectors have adopted employee empowerment initiatives "to increase organizational productivity, flexibility, responsiveness, and customer service" (Shafritz and Ott, 1996: 487). Both workers and managers seem to share a belief that the process of employee empowerment is an advantage for both the individual and the organization (Koberg, et.al., 1999). Empowerment means that power within the organization is distributed to a broader range of employees at more levels of the hierarchy. Delegation of authority by the supervisor to the employee is seen as a normal progression in the selection, training, observation, and evaluation of the employee

(Rohrer, 1999). Empowered employees may make decisions that typically were reserved for a supervisor. The control hierarchy is reduced or dismantled, and decision-making is pushed down to the frontline employees. Empowered employees no longer require the close supervision of middle managers and supervisors.

The public sector has responsibilities to administer its programs with a broader public interest in mind and close compliance with detailed laws and regulations, especially in the areas of personnel and purchasing. However, public sector adaptations of predominantly private sector reforms often fail to consider these unique responsibilities (Bozeman and Rainey, 1998; Langbein, 2000). Employee empowerment efforts in the public sector create a tension with traditional normative concepts such as equivalent outcomes for equivalent circumstances, effectiveness, efficiency, equal treatment for all citizens, and accountability. Empowered employees are given more decision-making opportunities and greater discretion to make those decisions. Discretion, therefore, provides an opportunity for dissimilar decisions and variations in treatment to the clients.

Empowerment does not occur through decree. Supervisors do not easily delegate their authority over resources and decision-making. Supervisors are accustomed to organizational environments where they are accountable for mistakes made by their employees. In an environment of empowerment, supervisors who are comfortable with making decisions may find it difficult to sanction employee decisions, especially if those decisions are different than what the supervisor might have made. Employees may believe that they are given the responsibility for more decisions without the equivalent recognition and benefits. An employee must trust that a supervisor supports bottom-up

decision-making, will accept employee feedback, and uphold the employee's decisions. Empowerment requires a change in the relationship between supervisor and employee; any change disrupts the "comfort level" in the previous relationship. If the employee has a pre-empowerment sense of trust in the supervisor it can be anticipated that the relationship will survive the uncertainties of the post-empowerment environment.

Although supervisors often receive tools and training for decision making, the organization rarely provides training on how to encourage greater employee involvement in the management of operations or decision making. The organization provides employees with the tools and training needed to make decisions in an empowered environment even less frequently. A sense of empowerment is not innate. It is something that must be learned, developed, and honed (Argyris, 1998).

Despite the interest in empowerment, there has been no consistent agreement as to what the concept means, and there has been little evaluation of the conditions that make empowerment efforts successful in the public sector. This study will examine empowerment and attempt to identify what it means to the employee in the public sector, why the concept is important to academics and public sector managers, and, more specifically, whether there is a link between employee trust in the supervisor and the potential for success of empowerment efforts.

1.4. Empowerment as a Management Tool

As early as 1957 Argyris and others discussed the concepts of “democratic leadership” or “employee-centered leadership.” House (1977) hypothesized that leaders who are able to communicate high expectations and confidence in their followers would

have followers that accept the goals of the leader, attempt to contribute to the organization, and “strive to meet specific and challenging performance standards” (201). Later, Harrison (1987) described an “achievement-oriented” organization as one in which “[e]mployees ... at lower levels are empowered to make decisions that other organizations reserve for supervisors and middle managers” (11).

Wilkinson (1997) saw the foundations of the modern empowerment movement in the 1982 publication of Peters and Waterman's *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies*. Peters and Waterman documented a new management approach that understood employees as "entrepreneurs" who, if allowed to function without bureaucratic rules, could take "destiny into their own hands" (Wilkinson, 1997: 42). This concept became popular in management approaches such as Total Quality Management (TQM) and the Human Resource Management (HRM) movement. Thomas and Velthouse (1990) believed that empowered employees demonstrate flexibility in controlling their own tasks, initiate new tasks in response to problems or opportunities, and demonstrate resiliency to obstacles, thereby sustaining motivation in the face of problems or ambiguity.

Private sector organizations saw employee empowerment as a way to better target specific customers and adapt the organization's product to specialized markets. Similarly, the public sector received great pressure to become more flexible, innovative, and responsive to the demands of the public (the "customer" of governmental services) (see Osborne and Gaebler, 1992; Osborne and Plastrik, 1997; Gore, 1993). According to Drucker (1995), "Government has outgrown the structure, the policies, and the rules

designed for it and still in use" (52). During the early years of the Clinton administration there were many promises to "reinvent government."

Conger and Kanungo (1988) analyzed the management literature on empowerment at that time. They grouped the studies into three themes, essentially around the relationship of power: 1) empowering subordinates enhances managerial and organizational effectiveness; 2) as superiors share power and control with their subordinates, organizational effectiveness actually increases; and 3) empowerment efforts enhance attempts to implement effective teams within the organization. Based upon this analysis, they defined empowerment as "a process of enhancing feelings or self-efficacy among organizational members through the identification of conditions that foster powerlessness and through their removal by both formal organizational practices and informal techniques of providing efficacy information" (474).

Argyris (1998), however, viewed empowerment in just two capacities. First, empowerment was examined as a managerial act of power sharing. The person who traditionally possesses power within the organization actively seeks to give some of that power to the employees at the lower levels of the organization either by offering them a greater role in decision making (Conger and Kanungo, 1988) or greater access to information (Spreitzer, 1995a).

Second, empowerment was examined as a means to motivate the employee and increase employee support for the organization, often through participative management techniques (Wilkinson, 1997). Liden, et.al. (2000) from their research believed that "(e)mpowering individuals may result in higher levels of work satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job performance" and that "empowerment appears to

complement relationships with the immediate supervisor and coworkers in the determination of commitment and performance” (414). Campbell and Martinko (1998) found that empowered employees expressed less tedium, more positive expectations, less depression, and more persistence in their positions.

1.5. Limitations of Empowerment

Empowerment has not necessarily achieved its lofty promises in either the public or private sector. Expectations often exceed the reality in actual implementation. Argyris (1998) believed that the reinvention movement has not produced highly motivated employees. It failed because the organization and the people within the organization have not been properly prepared to give or accept empowerment. For Argyris (1998), the traditional hierarchy found in government is just too pervasive to believe that it can be completely replaced. That traditional organization gets things done, and it should not be abandoned or condemned just because it "goes against the theory of empowerment" (104).

There is little support for the assumption that a link exists between empowerment and overall performance (Kaminski et.al., 2000). According to Forrester (2000: 68-72) there are several reasons for this:

- 1) the organization has not been adequately prepared for empowerment efforts;
- 2) recent understandings of empowerment in psychological terms lessens the organization's obligation to actually transfer power to more people;
- 3) empowerment has been used to create two groups – those who are empowered and those who are not;
- 4) empowerment implementers at the upper levels of the organization ignore the impact empowerment initiatives may have upon the traditional managers, especially the middle managers;

- 5) empowerment may require changes in other organizational operations, but the zeal for empowerment implementation may cause organizations to ignore the other changes necessary for empowerment to succeed; and
- 6) in the traditional organization, power brings accountability, but management may try to protect the employees from the accountability of their decisions or the newly empowered employee may not be willing to accept the possible consequences of their decision making power.

Empowerment opportunities are often suggested by managers and employees at the service delivery level, but at the same time top management is often uncertain about what benefits will actually develop (Lee and Koh, 2001; Bowen and Lawler, 1992). This is complicated because empowerment efforts are by their very nature implemented by top management. Thomas and Velthouse (1990) encouraged management initiatives to redesign jobs and change reward systems. As Conger and Kanungo (1988) remarked, most management initiatives do not consider such items as job design, organizational structure, and rewards. Over time, employees at all levels develop "standard operating procedures" and a set of beliefs for continuing in that position and organization. This lack of environmental understanding by management reduces the chance for success. Management strategies consistently damaged empowerment efforts because employees actually had little control or influence in those management decisions (Proctor et.al., 1999). This management perspective failed to recognize the active participation of the empowered employee. "Organizational factors can support or inhibit the process of empowerment, but they do not direct it" (Kaminski et.al., 2000: 1361).

Empowerment, therefore, is not accomplished by edict. As Bandura (1997) described it, "Those who exercise authority and control do not go around voluntarily granting to others power over resources and entitlements in acts of beneficence" (477). There is a lack of research on the role of organizational leaders in the empowerment

process (Konczak et.al. 2000). Argyris (1998) argued that empowerment – at least as it has been implemented so far – has what others might describe as a “fad” nature about it. Managers know that empowerment is currently the favored approach for employee motivation, and they even support it in theory. It is, however, inconsistent with the typical manner in which they have been trained to operate. Spreitzer (1996) noted that management’s good intentions and job redesign efforts cannot assure empowerment. Even when management really wants to empower its employees, empowerment does not occur automatically; the opportunities may be there, but only the receiving employee can achieve a sense of empowerment.

Quinn and Spreitzer (1997: 38) identified seven questions that leaders should consider when contemplating the implementation of an empowerment strategy:

1. What do we mean when say we want to empower people?
2. What are the characteristics of an empowered person?
3. Do we really *need* empowered people?
4. De we really *want* empowered people?
5. How do people develop a sense of empowerment?
6. What organizational characteristics facilitate employee empowerment?
7. What can leaders do to facilitate employee empowerment?

In practice, empowerment may become an attempt to manipulate employee motivation (Wilkinson 1997). The failure of empowerment efforts may result in an environment with more rules and regulations on employee actions and greater mistrust by both the supervisor and the employee.

As Argyris (1998) commented, middle managers are most comfortable with the "command-and-control" model and find it difficult not to function in this manner, especially when the employees themselves seek guidance or answers. Middle managers are reluctant to embrace empowerment because of the change in their own traditional role

of expertise and an added burden in the process of decision-making (Denham, et.al., 1997). Those in management positions have achieved their positions through work, formal education, and in-house training, and they have traditionally been expected to make decisions and manage their employees. Success at product and service delivery within expectations brings rewards that are threatened when participants in the decision-making process are increased. Managers resist delegation (Portny, 2002). Management may not change its own attitudes in a way that a new relationship between manager and employee can create positive employee attitudes for the organization.

Aghion and Tirole (1997) developed a theory on the delegation of formal authority (the right to make decisions) and real authority (actual control of the decisions). Their purpose was to examine a subordinate's real authority and the impact that having real authority has on the employee. They found that the perceived costs of delegation of real authority limited the willingness of the supervisor to delegate anything that was personally important to the supervisor, anything to an untrusted employee, anything that was perceived to be especially important to that employee, or anything about which the supervisor did not have previous experience or expertise.

Argyris (1998), Nyhan (1999), and Doig and Wilson (1998) saw this problem as requiring greater preparation by managers and employees for empowerment if it is to succeed. The challenge to management, then, is that its attempt to empower employees must be genuine in both reality and employee perception. As Quinn and Spreitzer (1997) noted, *"It is nearly impossible for unempowered people to empower others"* (46, emphasis in original). Just as Nyhan (1999) found that public sector employees are more cynical than private sector employees, Argyris (1998) believed that all employees are

offended by managers who encourage an internal commitment, i.e., provide opportunities for empowerment, and at the same time continue with traditional management practices. Perception is as important as reality; an employee's perception that the organization does not support their empowerment or that the supervisor cannot be trusted in this new empowered relationship will reduce a willingness to accept the organization's efforts to build an empowered environment.

Successful empowerment efforts require a strong relationship between employee and supervisor - an enhanced level of trust between employee and immediate supervisor as well as employee and top management. Employees want to trust that they can take risks, make mistakes, and determine how best to do their jobs without fear of recrimination. As a result, employees must trust that the organization really wants to empower them, and the employee must be willing to accept and utilize the empowerment opportunities they are given. When the employee trusts that their supervisors and top management have an honest interest in employee welfare and keep their promises, the employee will respond constructively to the challenges and opportunities that are presented to them. (Mishra and Spreitzer, 1998). Higher levels of employee trust in the supervisor is likely to improve employee response to empowerment.

1.6. Trust as a Management Tool

Today, large organizations create complex relationships for which the traditional bureaucratic organization has been the logical method for organizational management (Allcorn, 1997). Managers and frontline employees alike are comfortable with their roles;

the structure is familiar to all internal and external members. There are specific roles and boundaries that reduce uncertainty of operation and maintain predictability. This organizational comfort results in a resistance to change – even when that change can result in greater flexibility and control by those employees most responsible for the delivery of services.

Trust is an increasingly examined construct in the area of management, because "trust profoundly affects the relationship between subordinates and supervisors" (Brehm and Gates, 2002: 15). Trust-worthiness includes a concern for others' interest, competence, openness, and reliability (Mishra and Spreitzer, 1998). In the supervisor-employee relationship, trust in the supervisor is a belief by the employee that the supervisor keeps promises, behaves in a consistent manner, and provides the employee with straight answers (Reinke and Baldwin, 2001). A feeling of trust is not based upon competence only; "if you sense that person is not kind, then you have to hold something back" (H.H. the Dalai Lama, 1998: 40). Before managers are willing to empower their employees, they must first trust them (Mayer et.al., 1995). Cooperation between employee and supervisor requires trust to succeed (Child and Faulkner, 1998). There is, however, a common lack of interest in trust in most books on public administration (Thomas, 1998).

Trust is multidimensional, and there is no consensus of an empirical definition of the construct of trust in the supervisor (McCauley and Kuhnert, 1992). It, therefore, becomes necessary to find alternative methods to operationalize this trust relationship.

Organizational justice becomes a part of the discussion of trust because employees are concerned with the fairness of the outcomes they receive and the fairness

of the decision processes used to determine the allocation of rewards (Beugré, 1998). At least three different concepts within organizational justice have been discussed in the literature: 1) distributive justice (Beugré and Baron, 2001; Tepper, 2000; Williams, 1999; Mishra and Spreitzer, 1998; Skarlicki and Folger, 1997; Folger and Konovsky, 1989), 2) procedural justice (Beugré and Baron, 2001; Masterson, et.al. 2000; Tepper, 2000; Williams, 1999; Mishra and Spreitzer, 1998; Skarlicki and Folger, 1997; Makkai and Braithwaite, 1996; Tata and Bowes-Sperry, 1996; Folger and Konovsky, 1989), and 3) interactional justice (Beugré and Baron, 2001; Masterson, et.al. 2000; Tepper, 2000; Mishra and Spreitzer, 1998; Skarlicki and Folger, 1997; Tata and Bowes-Sperry, 1996).

First, distributive justice refers to employee perceptions about whether they receive the outcomes they believe they deserve, such as pay level, work schedule, work load, and job responsibilities (i.e., fair rewards for employee decisions). Mishra and Spreitzer (1998) added a second element, that of shared burden across the organizational hierarchy when the organization is going through downsizing.

Second, procedural justice is the formal organizational structures or the formal procedural mechanisms of compensation, evaluation, rewards, and dispute resolution. The process needs to be consistent, with bias suppression, accurate, correctable, representative, and ethical (Gabris and Ihrke, 2001). Management decisions that are grounded “in a well-established performance management system” that links the decisions “to the future mission of the organization” are perceived as procedurally fair (Mishra and Spreitzer, 1998: 576).

Finally, interactional justice takes procedural justice one step further. As procedural justice examines the formal organizational structures, interactional justice

deals with the employee perception of the implementation of the rules by the supervisors - interpersonal treatment and employee belief that they are treated with respect and honesty. Bies (1987) noted research has shown that management decisions, even unpopular ones, accompanied by explanations for the decision promote greater employee belief that the decisions are fair.

Distributive justice has proven to be a less effective measure of trust. Barling and Phillips (1993) found no influence of distributive justice on trust in management in their survey of full-time Canadian students. Distributive justice appears even less meaningful in a governmental setting. Rewards are a tangible element of how empowered an employee may be, but in the public sector the legislative process typically sets employment conditions. Thus, the variation in outcomes for such issues as pay level, schedule, work load, and job responsibilities is more limited. Individual agencies and supervisors do not have much influence over these decisions and the parameters are limited.

There is a link between procedural fairness and trust (Barling and Philips, 1993). Procedural justice, or one of its components, is frequently reported as a variable related to trust (Folger and Konovsky, 1989; Korsgaard, et.al., 1995; Kim and Mauborgne, 1991). Therefore,

H₁: Procedural justice is positively associated to the employee's perception of empowerment.

Interactional justice also has been found to create trust in management (Barling and Phillips, 1993). Therefore,

H₂: Interactional justice is positively associated to the employee's perception of empowerment.

Brockner and Siegel (1996) found that over time procedural and interactional justice may create higher levels of trust. Therefore, procedural justice and interactional justice will be used to operationalize trust.

1.7. Trust as a Foundation for Empowerment

Empowerment efforts for which there is little preparation can create an environment of mistrust within the organization. Trust has been shown to be an important component of the relationship between supervisor and employee. In the public sector, trust can lead to greater performance by employees. As Carnevale (1995) noted, "If it is believed that people instinctively enjoy work, then trust and empowerment follow" (35). However, studies linking trust and empowerment have only looked at the supervisor's trust in the employee. No studies have examined a link between an employee's trust in the supervisor and an employee's perception of empowerment. If there is a link between employee trust in the supervisor, it may prove important for the successful implementation of employee empowerment efforts within an organization.

The reinvention movement gives considerable attention to employee empowerment. Trust appears to provide a strong foundation underlying both empowerment and employee motivation. The assumption is that as employees become empowered they become sufficiently self-motivated to work effectively and efficiently in the best interest of the organization and, in the case of a public agency, of the citizens. When employees believe that the leader considered their opinions and that they are legitimate members of an organizational team, they will sense greater trust in their leader (Korsgaard et.al.,

1995). The employee must both perceive and receive a willingness by the manager to support a bottom-up decision-making process, to provide the tools and training for the employee to function in an empowered environment, and to accept the decisions and feedback of the employees. As Spreitzer (1996) noted, “[M]utual trust ... breaks down forces of domination in a work unit and enhances empowerment” (498).

Studies have shown that the success of empowerment depends on a clear vision for empowerment that is shared by all employees (Wilkinson, 1995). Employees must believe that they are empowered by the organization, and they must be willing to accept and utilize the empowerment opportunities they receive. Trust is a basis for empowerment because trust is necessary for employees to build greater capability and potential (Boren, 1994). In an environment of task delegation, especially if the employee is concerned with criticism from the supervisor, employee trust in the supervisor improves the communication necessary for successful delegation (Aghion and Tirole, 1997). Quinn and Spreitzer (1997) stated that people will sense empowerment “in an environment that values and supports risk, trust, and initiative” (48). The opportunity for empowerment increases when trust between supervisor and employee exists. Therefore,

- H₃: Trust (procedural justice and interactional justice) is positively associated to the employee’s perception of empowerment.
- H₄: Employees who perceive that they have a high level of trust (procedural justice and interactional justice) in the supervisor will have a higher sense of empowerment than employees who have a low level of trust in the supervisor.

1.8. Empowerment in the Public Sector

Recently, academically identified differences between the public and private

sectors have been blurred by the greater use of private and non-profit organizations to perform traditional public sector functions. Reinventing government is a recent manifestation of this trend. The reinventing government and the new public entrepreneurship have gained momentum in the public sector because of a perceived lack of flexibility within the traditional organizational structure.

Reinventing government – the governmental reform process advocated by Osborne and Gaebler (1992) and Osborne and Plastrik (1997) and embraced by the Clinton Administration (see Gore, 1993) – emphasized the role of employees and the need to empower them as the core of any effort to reduce the size of government and to improve government services to citizens. Employee empowerment promised a move from a system where the hierarchical decision-making approach depended upon managers to a system where the control hierarchy was reduced or dismantled, i.e., a push of decision-making authority down to the frontline employees (Langbein, 2000). Empowerment took advantage of employee creativity and talents – a creativity that both human relations and reinvention theories believed the traditional organization structure stifled.

In spite of widespread criticism that their recommendations were inconsistent, lacked real practical advice, and lacked empirical foundations for their recommendations (see Williams, 2000), Osborne and Gaebler became worldwide populist gurus for change in governmental operations after the publication of their 1992 book, *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. In this first discussion, they “described the characteristics of entrepreneurial governments” but “did not lay out the strategies by which bureaucratic systems and organizations [can] be

transformed into entrepreneurial systems and organizations” (Osborne and Plastrik 1997: 9-10). Their 1997 follow-up book, *Banishing Bureaucracy: The Five Strategies for Reinventing Government*, outlined these strategies. They suggested that the best way to change the emphasis from management demands to customer demands is through employee empowerment. The empowerment process required the shift of decision-making to the lowest possible level, which is usually at the level that has the greatest contact with the citizen-customer. A core belief within the reinventing government philosophy is that as customers use their knowledge to make informed demands for governmental services those services will improve, go out of existence, or be provided by the private sector.

A goal of empowerment is to reduce the traditional hierarchy in a bureaucracy; in fact, the emphasis is on the needs of the customer for goods and services provided by the organization rather than the needs of the organization. If there is to be greater commitment by the employee to the organization, the traditional command and control relationships between the supervisor and employee must change. The flow of information and communication becomes distinctively bottom-up rather than top-down. Lower level employees are given greater discretion, or empowerment, to make adjustments as needed without first obtaining approval from management.

Not everyone agrees that empowerment is appropriate in the public sector. There is the potential for public employees “to neglect the public perspective or public service standards,” although there is little evidence of misappropriation or fraud in public agencies that instituted the principles of empowerment (Doig and Wilson, 1998: 272). This may occur because through empowerment the managers and employees may see

themselves not as a part of the greater public agency but of the individual program for which they work. Additionally, the public interest perspective may not be consistent with a reward system that only recognizes individual initiative and responsibility.

Behn (1995) discussed motivation as one of the “big questions” in public management. He considered it the “core of the human resource problem of government reform” (454). His concern was that managers may not know how to motivate public employees to achieve public objectives because in the public sector managers have little discretion in the creation of pay scales, in providing pay incentives or rewards, in formulating benefits, and in establishing work conditions. Supervisors in the public sector are traditionally seen as constrained because of the inability to know the preferences and abilities of their employees or to directly observe all their actions (Brehm and Gates, 1997). The principal-agent theory discusses this constraint as an opportunity for agent "shirking." Managers, especially public managers, are faced with a constant need to “identify strategies to motivate employees to increase their effectiveness and to increase the productivity of their units” (Nyhan, 1999: 58).

Any discussion of employee empowerment is complicated by the continuing debate about the level of discretion that should be exercised by public employees. If citizens are “customers,” then greater discretion and flexibility at lower levels of the organization are needed to better respond to citizen demands. But government organizations are traditionally bureaucratic in nature with hierarchy, limited span of control, top-down management, and legal constraints on the alternatives available to the public administrator. Legal constraints that involve the provision of services to the public and include employee protections against managerial abuse and job layoffs or

reassignment also limit managerial control within the organization. As a result, the public sector is often viewed as inefficient with an overabundance of poor quality employees. Thus, one side of the argument is that the public sector, in general, does not have the discretion and flexibility typically found in private sector organizations.

The alternative argument contends that public employees already have more discretion in their duties than private sector employees (Carnevale, 1995). Although public employees typically have very detailed job rules and regulations for the performance of their duties, a great deal of judgment and discretion are required to do it well. Using the language of empowerment, public employees typically provide services directly to the customer in “face-to-face” encounters. Thus, “[i]t is impossible to fully establish rules and procedures for all the contingencies and nuances of each individual confrontation” (Carnevale, 1995: 78).

The key debate between public and private administration is the apparent conflict between the perceived rationality of the private management model (with its standard of economic efficiency) and the public management model (with its normative foundations of efficiency, effectiveness, and equality tempered by consensus and compromise). But organizations share similar structures whether they are within the public sector or the private sector. Consequently, public management has borrowed heavily from private sector practices.

1.9. Reinventing Government and Empowerment in Operation: The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act¹

¹ See Appendix 1 for a more detailed discussion of federalism and the history of The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996.

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) provides an example of an attempt to implement the language of empowerment into the governmental operations surrounding welfare in the United States. Welfare programs at the national and state levels were described as embodying the worst characteristics of governmental organization: multiple layers of approvals required with corresponding oversight, volumes of rules and regulations designed to limit discretion at all levels, and thousands of insensitive employees more interested in their pay and benefits than the needs of their clients. PRWORA was intended to change that environment.

First, the historical background on welfare can be helpful. Federalism and states rights as core concepts in American governmental theory have shaped policy choices throughout the history of the United States from the creation of the original arguments surrounding the drafting of the Constitution through the armed fighting of the Civil War to the Roosevelt New Deal (with its introduction of greater federal roles in traditionally state issues by setting standards and distributing funds known as cooperative federalism or “marblecake” federalism) to the current devolutionary era where states are given new opportunities for experimentation and policy control. The election of the Republican-controlled Congress in 1994 was the latest wave of “New Federalism” (Cashin, 1999; Mackey, 1998; Tannenwald, 1998).

Welfare policy paralleled this changing emphasis on the relationship between the national and state governments and consistently became a focal point of discussion about this relationship. Welfare was an issue punctuated with major policy initiatives during the New Deal era under President Franklin Roosevelt and the Great Society under President

Lyndon Johnson. As welfare developed into an entitlement program welfare costs rose for both the federal government and the states. Both the federal government and the states sought causes and solutions for the underlying issues that increased these welfare costs. The complex issues of paternity and child support became consistently equated with poverty, especially children in poverty.

In 1996 PRWORA espoused the opportunity for experimentation as justification for the welfare reforms it advocated. “[T]he key reform of welfare consists of attempting to decentralize the program to the 50 states and thereby stimulate numerous creative approaches to dealing with social problems” (Gayner, 1995). States were given greater authority over program features that had traditionally been specified through federal law or regulation. They also had discretion to design their administrative structure, whether that meant through multiple state agencies or through contractual relationships with charitable, religious or non-profit organizations. The reduction in federal “strings” also encouraged welfare organizations to be rewarded for their actual performance in achieving the Act objectives (Lurie, 1997).

Opponents to the legislation charged that the loss of federal restrictions on state action would give caseworkers the ability to lengthen the process of eligibility determination and "create other hassles to discourage [citizens with needs] from coming on assistance or receiving the correct amount of assistance” (Lurie, 1997: 85). Potentially, the inherent lack of sophistication by welfare recipients and the greater discretion by caseworkers would prevent the applicant from receiving all eligible benefits. Caseworker discretion would create questions of equity and accountability.

Francis (1998), on the other hand, believed that the organization and professionalism within the state welfare bureaucracy would provide a legitimate balance against potential state cutbacks in benefits and support. Public sector administrators strive to achieve the same level of services at lower cost. They “typically formulate plans, mobilize constituencies, provide access to favored groups, and advocate policies that can benefit themselves and the populations they serve” (154). For example, he found that political decision-makers in New England welcomed welfare agency administrators as active participants in the identification and implementation of state priorities and policies in compliance with welfare reform.

Congressional supporters believed that the states were best suited to reduce welfare dependence in a way that would also increase employment, marriage, and individual responsibility (Cashin, 1999). The Act changed welfare law to help families become less dependent on welfare and move them toward self-sufficiency, in part by improving child support collections (Sorenson and Zibman, 1999). The political premise was that state governments could do a better job in developing welfare reforms and could be more responsive and accountable to the electorate than the federal government could ever be (Cashin, 1999). Local welfare office staff were charged “to construct and sustain a case management process intended to improve recipients’ lives as much as possible given a limited services budget” (Wiseman, 1996: 611).

Although one of the purposes of PRWORA was to reduce recipient reliance on government and to reduce the cost of welfare on government, at the same time the social worker had an obligation to act “individually and collectively to promote effective allocation and utilization of resources” (Long, 2000: 72). “The state controls who is

worth receiving public money” (Nissen, 1999: 249). “Rather than the worker ascertaining either what benefits the recipient was or was not entitled to, the worker now has an employment goal” – to place clients into paying jobs (Wolk and Schmahl, 1999: 28). The task was complicated by the fact that “much of what goes on in street-level welfare operation is difficult for higher levels of management to observe” (Wiseman, 1996: 612).

Nathan and Gais (2000) concluded that PRWORA essentially changed the concept of welfare and social programs and their delivery. As anticipated by the reformers, the devolution of the welfare program created more operational variations at the state and local social service delivery agencies.

Consistent with the tenants of reinventing government, welfare offices were expected to create a better customer-service orientation in their service delivery. Social work is dedicated to promoting the well being of the clients who need help. Social workers had a long-held adherence to the professional ideals of social-economic justice and human dignity. “Social workers hold a common bond in believing that people deserve fair and reasonable access to basic resources (e.g. food, housing, employment, education, and health care)” (Long, 2000: 66). They were trained to evaluate client needs and at-risk population groups. The devolution of responsibility to the caseworker outlined by PRWORA built on this training. Their role in the application of the broad requirements of social legislation to the real client increased the consequences for the client and the agency. They could no longer rely upon the traditional “safety net” of the welfare system to provide minimum services to their clients. The decisions by the caseworkers have definite and immediate consequences for the clients. According to Gross (1997), caseworkers who perform their tasks under the new legislation had an

obligation to their consumers “to find ways to make the new reforms work for [the consumers]” (133).

The change in the welfare environment anticipated by PRWORA makes a study of the state and local employees in social service and health services particularly timely. It is an opportunity to determine whether the language of reinventing government and empowerment has actually been implemented at the levels where delivery of those services occurs. If empowerment is supposed to give employees at the client level greater discretion, employees who provide social and health services should have greater discretion in determining the best responses to their clients' needs. If, however, these employees do not report a greater sense of empowerment, assuming that empowerment is really a management objective, are there organizational issues which can be addressed to improve the employees' sense of empowerment in the deliver of services?

1.10. Summary

Organizational theorists during the past 20 years have given a considerable amount of attention to the concept of employee empowerment and advocated it as a means to distribute organizational effectiveness and employee motivation. Employee empowerment became a cornerstone of reinventing government proposals as a means to improve governmental effectiveness and client services. The Personal Responsibility and Work Reconciliation Act of 1996 demonstrated an effort to implement a new relationship between the national and state governments in the area of welfare and social service delivery.

Empowerment efforts have been attempted in both the private and public sectors with mixed results. Some argue that empowerment is not appropriate within the public sector. Although reasons for failures have been discussed, little has been done to determine what organizational characteristics might preclude empowerment implementation efforts to improve success. Employee trust in the supervisor facilitates constructive responses to management initiatives, but its relationship to empowerment has received little attention. Chapter 2 discusses the literature of empowerment and trust and presents hypotheses about the relationship between empowerment and trust based upon this literature review.

Chapter 2

Empowerment and Trust: The Empirical Evidence

2.1. Introduction

There has been little qualitative and quantitative research on empowerment in the public sector and the relationship between trust and empowerment. Most studies have looked only in the private sector, and this background can form a foundation for additional research on empowerment in the public sector. Particular attention is given to Thomas and Velthouse's (1990) conceptualization of empowerment as a psychological construct with four core components: competence, impact, meaning, and self-determination. The chapter also looks at the role of trust in the supervisor.

Operationalization of trust has been difficult and the alternative use of interactional justice and procedural justice is discussed. Hypotheses based upon this research that might explain the relationship between procedural justice, interactional justice, and trust with empowerment are summarized at the end of the chapter.

2.2. Research on Empowerment

Although the term "has been used very loosely by practitioners and indeed academics" (Wilkinson, 1997: 45), the use of the model of empowerment has increased in managerial and academic attention during the past ten years. Lee and Koh (2001) noted that the term is ambiguous conceptually and often used interchangeably with similar words, such as authority delegation, motivation, self-efficacy, job enrichment, employee

ownership, autonomy, self-determination, self-management, self-control, self-influence, self-leadership, high-involvement, and participative management.

Since the late 1980s, empowerment has been seen as a process of employee participation in decision-making intended to increase employee commitment and contributions to the organization. Organizational behavior and management for over 50 years, however, have discussed this concept of employee participation in the organization (Chisholm and Vanisna, 1993). For example, McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y examined authoritative management and participative management. Theory X managers may "find it difficult to utilize organizational practices that rely on trust and confidence in subordinates" (Bowditch and Buono, 1997: 86). In the 1960's Likert proposed System 4 as a participative organizational design that was non-bureaucratic in nature in that management and employees interacted in an environment of confidence and trust.

Two recent articles found that participation is not sufficient to meet the expectations of empowerment. Marshall and Stohl (1993) looked at participation at a network rather than at the individual level by studying 148 hourly workers divided into 14 teams at a Midwestern processing plant. They found some evidence that a sense of empowerment by employees "is more closely related to feeling satisfied than simply becoming more involved in the communicative system" (152). Participation is important, but it remains within a management perspective that rarely includes power sharing, especially at the "higher level strategic decisions such as product and investment plans" (Wilkinson, 1995: 49).

Chisholm and Vanisna (1993) examined the literature about if and how participation by employees contributes to employee and organization improvement. They

described participation in the organization as a continuum between when employees are rarely encouraged to participate in decision solving, i.e., sporadic use, and when employees routinely participate in autonomous work groups, i.e., continuous use. Chisholm and Vanisna saw participation and empowerment as "integrally intertwined" (304). Empowered employees see a shift from the mechanics of participation to believing that their participation is a way to influence the functions of the organization. The result is an employee with greater self-esteem and a willingness to participate in the organization's future activities.

Thomas and Velthouse (1990) concluded that participation alone is an inadequate attempt at empowerment and that the success of the organization's efforts are also affected by whether the task is meaningful, the employee feels competent to perform the task, and the organization acts upon employee suggestions or decisions (678). They looked at the existing models of empowerment as a motivational process, in particular the effort by Conger and Kanungo (1988) to identify the "organizational conditions, managerial strategies, and types of information that produce empowerment and its behavioral effects" (666). Thomas and Velthouse saw the existing understanding of empowerment as emphasizing external conditions and events, such as job characteristics or leaders' behavior (668). They argued instead that empowerment should be considered a new paradigm created through an emphasis on intrapersonal cognitive processes (669). These processes included the employee's assessment of the task, the employee's past assessment of the global environment, and the employee's interpretive style. They determined that the conceptual definition of empowerment should consist of a psychological model of four task assessments that lead to intrinsic task motivation:

impact on work outcomes, competence (similar to self-efficacy or the level of skill an employee applies to work tasks), meaningfulness (a matching of the individual's personal ideals to the goals of the task), and choice (self-determination). The organization must address its empowerment effort in all these ways if it wants the employees to actually have a sense of empowerment.

By conducting two separate empirical studies in Montreal, one with 125-French speaking graduate students and one with 40 French-speaking swim team athletes, Richer and Vallerand (1995) concluded that supervisory style has much to do with the intrinsic motivation felt by employees. The supervisor who provides an environment of autonomy and support to the employees is rewarded with employees who feel higher levels of self-determination, competence, and intrinsic motivation. Self-determination and competence are two of the four components of the Thomas and Velthouse (1990) conceptualization of empowerment.

Liden and Arad (1996) reviewed literature that examined empowerment as a micro concept ("determinates of intrinsic motivation," 205) and macro concept ("structural conditions that enable individuals and groups to assume greater levels of power," 205) and continued the debate on the foundations of empowerment as a new term for an old concept. Their emphasis was upon the role of power within the organization. Research viewed power as a prize that was achieved in several identifiable ways by organizational members: 1) reaching the higher levels of the formal organizational structure, 2) becoming the center of an informal network, 3) possessing critical resources or expertise, 4) utilizing political behavior, or 5) attaching to key organizational members (206, 207). They saw power as the integrating element within both the micro and macro

sides. The unique nature of empowerment is that within the organizational structure it becomes an intentional effort by the organization to share power with individuals or groups that could not otherwise achieve power in the traditional manner.

Parker and Price (1994) used self-administered surveys to study 692 workers and 141 managers of group homes in Michigan. They defined empowerment as the employee's perceived control over decision making in the organization. They examined the level of managerial support for empowerment and found that managers who empower their employees did not lose their own sense of empowerment. Likewise, workers who perceived their managers as supportive believed that they were influential in the organization. "[W]orkers feel most empowered when they perceive that their managers are both empowered and supportive" (923). Thus, the workers' own sense of empowerment increased when they had supportive managers who perceived that they were empowered and in control of their work environment.

Liden and Arad (1996) saw the Thomas and Velthouse (1990) psychological empowerment dimensions as having a foundation in the Job Characteristic Model (JCM). Job characteristics, a theory first advocated by Hackman and Oldham (1976), saw intrinsic motivation achieved through the core job characteristics of skill variety, task identity, task significance, and feedback with the mediation of the psychological states of experienced meaningfulness, experienced responsibility, and knowledge of results. Liden and Arad incorporated three of the Thomas and Velthouse (1990) empowerment dimensions – competence, choice, and impact – into their own model of the power acquisition process. "Competence is a necessary prerequisite for power acquisition; choice represents potential for power acquisition; and impact depicts the actual use of

power” (211, 212). They concluded that "empowerment is an organizationally induced strategy that distributes power across a larger proportion of the organizational work force" (207).

In contrast, however, Corsun and Enz (1999) described psychological empowerment as distinct from JCM because empowerment “exists as a result of factors other than structural change or work redesign” (208). They believed that employees could hold a sense of empowerment along a continuum, rather than just the dichotomy of being empowered or not being empowered.

In a more recent study, Liden et.al. (2000) compared the concept of empowerment to three earlier theories of the social context and the nature of work – job characteristics (based upon JCM; see Hackman and Oldham, 1976), leader-member exchange (LMX; see Liden et.al., 1993; see Dansereau et.al. 1975), and team-member exchange (TMX; see Seers, 1989). The leader-member exchange stressed the importance of the leader in the supervisor-employee relationship and the employee's work experiences; the quality of the leader-member exchange determined the employee's perception of empowerment. Team-member exchange, described by Seers (1989), emphasized the importance of work group members on the individual employee when the other workers share resources and support, work-related expertise and feedback, and social support.

Liden et.al. (2000) used employee questionnaires and supervisor interviews in a large service organization with divisions in three Midwest states ($n = 337$) to compare these three theories on the four dimensions of empowerment as a mediating variable for work satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job performance. Table 2.1 shows the results of their regression of the four empowerment dimensions against the three

variables. Job characteristics were positively related to the four dimensions of empowerment [meaning, competence, self-confidence, and impact], but LMX was only related to impact and self-determination, but not competence or meaning. They were surprised to find, however, that TMX was not related in a statistically significant way to any of the dimensions of empowerment. This finding may indicate that empowerment is achieved more at an individual level than as a group, but also that the relationship between employee and supervisor is important in the employee's sense of empowerment. The study confirmed previous research that job characteristics such as recognition and

**Table 2.1 Empowerment Components Regressed on Job Characteristics, Leader-Member Exchange, and Team-Member Exchange
(N = 337)**

Dependent Variables	Empowerment Components Beta Coefficients			
	Meaning	Impact	Competence	Self-Determination
Job Characteristics	.53**	.45**	.14*	.39**
Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)	.07	.14**	-.03	.18**
Team-Member Exchange (TMX)	.06	.05	.10	.06
Adjusted R²	.33	.27	.02	.25

Source: Liden, et.al. (2000: 412)

*p < .05 ** p < .01

responsibility can be important intrinsic motivating factors for the employee, and the study extended the importance of job characteristics on the psychological components of empowerment. As discussed previously, however, supervisors in the public sector may have some control over the job characteristics of their employees, but it is often limited by the rules and regulations established by governing bodies and higher management. More important to this current research was the relationship of the supervisor and employee and its impact upon the employee's sense of empowerment.

The attention given to the concept of empowerment in the quantitative and qualitative literature is demonstrated by the 67 studies published between 1990 and 2002 that include empowerment as a variable. All of the studies are summarized in the table included in Appendix 2. The great majority of these studies use empowerment as an independent variable; only eleven of the identified studies use empowerment as a dependent variable (Laschinger, et.al., 2001; Vardi, 2000; Koberg et.al., 1999; Proctor et.al. (1999); Spreitzer, et.al., 1999; Spreitzer, et.al., 1997; Spreitzer, 1996, 1995; Corsun and Enz, 1999; Campbell and Martinko, 1998; Parker and Price, 1994; Marshall and Stohl, 1993). Two of the eleven studies were conducted outside of the United States. Laschinger, et.al. (2001) used nurses in tertiary hospitals in Ontario, Canada. Vardi (2000) used professionals from a variety of different organizations in Tel Aviv, Israel.

Only one of these eleven studies used subjects from the public sector (Campbell and Martinko, 1998). In their examination of employees in a regulatory agency in a southeastern state, Campbell and Martinko (1998) used a combination of questionnaires (n = 155), semistructured interviews (n = 40, chosen from the 155 questionnaire respondents) and subjective researcher evaluations to examine whether learned helplessness and employee empowerment were really the same construct on a continuous scale. They defined learned helplessness as “a debilitating cognitive state in which individuals often possess the requisite skills and abilities to perform their jobs, but exhibit suboptimal performance because they attribute prior failures to causes which they cannot change” (175) Unlike empowered employees, employees who demonstrated levels of learned helplessness tended to blame uncontrollable and global causes when negative events occurred in their work environment. Campbell and Martinko pointed out that

empowerment is individually influenced and cannot be achieved simply through organizational initiative or management practices.

Spreitzer (1995a, 1995b, 1996) was the first to empirically operationalize the Thomas and Velthouse (1990) conceptual definition of empowerment with its four components of competence, impact, meaning, and self-determination. She found that the four dimensions “combine additively to create an overall construct of psychological empowerment ... in which an individual wishes and feels able to shape his or her work role and context” (1995a: 1444). She published individual and collaborative articles on psychological empowerment and leadership development in the private sector with a particular emphasis on organizational change and downsizing. Her foundational studies in 1995 and 1996 became the basis for numerous other studies (the 1995a article has been cited 65 times between 1995 and 2001 and the 1996 article 37 times between 1996 and 2001). A further discussion of Spreitzer's psychological empowerment scale is found in Chapter 3.

Empowerment has been examined as a motivational process of encouraging employee participation in decision-making and an organizational sharing of power. However, participation is not sufficient to meet the expectations of empowerment (Marshall and Stohl, 1993; Chisholm and Vanisna, 1993; Thomas and Velthouse, 1990), and empowerment can be viewed as an intentional attempt by the organization to share power with members of the organization who would not normally share in it (Liden and Arad, 1996). Yet, in spite of both anecdotal and empirical evidence in its support (Chisholm and Vanisna, 1993; Thomas and Velthouse, 1990), empowerment efforts are not universal and not all efforts have been successful (Marshall and Stohl, 1993).

Empowerment has been shown to have a strong relationship to the Hackman and Oldham (1976) Job Characteristics Model (Liden and Arad, 1996; Corsun and Enz, 1999; Liden et.al., 2000), a partial relationship with the Liden et.al. leader-member exchange (Liden et.al., 2000), and no relationship with the Seers team-member exchange (Liden et.al., 2000). Spreitzer (1995a, 1995b, 1996) operationalized the Thomas and Velthouse (1990) definition of empowerment with its four components of competence, impact, meaning, and self-determination.

2.3. Research on Trust

Organizational effectiveness is dependent upon the existence of trust within the organization. Trust is critical for leadership credibility, yet trust is "elusive and difficult to comprehend" (Carnevale, 1995: 19). Private sector leadership was described as possessing two primary responsibilities: to epitomize trust and to create an organizational culture of support for trust (Shaw, 1997). A review of research on trust shows that it is a multifaceted and subjective construct.

Bowditch and Buono (1997), in their broad discussion of organizational behavior, described trust as the interaction of several components: integrity (honesty and truthfulness), competence (technical knowledge and interpersonal skill), consistency (reliability, predictability, and good judgment), loyalty (willingness to protect, support, and encourage), and openness (willingness to share ideas) (141). They saw trust as one of the influences on the credibility given to any message by its receiver. "Since trust is a strong determinant of openness and accuracy, we tend to believe those individuals we trust" (126). If the receiver trusts the messenger, there is a greater degree of openness and acceptance of the accuracy of the message.

Roberts and O'Reilly (1974), in their effort to create and validate an instrument to measure communication within and across organizations, found employee trust in the immediate supervisor increased the willingness of the employee to believe information given to them by the supervisor. They used graduate students with prior work experience and mental health workers to reduce their original pool of 189 items to the final instrument with 35 items. The final instrument was then administered to seven different groups of employees and military personnel ($n = 1,218$) in the United Kingdom and the United States. Items to measure trust in the supervisor were included because it has "been repeatedly shown to influence individual communication in organizations" (321). Trust in the supervisor was significantly related to the respondent's overall job satisfaction, perceived considerate leadership style, perceived organizational competence and flexibility, and commitment to the organization (325).

When there is mutual trust between supervisor and employee, the amount of feedback and communication increases. Nathan et.al. (1991) studied the appraisal review and its impact upon actual performance measures. They tested whether the supervisor-subordinate interpersonal relationship prior to the appraisal was positively related to results-oriented evaluation criteria, career discussion, and employee participation in the review. They administered two questionnaires at separate times to 300 dyads of professionals and managers with their supervisors in a multinational, multiindustry corporation. The employee's performance review occurred between the two questionnaires. They found that "the more evaluations were based on behavioral, results-oriented criteria, the more career issues were discussed, and the more subordinates had an opportunity to participate in the discussion, the greater their satisfaction with work and

supervisor” (363). They found that the interpersonal relationship between the supervisor and subordinate profoundly affected both the content of a review, such as the subordinate's opportunity to participate, the evaluation criteria, and issues important to the subordinate, and the subordinate's subsequent actions, such as attitudes toward work, supervisor, and organization.

In their cross-sectional research design to examine the manager-employee relationship, Gomez and Rosen (2001) studied 128 manager-employee dyads at 13 diverse industries using questionnaires to examine the Leader-Member Exchange (LMX; see Dansereau et.al., 1975) theory. They saw LMX as a link between managerial trust and employee empowerment. They defined managerial trust as a belief by the manager in the competence, openness, concern and reliability of the employee. Although they did not specifically hypothesize a relationship between managerial trust and employee empowerment, they found that "the organization must support the empowered employees by providing them with the needed resources and information along with the adequate responsibility and power" and "successful implementation of empowerment efforts depends on managers' willingness to relinquish control and share power" (66). They pointed out that, while high levels of managerial trust could enhance an employee's perception of empowerment, the employee is also a contributor to the trust relationship.

In particular, employees in public organizations show "persistent evidence of a widening trust gap in the workplace" (Carnevale, 1995: 31). Although his primary emphasis was on the ability of governmental organizations to increase external levels of trust toward the governmental agency, Carnevale (1995) found, first, that the creation of trust within organizations becomes critical because it influences useful learning. Second,

every position has a certain amount of discretion that the employee can use either to further the purposes of the organization or to work against the organization. There is a requirement that the organization and its supervisors must hold a certain level of trust that the employee works for organizational purposes even when not under direct supervision. Third, middle managers and front-line supervisors have a sense of fear and defensiveness that is an antithesis of trust, which makes change more difficult. Finally, trust is a voluntary expression of faith and confidence that a person or an institution will be fair, reliable, ethical, competent, and nonthreatening.

[Trust] is *built* through countless exchanges conducted over time between people where each has something to offer or withhold, and whose conduct demands authenticity. The use of the word *built* in conjunction with trust is meant to underscore the care with which this attitude is constructed, as opposed to commanded or orchestrated. An equally appropriate word is *earned*, which also implies the slow accumulation of this precious capital. (50, 51, emphasis in original)

Carnevale saw a critical role of the leader is to increase the levels of trust within the organization.

In their study of performance feedback in the United States Air Force, Reinke and Baldwin (2001) found trust as critical in the accomplishment of two-way feedback. They used a questionnaire to survey 595 active duty Air Force captains attending the Air Force's Squadron Officer School and to investigate whether the quality of performance feedback is improved through supervisor credibility (as measured by trust and expertise), superior-subordinate similarity, and management support. They found that trust was significantly related to feedback specificity, two-way communication, and feedback objectivity. They concluded that trust was necessary as a way for subordinates to feel comfortable with their supervisors in areas most critical to the supervisor-employee

relationship, including a willingness to request additional feedback. Two-way communication and an acceptance of the objectivity of the feedback information received are enhanced by trust. “Even when management does not believe in or encourage feedback, employees may still perceive they are receiving quality performance evaluation when it comes from trustworthy and expert evaluators” (172).

Gabris et.al. (2001) examined leadership credibility by surveying 108 city administrators, department heads, and elected board members in the Chicago area. A leadership credibility index established by co-author Ihrke in his doctoral dissertation included the willingness of employees to trust the chief-administrative officer (CAO) and place their fate in the hands of that officer. Gabris et.al. reported that when leadership credibility was high, there was a corresponding high level of trust between the CAO and the elected board. Their conclusion was that CAOs with high leadership credibility "might be better at mitigating the degenerative tendencies of the traditional bureaucratic structures they typically administer" (106).

Mistrust, or the absence of trust, has the effect that employees will be defensive and make every effort to protect themselves. According to Carnevale (1995: 20), "Mistrust suggests a belief that someone's intentions and motives are not always what they appear; that a person is insincere, unethical, has ulterior motives, or is unwilling to honor an agreement." Brehm and Gates (2002) noted that when there is a limited amount of trust held by the subordinate in the supervisor, the subordinate is likely to spend more time in the close adherence to the rules and routines as a means to justify their performance and task completion.

Tepper (2000) surveyed 712 full-time residents of a medium-sized Midwestern city selected through random-digit telephone dialing and found that abusive supervision - "the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical contact" (178) - creates lower job and life satisfaction, lower job commitment, worker and family conflict, and psychological distress. Just as Richer and Vallerand (1995) found in their two studies in Montreal that the supervisor who provides an environment of autonomy and support to the employees is rewarded with employees who feel higher levels of self-determination, competence, and intrinsic motivation, a punitive supervisory style results "in a greater reduction in intrinsic motivation, probably because this type of supervisory style had a more negative effect on subordinates' perceptions of competence and self-determination" (719).

Trust has received little empirical attention, especially in the public sector (Nyhan, 2000). Yet trust is reported as essential to the success of the relationship between members of the organization, especially in the area of communication and feedback, and delegation (Nyhan, 2000; Roberts and O'Reilly, 1974; Nathan et.al., 1991; Gomez and Rosen, 2001; Carnevale, 1995; Reinke and Baldwin, 2001; Tepper, 2000). Part of the difficulty in studying trust has been the multifaceted and subjective nature of its conceptualization (Bowditch and Buono, 1997). This situation, therefore, makes it more difficult to operationalize a construct of trust.

2.4. Trust and Empowerment

Although empowerment and organizational change have been important

discussions in the public arena during the past decade, there has been no effort to study the relationship of employee trust in management.

Of the eleven studies with empowerment as a dependent variable identified earlier, only Koberg, et.al. (1999) considered trust as an independent variable and their interest was in a group setting. Intragroup trust was defined as "the extent to which members of a work group hold trust and confidence in one another" (79). Koberg, et.al. surveyed 612 professional employees of a large private hospital and measured empowerment, individual characteristics, group and organizational characteristics, and work outcomes. They found that, as leader approachability, group effectiveness, and group worth increased, feelings of empowerment increased, but they were unable to show that empowerment feelings were related to intragroup trust. This finding is consistent with the Liden et.al. (2000) examination of empowerment and team-member exchange theory. An important finding in this study was that while perceived empowerment was related to employment tenure, it did not differ by gender, ethnicity, or education.

Nyhan (1999) surveyed employees in three different public organizations - 327 employees in the engineering division in a county government, 182 employees of a middle-sized city government, and 100 employees in a community services organization - to study the affective commitment of the employee to the organization. Affective commitment was important because it has been linked with the motivation of the employee to the public service purposes of the governmental organization. He hypothesized that trust would be a strong link to affective commitment. Trust was examined both as a systems trust between organization and employee and as an interpersonal trust between employee and supervisor. Nyhan found that interpersonal

trust had the stronger association with affective commitment and employee empowerment was an important management practice that could improve interpersonal trust. He suggested that if the public organization wanted to see higher levels of affective commitment by its employees, greater attention should be given to these bottom-up relationships.

Budget cuts and organizational downsizing in both the public and private arenas place management in a difficult position. Empowerment, if successful, can potentially be a solution as products and fewer employees provide services with greater flexibility and authority within their tasks without the difficulties and delays of supervisor oversight. Yet, the downsizing environment challenges the opportunities of empowerment if there has been inadequate preparation for empowerment. Trust in the supervisor, if it exists, should improve the willingness of the employee to assume greater responsibilities inherent in an empowerment effort as well as improve the success of an organization faced with downsizing.

Research has demonstrated that the relationship between the various actors within the organization is important in a variety of circumstances (Parker and Price, 1994). It is anticipated here that this would be no less true in the organization's efforts to implement empowerment. Since empowerment has been shown to be a top-down process, and trust is important in the interactions among the members of the organization, it can be expected that any pre-existing trust relationship between the employee and the supervisor will also have an impact upon the success of the organization's effort to empower its employees.

2.5. Hypotheses

Although empowerment and organizational change have been important discussions in the public arena during the past decade, there has been no effort to study their relationship to employee trust in management. Further research is needed to examine the conditions under which empowerment is most effective and employee commitment to the implementation of empowerment is improved. The proposed study should help to extend the knowledge within public administration of the relationship between trust and empowerment.

In summary, the dissertation hypothesizes that employee empowerment is linked to trust. The thesis includes procedural justice and interactional justice as surrogate measures of trust. Specifically, the study will test these hypotheses:

- H₁: Procedural justice is positively associated to the employee's perception of empowerment.
- H₂: Interactional justice is positively associated to the employee's perception of empowerment.
- H₃: Trust (procedural justice and interactional justice) is positively associated to the employee's perception of empowerment.
- H₄: Employees who perceive that they have a high level of trust (procedural justice and interactional justice) in the supervisor will have a higher sense of empowerment than employees who have a low level of trust in the supervisor will.

These relationships are anticipated to persist when working directly with clients, years with the agency, and kind of work are controlled.

Chapter 3

Methodology and Sample

3.1. Introduction

The purpose of this dissertation is to gain a better understanding of the relationship between trust and employee perceptions of empowerment. An understanding of the relationship between trust and employee perceptions of empowerment is particularly important when organizations attempt significant change (Beugré, 1998; Thomas, 1998; Skarlicki and Folger, 1997). The level of employee trust in the supervisor may determine whether the empowerment effort and other attempts at organizational change are successful. Employees must believe that they are empowered by the organization, and they must be willing to accept and utilize the empowerment opportunities they receive. Trust is a basis for empowerment because trust is necessary for employees to build greater capability and potential (Boren, 1994).

The research should demonstrate that the strength of the level of trust that an employee has in his or her supervisor directly impacts whether that employee believes that they are empowered within the organization, i.e., perceptions of trust create perceptions of empowerment.

3.2. Sample

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) is one of the many acts that controls the operations of the state health and social service activities, and it was the cornerstone of the Clinton and Republican

Congress pledge to change the welfare system. Although it was intended to devolve more discretion and decision-making authority to the states, the states were still required to comply with a long list of other mandates (Conlan, 1998). Still, however, PRWORA changed the environment of welfare and social service delivery throughout the states. Employees in the social service and health services were the implementers of the changes in welfare policy at the state and local levels.

As a result of this important change in the role of the employee in welfare and social service delivery, employees in departments responsible for social and health services were selected as subjects for this study. These state-level departments typically are one of the largest departments; hire a broad range of social, race and ethnic employees; and the nature of their work typically encourages employee discretion within certain guidelines.

An initial sample of state employees from departments responsible for social services in four states – Maine, New Mexico, North Carolina, Wisconsin – were invited to participate in the study. (Some of the agencies also have health service responsibilities.) A 50-state study was not economically feasible. A multi-state study was still preferred because of the opportunity to compare state-specific results. A set of selection criteria was developed: 1) at least four states, 2) different geographic regions with similar urban/rural mixes, 3) different economic, social, and growth experiences, and 4) on-line employee directories with email addresses for all state employees. Because Maine declined to participate, Vermont was selected as an alternate state.

The chief administrator of the agency responsible for social or health services in each state was asked to provide a means to obtain email addresses of its employees.

North Carolina provided a random sample of over 400 employee names; after randomly selecting 200 employees from this list, the email addresses were obtained through the email directory at the official State of North Carolina webpage. New Mexico provided an employee directory, from which a random sample of 200 employees was identified and their email addresses obtained by using the email directory at the official State of New Mexico webpage. The random sample of 200 employees in Wisconsin was identified and their email addresses found through the official departmental directory at the official State of Wisconsin webpage. The number of sample participants in New Mexico, North Carolina, and Wisconsin was not based upon the size of each agency.

In Vermont, the agency administration, as a condition of its participation, preferred to send out itself an email notice to all applicable employees. The notice briefly explained the project and asked for volunteers. Volunteers indicated their initial willingness to participate, either directly to me or through the Vermont agency administration. This procedure increased the size of the pool of respondents, and it gave the entire population an opportunity to participate in the study.

Although procedures to achieve a simple random sample were followed in New Mexico, North Carolina, and Wisconsin, the "randomness" was threatened for at least three reasons:

- 1) not all employees who were identified through the random selection process actually had an email address (hence, this excluded them from the original sample);
- 2) email addresses were identified from the state's own official webpage.

However, these directories were often inaccurate. The most common problem

was that an employee and email address were on the official directory but email notices were returned as undeliverable or addressee unknown; and

3) while employees without email addresses or with undeliverable addresses were replaced to maintain the original pool size of 200 subjects, the low responses from the original pool in New Mexico, North Carolina, and Wisconsin further compromised the sample (see Table 3.1).

Table 3.1 State Sample Participation

State	Number Contacted	Number Agreed to Participate	Number Participated
New Mexico	200	39	18
North Carolina	200	57	37
Wisconsin	200	28	24
Vermont	1,500 (est)	287	206

It was necessary to determine whether the size of the Vermont response would skew the results of the analysis. The state data were compared using a Pearson chi-square analysis to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference between the demographics of the respondents from Vermont and the respondents of the other three states. If there was not a statistically significant difference between the respondents in the four states, all respondents could be combined into a single pool for further analysis. Table 3.2 provides the results of that analysis. None of the chi-square statistics were statistically significant. As a result, all state responses were combined into one pool. To

Table 3.2 Chi-square Analysis of Vermont and Other States Respondent Demographics

Demographic	State Percentage		Chi-square
	Vermont	Other States	
Work with Clients	N = 203	N = 82	
Yes	68.5	63.4	
No	31.5	36.6	.676 (df = 1) p = .411
Kind of Work	N = 205	N = 82	
Administrative/ Support ¹	36.1	46.3	
Social Services	38.0	31.7	
Health	25.9	22.0	2.586 (df = 2) p = .275
Years with the Agency²	N = 204	N = 82	
0-5 Years	44.1	37.8	
6-15 Years	34.8	31.7	
16+ Years	21.1	30.5	2.894 (df = 2) p = .235

¹Facility Maintenance was recoded and included with Administrative/Support

²Years with the Agency was recoded for this analysis from the original 6 options to 3.

further test the impact of the Vermont response, a dichotomous variable for state with Vermont and "other states" as the two options was included in the regression analysis discussed later.

The social services agencies in an additional 14 states were approached about their willingness to participate in this study. The states were identified using a report from the National Association of State Budget Officers at its official organizational webpage. The report identified states that are experiencing budget shortfalls in 2002. The assumption was that states with budget difficulties would be less willing to participate in

a personnel-related study because of increased workloads and possible discussions of personnel cuts. Eight of these states declined, and six states never responded to repeated inquiries. See Appendix 3 for the status of each state.

An effort was then made to increase the study pool by contacting social service departments in counties within North Carolina. Departments in six counties were identified and contacted because 1) there remained an interest in employees that deliver social services because of the empowerment opportunities anticipated there; 2) the employees in these departments most often provide direct client services; and 3) a pre-existing relationship with the Department of Political Science and Public Administration at North Carolina State University and the staff or administration in the departments might improve the willingness to participate. Each county was requested to follow the "Vermont model" by sending the initial announcement of the study to their employees along with any limitations on participation the administration might deem appropriate. See Appendix 3 for a list of these counties.

Two counties declined to participate. Johnston County agreed to participate, but the department had no way to broadcast the announcement to its employees. An initial 160-hardcopy invitations were distributed to the employees. After two additional follow-up invitations, only 23 employees (14.3%) actually participated. Ultimately, three counties - Durham, Guilford, and Mecklenburg - allowed their employees to participate using the "Vermont model." The Director of Social Services in Mecklenburg limited participation to employees in the Division of Adult Services because of organizational changes occurring in other divisions. Only Guilford County achieved the 50-person threshold that was preferred for individual analysis. Table 3.2 presents the participation

Table 3.3 North Carolina County Sample Participation

County	Number Contacted	Number Agreed to Participate	Number Participated
Johnston	160	29	23
Durham	Unknown	48	44
Guilford	Unknown	66	56
Mecklenburg	260 (est)	60	42

from the four North Carolina counties. Again, Pearson chi-square analysis was conducted to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference between the demographics of the respondents from the four counties or whether they could be combined into a single dataset. Table 3.4 provides the results of that analysis. Although the chi-square statistic was significant for years of service with the agency, all county participants were combined into one pool because 1) an examination of the demographics of the participants showed that except for the years with the agency there was little difference in the participants by county, 2) two cells in the years with the agency had less than expected counts and the addition of just a few respondents could have affected the statistical significance of that variable, and 3) the employees should have similar responsibilities because they all deliver local client services and operate under guidelines established by the North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services. The individual counties were coded as "dummy" variables for the regression analysis discussed later in Chapter 4.

**Table 3.4 Chi-square Analysis of North Carolina County Respondent Demographics
(N = 165)**

Demographic	North Carolina Counties Percentages				Chi-square
	Durham N = 43	Guilford N = 56	Johnston N = 23	Mecklenburg N = 42	
Work with Clients					
Yes	74.4	73.2	87.0	71.4	
No	25.6	26.8	13.0	28.6	2.142 (df = 3) p = .543
Kind of Work¹	N = 44	N = 56	N = 23	N = 42	
Administrative / Support	29.5	21.4	21.7	26.2	
Social Services	70.5	78.6	78.3	73.8	1.030 (df = 3) p = .794
Years with the Agency²	N = 43	N = 56	N = 23	N = 42	
0-5 Years	67.4	37.5	43.5	33.3	
6-15 Years	23.3	30.4	47.8	42.9	
16+ Years	9.3	32.1	8.7	23.8	18.724 (df = 6) p = .005

¹Unlike the State agencies, the county departments provided social services only.

²Years with the Agency was recoded for this analysis from the original 6 options to 3.

3.3. Measures of Empowerment

Empowerment reduces or eliminates hierarchical management controls within organizations and pushes authority down to frontline employees. Spreitzer (1995a) was the first to operationalize and validate the Thomas and Velthouse (1990) conceptual definition of psychological empowerment. Their four elements of empowerment were meaning (the value of the work), competence (ability to perform the work), self-determination (ability to initiate and regulate actions), and impact (ability to influence or determine organizational outcomes). Table 3.5 presents the statements for

Table 3.5 Indicator Statements for Empowerment Used by Spreitzer (1995a)

Meaning

- The work I do is very important to me.
- My job activities are personally meaningful to me.
- The work I do is meaningful to me.

Competence

- I am confident about my ability to do my job.
- I am self-assured about my capabilities to perform my work activities.
- I have mastered the skills necessary for my job.

Self-Determination

- I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job.
- I can decide on my own how to go about doing my work.
- I have considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do my job.

Impact

- My impact on what happens in my department is large.
- I have a great deal of control over what happens in my department.
- I have significant influence over what happens in my department.

NOTE: A 7-point Likert scale was used from very strongly agree to undecided to very strongly disagree.

operationalizing the four components of empowerment.

As part of her testing of a model of empowerment, Spreitzer (1995a) examined two separate samples to cross-validate the measurement model. The first sample consisted of 393 managers randomly selected from all units of a *Fortune 500* industrial organization. The second sample consisted of 128 employees selected through a stratified random sampling technique from an insurance company. There was evidence of internal consistency and test-retest reliability. Spreitzer (1995a) reported a Cronbach alpha reliability of .87 for the meaning scale, .81 for the competence scale, .81 for the self-determination scale, and .88 for the impact scale. Her operational definition included an overall construct of empowerment that was created by adding the four dimensions. For this overall empowerment construct, she reported a reliability of .72 for the industrial sample and .62 for the insurance sample. Spreitzer reported three goodness of fit measures to assess convergent and discriminant validity: AGFI of .93, RMSR of .04, and NCNFI of .97 for the industrial sample and AGFI of .87, RMSR of .07, and NCNFI of

.98 for the insurance sample.² According to the both the RMSR and the NCNFI this was a good model, although additional research was encouraged.

The Thomas and Velthouse (1990) conceptual model and the Spreitzer (1995a) measures, or a part of the four components of empowerment, have been used in many studies since first developed in 1995 (see Appendix 2). But these are not the only empowerment scales available. Leslie et.al. (1998), Menon (1999), and Konczak et.al. (2000) also developed empowerment measures.

Leslie et.al. (1998) created and tested a Worker Empowerment Scale (WES) in an attempt to fill a perceived gap created by a lack of earlier instruments to empirically measure differential levels of empowerment and changes in the sense of empowerment among staff. An original pool of 51 items drawn from human resource literature was tested in several steps: 1) a panel of 20 social agency executives examined item usefulness and reduced the number of items to 41; 2) a sample of 211 businesspersons and social service worker trainees was given the WES and a pre-existing Work Locus of Control Scale. When inter-item correlations and item-to-total correlations were not strongly related, the item was dropped, which further reduced the number of items to 28; 3) factor analysis using this same sample further reduced the items to 24 when four items had loadings less than .45; and 4) a sample of 237 state welfare departments workers was given the WES, Work Locus of Control Scale, and Job Satisfaction Survey to confirm reliability and the previous factor analysis. An additional six items were eliminated with factor loadings less than .49.

² The AGFI is affected by sample size and is no longer considered a valid goodness of fit measure (Kenny, 2001). The RMSR or Root Mean Square includes a penalty for each added parameter. A value of .05 or less is considered a good model. The Non-normed Fit Index (NCNFI) includes a correction for

At the end of this analysis, they validated the WES with 18 items divided into three subscales of six statements each: empowerment and personal work orientation, empowerment and control of work environment, and empowerment and work relationships. Alpha reliability for the full scale was reported as .89, and the alpha coefficient for the empowerment and personal orientation subscale was .83, the empowerment and work environment subscale was .83, and the empowerment and work relationships subscale was .82. Pearson's correlation coefficients between the WES and the Work Locus of Control Scale and the Job Satisfaction Survey scale were used to test convergent and discriminate validity. It was expected that there would be low correlation between the WES and the Work Locus of Control Scale and a high correlation between the WES and the Job Satisfaction Survey. Leslie et.al. reported that both results supported construct validity. They concluded that the WES provided a tool that could be used for a quick assessment of a worker's perceived empowerment, especially to test the success of intervention efforts.

Menon (1999) used an original pool of 60 items to measure psychological empowerment in three cognitive areas: a sense of perceived control, perceptions of competence, and internalization of the organizational goals and objectives. An initial review by two faculty members and three doctoral students reduced the items to a study pool of 15 items, five items for each of the three dimensions. The questionnaire was then given to a sample of 311 employed individuals enrolled part-time business degree programs in Montreal. An exploratory factor analysis further reduced the items to three for each dimension. Menon reported alpha reliability for the subscales of .83 for

additional parameters. A value between .90 and .95 is acceptable and above .95 is good. For a general discussion of several goodness-of-fit measures, see Garson (2002d).

perceived control, .80 for perceived competence, and .88 for goal internalization. A confirmatory factor analysis yielded a Chi-square of 50.67 ($df = 24$, $p = .001$), AGFI = .933, and RMSR = .051. The model of the nine items as a single construct was compared to the three dimension construct; the results yielded a Normed Fit Index (NFI) = .92 and a Tucker-Lewis Index (TL) = .95.³ The reduced questionnaire was administered to 66 employees of a financial services company in Western Ontario. The questionnaire included items from existing scales to measure centralization, delegation, consulting, global self-esteem, affective commitment, job involvement, and citizenship behavior. Menon reported that the factor analysis showed strong evidence of discriminant validity in the three-dimension model of empowerment.

Konczak et.al. (2000) determined that the Thomas and Velthouse (1990) multifaceted construct of empowerment and the Spreitzer (1995) measures of empowerment did not adequately provide a means to measure leader behaviors that encouraged employee empowerment. They used two studies, first, to develop the instrument to measure empowering leader behavior (LEBQ), and, second, to compare their instrument with other existing instruments, included the Spreitzer psychological empowerment measures. In their first study Konczak et.al. used a sample of 1,309 subordinates at a *Fortune* 500 consumer products company in a leadership-training program to test 21 items in seven proposed dimensions of leader-empowering behavior (delegation of authority, accountability, encouragement of self-directed decision-making,

³ The Normed Fit Index (NFI) compares a theoretical model to a null model of random variables. The value reported reflects the improvement of the theoretical model; in the Menon study, the NFI = .92 means that the theoretical model improves the fit by 92%. A value of .90 is typically required to accept the new model. The Tucker-Lewis (TL) is also referred to as the Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI). It is less affected by sample size. A value of .95 is now considered the minimum for accepting the new model. For a general discussion of several goodness-of-fit measures, see Garson (2002d).

encouragement of self-directed problem-solving, information sharing, skill development, coaching for innovative performance). The subordinates rated 424 managers. They reported four fit indices: CFI = .93, GFI = .85, AGFI = .80, and RMSR = .12⁴. They concluded from this initial confirmatory factor analysis that the model fit was marginally acceptable. They decided to improve the model fit by deleting the skill development subscale and either reclassifying or deleting several of the individual test items. The new six-factor model was tested and found to be a better fit (CFI = .96, GFI = .90, AGFI = .86, and RMSR = .08). A single-factor model showed that the six-factor model was not testing a single construct (CFI = .73, GFI = .69, AGFI = .60, and RMSA = .16).

The second study used a questionnaire sent to 150 at a *Fortune* 500 company to compare the new LEBQ with existing measurement instruments: the Hackman and Oldham (1975) job satisfaction measure, the Mowday et.al. (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire, and the Spreitzer psychological empowerment scale. Konczak et.al. concluded that leader behaviors were related to the psychological experience of empowerment. Although they did not report the results comparing the four individual components of the Spreitzer empowerment scale with the LEBQ, they concluded that with the exception of competence component, the correlations between the LEBQ dimensions and the empowerment components were moderate to large.

The many studies that used the Spreitzer measures (see Appendix 2) demonstrate that the Thomas and Velthouse conceptual definition of empowerment is a widely accepted understanding of the concept of empowerment in the organization. The

⁴ A Comparative Fit Index (CFI) (developed by Butler, 1990) of .90 to .95 is acceptable, and a CFI of .95 or greater is good. For a further discussion of the CFI, see Butler (1990), Kline (1998), Kenny (2001) and Garson (2002d). The Goodness-of-fit Index (GFI) is affected by large sample sizes. GFI should exceed .90

Spreitzer measures have been tested in many different studies and with many different samples. These studies provide a history of how the concept works. They provide additional tests of reliability, content validity, and convergent/discriminate validity for the Thomas and Velthouse construct of empowerment. The Spreitzer measures have been considered legitimate for studying a sense of employee empowerment, and the measures provided a justifiable scale for use in this study. The Spreitzer measures were, however, originally developed for the private sector, so some modification of the statements was necessary to better fit the public sector environment.

3.4. Measures of Trust

Recent examinations of trust in the organization have demonstrated its importance in the workplace (Gomez and Rose, 2001; Wadsworth, 2001; Bundt, 2000; Nyhan, 1999; Spreitzer and Mishra, 1999; Creed and Miles, 1996; McAllister, 1995). In spite of an interest in the concept of trust, there is no consensus on the role of trust, and most importantly here, there is no consensus on a definition of trust (McAllister, 1995; Richer and Vallerand, 1995; Thomas, 1998; Wadsworth, 1997, 2001).

There also does not exist agreement on whether trust is the outcome of previous action or whether trust is necessary for future action (Mayer et.al. 1995). Nor is there a contemporary measure for trust within the supervisor-employee relationship. Roberts and O'Reilly (1974) developed a scale to measure employee trust in the supervisor, but the report of their scale development does not include all the items used to measure this trust.

In addition, the use of the actual scale was unknown. This makes it difficult to know how to measure the level of trust in this relationship.

Brockner and Siegel (1996) found that over time procedural and interactional justice may create higher levels of trust. Procedural justice refers to the perceived fairness of procedures and decisions for compensation, evaluation, rewards, and dispute resolution. Procedural justice is frequently reported as a variable related to trust (Korsgaard et.al., 1995; Kim and Mauborgne, 1991; Folger and Konovsky, 1989). There is a link between procedural fairness and trust (Korsgaard et.al., 1995; Barling and Phillips, 1993; Folger and Konovsky, 1989).

Interactional justice refers to the perceptions that a supervisor implements the rules fairly and treats the employee with respect and honesty. Interactional justice, too, has been found to create trust in management (Barling and Phillips, 1993). Bies (1987) found that actions taken by a manager as the manager implements the formal justice procedures of the organization are used by the employee to evaluate whether the formal procedures actually exist.

Niehoff and Moorman (1993) used six indicator statements to measure procedural justice. Table 3.6 presents each of these statements. The items measure the degree to which job decisions include mechanisms that insure the gathering of accurate and unbiased information, employee voice and an appeals process. Their construction was based upon rules of procedural justice first developed by Leventhal (1980) and Leventhal et.al. (1980) and later used by Moorman (1991). Niehoff and Moorman reported a

Table 3.6 Indicator Statements for Procedural Justice Used by Niehoff and Moorman (1993)

Job decisions are made by the general manager in an unbiased manner.

My general manager makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before job decisions are made.

To make job decisions, my general manager collects accurate and complete information.

My general manager clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees.

All job decisions are applied consistently across all affected employees.

Employees are allowed to challenge or appeal job decisions made by the general manager.

NOTE: A 7-point Likert scale was used from very strongly agree to undecided to very strongly disagree.

reliability of .85 for their procedural justice measures. Niehoff and Moorman reported a CFI of .92⁵. This is in the acceptable range.

Kim and Mauborgne (1991) also created a measure for procedural justice because of a lack of commonly accepted way to measure it. They used an open-ended questionnaire to 190 subsidiary presidents in 19 multinational corporations to identify factors that made a recent strategic planning process particularly fair or unfair. They received 63 statements that they then submitted to 15 research associates to sort the statements into homogeneous groups. This process reduced the 63 statements into 16 statements that could be arranged into five procedural justice components: the extent to which bilateral communication exists between the managers of head offices and subsidiary units involved in global strategic decision-making; the extent to which head offices do not discriminate but apply consistent decision-making procedures across

⁵ A Comparative Fit Index (CFI) (developed by Butler, 1990) of .90 to .95 is acceptable, and a CFI of .95 or greater is good. For a further discussion of the CFI, see Butler (1990), Kline (1998), Kenny (2001) and Garson (2002d).

subsidiary units; the extent to which subsidiary units can challenge and refute the strategic views of head office managers; the extent to which subsidiary units are provided a full account for the final strategic decisions of the head office; and the degree to which head office managers involved in strategic decision-making are well informed and familiar with local situations of subsidiary units. They reported a within-category rate of 87% by the research associates. A second group of six new research associates sorted the 16 statements and had 94.8% classification accuracy with the original sorting. A questionnaire was then given to a sample of 142 subsidiary executives from the same 19 multinational companies. Factor analysis showed that all five indicators loaded on a single factor that explained 90.3% of the variance. Each indicator had a loading greater than .4.

Folger and Konovsky (1989) developed 26 measures of procedural justice through a review of existing literature on procedural fairness. The statements were part of a questionnaire completed by 217 first-line employees at a privately owned manufacturing plant. Factor analysis yielded five factors with item loadings of at least .4. One factor was eliminated because of low reliability and marginal eigenvalue. The four remaining factors were labeled feedback, planning, recourse, and observation. Folger and Konovsky used the Roberts and O'Reilly (1974) trust in the supervisor scale within their study. They found that two of their four factors of procedural justice, feedback and recourse, were significantly related to trust in the supervisor.

Niehoff and Moorman (1993) used nine indicator statements to measure interactional justice. Table 3.7 presents each of these statements. Niehoff and Moorman reported a reliability of .92 for their interactional justice measures. The Comparative Fit

Index (CFI) was reported as .91. This is in the acceptable range (see footnote 4).

Table 3.7 Indicator Statements for Interactional Justice Used by Niehoff and Moorman (1993)

When decisions are made about my job, the general manager treats me with kindness and consideration.

When decisions are made about my job, the general manager treats me with respect and dignity.

When decisions are made about my job, the general manager is sensitive to my personal needs.

When decisions are made about my job, the general manager deals with me in a truthful manner.

When decisions are made about my job, the general manager shows concern for my rights as an employee.

Concerning decisions made about my job, the general manager discusses the implications of the decisions with me.

The general manager offers adequate justification for decisions about my job.

When making decisions about my job, the general manager offers explanations that make sense to me.

My general manager explains very clearly any decision made about my job.

NOTE: A 7-point Likert scale was used from very strongly agree to undecided to very strongly disagree.

Barling and Phillips (1993) created a set of eight vignettes to measure high and low levels of formal (procedural) justice, interactional justice, and distributive justice. They used ten Canadian students in a third-year organizational psychology course to test the reliability of the vignettes. Barling and Phillips reported paired t-test results of $t(54) = 3.5$ ($p < .05$) for formal procedures and $t(54) = 9.78$ ($p < .01$) for interactional justice. They stated that this confirmed the vignettes were reliable. They also used three items from the Cook and Wall (1980) Trust in Management Scale. They administered the

questionnaire to 213 full-time Canadian students (144 undergraduate psychology students and 99 MBA students). They reported an alpha of .71 for the trust in management scale. When they controlled for age and union attitudes, they reported that interactional justice exerted a significant effect on trust in management, $F(1, 189) = 8.05$ ($p < .01$) and formal procedures (procedural justice) also exerted a significant effect on trust in management, $F(1, 189) = 20.18$ ($p < .001$).

There are a number of recent studies that used the Niehoff and Moorman measures for procedural justice and interactional justice (see Appendix 4). This means that the measures have been tested with many different samples. These studies provide additional tests of reliability, content validity, and convergent/discriminate validity. There has been research that showed a relationship between procedural justice and interactional justice and the concept of trust. Scales for the measurement of employee trust in the supervisor are limited. Rather than use older scales from Roberts and O'Reilly (1974) or Cook and Wall (1980) for this purpose, the Niehoff and Moorman measures have been considered legitimate for studying procedural justice and interactional justice, and the measures provided a justifiable scale for use in this study. Because it becomes necessary to find a way to operationalize the concept of trust, interactional justice and procedural justice combined as surrogates for trust.

The Niehoff and Moorman measures were, however, originally developed for the private sector, so some modification of the statements was necessary to better fit the public sector environment.

3.5. Questionnaire Development and Administration

All statements were standardized to reflect the purpose of this study to specifically measure the relationship between the employee and the supervisor. For example, in the Niehoff and Moorman statements for interactional justice the title “general manager” is changed to the title “supervisor.” Kurland and Egan (1999) modified the Niehoff and Moorman measures of procedural justice to better reflect the organizational foundations of the concept. That modification was continued in this study. Niehoff and Moorman’s “general manager” and Kurland and Egan’s modification to “company” is changed to “department/agency.”

The questionnaire used a 7-point Likert-type scale. The response values of the items within each construct were totaled and then divided by the number of items in that construct to create a mean value.

Two additional statements were added to address the legal and regulatory limitations and supervisory interpretation. They were, “There are laws and regulations that limit my authority to get my job done” and “There are laws and regulations that my supervisor interprets to limit my authority to get my job done.”

As a result of this earlier research, this study requested limited profile information related to the respondent’s job, specifically state (or county), years of employment in the agency, whether the employee worked directly with clients, and kind of work in the agency. Gomez and Roman (2001) surveyed 128 manager-employee dyads in 13 manufacturing industries and found that an employee’s job tenure was related to empowerment. In their study of professional private hospital employees, Koberg et.al.

(1999) confirmed that empowerment was related to tenure but found that perceived empowerment did not differ by sex, ethnicity, or education.

Table 3.8 summarizes the variables and their measures. See Appendix 5 for a copy of the questionnaire.

Mehta and Sivadas (1995) compared the advantages and disadvantages of traditional and new research methods, such as mail surveys, email surveys, and web-based surveys. They found that surveys using the Internet save money and are convenient and flexible. Schillewaert et.al. (1998: 308, 309) found that Internet surveys can be valid for data collection when "(1) a central register of that research population exists and (2) that all members of this population can respond through the WWW." Sheehan (2001) found that email surveys have declined in response rates since 1986 for a variety of reasons: the types of populations with access to the Internet has changed; surveying in the United States has increased; and, Internet users receive an increasing number of unsolicited emails, and these create a concern for computer viruses. The poor response rate in New Mexico, North Carolina, and Wisconsin, and Johnston County where direct communication with the potential participant was used seemed to support the findings by Sheehan. In Vermont and the three North Carolina counties where the initial announcement of the study was distributed by the administration, there was a higher level of participation.

An email sent to the participants described the purpose of the survey, described the confidentiality of the responses, included "Informed Consent" language in compliance with the North Carolina State University Institutional Research Board requirements, requested confirmation of the respondents' willingness to participate in the

Table 3.8 Variables, Measures and Possible Values in the Questionnaire

Variable	Measure	Possible Values
Procedural Justice	Six indicator statements	1, 2, 3, ... 7
Interactional Justice	Nine indicator statements	1, 2, 3, ... 7
Total Empowerment	Twelve indicator statements	1, 2, 3, ... 7
Regulatory Environment	One indicator statement	1, 2, 3, ... 7
Regulatory Interpretation	One indicator statement	1, 2, 3, ... 7
Jurisdiction	Government unit	Vermont New Mexico North Carolina Wisconsin Johnston County (NC) Durham County (NC) Guilford County (NC) Mecklenburg County (NC)
Agency Employment	Number of years the respondent has worked in the Agency	0-1 2-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 Over 20
Kind of Work ⁶	Kind of work the respondent does in the Agency	Social Services Health Administration/Support Facility Maintenance Other: (Open response)
Optional Question	Empowerment activities of Agency	Open response

⁶ Employees who responded with "other" for kind of work were asked to provide more specific information. Their responses were examined and, where appropriate, recoded to reflect the broader work area. For example, several respondents identified their work area as "mental health;" these responses were recoded to the broader category of "Health." Those respondents who classified themselves as Facility Maintenance were recoded and included with Administrative/Support because of the small number of respondents in this category and the belief that these respondents more likely are in supervisory positions than janitorial.

survey, and requested the respondent to confirm the preferred email address for future email notifications (see Appendix 6 for a copy of this email). Upon agreement the potential participants were provided with the web address of the questionnaire (see Appendix 7 for a copy of this email).⁷ A follow-up email was sent either by the agency or me approximately one week after the initial announcement. Some potential respondents had difficulty accessing the questionnaire and requested an alternative means of participation. These subjects were thanked for their efforts, but no alternative methodology was provided. Once the respondent accessed the questionnaire, they could complete and submit the questionnaire or exit the questionnaire. If the questionnaire was submitted, the respondent received a thank you message. The responses were tabulated automatically as the subjects completed the questionnaire.

3.6. Construct and Reliability Analysis

Factor analysis was performed on all the construct items to confirm construct validity and internal consistency reliabilities. There was the possibility that items might load differently than expected because of this blending of instruments. All respondents in the study were included in this analysis. Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted using SPSS v10 by specifying the exact number of factors anticipated, in this case seven - empowerment meaning, empowerment competence, empowerment impact, empowerment self-determination, interactional justice, procedural justice, and regulatory environment (legal and supervisory interpretation limitations on employee authority).

⁷ The questionnaire was created as a webpage with the assistance of the Social Science Computer Lab of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences at North Carolina State University. There were safeguards included which protected the identity of the respondent while also ensuring that each respondent completed the survey only once.

Appendix 5 presents the questionnaire with a code to identify what construct the item is intended to measure. These seven factors accounted for 78.09% of the total variance explained. Rotation was achieved using Varimax. A factor loading above .7 is usually required for the set of items to be considered a scale. Reliability was tested using Chronbach's alpha. The closer the Alpha is to 1.00, the greater the internal consistency of the items assessed.

Table 3.9 presents the results of this analysis for the four empowerment

Table 3.9 Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results: Empowerment Components

Variable (in order on questionnaire)	Component			
	Competence	Impact	Meaning	Self- Determination
Empowerment Meaning 1	.163	5.255E-02	.859	1.421E-02
Empowerment Competence 1	.899	-4.591E-03	.149	8.863E-02
Empowerment Self- Determination 1	.130	.127	.104	.796
Empowerment Meaning 2	.216	2.953E-02	.905	5.753E-02
Empowerment Impact 1	7.631E-03	.765	.120	.138
Empowerment Meaning 3	.113	.111	.867	5.666E-02
Empowerment Competence 2	.886	3.641E-02	.187	8.942E-02
Empowerment Competence 3	.824	3.676E-02	.131	9.328E-02
Empowerment Self- Determination 2	.108	.149	1.209E-02	.849
Empowerment Self- Determination 3	.113	.173	3.672E-02	.811
Empowerment Impact 2	4.752E-02	.759	2.529E-02	.144
Empowerment Impact 3	4.287E-02	.830	5.922E-02	.133
<i>Chronbach's Alpha</i>	.8510	.8295	.8944	.8835

components. As expected, all items loaded on the appropriate factor above the .7 threshold for a good scale. The Chronbach's Alpha for all the components was very high. Table 3.10 presents the results of this analysis for interactional justice, procedural justice, and the regulatory environment component. These constructs were grouped together because of the possibility that the regulatory environment might be related to and load on one of the justice constructs. Only three factor loadings did not exceed the .7 threshold for a good fit: 1) first statement for procedural justice ("Job decisions about employees in general, or me in particular, are made by my agency/department in an unbiased manner.") which had a factor loading of .680; 2) the last statement for procedural justice ("Employees are allowed to challenge or appeal job decisions made in my agency/department.") which had a factor loading of .472; and 3) the second statement for regulatory environment ("The way my supervisor interprets laws and regulations limits my authority to get my job done.") which had a factor loading of .608. All, however, had a factor loading on the appropriate component and loaded higher on that component than for any of the other potential components. The Chronbach's Alpha for procedural justice remained high at .8823, so the internal consistency remains very good with the first and last statements included. The Chronbach's Alpha is not improved by the removal of the first statement and is only improved very slightly (.0030) if the last statement is removed. Since all these statements were adopted from Neihoff and Moorman (1993), the decision was made to keep all of the statements within this construct. Future research can determine whether these two statements can be deleted from the construct or whether this was just a product of this survey sample.

**Table 3.10 Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results:
Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice, and Regulatory Environment**

Variable (in order on questionnaire)	Component		
	Procedural Justice	Interactional Justice	Regulatory Environment
Procedural Justice 1	.680	.331	2.799E-02
Interactional Justice 1	.199	.874	5.680E-03
Procedural Justice 2	.729	.383	-2.781E-03
Interactional Justice 2	.261	.801	5.108E-02
Procedural Justice 3	.731	.348	-.107
Interactional Justice 3	.242	.783	1.409E-02
Procedural Justice 4	.726	.340	3.790E-02
Interactional Justice 4	.336	.782	-1.906E-02
Interactional Justice 5	.282	.837	-3.122E-02
Interactional Justice 6	.285	.848	-3.264E-02
Interactional Justice 7	.237	.871	5.545E-03
Interactional Justice 8	.267	.849	2.453E-02
Procedural Justice 5	.763	.264	6.574E-03
Regulatory Environment 1	-9.959E-02	.214	.843
Procedural Justice 6	.472	.275	-.105
Interactional Justice 9	.248	.850	4.310E-03
Regulatory Environment 2	7.415E-02	-.516	.608
<i>Chronbach's Alpha</i>	.8823	.9716	.2742

The internal reliability for these constructs was very high with the exception of the regulatory environment construct (Chronbach's alpha = .2742). This is not surprising as the construct contained only two statements and one emphasized regulatory and legal

restraints ("There are laws and regulations that limit my authority to get my job done.") and the other emphasized supervisory interpretation ("The way my supervisor interprets laws and regulations limits my authority to get my job done."). Factor loadings for both statements were above .6 (moderately strong) and did load together. Neither statement loaded on either interactional justice or procedural justice, so they are measuring a different concept. It was decided, however, that the low factor loading of .608 for the supervisory interpretation and the very low reliability discouraged the use of these two statements as a single construct. In addition, it was felt that the two statements were sufficiently different that they could provide greater information as separate variables than as a single construct. So, the two statements were separated as "Regulatory Environment" and "Regulatory Interpretation" and used individually in the regression analysis.

The confirmatory factor analysis showed that for this set of respondents the items loaded as expected and that reliability of each of the theoretically-based constructs was very high. Their use is appropriate for this study.

3.7. Correlation Analysis

Appendix 8 provides two sets of two tables of Pearson correlation coefficients among the variables of the questionnaire⁸. Correlation provides a test of the association between two variables without the influence of other variables. The correlation coefficient may also be used as a means of determining multicollinearity.

⁸ Data was divided between the state respondents and North Carolina county respondents and analyzed separately.

The first table presents the association between the four components of empowerment. The second table presents the association between the theoretical constructs (total empowerment, interactional justice, procedural justice), the environmental variables (regulatory environment, regulatory interpretation) and the demographic information (years with the agency, works directly with clients, and kind of work - administrative/support, social services, health).

As might be expected, the highest correlations were found between procedural justice and interactional justice ($r = .702$ for state data; $r = .662$ for North Carolina county data). A correlation this high could raise concerns about multicollinearity, but these constructs were used in separate models and combined together to form the construct of trust. As a result, multicollinearity did not have to be considered.

3.8. Use of Multiple Regression

The models were analyzed using multiple regression analysis. Multiple regression analysis allows the measurement of the variance (or influence) of more than one independent variable on the dependent variable. The dependent variable must be interval or ratio, i.e., continuous, but the independent variables may be interval, dichotomous, or dummy variables. All the variables in this study meet this requirement.

Likert scales, like those used for the constructs in this study, have been accepted as interval for use in statistical analysis (O'Sullivan and Rassel, 1995), especially those with five or more options. The dependent variable of empowerment (and each of the four individual components) and independent variables of trust (and each of the two individual components), regulatory environment, and regulatory interpretation are therefore

considered interval because they use a 7-point Likert scale and their value is determined by averaging the individual ratings for each indices.

The independent variable of years with the agency is also treated as interval. Labovitz (1970) suggested that ordinal data can be treated as interval when there are multiple rank order categories and all categories are used. Powerful statistical procedures that use interval data tend to reduce the error if the variable is "'nearly' interval" (523). The years with the agency has six categories with no gaps in the years.

One independent variable is dichotomous, work with clients (yes/no option). Two independent variables are nominal, type of work (administrative/support, social services, health, facility maintenance options) and state/county (New Mexico, North Carolina, Vermont, Wisconsin, Durham Co., Guilford Co., Johnston Co., Mecklenburg Co. options). These nominal variables were converted into dummy variables so that they could be entered into the regression equation.

Multiple regression provides a coefficient for each independent variable that indicates the size of the influence and the direction (positive/negative) of that independent variable upon the dependent variable. These coefficients, however, cannot be compared to each other because the variables use different scales. There is a statistical process that standardizes these coefficients into Beta coefficients that allow this direct comparison. Therefore, Beta coefficients were provided and used to compare the influence of each independent variable upon the dependent variable.

Multiple regression analysis also provides an R^2 that reports the strength of the model, i.e., the strength of the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable. The R^2 value represents the proportion of the variation in the

dependent variable that is explained by all of the independent variables together and is reported as a percentage of the variance explained by the model. Because it is theoretically possible to add enough independent variables to the model to explain all of the variance in the dependent variable, R^2 is considered an inflated estimate. Even though the predicted models in this study had a small number of independent variables, it is still appropriate to report the adjusted R^2 which lowers the R^2 as the number of independent variables increases.

Multiple regression does not require a random sample. Random sampling does permit accurate inferences for population characteristics. The data collection procedures were intended to provide random samples, but challenges to the randomness of the responses was discussed earlier. The use of significance tests with non-random samples is generally considered as inappropriate. Tests of statistical significance are still valuable as additional evidence on the importance of specific variables in the regression model and that the relationship probably does not occur by chance. This study used a minimum alpha level of .05 as this filter.

Multiple regression assumes the proper specification of the model. This means that relevant independent variables are included and irrelevant variables are excluded from the model. The purpose of this study is to test hypotheses that predicted the relationship between employee empowerment and employee trust in the supervisor. Since trust in the supervisor was operationalized by using two measures of justice, procedural and interactional, the relationship between these measures of justice and employee empowerment were also hypothesized. Previous research helps to provide information on other relevant independent variables, but the research that examines these relationships is

limited. Gomez and Roman (2001) found that an employee's job tenure was related to empowerment, and Koberg et.al. (1999) confirmed that empowerment was related to tenure but found that perceived empowerment did not differ by sex, ethnicity, or education. Years with the agency was included to confirm the importance of tenure on empowerment.

Social services and health services have a strong customer component in their operations. The variable of work with clients was added to measure if it has a relationship with empowerment. This variable was added as a means to identify whether it had a predictive influence on employee empowerment. Reinventing government has stressed the importance of employee empowerment as a means to improve customer/citizen services. Two additional variables, state/county and type of job, were added as a way to categorize the respondents and to better examine the representativeness of the respondents.

The SPSS v 10.0 statistical package was used to perform all analyses. The multiple regression analysis used a forced entry option where all independent variables are entered in the analysis at one time regardless of the significance level. In this way each full model could be analyzed to determine the amount of the variance in the dependent variable that was explained by the model as well as the relative strength of the relationships of each independent variable.

3.9. State Demographics

A total of 288 employees from the four states actually completed the survey, and 287 of these employee responses were usable.⁹ Table 3.11 shows the profile of the state study sample, divided by Vermont and Other States.

Table 3.11 Profile of State Study Sample (N = 287)

Demographic	State Percentage ¹	
	Vermont	Other States
Work with Clients		
Yes	68.5	63.4
No	31.5	36.6
Kind of Work		
Administrative/Support	36.1	46.3
Social Services	38.0	31.7
Health	25.9	22.0
Years with the Agency		
0-1	15.1	11.0
2-5	28.8	26.8
6-10	16.1	13.4
11-15	18.5	18.3
16-20	7.8	7.3
20+	13.2	23.2
Work Directly with Clients by Kind of Work		
Administrative/Support	48.6	47.4
Social Services	82.9	80.8
Health	75.5	72.2

¹Total may not equal 100% because of "No Response."

⁹ Responses were evaluated as to completeness of the empowerment and trust construct statements. Subjects who failed to score only one statement were retained (11), and the missing value was replaced with the mean score of all other subjects for that variable. Any respondent who failed to rate more than one statement (1) was deleted from the analysis.

As expected, approximately two-thirds of the respondents worked directly with clients in both Vermont and the Other States. Four of every five respondents who worked in social services worked directly with clients, and approximately three of every four respondents who worked in health worked directly with clients.

In both Vermont and the Other States the largest group of respondents worked either in administrative/support or social services with the smallest group working in health. Approximately 30% of the respondents worked in the health area. The largest percentage of employees worked in the agency from 2 to 5 years, and the smallest group of employees worked between 16 and 20 years.

3.10. North Carolina County Demographics

A total of 165 employees from the four counties actually completed the survey, and all these employee responses were usable (see footnote 4). Table 3.12 shows the profile of the county study sample, divided by the individual county.

In all the counties the largest group of respondents worked in social services.¹⁰ All counties showed the largest percentage of employees worked in the agency for 5 years or less. In Durham County, over 65% of the respondents worked in the agency for 5 years or less. As expected for social services employees, more than 70% of the respondents worked directly with clients.

¹⁰ These county departments did not provide health services, so the only options were administrative/support and social services.

Table 3.12 Profile of North Carolina County Study Sample (N = 165)

Demographic	County Percentage¹			
	Durham	Guilford	Johnston	Mecklenburg
Work with Clients				
Yes	74.4	73.2	87.0	71.4
No	25.6	26.8	13.0	28.6
Kind of Work				
Administrative/ Support	29.5	21.4	21.7	26.2
Social Services	70.5	78.6	78.3	73.8
Health²				
Years with the Agency				
0-1	29.5	21.4	4.3	4.8
2-5	36.4	16.1	39.1	28.6
6-10	15.9	16.1	26.1	23.8
11-15	6.8	14.3	21.7	19.0
16-20	0.0	17.9	0.0	2.4
20+	9.1	14.3	8.7	21.4
Work Directly with Clients by Kind of Work				
Administrative/ Support	23.1	41.7	40.0	18.2
Social Services	96.7	81.8	100.0	90.3
Health²				

¹Total may not equal 100% because of "No response."

²The North Carolina county Departments of Social Services in this study do not provide health services.

3.11. Comparison of State and North Carolina County Demographics

A higher percentage of respondents in the North Carolina counties worked directly with clients, but this probably is the result of a generally higher percentage of administrative/support employees among the State respondents. Except for Durham County and Mecklenburg County, over 40% of the administrative/support respondents in the State sample and in the North Carolina county sample also worked with clients. Except for Durham County, there was a generally broad distribution of years of service with the agency; respondents with 5 years of service typically accounted for 35% to 45% for the years of service, but they accounted for over 65% of the respondents in Durham County.

Chapter 4

Regression Analysis and Discussion

4.1. State Results

4.1.1. Empowerment

Empowerment, as a total construct and divided into each of its four components, was examined. The scale for each component was recoded to run from 1 (low) to 7 (high). Table 4.1 provides the means and standard deviations. The respondents reported a high sense of competence in their work activities (mean = 6.096, sd = .800) and a high sense of meaning in the work that they perform (mean = 6.125, sd = .886). Both had a

Table 4.1 Means and Standard Deviations of Empowerment Components and Total Empowerment (N = 287)

Empowerment Component	Mean	Standard Deviation
Competence	6.096	.800
Impact	3.551	1.384
Meaning	6.125	.886
Self-Determination	5.315	1.276
Total	5.272	.742

fairly narrow range of responses. Given the nature of the objectives in both social services and health services delivery, it is good to see that the employees believe in the goals of their programs and believe that they can perform their duties well. The respondents reported a sense of self-determination (mean = 5.315, sd = 1.276) and total empowerment (mean = 5.272, sd = .742), but these were more moderate. Of particular

note is the low sense of impact reported by the respondents (mean = 3.551, sd = 1.384). The wide range of responses shows that many employees reported a low sense of impact. Impact and self-determination had the broadest range of responses. This indicates that although the employees feel competent and a sense of meaning in their delivery of social and health services, they may find that their individual impact on what happens in their department is small.

Total empowerment and its four components were further analyzed using multiple regression with the variables of interactional justice and procedural justice. Other variables were also included in the analysis: regulatory environment, kind of work - divided into its three options of administrative/support, social services and health, work with clients, and years with the agency. State was a dichotomous dummy variable with two options, "Vermont" and "Other States."

4.1.2. Empowerment and Procedural Justice

Table 4.2 presents the model that tested procedural justice - formal organizational structures or the formal procedural mechanisms of compensation, evaluation, rewards, and dispute resolution - against the individual empowerment components and total empowerment. The model explained over three-tenths of the variance in total empowerment ($R^2 = .314$), over one-quarter of the variance in impact ($R^2 = .261$), and almost one quarter of the variance in self-determination ($R^2 = .233$). The model explained almost 14% of the variance in meaning ($R^2 = .139$) and much less in competence ($R^2 = .064$).

Table 4.2 Regression Estimates (N = 284)
Empowerment Components and Total by Procedural Justice

Independent Variables	Competence	Impact	Meaning	Self-Determination	Total
Procedural Justice					
Beta Coefficient	-.033	.476	.183	.321	.405
t-statistic	-.536	8.687**	3.094**	5.753**	7.664**
Regulatory Environment					
Beta Coefficient	-.014	-.070	.105	.032	.009
t-statistic	-.230	-1.294	1.805	.589	.172
Regulatory Interpretation					
Beta Coefficient	-.141	-.086	-.136	-.233	-.218
t-statistic	-2.224*	-1.522	-2.231*	-4.051**	-4.012**
Administrative/Support					
Beta Coefficient	-.202	-.317	.244	-.224	-.225
t-statistic	-.922	-1.627	1.159	-1.128	-1.197
Social Services					
Beta Coefficient	-.025	-.296	.121	-.162	-.177
t-statistic	-.115	-1.536	.581	-.824	-.955
Health					
Beta Coefficient	-.133	-.240	.221	-.112	-.129
t-statistic	-.659	-1.334	1.138	-.613	-.747
States (Vermont = 0)					
Beta Coefficient	.095	.096	.062	.044	.108
t-statistic	1.633	1.850	1.105	.838	2.163*
Work with Clients					
Beta Coefficient	-.124	.015	-.165	.011	-.071
t-statistic	-2.019*	.284	-2.794**	.194	-1.357
Years with Agency					
Beta Coefficient	.184	.042	.190	.190	.207
t-statistic	3.122**	.795	3.360**	3.559**	4.103**
Adjusted R²	.064	.261	.139	.233	.314
F	3.158**	12.132**	6.097**	10.573**	15.448**

*Statistic is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Statistic is significant to the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Procedural justice had a positive and statistically significant relationship¹¹ with impact (Beta = .476, $p < .01$), meaning (Beta = .183, $p < .01$), and self-determination (Beta = .321, $p < .01$). It did not have a statistically significant relationship with

¹¹ Statistical significance is used as a means to identify the independent variables which merit further examination.

competence. Hypothesis 1 predicted that procedural justice is positively associated to the employee's perception of empowerment; this hypothesis was supported as procedural justice had a strong, positive, and significant relationship with empowerment (Beta = .405, $p < .01$).

Years with the agency had a statistically significant and positive relationship with competence (Beta = .184, $p < .01$), meaning (Beta = .190, $p < .01$), self-determination (Beta = .190, $p < .01$), and total empowerment (Beta = .207, $p < .01$). The longer the employee worked in this agency, the greater the sense of competence, meaning, self-determination, and total empowerment.

Regulatory environment did not have a statistically significant relationship with any of the empowerment components or total empowerment, but regulatory interpretation by the supervisor had a statistically significant and negative relationship with competence (Beta = -.141, $p < .05$), meaning (Beta = -.136, $p < .05$), self-determination (Beta = -.233, $p < .01$) and total empowerment (Beta = -.218, $p < .01$). Work with clients had a statistically significant and negative relationship with competence (Beta = -.124, $p < .05$) and meaning (Beta = -.165, $p < .01$). State showed a statistically significant and positive relationship with total empowerment (Beta = .108, $p < .05$), an indication that "other states" reported a higher sense of empowerment than respondents in Vermont.

In summary, the Beta values showed that procedural justice was the strongest variable in the regression equations for impact, self-determination, and total empowerment. Years with the agency and procedural justice were equally strong for meaning. Procedural justice was not associated with competence. Years with the agency (positive) and regulatory interpretation by the supervisor (negative) were shown to have a

statistically significant relationship with total empowerment and one or more of the individual components. The model provided a strong explanation for the total variance in total empowerment, impact, and self-determination. Hypothesis 1 stated that procedural justice is positively associated to the employee's perception of empowerment; this hypothesis was supported.

4.1.3. Empowerment and Interactional Justice

Table 4.3 presents the model that tested interactional justice - the belief by the employee that the rules are being implemented by the supervisor with respect and honesty - against the individual empowerment components and total empowerment. The model explained almost three-tenths of the amount of the variance in self-determination ($R^2 = .294$) and in total empowerment ($R^2 = .277$) and approximately 14% of the amount of the variance in impact and meaning. The model explained the least amount of the variance in competence ($R^2 = .066$).

Interactional justice had a positive and statistically significant relationship with impact (Beta = .305, $p < .01$), meaning (Beta = .198, $p < .01$), and self-determination (Beta = .443, $p < .01$). It did not have a statistically significant relationship with competence. Hypothesis 2 predicted that interactional justice is positively associated to the employee's perception of empowerment; this hypothesis was supported as interactional justice had a strong, positive, and significant relationship with empowerment (Beta = .374, $p < .01$).

Working directly with clients had a statistically significant and negative relationship with competence (Beta = -.125, $p < .05$) and meaning (Beta = -.167, $p < .01$).

Table 4.3 Regression Estimates (N = 284)
Empowerment Components and Total by Interactional Justice

Independent Variables	Competence	Impact	Meaning	Self-Determina- tion	Total
Interactional Justice					
Beta Coefficient	-.059	.305	.198	.443	.374
t-statistic	-.895	4.799**	3.141**	7.734**	6.452**
Regulatory Environment					
Beta Coefficient	-.006	-.086	.083	-.024	-.027
t-statistic	-.091	-1.457	1.403	-.452	-.503
Regulatory Interpretation					
Beta Coefficient	-.158	.108	-.105	-.134	-.182
t-statistic	-2.340*	1.665	-1.625	-2.275*	-3.061**
Administrative/Support					
Beta Coefficient	-.193	-.268	.236	-.268	-.220
t-statistic	-.882	-1.267	1.123	-1.403	-1.141
Social Services					
Beta Coefficient	-.021	-.215	.132	-.164	-.136
t-statistic	-.099	-1.030	.637	-.875	-.716
Health					
Beta Coefficient	-.126	-.191	.218	-.143	-.119
t-statistic	-.626	-.979	1.122	-.816	-.668
States (Vermont = 0)					
Beta Coefficient	.098	.083	.054	.026	.092
t-statistic	1.673	1.464	.958	.518	1.797
Work with Clients					
Beta Coefficient	-.125	-.003	-.167	.013	-.079
t-statistic	-2.041*	-.043	-2.829**	.252	-1.473
Years with Agency					
Beta Coefficient	.184	.028	.188	.189	.200
t-statistic	3.121**	.497	3.322**	3.694**	3.855**
Adjusted R²	.066	.131	.140	.294	.277
F	3.221**	5.745**	6.135**	14.138**	13.091**

*Statistic is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Statistic is significant to the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Years with the agency had a statistically significant and positive relationship with competence (Beta = .184, $p < .01$), meaning (Beta = .188, $p < .01$), self-determination (Beta = .189, $p < .01$) and total empowerment (Beta = .200, $p < .01$). The longer the employee worked in this agency, the greater the sense of competence and self-determination and total empowerment.

The regulatory environment - the existence of laws and regulations - did not have a statistically significant relationship with any of the empowerment components or total empowerment, but regulatory interpretation - the interpretation of those rules and regulations by the supervisor - did have a statistically significant and negative relationship with competence (Beta = $-.058$, $p < .05$), self-determination (Beta = $-.134$, $p < .05$), and total empowerment (Beta = $-.182$, $p < .01$).

In summary, the Beta values showed that interactional justice was the strongest variable in the regression equations for impact, meaning, self-determination, and total empowerment. Years with the agency was equally strong for meaning. Interactional justice did not have a strong association with competence. Years with the agency (positive) and regulatory interpretation by the supervisor (negative) were shown to have a statistically significant relationship with total empowerment and one or more of the individual components. The model provided a strong explanation for the total variance in self-determination and total empowerment. Hypothesis 2 stated that interactional justice is positively associated to the employee's perception of empowerment; this hypothesis was supported.

4.1.4. Empowerment and Trust

After interactional justice and procedural justice were examined separately, they were combined to operationalize the construct of trust. Trust and its relationship with total empowerment and its four components were then analyzed through multiple regression, including the variables used in the previous analysis.

Table 4.4 presents the model that tested trust against the individual empowerment

components and total empowerment. The model explained the least variance in

**Table 4.4 Regression Estimates (N = 284)
Empowerment Components and Total by Trust**

Independent Variables	Competence	Impact	Meaning	Self-Determina- tion	Total
Trust					
Beta Coefficient	-.051	.435	.213	.427	.434
t-statistic	-.794	7.302**	3.438**	7.552**	7.858**
Regulatory Environment					
Beta Coefficient	-.009	-.095	.088	-.006	-.023
t-statistic	-.145	-1.701	1.504	-.108	-.442
Regulatory Interpretation					
Beta Coefficient	-.153	-.056	-.103	-.151	-.163
t-statistic	-2.300*	-.911	-1.622	-2.600**	-2.865**
Administrative/Support					
Beta Coefficient	-.195	-.319	.227	-.271	-.248
t-statistic	-.887	-1.581	1.083	-1.415	-1.327
Social Services					
Beta Coefficient	-.020	-.273	.115	-.187	-.177
t-statistic	-.092	-1.372	.558	-.989	.961
Health					
Beta Coefficient	-.127	-.237	.208	-.150	-.146
t-statistic	-.629	-1.274	1.078	-.848	-.846
States (Vermont = 0)					
Beta Coefficient	.097	.085	.057	.035	.098
t-statistic	1.653	1.592	1.020	.678	1.965*
Work with Clients					
Beta Coefficient	-.125	.011	-.163	.018	-.070
t-statistic	-2.041*	.198	-2.774**	.335	-1.340
Years with Agency					
Beta Coefficient	.183	.037	.190	.193	.206
t-statistic	3.113**	.690	3.381**	3.756**	4.107**
Adjusted R²	.065	.211	.146	.288	.320
F	3.200**	9.436**	6.387**	13.769**	15.863**

*Statistic is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Statistic is significant to the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

competence ($R^2 = .065$), but it explained over 14% of the variance in meaning ($R^2 = .146$). The model provided the strongest explanation of the variance in impact ($R^2 = .211$), self-determination ($R^2 = .288$) and total empowerment ($R^2 = .320$).

Trust had a positive and statistically significant relationship with impact (Beta = .435, $p < .01$), meaning (Beta = .213, $p < .01$), and self-determination (Beta = .427, $p < .01$). It did not have a statistically significant relationship with competence. Hypothesis 3 predicted that trust is positively associated to the employee's perception of empowerment; this hypothesis was supported as trust had a strong, positive, and significant relationship with empowerment (Beta = .434, $p < .01$).

Working with clients had a statistically significant and negative relationship with meaning (Beta = -.163, $p < .01$); it had a statistically significant but negative relationship with competence (Beta = -.125, $p < .05$). Years with the agency had a statistically significant and positive relationship with competence (Beta = .183, $p < .01$), meaning (Beta = .190, $p < .01$), self-determination (Beta = .193, $p < .01$), and total empowerment (Beta = .206, $p < .01$). The regulatory interpretation by the supervisor had a statistically significant and negative relationship with both self-determination (Beta = -.151, $p < .01$) and total empowerment (Beta = -.163, $p < .01$). State showed a statistically significant and positive relationship with total empowerment (Beta = .098, $p < .05$), an indication that "other states" reported a higher sense of empowerment than respondents in Vermont.

In summary, the Beta values showed that trust was the strongest variable in the regression equations for impact, meaning, self-determination, and total empowerment. Although competence was high for these respondents ($M = 6.096$, $sd = .800$), trust was not important in helping those employees achieve a sense of competence. Years with the agency (positive) and regulatory interpretation by the supervisor (negative) were shown to have a statistically significant relationship with total empowerment and one or more of the individual components. The model provided a strong explanation for the total

variance in total empowerment and self-determination. Hypothesis 3 stated that trust (procedural justice and interactional justice) is positively associated to the employee's perception of empowerment; this hypothesis was supported.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that employees who perceive that they have a high level of trust (procedural justice and interactional justice combined) in the supervisor would have a higher sense of empowerment than employees who have a low level of trust in the supervisor would. As hypothesized, there was a statistically significant and positive relationship between trust in the supervisor and total empowerment (Beta = .495, $p < .01$).

4.2. North Carolina County Results

4.2.1 Empowerment

Empowerment, as a total construct and divided into each of its four components, was examined. The scale for each component was recoded to run from 1 (low) to 7 (high). Table 4.5 provides the means and standard deviations. The respondents reported a high sense of competence in their work activities (mean = 6.289, sd = .703) and a high sense of meaning in the work they perform (mean = 6.231, sd = .879). Both had a fairly narrow range of responses. The respondents reported a moderate sense of total empowerment (mean = 5.271, sd = .706), but a lower sense of self-determination (mean = 5.075, sd = 1.331). Impact and self-determination had the broadest range of responses. Of particular

Table 4.5 Means and Standard Deviations of Empowerment Components and Total Empowerment (N = 165)

Empowerment Component	Mean	Standard Deviation
Competence	6.289	.703
Impact	3.487	1.377
Meaning	6.231	.879
Self-Determination	5.075	1.331
Total	5.271	.706

note is the low sense of impact reported by the respondents (mean = 3.487, sd = 1.377).

The wide range of responses shows that many employees reported a low sense of impact. This indicates that although the employees feel competent and a sense of meaning in their delivery of social services, they may find that their individual impact on what happens in their department is small.

Total empowerment and its four components were further analyzed using multiple regression with the variables of interactional justice and procedural justice. Other variables were also included in the analysis: regulatory environment, kind of work (which for the North Carolina counties is a dichotomous variable of administration/support and social services), work with clients, and years with the agency. The participating counties were entered as dummy variables.

4.2.2. Empowerment and Procedural Justice

Table 4.6 presents the model that tested procedural justice against the individual empowerment components and total empowerment. The model explained almost half of

the variance in impact ($R^2 = .499$) and over two-fifths of the variance in total

Table 4.6 Regression Estimates (N = 165)
Empowerment Components and Total by Procedural Justice

Independent Variables	Competence	Impact	Meaning	Self-Determination	Total
Procedural Justice					
Beta Coefficient	.139	.629	.156	.406	.581
t-statistic	1.691	10.603**	1.933	5.434**	9.016**
Regulatory Environment					
Beta Coefficient	.127	.085	.138	-.104	.067
t-statistic	1.639	1.513	1.812	-1.477	1.097
Regulatory Interpretation					
Beta Coefficient	.004	-.071	-.088	-.158	-.136
t-statistic	.045	-1.229	-1.117	-2.163*	-2.153*
Job (admin/support = 0)					
Beta Coefficient	-.062	-.122	.121	-.023	-.048
t-statistic	-.755	-2.058*	1.507	-.303	-.742
Guilford (Durham = 0)					
Beta Coefficient	.087	-.017	.198	-.081	.037
t-statistic	.890	-.242	2.063*	-.915	.477
Johnston (Durham = 0)					
Beta Coefficient	.206	-.056	.091	.008	.056
t-statistic	2.244*	-.850	1.011	.095	.775
Mecklenburg (Durham = 0)					
Beta Coefficient	.155	.067	.157	-.035	.104
t-statistic	1.597	.962	1.645	-.397	1.361
Work with Clients					
Beta Coefficient	-.037	.136	-.027	.023	.059
t-statistic	-.428	2.152*	-.318	.294	.867
Years with Agency					
Beta Coefficient	.217	.036	.240	.090	.189
t-statistic	2.647**	.613	2.982**	2.907	2.934**
Adjusted R^2	.043	.499	.074	.207	.409
F	1.814	19.126**	2.465*	5.755**	13.596**

*Statistic is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Statistic is significant to the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

empowerment ($R^2 = .409$). The model explained just over one-fifth of the variance in

self-determination ($R^2 = .207$). There was a drop in its explanation of the variance in

meaning to just 7% ($R^2 = .074$) and just 4% of the variance in competence ($R^2 = .043$).

The model, however, was not significant for competence, so the model results could have occurred by chance.

Procedural justice had a positive and statistically significant relationship with impact ($\text{Beta} = .629, p < .01$) and self-determination ($\text{Beta} = .406, p < .01$). It did not have a statistically significant relationship with competence or meaning. Hypothesis 1 stated that procedural justice is positively associated to the employee's perception of empowerment; this hypothesis was supported as procedural justice had a strong, positive, and significant relationship with empowerment ($\text{Beta} = .581, p < .01$).

Years with the agency had a statistically significant and positive relationship with competence ($\text{Beta} = .217, p < .01$), meaning ($\text{Beta} = .240, p < .01$), and total empowerment ($\text{Beta} = .189, p < .01$).

Regulatory environment did not have a statistically significant relationship with any of the empowerment components or total empowerment, but regulatory interpretation by the supervisor had a statistically significant and negative relationship with self-determination ($\text{Beta} = -.158, p < .05$) and total empowerment ($\text{Beta} = -.136, p < .05$).

Working in social services rather than administration/support had a statistically significant and negative relationship with impact ($\text{Beta} = -.122, p < .05$).

Working directly with clients had a statistically significant and positive relationship with impact ($\text{Beta} = .136, p < .05$). This appears consistent for employees whose primary responsibilities are to deliver social services to citizens who have a need for those services.

Interestingly, when procedural justice and the other variables were held constant,

there was a positive difference between respondents in Guilford County and Durham County (the reference county for this dummy variable) for a sense of meaning (Beta = .198, $p < .05$). Likewise, there was a positive difference between respondents in Johnston County and Durham County for a sense of competence (Beta = .206, $p < .05$).

In summary, the Beta values showed that procedural justice was the strongest variable in the regression equations for impact, self-determination, and total empowerment. Procedural justice was not strongly associated with meaning or competence. Years with the agency was the strongest variable in the regression equations for meaning and competence. Years with the agency was shown to have a statistically significant and positive relationship with total empowerment, work with clients was shown to have a statistically significant and positive relationship with impact, working in social services had a statistically significant and negative relationship with impact, and regulatory interpretation had a statistically significant and negative relationship with self-determination and total empowerment. The model provided a strong explanation for the total variance in impact and total empowerment. Hypothesis 1 stated that procedural justice is positively associated to the employee's perception of empowerment; this hypothesis was supported.

4.2.3. Empowerment and Interactional Justice

Table 4.7 presents the model that tested interactional justice against the individual empowerment components and total empowerment. The model explained over one-third of the variance in total empowerment ($R^2 = .332$), almost three-tenths of the variance in impact ($R^2 = .299$) and almost one-quarter of the variance in self-determination ($R^2 =$

.246). There was a drop in its explanation of the variance in meaning to just 8% ($R^2 = .081$) and just 4% of the variance in competence ($R^2 = .037$). The model, however, was not significant for competence, so the model results could have occurred by chance.

Table 4.7 Regression Estimates (N = 165)
Empowerment Components and Total by Interactional Justice

Independent Variables	Competence	Impact	Meaning	Self-Determina- tion	Total
Interactional Justice Beta Coefficient t-statistic	.121 1.357	.458 6.019**	.193 2.220*	.493 6.257**	.546 7.355**
Regulatory Environment Beta Coefficient t-statistic	.115 1.456	.043 .633	.116 1.504	-.161 -2.310*	.009 .143
Regulatory Interpretation Beta Coefficient t-statistic	.030 .334	.004 .053	-.032 -.363	-.015 -.192	-.008 -.102
Job (admin/support = 0) Beta Coefficient t-statistic	-.063 -.768	-.132 -1.887	.123 1.530	-.019 -.267	-.051 -.748
Durham (Guilford = 0) Beta Coefficient t-statistic	-.069 -.760	.078 1.005	-.176 -1.981*	.101 1.251	.013 .178
Johnston (Guilford = 0) Beta Coefficient t-statistic	.127 1.485	-.117 -1.600	-.069 -.828	.027 .358	-.034 -.478
Mecklenburg (Guilford = 0) Beta Coefficient t-statistic	.072 .814	.066 .875	-.026 -.305	.038 .491	.060 .814
Work with Clients Beta Coefficient t-statistic	-.026 -.305	.198 2.677**	-.023 -.276	.035 .451	.099 1.371
Years with Agency Beta Coefficient t-statistic	.213 2.595**	.014 .205	.239 2.980**	.086 1.187	.175 2.560*
Adjusted R²	.037	.299	.081	.246	.332
F	1.692	8.770**	2.612**	6.954**	10.051**

*Statistic is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Statistic is significant to the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Interactional justice had a positive and statistically significant relationship with

impact (Beta = .458, $p < .01$), meaning (Beta = .193, $p < .05$), and self-determination (Beta = .493, $p < .01$). It did not have a statistically significant relationship with competence. Hypothesis 2 stated that interactional justice is positively associated to the employee's perception of empowerment; this hypothesis was supported as interactional justice had a strong, positive, and significant relationship with empowerment (Beta = .546, $p < .01$).

Working directly with clients had a statistically significant and positive relationship with impact (Beta = .198, $p < .01$). This appears consistent for employees whose primary responsibilities are to deliver social services to citizens who have a need for those services.

Years with the agency had a statistically significant and positive relationship with competence (Beta = .213, $p < .01$), meaning (Beta = .239, $p < .01$), and total empowerment (Beta = .175, $p < .05$). The longer the employee worked in the agency, the greater the sense of competence, self-determination, and total empowerment. In fact, years with the agency was the most important variable for the sense of meaning.

The regulatory interpretation by the supervisor did not have a statistically significant relationship with any of the empowerment components or total empowerment, but the regulatory environment did have a statistically significant and negative impact upon self-determination (Beta = -.161, $p < .05$).

When interactional justice and the other variables were held constant, there was a negative difference between the respondents in Durham County and Guilford County (the reference county for this dummy variable) for a sense of meaning (Beta = -.176, $p < .05$).

In summary, the Beta values showed that interactional justice was the strongest

variable in the regression equations for impact, self-determination, and total empowerment. Although interactional justice had a strong and statistically significant relationship with meaning, years with the agency was the strongest variable in this model. Interactional justice was not strongly associated with competence. Years with the agency improved competence. Years with the agency was shown to have a statistically significant and positive relationship with total empowerment, work with clients was shown to have a statistically significant and positive relationship with impact, and regulatory environment was shown to have a statistically significant and negative relationship with self-determination. The model provided a strong explanation for the total variance in self-determination, impact, and total empowerment. Hypothesis 2 stated that interactional justice is positively associated to the employee's perception of empowerment; this hypothesis was supported.

4.2.4. Empowerment and Trust

After interactional justice and procedural justice were examined separately, they were combined to operationalize the construct of trust. Trust and its relationship with total empowerment and its four components were then analyzed through multiple regression. Other variables were also included in the analysis.

Table 4.8 presents the model that tested trust against the individual empowerment components and total empowerment. The model explained the least variance in competence ($R^2 = .042$). The model, however, was not significant for competence, so the model results could have occurred by chance. The model explained just over 8% of the variance in meaning ($R^2 = .084$), but it provided a stronger explanation of 26% of the

**Table 4.8 Regression Estimates (N = 165)
Empowerment Components and Total by Trust**

Independent Variables	Competence	Impact	Meaning	Self-Determina- tion	Total
Trust					
Beta Coefficient	.144	.603	.195	.501	.627
t-statistic	1.673	9.120**	2.307*	6.629**	9.378**
Regulatory Environment					
Beta Coefficient	.117	.044	.123	-.142	.022
t-statistic	1.498	.743	1.613	-2.085*	.361
Regulatory Interpretation					
Beta Coefficient	.030	.026	-.046	-.051	-.018
t-statistic	.347	.400	-.552	-.675	-.272
Job (admin/support = 0)					
Beta Coefficient	-.061	-.121	.124	-.016	-.043
t-statistic	-.745	-1.932	1.547	-.222	-.682
Durham (Guilford = 0)					
Beta Coefficient	-.077	.039	-.185	.077	-.021
t-statistic	-.851	.562	-2.077*	.967	-.303
Johnston (Guilford = 0)					
Beta Coefficient	.136	-.078	-.058	.055	.004
t-statistic	1.588	-1.192	-.695	.738	.055
Mecklenburg (Guilford = 0)					
Beta Coefficient	.075	.080	-.024	.045	.071
t-statistic	.848	1.185	-.278	.578	1.043
Work with Clients					
Beta Coefficient	-.036	.151	-.032	.012	.060
t-statistic	-.415	2.259*	-.376	.154	.891
Years with Agency					
Beta Coefficient	.217	.031	.242	.094	.189
t-statistic	2.643**	.496	3.019**	1.313	2.974**
Adjusted R²	.042	.437	.084	.264	.425
F	1.807	15.150**	2.661**	7.550**	14.465**

*Statistic is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Statistic is significant to the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

variance in self-determination ($R^2 = .264$). The model provided the strongest explanation of the variance in impact ($R^2 = .437$) and total empowerment ($R^2 = .425$).

Trust had a positive and statistically significant relationship with impact (Beta = .603, $p <$

.01), meaning (Beta = .195, $p < .05$), and self-determination (Beta = .501, $p < .01$). It did not have a statistically significant relationship with competence. Hypothesis 3 stated that trust is positively associated to the employee's perception of empowerment; this hypothesis was supported as trust had a strong, positive, and significant relationship with empowerment (Beta = .627, $p < .01$).

Working with clients had a statistically significant and positive relationship with impact (Beta = .151, $P < .05$). Years with the agency had a statistically significant and positive relationship with competence (Beta = .217, $p < .01$), meaning (Beta = .242, $p < .01$), and total empowerment (Beta = .189, $p < .01$). The regulatory environment had a statistically significant and negative relationship with self-determination (Beta = -.142, $p < .05$).

When trust and the other variables were held constant, there was a negative difference between respondents in Durham County and Guilford County (the reference county for this dummy variable) for a sense of meaning (Beta = -.185, $p < .05$).

In summary, the Beta values showed that trust was the strongest variable in the regression equations for impact, self-determination, and total empowerment. Trust was not strongly associated with competence. The model, however, was not significant for competence, so the model results could have occurred by chance. Working with clients increased a sense of impact, but the regulatory environment decreased a sense of self-determination and working in Durham County decreased a sense of meaning. Years with the agency had the strongest relationship with the sense of meaning, but it also increased the sense of competence and total environment.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that employees who perceive that they have a high level of

trust (procedural justice and interactional justice combined) in the supervisor would have a higher sense of empowerment than employees who have a low level of trust in the supervisor would. As hypothesized, there was a statistically significant and positive relationship between trust in the supervisor and total empowerment (Beta = .638, $p < .01$).

4.3. Comparison of State and North Carolina County Results

Both samples rated the four components of empowerment almost in the same order. Competence and meaning were reported as high for the state respondents and the North Carolina county respondents, but the order was reversed. Meaning was rated the highest with the state sample, and competence was rated the highest with the county sample. Both samples rated self-determination next, but it was at a more moderate level. Self-determination also had a wider range of responses from moderately low to high. Both the state and county respondents rated their impact as the lowest of the four components. Impact also had a wide range of responses, so the respondents rated their impact as low to only moderate. Total empowerment for both samples was in the moderate range and essentially the same.

Because significance tests are sensitive to sample size, it is more difficult to make direct comparisons between the larger sample of the states ($N = 284$) and the smaller sample of the North Carolina counties ($N = 165$). What is important to note is that, as expected, interactional justice, procedural justice, and trust consistently had a strong positive relationship with the sense of empowerment. In neither sample, however, did they have a significant relationship with a sense of competence. Competence appears to

be more internal to the individual, while the components of impact, meaning, and self-determination are more external conditions that might be affected by actions of the supervisor.

Years with the agency also appeared to consistently have a strong positive relationship with a sense of competence, meaning, and total empowerment in both samples. Only with the state sample, however, did years with the agency have a strong positive relationship with self-determination.

The supervisor interpretation of the regulations appeared to be more important in the state sample, but the existence of the rules and regulations appeared to be more important in the North Carolina counties. In both situations, the statistically significant relationships were negative.

Working with clients was also different between the state sample and the county sample. In the relationships that were statistically significant, they were negative for the state sample (competence and meaning) but positive for the county sample (impact).

4.4. Hypotheses Summary

Table 4.9 summarizes the four hypotheses and the results of their tests with the data in this study. The study anticipated that there is a link between employee trust in supervisors and employee perceptions of empowerment. The analysis of the responses in this study have shown that this is in fact the case and that employee trust in the supervisor has a strong relationship with a sense of empowerment. Chapter 5 presents implications of this finding for management in the public sector, but it can be stated here that these results demonstrate that as an organization attempts to implement employee

empowerment it needs to pay attention to the level of employee trust in the supervisor as a means to improve implementation success.

Table 4.9 Confirmation of Hypotheses through the Analysis of State and North Carolina County Data

Hypothesis	State Data	North Carolina County Data
H₁: Procedural Justice is positively associated to the employee's perception of empowerment	Yes	Yes
H₂: Interactional Justice is positively associated to the employee's perception of empowerment	Yes	Yes
H₃: Trust (procedural justice and interactional justice) is positively associated to the employee's perception of empowerment	Yes	Yes
H₄: Employees who perceive that they have a high level of trust (procedural justice and interactional justice) in the supervisor will have a higher sense of empowerment than employees who have a low level of trust in the supervisor	Yes	Yes

Chapter 5

Implications for Public Management, Limitations, and Suggestions for Future Research

5.1. Introduction

This study has examined the constructs of employee empowerment and employee trust in the supervisor with particular consideration to their roles as management tools. Empowerment has been given much attention in the reinventing government movement of the past decade, and the language of empowerment has become commonplace in public administration literature.

In spite of this interest in empowerment there has been limited empirical research of the construct in the public sector. There has been even less attention given to other supervisor-employee relationships which might impact the potential for success of public sector attempts to implement employee empowerment. This study hypothesized that employee trust in the supervisor is one of the important supervisor-employee relationships that affects employee empowerment. These hypotheses were tested using samples of employees in four state departments of health and social services and in four North Carolina county departments of social services. The results showed that, as predicted, a strong relationship existed.

This chapter presents what these results mean for managers in the public sectors. It also summarizes the limitations of the current study and future research that would expand the results of this study as well as take these limitations into consideration.

5.2. Implications for Public Management

This research shows that there is a definite positive relationship between trust in the supervisor and the sense of empowerment by the employee. Agencies that accept the premises of empowerment, that employees should be given a greater level of control over their jobs and the delivery of their services to the clients, should consider the relationship between supervisor and employee prior to any implementation effort. Traditionally, rewards of promotion into supervisory positions are given because of the applicant's knowledge of the resources and services of the agency and the ability to make decisions. Supervisors expect compliance with decisions because of the hierarchy of the organization, not their interpersonal relationship with the employees. Empowerment assumes that more decisions will be made at the employee level and that supervisors will take a more supportive role in the process.

Empowerment consists of many components. This study showed that impact, meaning, and self-determination had the strongest association with procedural justice, interactional justice, and trust. These components are also the parts of total empowerment over which the organization has the greatest control. Agencies that intend to implement empowerment into their organization, therefore, must consider their approach in different dimensions; jobs must be designed so that employees achieve a sense of meaning in the work, have opportunities for discretion in the decisions they make, and see an impact in the operations/outcomes of the agency in which they work.

As discussed earlier in this study, empowerment as a concept presents a strong contradiction. The ideas of employee discretion and participation are certainly not new in

either public or private sector organizations. The public sector, however, is resplendent with examples of abuse of discretion. The complexity of governmental bureaucracy and the volumes of rules and regulations for service delivery have been created because of abuses of power and discretion and the premise of equality in the delivery of services for those with the same needs. The advocates of empowerment would argue that most of the rules and regulations are "overkill" in light of the actual abuses. They advocate that the great majority of government employees, especially those in social service and health service delivery systems, are hard working and dedicated to the provision of essential government services to those who need them. It will be difficult for elected officials who rely upon the effective and efficient delivery of governmental services for their own political future to lighten the burden of existing rules and regulations. In spite of the language of empowerment, the public employee is often confronted with the reality of "you're empowered until you do something that the supervisor or governing body doesn't like."

The Personal Responsibility and Work Reconciliation Act of 1996 and other national legislation passed during a time of federal devolution were certainly efforts in that direction. As some of the county respondents mentioned, however, state controls and even local ones have often replaced national controls. The advocates of the reinventing government movement of the past decade expound a language of employee flexibility and individual client service. But this language contradicts the traditional public administration and public policy characteristics of equality, effectiveness, efficiency, and economy.

It would appear, however, that there is room for flexibility, and that employees at

the service delivery level are willing to assume greater responsibility in exchange for greater self-determination. Empowerment can also provide the supervisors the opportunity to plan and manage less-restrictive boundaries of service delivery rather than the micro-managing that is too often typical in governmental agencies. In the event of empowerment implementation, however, the relationship between supervisor and employee certainly appears to have an impact upon the potential for success. As one social service administrator noted, "How can we expect to empower our clients if our staff is not empowered?" As this study found, trust has a strong relationship with both the individual empowerment components of impact, meaning, and self-determination, as well as the construct of empowerment as a whole.

The organization that wants to undertake empowerment efforts, specifically, and organizational change, generally, should consider several things:

- 1) The respondents in this study had high levels of competence, but reported lower levels of meaning and self-determination and very low levels of impact in their effect on the operations/outputs of the agency. Whether the sense of competence was achieved individually by the employee or in conjunction with organizational efforts is not completely known. The implication of this finding is that the organization can have an effect upon the employee's sense of meaning, impact, and self-determination in the duties the employee performs. It is doubtful that competent employees who report lower levels of meaning, impact, and self-determination will continue to be productive employees willing to achieve the service-delivery purposes of the public agency.
- 2) The relationship between supervisor and employee will change when

empowerment is implemented. Supervisors and employees must be prepared for this change. Organizational leaders play an essential role at the beginning of the empowerment process, but empowerment does not just happen by their decree. Unfortunately, trust is not "teachable." The organization can, however, train supervisors in methods to improve their relationships with subordinates (interactional justice), and training provides guidelines for the consistent implementation of decision-making procedures (procedural justice). Training resolves many potential conflicts before those conflicts can adversely affect the organization. Supervisors must be trained to provide information adequate for employee decision-making and to support employee discretion and the reality that some decisions will be made that are contrary to the preferences of the supervisor (but, hopefully, within the appropriate guidelines). Employees must be trained to make difficult decisions that in the past could be shifted up the organizational hierarchy. Unfortunately too often in the public sector, training is seen as an "employee benefit" and not as an "organizational benefit." Training programs are reduced or eliminated when the agency is faced with budget cuts. Agencies that expect to empower their employees need to maintain high levels of training for supervisors and employees.

- 3) The implementation of empowerment in the organization is not easy and carries a cost. Failed empowerment may actually create greater problems for the organization than not implementing empowerment in the first place. For example, research on participation in the organization showed that just offering employees to join in management meetings was not sufficient. The

employee must also believe that their opinions were respected, listened to, and, where appropriate, implemented. The same is true with empowerment efforts. To bequeath empowerment on the employee is not sufficient; the employee must actually believe they have the greater discretion and authority that empowerment advocates. The employee must see empowerment as an opportunity for success, not a minefield for failure. Trust in the supervisor is important for the employee to accept that the empowerment effort is real.

- 4) This study showed that trust is critical to the relationship between supervisor and employee. Previous research has shown that trust is important as an antecedent to positive experiences in the workplace. This study confirmed that trust is important to the employee's sense of empowerment. Empowerment efforts, while still new in the public sector, do cause change in the organization and the relationship of supervisor and employee. Other change efforts have similar impacts. The pre-existing trust relationship between supervisor and employee may improve organizational change attempts.

5.3. Limitations of the Study

The current research is limited by the small sample size for three of the four state agencies and at least three of the four North Carolina counties. Although it was found that there was no statistically significant difference between the Vermont respondents and the other state respondents, the large percentage of state respondents were from Vermont. Therefore, these respondents obviously influenced the overall results. There was an attempt to account for any differences by creating the dummy variables of Vermont and

other states, but the results would have been stronger if the sample sizes from all the states had been closer.

The use of public social service and health service employees may indicate a level of education and professional discretion that is not typical of all public employees. The respondents in this study reported high levels of competence that may not be typical in the public service.

Contact with the potential respondents was achieved through email and the data were collected through the Internet. Although the states and counties were selected because of the extensiveness of the accessibility of email and the Internet to the employees, not all employees of the agency did have access. This obviously either reduced the randomness of the respondents or it may have also restricted the demographic distribution of the respondents.

More employees in all of the agencies expressed a willingness to participate than actually completed the questionnaire. It is not known whether the decline was caused by the nature of the questions, local conditions, the inability to access the questionnaire for equipment or software reasons, or a concern for confidentiality by requiring an email address at questionnaire access.

Self-reporting always raises a concern about variance in the results, especially when the questionnaire deals with personnel issues. Although confidentiality was assured and maintained, it is impossible to know whether the respondent was convinced of those assurances. All the states and counties during data collection were experiencing budget and workload issues. In Vermont and the four North Carolina counties, management initiated the first contact with the employees. It is certainly possible that non-respondents

were concerned with the potential use of their responses and that respondents were less honest in their answers. The general consistency from eight different populations, however, seems to ameliorate this concern

5.4. Suggestions for Future Research

Future studies should attempt to achieve a larger and random sample to determine whether the results can be generalized to the larger population of social service and health employees.

This study did not completely confirm that the Thomas and Velthouse (1990) four component conceptual definition and model of empowerment fits the public sector. It raised questions about the role of competence within the construct. This finding may be a product of the study sample as employees in health and social services, the nature of government employment and its assumptions of merit-based appointment, or that there is a more appropriate conceptual definition for use in the public sector. Social service and health service employees tend to enter their professions with a specific desire to help the clients of their services. In addition, they tend to have both higher levels of formal education and the standards of the professions require more consistent in-house training by the agency. The individual components of empowerment may be different for different employees in different public agencies. The survey instrument should be used with other public employee groups to see whether this result is consistent across the public sector. Other scales to measure empowerment have been created which have more or fewer components. These other empowerment scales could be used simultaneously to test the concurrent and discriminate validity of the Spreitzer empowerment scale and its

individual components.

The earlier research showed that education did not have a statistically significant relationship with empowerment. The survey instrument, therefore, did not collect education information. It is anticipated, however, that the respondents in social and health services would have a higher level of education and more opportunities for professional training. This may have had an impact upon the high sense of competence that was reported in both samples. This high education and training experience is not necessarily consistent with other sectors of public employment. Future research should collect education information because the higher education levels expected for social service and health service employees may have influenced the results of this study.

Public social service and health service employees were selected for this study because it was anticipated that their agencies would have implemented empowerment opportunities or that the nature of social services and health services would already give many of the employees greater levels of discretion in providing services to their clients. Although this was not a case study, employees in all of the agencies reported varying levels of empowerment efforts in their agency or by their individual supervisor. This suggests that future studies should examine employees in public agencies where the traditional bureaucratic hierarchy and its limitations on discretion exist to see whether the results are consistent across the public sector.

Although this study showed that there was a strong positive relationship between trust and empowerment, the collection of empowerment data and trust data at the same time makes it impossible to know whether the employee's trust in the supervisor existed prior to the sense of empowerment in the employees. It is possible that there is a reverse

causal direction that a sense of empowerment exists before the trust in the supervisor. Even more likely is that there is a reciprocal relationship that is created between supervisor and employee, that supervisors who empower their employees are trusted more by their employees and that employees who trust their supervisors may be given more empowerment opportunities. A time-study in a public agency that planned to implement empowerment opportunities would help to clarify whether trust is an antecedent to empowerment. The employees could be surveyed on their levels of trust and empowerment prior to the program implementation and at a reasonable time following the empowerment effort and the results compared.

The results for both the state sample and the county sample showed that interactional justice, procedural justice, and trust were statistically significant for the components of impact, meaning, and self-determination. In addition, the Beta coefficients were largest and at similar levels for both self-determination and for total empowerment. This may mean that self-determination, the ability to initiate and regulate actions, may actually most closely reflect what public employees perceive as empowerment in their position. Future research should examine whether measuring empowerment can be achieved through only three of the Thomas and Velthouse components and whether measuring self-determination alone would be adequate to measure empowerment in the public sector.

In spite of extensive interest in the concept of trust, there was no current and validated scale that measured the employee trust in the supervisor. As a result, it was necessary for this study to find other scales to act as surrogates for its conceptual definition of trust. Future research should investigate and validate a scale that can

operationalize employee trust in the supervisor quickly. This might help organizational management to better prepare for organizational change, especially if additional research continues to show a strong relationship between employee trust and a sense of empowerment. This study could provide an important beginning to this scale development.

Employee trust in the supervisor may also be important when the organization attempts change in other areas of its operation, both for positive improvements in organizational performance or the negative realities of downsizing. Once a scale is constructed and validated, it could be used to test whether trust is an important antecedent for other organizational change efforts.

It is certainly possible that supervisor trust in the employee may also be important in the workplace environment to facilitate both the supervisor's willingness to empower individual employees and the employee's trust in the supervisor. Future research should examine this possible reciprocal relationship.

REFERENCES

- Aghion, Philippe, and Jean Tirole (1997). "Formal and Real Authority in Organizations." *Journal of Political Economy* 105(1): 1-29.
- Allard, Scott W. (1998). "Revisiting Shapiro: Welfare Magnets and State Residency Requirements in the 1990s." *Publius* 28(3): 45-65.
- Allcorn, Seth (1997). "Parallel Virtual Organizations: Managing and Working in the Virtual Workplace." *Administration and Society* 29(4): 412-439.
- Anderson, James C., and James A. Narus (1990). "A Model of Distributor Firm and Manufacturer Firm Working Partnerships." *Journal of Marketing* 54(1): 42-58.
- Anastasi, Anne (1982). *Psychological Testing*, 5th ed. New York: Macmillan Publishers co., Inc.
- Aquino, Karl, Steven L. Grover, Murray Bradford, and David G. Allen (1999). "The Effects of Negative Affectivity, Hierarchical Status, and Self-Determination on Workplace Victimization." *Academy of Management Journal* 42(3): 260-272.
- Argyris, Chris (1957). *Personality and Organization*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Argyris, Chris (1989). "Strategy Implementation: An Experience in Learning." *Organizational Dynamics* 18(2): 5-15.
- Argyris, Chris (1998). "Empowerment: The Emperor's New Clothes." *Harvard Business Review* 76(3): 98-105.
- Ashford, Susan J., and Anne S. Tsui (1992). "Self-regulation for Management Effectiveness: The Role of Active Feedback Seeking." *Academy of Management Journal* 34(2): 251-280.
- Aycan, Zeynep, Rabindra N. Kanungo, and Jai B. P. Sinha (1999). "Organizational Culture and Human Resource Management Practices: The Model of Culture Fit." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 30(4): 501-526.
- Babbie, Earl (1992). *The Practice of Social Research*, 6th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- Babbie, Earl (1999). *The Basics of Social Research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- Balfour, Danny L., and Barton Wechsler (1991). "Commitment, Performance, and Productivity in Public Organizations." *Public Productivity and Management Review* 14(4): 355-367.

- Bandura, Albert (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Barber, Bernard (1983). *The Logic and Limits of Trust*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Barling, Julian, and Michelle Phillips (1993). "Interactional, Formal, and Distributive Justice in the Workplace: An Exploratory Study." *The Journal of Psychology* 127(6): 649-656.
- Bass, Bernard M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Behn, Robert D. (1995). "The Big Questions of Public Management." *Public Administration Review* 55: 313-324.
- Bell, Robert (1985). "Professional Values and Organizational Decision Making." *Administration and Society* 17(1): 21-60.
- Bentler, P. M. (1990). "Comparative Fit Indices in Structural Models." *Psychological Bulletin* 107(2): 238-246.
- Bernard, H. Russell (2000). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Best, Samuel J., Brian Krueger, Clark Hubbard, and Andrew Smith (2001). "An Assessment of the Generalizability of Internet Surveys." *Social Science Computer Review* 19(2): 131-145.
- Beugré, Constant D. (1998). "Implementing Business Process Reengineering: The Role of Organizational Justice." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 34(3): 347-360.
- Beugré, Constant D., and Robert A. Baron (2001). "Perceptions of Systemic Justice: The Effects of Distributive, Procedural, and Interactional Justice." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 31(2): 324-339.
- Bies, Robert J. (1987). "The Predicament of Injustice: The Management of Moral Outrage." In L. L. Cummings and B. M. Staw, eds. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 9. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, Inc., 289-319.
- Bies, Robert J., and Joseph S. Moag (1986). "Interactional Justice: Communication Criteria of Fairness." In Roy J. Lewicki, Blair H. Sheppard, and Max H. Bazerman, eds., *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, Vol. 1. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, Inc., 43-55.

- Black, J. Stewart, and Hal B. Gregersen (1997). "Participative Decision-Making: An Integration of Multiple Dimensions." *Human Relations* 50(7): 859-878.
- Bollen, Kenneth A., and J. Scott Long, eds. (1993). *Testing Structural Equation Models*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Boren, Richard (1994). "Don't Delegate – Empower." *Supervisory Management* 39(10): 10.
- Boss, R. Wayne (1978). "Trust and Managerial Problem Solving Revisited." *Group and Organization Studies* 3(3): 331-342.
- Bowditch, James L., and Anthony F. Buono (1997). *A Primer on Organizational Behavior*, 4th ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Bowen, David E., and Robert Johnston (1999). "Internal Service Recovery: Developing a New Construct." *International Journal of Service Industry Management* 10(2): 118-131.
- Bowen, David E., and Edward E. Lawler III (1992). "The Empowerment of Service Workers: What, Why, How, and When." *Sloan Management Review* 33(3): 31-39.
- Bowman, James S. (1981). "Ethics and the Public Service: A Selected and Annotated Bibliography." *Public Personnel Management Journal* 10(1): 179-199.
- Bozeman, Barry, and Gordon Kingsley (1998). "Risk Culture in Public and Private Organizationa." *Public Administration Review* 58(2): 109-118.
- Bozeman, Barry, and Hal G. Rainey (1998). "Organizational Rules and the 'Bureaucratic Personality.'" *American Journal of Political Science* 42(1): 163-189.
- Bradley, Graham L., and Beverley A. Sparks (2000). "Customer Reactions to Staff Empowerment: Mediators and Moderators." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 30(5): 991-1012.
- Braun, Bonnie, and Linda Kay Benning (2001). "Welfare Reform 4 Years Later: The Mobilization of the Land-Grant System." *Journal of Extension* (electronic journal) 39(3), www.joe.org.
- Brehm, John, and Scott Gates (1997). *Working, Shirking, and Sabotage: Bureaucratic Response to a Democratic Public*. Ann Arbor; The University of Michigan Press.
- Brehm, John, and Scott Gates (2002). "Rules, Trust, and the Allocation of Time." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL, April 25-28.

Brett, Jeanne M. (1986). "Commentary on Procedural Justice Papers." In Roy J. Lewicki, Blair H. Sheppard, and Max H. Bazerman, eds., *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, Vol. 1. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, Inc., 81-90.

Brockner, Joel, and Phyllis Siegel (1996). "Understanding the Interaction Between Procedural and Distributive Justice." In Robert M. Kramer and Tom R. Tyler, eds., *Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 390-413.

Brown, Peter G. (1994). *Restoring the Public Trust: A Fresh Vision for Progressive Government in America*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Bundt, Julie (2000). "Strategic Stewards: Managing Accountability, Building Trust." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10(4): 757-777.

Burpitt, William J., and William J. Bigoness (1997). "Leadership and Innovation Among Teams: The Impact of Empowerment." *Small Group Research* 28(3): 414-423.

Burr, Renu, and John L. Cordery (2001). "Self-Management Efficacy as a Mediator of the Relations Between Job Design and Employee Motivation." *Human Performance* 14(1): 27-44.

Butler, Jr., John K. (1991). "Toward Understanding and Measuring Conditions of Trust: Evolution of a Conditions of Trust Inventory." *Journal of Management* 17(3): 643-663.

Cable, Daniel M., and Charles K. Parsons (2001). "Cutting Off Your Nose to Spite Your Face: A Justice Perspective on Damaging an Alma Mater's Reputational Ranking." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 31(1): 59-72.

Campbell, Constance R., and Mark J. Martinko (1998). "An Integrative Attributional Perspective of Empowerment and Learned Helplessness: A Multimethod Field Study." *Journal of Management* 24(2): 173-200.

Campbell, D. T., and D. W. Fiske (1959). "Convergent and Discriminant Validation by the Multitrait-Multimethod Matix." *Psychological Bulletin* 56: 81-105.

Carless, Sally A., Alexander J. Wearing, and Leon Mann (2000). "A Short Measure of Transformational Leadership." *Journal of Business and Psychology* 14(2): 389-405.

Carnevale, David G. (1995). *Trustworthy Government: Leadership and Management Strategies for Building Trust and High Performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Carson, Kerry D., Paula Phillips Carson, C. William Roe, Betty J. Berkenmeier, and Joyce S. Phillips (1999). "Four Commitment Profiles and their Relationship to

Empowerment, Service Recovery, and Work Attitudes." *Public Personnel Management* 28(1): 1-13.

Cashin, Sheryll D. (1999). "Federalism, Welfare Reform, and the Minority Poor: Accounting for the Tyranny of State Majorities." *Columbia Law Review* 99: 552-627.

Chartier, Myron R. (1991). "Trust-Orientation Profile." In J. William Pfeiffer, ed. *The 1991 Annual: Developing Human Resources*. San Diego: University Associates, 135-148.

Child, John, and David Faulkner (1998). *Strategies of Cooperation: Managing Alliances, Networks, and Joint Ventures*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Chisholm, Rupert F., and Leopold S. Vansina (1993). "Aarities of Participation." *Public Administration Quarterly* 17(3): 291-315.

Cleckley, Hervey M. (1976). *The Mask of Sanity*, 5th ed. St. Louis, MO: Mosby.

Cogburn, Jerrell D. (2000). "Personnel Deregulation: Exploring Differences in the American States." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 11(2): 223-244.

Cole, Nancy S., and Pamela A. Moss (1989). "Bias in Test Use." In Robert L. Linn, *Educational Measurement*, 3rd ed. New York: ACE/MacMillan Publishing Co., 201-219.

Coleman, James S. (1990). *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Collins, David (1999). "Born to Fail? Empowerment, Ambiguity, and Set Overlap." *Personnel Review* 29(3): 208-221.

Colquitt, Jason A. (2001). "On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of a Measure." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86(3): 386-400.

Colquitt, Jason A., Donald E. Conlon, Michael J. Wesson, Christopher O. L. H. Porter, and K. Yee Ng (2001). "Justice at the Millennium: A Meta-Analytic Review of 25 Years of Organizational Justice Research." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86(3): 425-445.

Conger, Jay A. (1999). "Charismatic and Transformational Leadership in Organizations: An Insider's Perspective on These Developing Streams of Research." *Leadership Quarterly* 10(2): 145-179.

Conger, Jay A., and Kanungo, Rabindra N. (1988). "The Empowerment Process: Integrating Theory and Practice." *The Academy of Management Review* 13(3): 471-482.

Conger, Jay A., Rabindra N. Kanungo, and Sanjay T. Menon (2000). "Charismatic Leadership and Follower Effects." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 21(7): 747-767.

Congressional Record

December 21, 1995: H15533

January 22, 1996: H342

August 22, 1996: H7105

Conlan, Timothy (1998). *From New Federalism to Devolution: Twenty-Five Years of Intergovernmental Reform*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Connor, Patrick E. (1997). "Total Quality Management: A Selective Commentary on Its Human Dimensions with Special Reference to its Downside." *Public Administration Review* 57(6): 501-509.

Conyne, Robert K., Riley L. Harvill, Rosemarie S. Morganett, D. Keith Morran and Fiana Huise-Killacky (1990). "Effective Group Leadership: Continuing the Search for Greater Clarity and Understanding." *Journal for Specialists in Group Work* 15(1): 30-36.

Cook, Thomas D., and Donald T Campbell (1979). *Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Cook, Colleen, Fred Heath, and Russel L. Thompson (2000). "A Meta-analysis of Response Rates in Web- or Internet-based Surveys." *Educational Psychology Measures* 60(6): 821-836.

Cook, John, and Toby Wall (1980). "New Work Attitude Measures of Trust, Organizational Commitment and Personal Need Non-Fulfilment." *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 53(1): 39-52.

Cooper, Terry L. (1987). "Hierarchy, Virtue, and the Practice of Public Administration: A Perspective for Normative Ethics." *Public Administration Review* 47(4): 320-328.

Cordery, John (1997). "Reinventing Work Design Theory and Practice." *Australian Psychologist* 32(3): 185-189.

Corsun, David L., and Cathy A. Enz (1999). "Predicting Psychological Empowerment Among Service Workers: The Effect of Support-Based Relationships." *Human Relations* 52(2): 205-224.

Couper, Mick P. (2000). "Web Surveys: A Review of Issues and Approaches." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 64(3): 464-494.

Couper, Mick P., Michael W. Traugott, and Mark J. Amias (2001). "Web Survey Design and Administration." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 65(2): 230-253.

Crandall, James E. (1981). *Theory and Measurement of Social Interest: Empirical Tests of Alfred Adler's Concept*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Crandall, James E. (1984). "Social Interest as a Moderator of Life Stress." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 47: 164-174.
- Crawford, Scott D., Mick P. Couper, and Mark J. Lamias (2001). "Web Surveys: Perceptions of Burden." *Social Science Computer Review* 19(2): 146-162.
- Creed, W. E. Douglas, and Raymond E. Miles (1996). "Trust in Organizations: A Conceptual Framework Linking Organizational Forms, Managerial Philosophies, and the Opportunity Costs of Controls." In Robert M. Kramer and Tom R. Tyler, eds., *Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 16-38.
- Crewson, Philip E. (1997). "Public-Service Motivation: Building Empirical Evidence of Incidence and Effect." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 7(4): 499-518.
- Cronbach, Lee J., and Paul E. Meehl (1955). Construct Validity in Psychological Tests. *Psychological Bulletin* 52(4): 281-302.
- Cropanzano, Russell, Zinta S. Byrne, D. Ramona Bobocel, and Deborah E. Rupp (2001). "Moral Virtues, Fairness Heuristics, Social Entities, and Other Denizens of Organizational Justice." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 58(2): 164-209.
- Crouse, Janice Shaw (1994). "Leadership: Working from the Inside Out." *Vital Speeches of the Day* 60(19): 597-602.
- Cummings, L. I., and P. Bromiley (1996). "The Organizational Trust Inventory (OTI)." In Robert M. Kramer and Tom R. Tyler, eds, *Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 302-330.
- Cunningham, Ian, and Jeff Hyman (1999). "The Poverty of Empowerment? A Critical Case Study." *Personnel Review* 28(3): 192-207.
- Curtis, Russell L. (1989). "Cutbacks, Management, and Human Relations: Meanings for Organizational Theory and Research." *Human Relations* 42(8): 671-689.
- Daley, Dennis M. (1991). Management Practices and the Uninvolved Manager: The effect of Supervisory Attitudes on Perceptions of Organizational Trust and Change Orientation. *Public Personnel Management* 20(1): 101-113.
- D'Annunzio-Green, Norma, and John Macandrew (1999). "Re-empowering the Empowered – the Ultimate Challenge?" *Personnel Review* 29(3): 258-278.
- Dansereau, Fred, George B. Graen, and William J. Haga (1975). "A Vertical Dyad Linkage Approach to leadership within Formal Organizations." *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 13(1): 46-78.

Davies, Paul, Howard Iams, and Kalman Rupp (2000). "The Effect of Welfare Reform of SSA's Disability Programs: Design of Policy Evaluation and Early Evidence." *Social Security Bulletin* 63(1): 3-11.

Dean, Jr., James W., and David E. Bowen (1994). "Management Theory and Total Quality: Improving Research and Practice Through Theory Development." *Academy of Management Review* 19(3): 393-418.

Denham, Nicola, Peter Ackers, and Cheryl Travers (1997). "Doing Yourself Out of a Job? How Middle Managers Cope with Empowerment." *Employee Relations* 19(2): 147-159.

Doig, Alan, and John Wilson (1998). "What Price New Public Management?" *The Political Quarterly* 69: 267-276.

Douglas, Scott C., and Mark J. Martinko (2001). "Exploring the Role of Individual Differences in the Prediction of Workplace Aggression." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86(4): 547-559.

Douthitt, Elizabeth A., and John R. Aiello (2001). "The Role of Participation and Control in the Effects of Computer Monitoring on Fairness Perceptions, Task Satisfaction, and Performance." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86(5): 867-874.

Drehmer, David E., James A. Belohlav, and Ray W. Coye (2000). "An Exploration of Employee Participation Using a Scaling Approach." *Group and Organization Management* 25(4): 397-418.

Drucker, Peter F. (1995). "*Really* Reinventing Government." *The Atlantic Monthly* 275(2): 49-58.

Eby, Lillian T., Deena M. Freeman, Michael C. Rush, and Charles E. Lance (1999). "Motivational Bases of Affective Organizational Commitment: A Partial Test of an Integrative Theoretical Model." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 72: 463-483.

Eller, Warren S., Kenneth J. Meier, and Carl Doerfler (2000). "Changing Dimes to Dollars: An Empirical Look at Maslow's and Herzberg's Motivation Theories." Paper presented at American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, August 31-September 2.

Ellis-Stoll, Cynthia C., and Sue Popkess-Vawter (1998). "A Concept Analysis on the Process of Empowerment." *Advances in Nursing Science* 21(2): 62-68.

Elrod, Linda D. (1997). "Child Support Reassessed: Federalization of Enforcement Nears Competition." *University of Illinois Law Review*: 695-709.

Eylon, Dafna, and Kevin Y. Au (1999). "Exploring Empowerment Cross-Cultural Differences Along the Power Distance Dimension." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 23(3): 373-385.

Eylon, Dafna, and Peter Bamberger (2000). "Empowerment Cognitions and Empowerment Acts: Recognizing the Importance of Gender." *Group and Organization Management* 25(4): 354-372.

Fairholm, Gilbert W. (1993). *Leadership: And the Culture of Trust*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Fiol, C. Marlene, Edward J. O'Connor, and Herman Aguinis (2001). "All for One and One for All? The Development and Transfer of Power across Organizational Levels." *Academy of Management Review* 26(2): 224-242.

Fischbacher, Colin, David Chappel, Richard Edwards, and Nick Summerton (2000). "Health Surveys Via the Internet: Quick and Dirty or Rapid and Robust?" *Journal of Royal Society of Medicine* 93(7): 356-359.

Folger, Robert, and C. Martin (1986). "Relative Deprivation and Referent Cognitions: Distributive and Procedural Justice Effects." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 22(4): 531-546.

Folger, Robert, and Mary A. Konovsky (1989). "Effects of Procedural and Distributive Justice on Reactions to Pay Raise Decision." *Academy of Management Journal* 32(1): 115-130.

Follett, Mary Parker (1997). "The Giving of Orders." In Jay M. Shafritz and Albert C. Hyde, eds. *Classics of Public Administration*, 4th ed. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace and Co., 53-60.

Forrester, Russ (2000). "Empowerment: Rejuvenating a Potent Idea." *Academy of Management Executive* 14(3): 67-80.

Foster-Fishman, Pennie G., and Christopher B. Keys (1997). "The Person/Environment Dynamics of Employee Empowerment: An Organizational Culture Analysis." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 25(4): 345-369.

Foster-Fishman, Pennie G., Deborah A. Salem, Susan Chibnall, Ray Legler, and Courtney Yapchai (1998). "Empirical Support for the Critical Assumptions of Empowerment Theory." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 26(4): 507-536.

Francis, Richard M. (1998). "Predictions, Patterns, and Policymaking: A Regional Study of Devolution." *Publius* 28(3): 143-160.

Frank, Robert H. (1988). *Passions without Reason: The Strategic Role of the Emotions*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Fukuyama, Francis (1995). *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. New York: The Free Press.

Fuller, J. Bryan, Ruby Morrison, Landon Jones, Donna Bridger, and Valerie Brown (1999). "The Effects of Psychological Empowerment on Transformational Leadership and Job Satisfaction." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 139(3): 389-391.

Gabris, Gerald T., and Douglas M. Ihrke (2001). "Does Performance Appraisal Contribute to Heightened Levels of Employee Burnout? The Results of One Study." *Public Personnel Management* 30(2): 157-172.

Gal-Or, Ester, and Raphael Amit (1998). "Does Empowerment Lead to Higher Quality and Profitability?" *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 36: 411-431.

Gamble, John E., Marjorie L. Icenogle, Norman B. Bryan, and Daniel A. Rickert (2000). "The Effects of Open Access on Member Satisfaction and Intentions to Remain in an HMO." *Health Care Management Review* 25(4): 34-47.

Garson, G. David (2001a). "Factor Analysis." Statnotes.
www2.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/factor.htm

Garson, G. David (2001b). "Measures of Association." Statnotes.
www2.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/association.htm

Garson, G. David (2001c). "Scales and Standard Measures." Statnotes.
www2.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/standard.htm

Garson, G. David (2001d). "Structural Equation Modeling." Statnotes.
www2.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/structure.htm

Gayner, Jeffrey B. (1995). "The Contract with America: Implementing New Ideas in the United States." Heritage Lecture No. 549. Washington, DC: The Heritage Foundation. (www.heritage.org/library/categories/theory/lec549.html).

George, Darren, and Paul Mallery (2001). *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference 10.0 Update*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Giesecke, Susan Sciamé (1995). *Defining Empowerment in the Context of American Organizations*. Dissertation (Ph.D.). Indiana University.

Gilliatt, Stephen, John Fenwick, and Daniel Alford (2000). "Public Services and the Consumer: Empowerment or Control?" *Social Policy and Administration* 34(3): 333-349.

Glenn, Tom (1992). "Getting People to Do What They Want to Do." *Public Manager* 21(3): 14-16.

Glew, David J., Anne M. O'Leary-Kelly, Ricky W. Griffin, and David D. Van Fleet (1995). "Participation in Organizations: A Preview of the Issues and Proposed Framework for Future Analysis." *Journal of Management* 21(3): 395-421.

Godard, John (2001). "High Performance *and* the Transformation of Work? The Implications of Alternative Work Practices for the Experience and Outcomes of Work." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 54(4): 776-805.

Golembiewski, Robert T., and Mark McConkie (1975). "The Centrality of Interpersonal Trust in Group Processes," In Cary L. Cooper, ed., *Theories of Group Processes*. London: John Wiley & Sons, 131-185.

Gomez, Carolina, and Benson Rosen (2001). "The Leader-Member Exchange as a Link Between Managerial Trust and Employee Empowerment." *Group and Organization Management* 26(1): 53-69.

Gore, Al (1993). *Creating a Government That Works Better and Costs Less: The Report of the National Performance Review*. New York: Plume.

Granovetter, Mark (1992). "Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness." In Mary Zey, ed. *Decision Making: Alternatives to Rational Choice Models*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 304-333.

Grayson, Mary (1993). "CEOs in the 1990s." *Hospitals* 67(2): 32-35.

Gregory, Robert J. (2000). *Psychological Testing: History, Principles, and Applications*. 3rd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Gross, E. (1997). "Is There Life After Welfare?" *Affilia – Journal of Women and Social Work* 12(2): 133-135.

Guion, Robert M. (1980). "On Trinitarian Doctrines of Validity." *Professional Psychology* 11(3): 385-398.

Gulanti, Ranjay (1995). "Does Familiarity Breed Trust? The Implications of Repeated Ties for Contractual Choice in Alliances." *Academy of Management Journal* 38(1): 85-112.

Gulick, Luther (1965). "The Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the American Society for Public Administration." *Public Administration Review* 15(1): 1-4.

Gulick, Luther (1965). "Management is a Science." *Academy of Management Journal* 8(1): 7-13.

Guterman, Neil B., and David Bargal (1996). "Social Workers' Perceptions of Their Power and Service Outcomes." *Administration in Social Work* 20(3): 1-20.

H.H. the Dalai Lama and Howard C. Cutler (1998). *The Art of Happiness: A Handbook for Living*. New York: Riverhead Books.

Hackman, J. Richard, and Greg R. Oldman (1975). "Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 60(2): 159-170.

Hackman, J. Richard, and Greg R. Oldham (1976). "Motivation Through the Design of Work: Test of a Theory." *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 16: 250-279.

Hales, Colin (2000). "Management and Empowerment Programmes." *Work, Employment and Society* 14(3): 501-519.

Hardy, Cynthia, and Sharon Leiba-O'Sullivan (1998). "The Power Behind Empowerment: Implications for Research and Practice." *Human Relations* 51(4): 451-483.

Hargrave, G. E. (1985). "Using the MMPI and CPI to Screen Law Enforcement Applicants: A Study of Reliability and Validity of Clinicians' Decisions." *Journal of Police Science and Administration* 13: 221-224.

Harrison, Roger (1987). "Harnessing Personal Energy: How Companies Can Inspire Employees." *Organizational Dynamics* 16(2): 5-20.

Hartline, Michael D., and O.C. Ferrell (1996). "The Management of Customer-Contact Service Employees: An Empirical Investigation." *Journal of Marketing* 60(4): 52-70.

Hartline, Michael D., James G. Maxham III, and Daryl O. McKee (2000). "Corridors of Influence in the Dissemination of Customer-Oriented Strategy to Customer Contact Service Employees." *Journal of Marketing* 64(2): 35-50.

Haworth, Chera L., and Paul E. Levy (2001). "The Importance of Instrumentality Beliefs in the Prediction of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 59(1): 64-75.

Hays, Steven W. (1999). "Changing Patterns in Human Resources Practice: The Emerging Model?" Paper presented at the Southeastern Conference on Public Administration Annual Meeting, October 8.

Hiatt, Deirdre, and George E. Hargrave (1988). "MMPI Profiles of Problem Peace Officers." *Journal of Personality Assessment* 52(4): 722-731.

Hidiroglou, Michael A., J. Douglas Drew, and Gerald B. Gray (1993). "A Framework for Measuring and Reducing Nonresponse in Surveys." *Survey Methodology* 19(1): 81-94.

House, Robert J. (1977). "A 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership." In James G. Hunt and Lars L. Larson, eds., *Leadership: The Cutting Edge*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press: 189-207.

Houseman, Alan W. (1998). "Devolution: The Legal Services Response." Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy.
(www.clasp.org/pubs/legalservices/MIEJAN_DR.htm)

Houston, David J. (2000). "Public-Service Motivation: A Multivariate Test." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10(4): 713-727.

Hutcheson, Graeme, and Nick Sofroniou (1999). *The Multivariate Social Scientist: Introductory Statistics Using Generalized Linear Models*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Jabri, Muayyad (1997). "Pairing Myth with Type of Change: Implications for Change Communication." *Journal of Organizational Change* 10(1): 21-29.

Jayaram, Jayanth, Cornelia Droge, and Shawnee K. Vickery (1999). "The Impact of Human Resource Management Practices on Manufacturing Performance." *Journal of Operations Management* 18(1): 1-20.

Jones, R., and N. Pitt (1989). "Health Surveys in the Workplace: Comparison of Postal, Email, and World Wide Web Methods." *Occupational Medicine-Oxford* 49(8): 556-558.

Johnson, Gerianne M. (1995). "Vision, Educational Level, and Empowering Work Relationships." *Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness* 89(2): 112-119.

Johnson-George, Cynthia, and Walter C. Swap (1982). "Measurement of Specific Interpersonal Trust: Construction and Validation of a Scale to Assess Trust in a Specific Other." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 43(6): 1306-1317.

Joseph, I. Nelson, C. Rajendran, T. J. Kamalanabhan, and R. N. Anantharaman (1999). "Organizational Factors and Total Quality Management – An Empirical Study." *International Journal of Production Research* 37(6): 1337-1352.

Kahnweiler, William M., and Margaret A. Thompson (2000). "Levels of Desired, Actual, and Perceived Control of Employee Involvement in Decision Making: An Empirical Investigation." *Journal of Business and Psychology* 14(3): 407-427.

Kaminski, Michelle, Jeffrey S. Kaufman, Robin Graubarth, and Thomas G. Robins (2000). "How Do People Become Empowered? A Case Study of Union Activists." *Human Relations* 53(10): 1357-1383.

Kanungo, Rabindra N. (1992). "Alienation and Empowerment: Some Ethical Imperatives in Business." *Journal of Business Ethics* 11(5-6): 413-422.

Kanungo, Rabindra N. (1998). "Leadership in Organizations: Looking Ahead to the 21st Century." *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne* 39(1-2): 71-82.

Kaplan, Ira T., and Howard H. Greenbaum (1989). "Measuring Work Group Effectiveness: A Comparison of Three Instruments." *Management Communication Quarterly* 2(3): 424-448.

Kasey, Robert Eugene (1997). "Human Resource Management and the African American Worker: Research in Support of Proactive Affirmative Action Initiatives." *Journal of Black Studies* 27(6): 751-767.

Kaye, Barbara K., and Thomas J. Johnson (1999). "Research Methodology: Taming the Cyber Frontier: Techniques for Improving Online Surveys." *Social Science Computer Review* 17(3): 323-337.

Keller, Tiffany, and Fred Dansereau (1995). "Leadership and Empowerment: A Social Exchange Perspective." *Human Relations* 48(2): 127-146.

Kelly, Scott W. (1993). "Discretion and the Service Employee." *Journal of Retailing* 69(1): 104-126.

Kenny, David A. (2001). "Measuring Model Fit." www.adv-energy.com/~dakenny/fit.htm

Kets de Vries, Manfred F. R. (1989). "Leaders Who Self-Destruct." *The Causes and Cures.* *Organizational Dynamics* 17(4): 4-17.

Kickul, Jill (2001). "When Organizations Break Their Promises: Employee Reactions to Unfair Processes and Treatment." *Journal of Business Ethics* 29(4): 289-307.

Kim, W. Chan, and Renee A. Mauborgne (1991). "Implementing Global Strategies: The Role of Procedural Justice." *Strategic Management Journal* 12(Summer): 125-143.

Kincaid, John (1998). "The Devolution Tortoise and the Centralization Hare." *New England Economic Review* (May/June): 13-40.

Kirkman, Bradley L., and Debra L. Shapiro (2001). "The Impact of Cultural Values on Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Self-Managing Work Teams: The Mediating Role of Employee Resistance." *Academy of Management Journal* 44(3): 557-569.

Kirkman, Bradley L., Paul E. Tesluk, and Benson Rosen (2001). "Assessing the Incremental Validity of Team Consensus Ratings Over Aggregation of Individual-Level Data in Predicting Team Effectiveness." *Personnel Psychology* 54(3): 645-667.

Kirkpatrick, Shelley A., and Edwin A. Locke (1991). "Leadership: Do Traits Matter?" *Academy of Management Executive* 5(2): 48-60.

Klein, Andrew S., Ralph J. Masi, and C. Ken Weidner II (1995). "Organization Culture, Distribution and Amount of Control, and Perceptions of Quality: An Empirical Study of Linkages." *Group and Organization Management* 20(2): 122-148.

Kline, Paul (1986). *A Handbook of Test Construction*. New York: Metheun.

Koberg, Christine S., R. Wayne Boss, Jason C. Senjem, and Eric A. Goodman (1999). "Antecedents and Outcomes of Empowerment: Empirical Evidence from the Health Care Industry." *Group and Organization Management* 24(1): 71-91.

Konczak, Lee J., Damian J. Stelly, and Michael L. Trusty (2000). "Defining and Measuring Empowering Leader Behaviors: Development of an Upward Feedback Instrument." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 60(2): 301-313.

Konovsky, Mary A. (2000). "Understanding Procedural Justice and Its Impact on Business Organizations." *Journal of Management* 26(3): 489-511.

Korsgaard, M. Audrey, David M. Schweiger, and Harry J. Sapienza (1995). "Building Commitment, Attachment and Trust in Strategic Decision-Making Teams: The Role of Procedural Justice." *Academy of Management Journal* 38(1): 60-84.

Krackhardt, David (1990). "Assessing the Political Landscape: Structure, Cognition, and Power in Organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 35(2): 342-369.

Krackhardt, David, and Jeffrey R. Hanson (1993). "Informal Networks: The Company Behind the Chart." *Harvard Business Review* 71(4): 104-111.

Kraimer, Maria L., Scott E. Seibert, and Robert C. Liden (1999). "Psychological Empowerment as a Multidimensional Construct: A Test of Construct Validity." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 59(1): 127-142.

Kramer, Roderick M., and Tom R. Tyler, eds. *Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Kruzich, Jean M. (1995). "Empowering Organizational Contexts: Patterns and Predictors of Perceived Decision-Making Influence Among Staff in Nursing Homes." *The Gerontologist* 35(2): 207-216.

Kurland, Nancy B., and Terri D. Egan (1999). "Telecommuting: Justice and Control in the Virtual Organization." *Organization Science* 10(4): 500-513.

Labianca, Giuseppe, Barbara Gray, and Daniel J. Brass (2000). "A Grounded Model of Organizational Schema Change During Empowerment 11(2): 235-257.

Labovitz, Sanford (1970). "The Assignment of Numbers to Rank Order Categories." *American Sociological Review* 35(3): 515-524.

Langbein, Laura I. (2000). "Ownership, Empowerment, and Productivity: Some Empirical Evidence on the Causes and Consequences of Employee Discretion." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 19(3): 427-449.

Lansdell, Herbert, and Edward F. Donnelly (1977). "Factor Analysis of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale Subtests and the Halstead-Reitan Category and Tapping Tests." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 45(3): 412-416.

Larzelere, Robert E., and Ted L. Huston (1980). "The Dyadic Trust Scale: Toward Understanding Interpersonal Trust in Close Relationships." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 42(3): 595-604.

Laschinger, Heather K. Spence, Joan Finegan, Judith Shamian, and Piotr Wilk (2001). "Impact of Structural and Psychological Empowerment on Job Strain in Nursing Work Settings: Expanding Kanter's Model." *The Journal of Nursing Administration* 31(5): 260-272.

Lashley, Conrad (1999a). "Employee Empowerment in Services: A Framework for Analysis." *Personnel Review* 28(1): 169-191.

Lashley, Conrad (1999b). "Empowerment – Introduction." *Personnel Review* 28(3): 166-168.

Leach, Desmond J., Paul R. Jackson, and Toby D. Wall (2001). "Realizing the Potential of Empowerment: The Impact of a Feedback Intervention on the Performance of Complex Technology." *Ergonomics* 44(9): 870-886.

Lee, Cynthia, Madan Pillutla, and Kenneth S. Law (2000). "Power-Distance, Gender and Organizational Justice." *Journal of Management* 26(4): 685-704.

Lee, Hyun-Jung (2001). "Willingness and Capacity: The Determinants of Prosocial Organizational Behaviour Among Nurses in the UK." *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 12(6): 1029-1048.

Lee, Mushin, and Joon Koh (2001). "Is Empowerment Really a New Concept?" *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 12(4): 684-695.

Leslie, Donald R., Carol M. Holzhalb, and Thomas P. Holland (1998). "Measuring Staff Empowerment: Development of a Worker Empowerment Scale." *Research on Social Work Practice* 8(2): 212-222.

Leventhal, Gerold S. (1980). "What Should Be Done with Equity Theory? New Approaches to the Study of Fairness in Social Relationships." In Kenneth J. Gergen, Martin S. Greenberg, and Richard H. Willis, eds., *Social Exchange: Advances in Theory and Research*. New York: Plenum, 27-55 .

Leventhal, Gerold S., Jurgis Kuruza, Jr., and William Rick Fry (1980). "Beyond Fairness: A Theory of Allocation Preferences." In Gerold Mikula, ed., *Justice and Social Interaction: Experimental and Theoretical Contributions from Psychological Research*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 167-218.

Lewis, J. David, and Andrew J. Weigert (1985). "Social Atomism, Holism, and Trust." *Sociological Quarterly* 26(4): 455-471.

Liden, Robert C., and Sharon Arad (1996). "A Power Perspective of Empowerment and Work Groups: Implications for Human Resources Management Research." *Research in Personnel and Human resources Management* 14: 205-251.

Liden, Robert C., Sandy J. Wayne, and Dean Stilwell (1993). "A Longitudinal Study on the Early Development of Leader-Member Exchanges." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 78(4): 662-674.

Liden, Robert C., Sandy J. Wayne, and Raymond T. Sparrowe (2000). "An Examination of the Mediating Role of Psychological Empowerment on the Relations Between the Job, Interpersonal Relationships, and Work Outcomes." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 85(3): 407-416.

Lindblom, Charles E. (1979). "Still Muddling, Not Yet Through." *Public Administration Review* 39(4): 517-526.

Lipsky, Michael (1980). *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.

Long, Dennis D. (2000). "Welfare Reform: A Social Work Perspective for Assessing Success." *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* 27(4): 61-78.

Luhmann, Niklas (1979). *Trust and Power*. New York. John Wiley and Sons.

Lurie, Irene (1997). "Temporary Assistance for Needy Families: A Green light for the States." *Publius* 27(Spring): 73-87.

Lynn, N., and Aaron Wildavsky, eds. (1990). *Public Administration: The State of the Discipline*. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.

Mackey, Scott (1998). "Devolution: Part II? With States Stronger than They've Been in Years, Maybe It's Time to Turn Some Programs to Local Governments." *State Legislatures* (April): 20-22.

Mainemelis, Charalampos (2001). "When the Muse Takes It All: A Model for the Experience of Timelessness in Organizations." *Academy of Management Review* 26(4): 548-565.

Makkai, Toni, and John Braithwaite (1996). "Procedural Justice and Regulatory Compliance." *Law and Human Behavior* 20(1): 83-98.

Malhotra, Manoj K., Michelle L. Heine, and Varun Grover (2001). "An Evaluation of the Relationship Between Management Practices and Computer Aided Design Technology." *Journal of Operations Management* 19(3): 307-333.

March, James G., and Johan P. Olsen (1989). *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics*. New York: Free Press.

Marshall, Alicia A., and Cynthia Stohl (1993). "Participating as Participation: A Network Approach." *Communication Monographs* 60(2): 137-157.

Maslow, Abraham H. (1970). "The Superior Person." In Warren G. Bennis, ed., *American Bureaucracy*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine, 27-38.

Maslow, Abraham H. (1970). *Motivation and Personality*, 2nd ed. New York: Harper and Row.

Masterson, Suzanne S., Kyle Lewis, Barry M. Goldman, and M. Susan Taylor (2000). "Integrating Justice and Social Exchange: The Differing Effects of Fair Procedures and Treatment on Work Relationships." *Academy of Management Journal* 43(4): 738-748.

Mavis, Brian E., and Joseph J. Brocato (1998). "Postal Surveys Versus Electronic Mail Surveys – The Tortoise and the Hare Revisited." *Evaluation and the Health Professions* 21(3): 385-408.

Mayer, Roger C., James H. Davis, and F. David Schoorman (1995). "An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust." *Academy of Management Review* 20(3): 709-734.

Maynard-Moody, Steven, Michael Musheno, and Dennis Palumbo (1990). "Street-Wise Social Policy: Resolving the Dilemma of Street-Level Influence and Successful Implementation." *The Western Political Quarterly* 43(4): 833-848.

McAllister, Daniel J. (1995). "Affect- and Cognition-based Trust as Foundations for Interpersonal Cooperation in Organizations." *Academy of Management Journal* 38(1): 24-59.

McDonough III, Edward F. (2000). "Investigation of Factors Contributing to the Success of Cross-Functional Teams." *Journal of Product Innovation and Management* 17(3): 221-235.

McEwan, Anne Marie, and Peter Sackett (1998). "The Human Factor in CIM Systems: Worker Empowerment and Control Within a High-Volume Production Environment." *Computers in Industry* 36(1): 39-47.

McGregor, Douglas (1957). "The Human Side of Enterprise." *Management Review* 46(11): 22-28.

McGregor, Douglas (1960). *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

McCauley, Dan P., and Karl W. Kuhnert (1992). "A Theoretical Review and Empirical Investigation of Employee Trust in Management." *Public Administration Quarterly* 16(2): 265-284.

Mehta, Raj, and Eugene Sivadas (1995). "Comparing Response Rates and Response Content in Mail Versus Electronic Mail Surveys." *Journal of Market Research Society* 37(4): 429-439.

Menon, Sanjay T. (1999). "Psychological Empowerment: Definition, Measurement, and Validation." *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science* 31(3): 161-164.

Menon, Sanjay T. (2001). "Employee Empowerment: An Integrative Psychological Approach." *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 50(1): 153-180.

Messick, Samuel (1980). "Test Validity and the Ethics of Assessment." *American Psychologist* 35(11): 1012-1027.

Messick, Samuel (1995). "Validity of Psychological Assessment: Validation of Inferences from Persons' Responses and Performance as Scientific Inquiry into Score Meaning." *American Psychologist* 50(9): 741-749.

Miller, Dale T. (2001). "Disrespect and the Experience of Injustice." *Annual Review of Psychology* 52: 527-553.

Mills, Terry L., Craig A. Boylstein, and Sandra Lorean (2001). "'Doing' Organizational Culture in the Saturn Corporation." *Organization Studies* 22(1): 117-143.

Miranne, Kristine B., and Alma H. Young (1998). "Women 'Reading the World': Challenging Welfare Reform in Wisconsin." *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* 25(2): 155-176.

Mirvis, Philip H., and Donald L. Kanter (1991). "Beyond Demography: A Psychographic Profile of the Workforce." *Human Resource Management* 30(1): 45-68.

Mishra, Aneil K. (1996). "Organizational Responses to Crisis: The Centrality of Trust." In Robert M. Kramer and Tom R. Tyler, eds. *Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 261-287.

Mishra, Aneil K., and Gretchen M. Spreitzer (1998). "Explaining How Survivors Respond to Downsizing: The Roles of Trust, Empowerment, Justice, and Work Redesign." *Academy of Management Review* 23(3): 567-588.

Mishra, Karen E., Gretchen M. Spreitzer, and Aneil K. Mishra (1998). "Preserving Employee Morale during Downsizing: How to Avoid Destroying Employees' Trust and Empowerment during Layoffs." *Sloan Management Review* 39(2): 83-95.

Misztal, Barbara A. (1996). *Trust in Modern Societies: The Search for the Bases of Social Order*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Moorman, Christine, Robert Deshpande, and Gerald Zaltman (1993). "Factors Affecting Trust in Market Research Relationships." *Journal of Marketing* 57(1): 81-101.

Moorman, Robert H. (1991). "Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Do Fairness Perceptions Influence Employee Citizenship?" *Journal of Applied Psychology* 76(6): 845-855.

Morris, Edward C. (1994). "Handling Today's Budget Cuts Without Sacrificing Services." *Corrections Today* 56(4): 20-22.

Morrison, Elizabeth Wolfe (1996). "Organizational Citizenship Behavior as a Critical Link between HRM Practices and Service Quality." *Human Resource Management* 35(4): 493-512.

Morrison, Elizabeth Wolfe, and Frances J. Milliken (2000). "Organizational Silence: A Barrier to Change and Development in a Pluralistic World." *Academy of Management Review* 25(4): 706-725.

Morrison, Ruby S., LaDon Jones, and Bryan Fuller (1997). "The Relation Between Leadership Style and Empowerment on Job Satisfaction of Nurses." *The Journal of Nursing Administration* 27(5): 27-34.

Murnighan, J. Keith, ed. (1993). *Social Psychology in Organizations: Advances in Theory and Research*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Murnighan, J. Keith (1985). *A Primer on Organizational Behavior*, 3rd ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

- Murray, Michael A. (1975). "Comparing Public and Private Management: An Exploratory Essay." *Public Administration Review* 35(4): 364-371.
- Nacoste, Rupert W. (1987). "But Do They Care About Fairness? The Dynamics of Preferential Treatment and Minority Interest." *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 8(3): 177-191.
- Nathan, Barry R., Allan M. Mohrman, Jr., and Milliman (1991). "Interpersonal Relations as a Context for the Effects of Appraisal Interviews on Performance and Satisfaction: A Longitudinal Study." *Academy of Management Journal* 34(2): 352-369.
- Nathan, Richard P., and Thomas L. Gais (2000). "Implementing the Personal Responsibility Act of 1996: A First Look." SUNY: The Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government. www.rockinst.org/publications/federalism/first_look/
- Nauta, Aukje, and Karin Sanders (2000). "Interdepartmental Negotiation Behavior in Manufacturing Organizations." *The International Journal of Conflict Management* 11(2): 135-161.
- Newland, Chester A. (2000). "The *Public Administration Review* and Ongoing Struggles for Connectedness." *Public Administration Review* 60(1): 20-38.
- Newton, Rae R., and Kjell Erik Rudestam (1999). *Your Statistical Consultant: Answers to Your Data Analysis Questions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Niehoff, Brian P., and Robert H. Moorman (1993). "Justice as a Mediator of the Relationship Between Methods of Monitoring and Organizational Citizenship Behavior." *Academy of Management Journal* 36(3): 527-556.
- Niehoff, Brian P., Robert H. Moorman, Gerald Blakely, and Jack Fuller (2001). "The Influence of Empowerment and Job Enrichment on Employee Loyalty in a Downsizing Environment." *Group and Organization Management* 26(1): 93-113.
- Nissen, Sylke (1999). "Control and Marginalization: Federal and Local Welfare Politics in New York City." *Crime, Law and Social Change* 32(3): 235-256.
- Novelli, L., Bradley L. Kirkman, and Debra L. Shapiro (1995). "Effective Implementation of Organizational Change: An Organizational Justice Perspective." In Cary L. Cooper and Denise M. Rousseau, eds., *Trends in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 2. New York: John Wiley, 15-36.
- Nyhan, Ronald C. (1999). "Increasing Affective Organizational Commitment in Public Organizations: The Key Role of Interpersonal Trust." *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 16(3): 58-69.

Nyhan, Ronald C. (2000). "Changing the Paradigm: Trust and Its Role in Public Sector Organizations." *American Review of Public Administration* 30(1): 87-109.

Olshfski, Dorothy, and Robert Cunningham (1998). "The Empowerment Construct in Manager-Executive Relationships." *Administration and Society* 30(4): 357-373.

Opperman, Martin (1995). "E-mail Surveys – Potentials and Pitfalls." *Marketing Research* 7(3): 29-33.

O'Reilly III, Charles A., Richard C. Snyder, and Joan N. Boothe (1993). "Effects of Executive Team Demography on Organizational Change." In George P. Huber and William H. Glick, eds., *Organizational Change and Redesign*. New York: Oxford University Press, 147-175.

Organ, Dennis W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Osborne, Davis, and Ted Gaebler (1992). *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. New York: Plume.

Osborne, David, and Peter Plastrik (1997). *Banishing Bureaucracy: The Five Strategies for Reinventing Government*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

O'Sullivan, Elizabethann, and Gary R. Rassel (1995). *Research Methods for Public Administrators*, 2nd ed. White Plains, NY: Longman, Inc.

Packanowsky, Michael (1988). "Communication in the Empowering Organization." *Communication Yearbook* 11: 356-379.

Papa, Michael J., Mohammad A. Auwal, and Arvind Singhal (1997). "Organizing for Social Change Within Concertive Control Systems: Member Identification, Empowerment, and the Masking of Discipline." *Communication Monographs* 64(3): 219-249.

Parker, Louise E., and Richard H. Price (1994). "Empowered Managers and Empowered Workers: The Effects of Managerial Support and Managerial Perceived Control on Workers' Sense of Control over Decision Making." *Human Relations* 47(8): 911-928.

Parker, Sharon K. (1998). "Enhancing Role Breadth Self-Efficacy: The Roles of Job Enrichment and Other Organizational Interventions." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 83(6): 835-852.

Parker, Sharon K., Toby D. Wall, and John L. Cordery (2001). "Future Word Design Research and Practice: Towards an Elaborated Model of Word Design." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 74(4) 413-440.

Parnell, John A., and Edward D. Bell (1994). "The Propensity for Participative Decision Making Scale: A Measure of Managerial Propensity for Participative Decision Making." *Administration and Society* 25(4): 518-530.

Peccei, Riccardo, and Patrice Rosenthal (2001). "Delivering Customer-Oriented Behaviour Through Empowerment: An Empirical test of HRM Assumptions." *Journal of Management Studies* 38(6): 831-857.

Perrow, Charles (1986). *Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay*, 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Perry, James L. (1993). "Transforming Federal Civil Service." *Public Manager* 22(3): 14-16.

Perry, James L. (1996). "Measuring Public Service Motivation: An Assessment of Construct Reliability and Validity." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 6(1): 5-22.

Perry, James L. (2000). "Bringing Society In: Toward a Theory of Public-Service Motivation." *Journal of Public Administration and Theory* 10(2): 471-488.

Pond III, Samuel B., Rubert W. Nacoste, Monique F. Mohr, and Christopher M. Rodriguez (1997). "The Measurement of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Are We Assuming Too Much?" *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 27(17): 1527-1544.

Porter, Lyman W., Edward E. Lawler, and Richard Hackman (1975). *Behavior in Organizations*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Portny, Stanley E. (2002). "The Delegation Dilemma: When Do You Let GO? Learning How to Delegate Effectively May Mean the Difference Between Success and Failure for Managers in Today's Dynamic Business World." *Information Management Journal* 36(2): 60-65.

Proctor, Stephen, Graeme Currie, and Helen Orme (1999). "The Empowerment of Middle Managers in a Community Health Trust: Structure, responsibility and Culture." *Personnel Review* 28(3): 242-257.

Psoinos, Anna, Thomas Kern, and Steve Smithson (2000). "An Exploratory Study of Information Systems in Support of Employee Empowerment." *Journal of Information Technology* 15(3): 211-230.

Putnam, Robert D. (1993). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Quinn, Robert E., and Gretchen M. Spreitzer (1997). "The Road to Empowerment: Seven Questions Every Leader Should Consider." *Organizational Dynamics* 26(2): 37-49.

Quinn, Robert E., Gretchen M. Spreitzer, and Matthew V. Brown (2000). "Changing Others Through Changing Ourselves: The Transformation of Human Systems." *Journal of Management Inquiry* 9(2): 147-164.

Rainey, Hal G. (1996). "The American Bureaucracy: The Core of Modern Government (2nd ed.)/Bureaucratic Dynamics: The Role of Bureaucracy in a Democracy/How do Public Managers Manage? Bureaucratic Constraints, Organizational Culture, and the Potential for Reform (Book Review)." *American Review of Public Administration* 26(3): 387-390.

Rainey, Hal G. (2001). "Governance and Performance (Book Review)." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 46(4): 773-777.

Ramus, Catherine A. (2001). "Organizational Support for Employees: Encouraging Creative Ideas for Environmental Sustainability." *California Management Review* 43(3): 85-105.

Ramus, Catherine A., and Ulrich Steger (2000). "The Roles of Supervisory Support Behaviors and Environmental Policy in Employee 'Ecoinitiatives' at Leading-Edge European Companies." *Academy of Management* 43(4): 605-626.

Rao, T. Venkateswara, and E. Abraham (1990). "The HRD Climate Survey." In J. William Pfeiffer, ed., *The 1990 Annual: Developing Human Resources*. San Diego: University Associates, 143-151.

Rees, Chris (1999). "Teamworking and Service Quality: The Limits of Employee Involvement." *Personnel Review* 28(5/6): 455-473.

Reinke, Sandra J., and J. Norman Baldwin (2001). "Is Anybody Listening? Performance Evaluation Feedback in the US Air Force." *Journal of Political and Military Sociology* 29(1): 160-176.

Reitan, R. M., and D. Wolfson (1993). *The Halstead-Reitan Neuropsychological Test Battery: Theory and Clinical Interpretation*, 2nd ed. Tucson, AZ: Neuropsychology Press.

Reynolds, Jr., Harry W. (1993). "Public Administration and Public Policy: Old Perspectives, New Directions." *International Journal of Public Administration* 16(8): 1079-1103.

Richer, Sylvie F., and Robert J. Vallerand (1995). "Supervisors' Interactional Styles and Subordinates' Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 135(6): 707-722.

Roberts, Karlene H., and Charles A. O'Reilly III (1974). "Measuring Organizational Communication." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 59(3): 321-326.

Rohr, John A., and Rosemary O'Leary (1989). "Public Administration, Executive Power, and Constitutional Confusion: Response to John Rohr." *Public Administration Review* 49(2): 108-115.

Rohr, John A. (1992). "On Achieving Ethical Behavior in Government." *Public Manager* 21(1): 47-51.

Rohrer, Robert (1999). "Does the Buck Ever Really Stop?" *Supervision* 60(4): 11-13.

Rousseau, Debra M. (1996). "Book Review: Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research, Roderick M. Kramer and Tom R. Tyler, eds." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 43(1): 186-188.

Rousseau, Denise M., Sim B. Sitkin, Ronald S. Burt, and Colin Camerer (1998). "Not So Different After All: A Cross-Discipline View of Trust." *Academy of Management Review* 23(3): 393-404.

Ruscio, Kenneth P. (1996). "Trust, Democracy, and Public Management: A Theoretical Argument." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 6(3): 461-477.

Ryan, John J. (2001). Moral Reasoning as Determinant of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Study in the Public Accounting Profession." *Journal of Business Ethics* 33(3): 233-244.

Schaefer, David R., and Don A. Dillman (1998). "Development of a Standard E-Mail Methodology: Results of an Experiment." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 62(3): 378-397.

Schein, Edgar H. (1992). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*, 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Schillewaert, Niels, Fred Langerak, and Tim Duhamel (1998). "Non-probability Sampling for WWW Surveys: A Comparison of Methods." *Journal of the Market Research Society* 40(4): 307-322.

Schulz, Amy J., Barbara A. Israel, Marc A. Zimmerman, and Barry N. Checkoway (1995). "Empowerment as a Multi-level Construct: Perceived Control at the Individual, Organizational and Community Levels." *Health Education Research* 10(3): 309-327.

Scott, Patrick G. (1997). "Assessing Determinants of Bureaucratic Discretion: An Experiment in Street-Level Decision Making." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 7(1): 35-57.

Scott, Patrick G., and Sanjay K. Pandey (2000). "The Influence of Red Tape on Bureaucratic Behavior: An Experimental Simulation." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 19(4): 615-633.

Seers, Anson. (1989). "Team-Member Exchange Quality: A New Construct for Role-Making Research." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 43(1): 118-135.

Seibert, Scott E., Maria L. Kraimer, and Robert C. Liden (2001). "A Social Capital Theory of Career Success." *Academy of Management Journal* 44(2): 219-237.

Shafritz, Jay M., and J. Steven Ott (1996). *Classics of Organization Theory*, 4th ed. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Shaw, Robert Bruce (1997). *Trust in the Balance: Building Successful Organizations on Results, Integrity, and Concern*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sheehan, Kim (2001). "E-mail Survey Response Rates: A Review." *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 6(2): no page numbers.

Sheppard, Blair H., Roy J. Lewicki, and John W. Minton (1992). *Organizational Justice: The Search for Fairness in the Workplace*. New York: Lexington Books.

Shera, Wes, and Jaime Page (1995). "Creating More Effective Human Service Organizations Through Strategies of Empowerment." *Administration in Social Work* 19(4): 1-15.

Shields, Laurene E. (1995). "Women's Experiences of the Meaning of Empowerment." *Qualitative Health Research* 5(1): 15-35.

Siders, Mark A., Gerald George, and Ravi Dharwadkar (2001). "The Relationship of Internal and External Commitment Foci to Objective Job Performance Measures." *Academy of Management Journal* 44(3): 570-579.

Siegall, Marc, and Susan Gardner (2000). "Contextual Factors of Psychological Empowerment." *Personnel Review* 29(6): 703-722.

Simmons, Robert H. (1970). "Public Administration: The Enigma of Definition." *Social Science* 45(4): 202-207.

Sineta, Marsha (1988). "Building Trust into Corporate Relationships." *Organizational Dynamics* 16(3): 73-79.

Singh, Jagdip (2000). "Performance Productivity and Quality of Frontline Employees in Service Organizations." *Journal of Marketing* 64(2): 15-34.

Singleton, Jr., Royce, Bruce C. Straits, Margaret M. Straits, Ronald J. McAllister (1988). *Approaches to Social Research*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Simmons, Robert (1995). "Control in the Age of Empowerment." *Harvard Business Review* 73: 80-88.
- Sitkin, Sim B., and Nancy L. Roth (1993). "Explaining the Limited Effectiveness of Legalistic 'Remedies' for Trust/distrust." *Organizational Science* 4(3): 367-392.
- Skarlicki, Daniel P., and Robert Folger (1997). "Retaliation in the Workplace: The Roles of Distributive, Procedural, and Interactional Justice." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 82(3): 434-443.
- Sorensen, Elaine, and Ariel Halpern (1999). "Child Support Enforcement is Working Better Than We Think (A-31)." Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. (newfederalism.urban.org/html/anf_31/html)
- Sorenson, Elaine, and Chava Zibman (1999). "To What Extent Do Children Benefit from Child Support? (99-19)." Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. (newfederalism.urban.org/html/discussion99-19.html).
- Spreitzer, Gretchen (1995a). "Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace: Dimensions, Measurement, and Validation." *Academy of Management Journal* 38(5): 1442-1465.
- Spreitzer, Gretchen M. (1995b). "An Empirical Test of a Comprehensive Model of Intrapersonal Empowerment in the Workplace." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 23(5): 601-629.
- Spreitzer, Gretchen M. (1996). "Social Structural Characteristics of Psychological Empowerment." *Academy of Management Journal* 39(2): 483-504.
- Spreitzer, Gretchen M., Susan G. Cohen, and Gerald E. Ledford, Jr. (1999). "Developing Effective Self-Managing Work Teams in Service Organizations." *Group and Organization Management* 24(3): 340-366.
- Spreitzer, Gretchen M., Suzanne C. de Janasz, and Robert E. Quinn (1999). "Empowered to Lead: The Role of Psychological Empowerment in Leadership." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 20(4): 511-526.
- Spreitzer, Gretchen M., Mark A. Kizilos, and Stephen W. Nason (1997). "A Dimensional Analysis of the Relationship between Psychological Empowerment and Effectiveness, Satisfaction, and Strain." *Journal of Management* 23(5): 679-704.
- Spreitzer, Gretchen M., and Aneil K. Mishra (1999). "Giving Up Control Without Losing Control: Trust and its Substitutes' Effects on Managers' Involving Employees in Decision Making." *Group and Organization Management* 24(2): 155-187.

Spreitzer, Gretchen M, Robert E. Quinn, and Jerry Fletcher (1995). "Excavating the Paths of Meaning, Renewal, and Empowerment." *Journal of Management Inquiry* 4(1): 16-39.

Stapleton, Connie D. (1997). "Basic Concepts and Procedures of Confirmatory Factor Analysis." ericae.net/ft/tamu/Cfa.htm

Styhre, Alexander (2001). "Kaisen, Ethics, and Care of the Operations: Management after Empowerment." *Journal of Management Studies* 38(6): 795-810.

Swim, David H. (1997). "A Methodological Study to Create a Reliable and Valid Instrument to Measure Police Officer Trust in the Internal Affairs Process." Dissertation, School of Public Administration, University of Southern California, December.

Tannenwald, Robert (1998). "Come the Devolution, Will States Be Able to Respond?" *New England Economic Review* (May/June): 53-73.

Tata, Jasmine, and Lynn Bowes-Sperry (1996). "Emphasis on Distributive, Procedural, and Interactional Justice: Differential Perceptions of Men and Women." *Psychological Reports* 79: 1327-1330.

Tenbrunsel, Ann E., and David M. Messick (1999). "Sanctioning Systems, Decision Frames, and Cooperation." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 44(4): 684-707.

Tepper, Bennett J., Daniel Lockhart, and Jenny Hoobler (2001). "Justice, Citizenship, and Role Definition Effects." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86(4): 789-796.

Thibaut, John W., and Laurens Walker (1975). *Procedural Justice: A Psychological Analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Thomas, Craig W. (1998). "Maintaining and Restoring Public Trust in Government Agencies and Their Employees." *Administration & Society* 30(2): 166-193.

Thomas, Kenneth W. (1992). "Conflict and Negotiation Processes in Organizations." In Marvin D. Dunnette and Leaette M. Hough, eds., *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 2nd ed. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., 651-718.

Thomas, Kenneth W., and Betty A. Velthouse (1990). "Cognitive Elements of Empowerment: An 'Interpretative' Model of Intrinsic Task Motivation." *Academy of Management Review* 15(4): 666-681.

Thompson, Lyke (1999). "Let Them Eat Marblecake: The Preferences of Michigan Citizens for Devolution and Intergovernmental Service-Provision." *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 29(1): 139-153.

- Thorlakson, Alan J. H., and Robert P. Murray (1996). "An Empirical Study of Empowerment in the Workplace." *Group and Organization Management* 21(1): 67-83.
- Tjosvold, Dean, Chun Hui, and Kenneth S. Law (1998). "Empowerment in the Manager-Employee Relationship in Hong Kong: Interdependence and Controversy." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 138(5): 624-636.
- Tse, A., et.al. (1995). "Comparing Two Methods of Sending Out Questionnaires: E-mail Versus Mail." *Journal of the Market Research Society* 37(4): 441-446.
- Tubbesing, Carl (1998). "The Dual Personality of Federalism: States May Be the Best Laboratories of Democracy, but the Federal Government Thinks That It Knows Best. It Hardly Ever Does." *State Legislatures* (April): 14-19.
- Tyler, Tom R. (1986). "When Does Procedural Justice Matter in Organizational Settings?" In Roy J. Lewicki, Blair H. Sheppard, and Max H. Bazerman, eds., *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, Vol. 1. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, Inc., 7-23.
- Tyler, Tom R., and Peter Degoey (1996). "Trust in Organizational Authorities: The Influence of Motive Attributions on Willingness to Accept Decisions." In Robert M. Kramer and Tom R. Tyler, eds., *Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 331-356.
- Vardi, Yoav (2000). "Psychological Empowerment as a Criterion for Adjustment to a New Job." *Psychological Reports* 87(3): 93-113.
- Vigoda, Eran (2000). "Organizational Politics, Job Attitudes, and Work Outcomes: Exploration and Implications for the Public Sector." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 57(3): 326-347.
- Wadsworth, Lee Ann D. (1997). *Interpersonal Trust as Moderator of Subordinate Perceptions of Supervisory Transformational Leadership and Performance Variables*. Thesis (M.S.). North Carolina State University.
- Wadsworth, Lee Ann D. (2001). *The Relationship between Member Concerns about Organizational Change and Their Organizational Commitment: The Impact of Interpersonal Trust as Moderator*. Dissertation (Ph.D.). North Carolina State University.
- Watson, Keith, and Steven D. Gold (1997). "The Other Side of Devolution: Shifting Relationships Between State and Local Governments/" Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. (newfederalism.urban.org/html/other.htm).
- Wayne, Sandy J., and Gerald R. Ferris (1990). "Influence Tactics, Affect, and Exchange Quality in Supervisor-Subordinate Interactions: A Laboratory Experiment and Field Study." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 75(5): 487-499.

Wayne, Sandy J., and Shawn A. Green (1993). "The Effects of Leader-Member Exchange on Employee Citizenship and Impression Management Behavior." *Human Relations* 46(12): 1431-1440.

Webb, Eugene J. (1996). "Trust and Crisis." In Robert M. Kramer and Tom R. Tyler, eds., *Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 288-301.

Whitener, Ellen, Susan Brodt, M. Audrey Korsgaard, and John Werner (1998). "Managers as Initiators of Trust: An Exchange for Understanding Managerial Trustworthy Behavior." *Academy of Management Review* 23(3): 513-530.

Wilkinson, Adrian (1998). "Empowerment: Theory and Practice." *Personnel Review* 27(1): 40-56.

Williams, Daniel W. (2000). "Reinventing the Proverbs of Government." *Public Administration Review* 60(6): 522-533.

Williams, Michele (2001). "In Whom We Trust: Group Membership as an Affective Context for Trust Development." *Academy of Management Review* 26(3): 37-396.

Williams, Steve (1999). "The Effects of Distributive and Procedural Justice on Performance." *The Journal of Psychology* 133(2): 183-193.

Williamson, Oliver, E. (1985). *Economic Institutions of Capitalism: Firms, Markets, Rational Contracting*. New York: The Free Press.

Willis, Sherry, and K. Warner Schaie (1986). "Training the Elderly on the Ability Factors of Spatial Orientation and Inductive Reasoning." *Psychology and Aging* 1(3): 239-247.

Wise, Lois Recadcino (2000). "Public Service Motivation and Democracy." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, September 2.

Wiseman, Michael (1996). "Welfare Reform in the United States: A Background Paper." *Housing Policy Debate* 7(4): 595-648.

Wolk, James L., and Sandra Schmahl (1999). "Child Support Enforcement: The Ignored Component of Welfare Reform." *Families in Society* 80(5): 526-230.

Zey, Mary (1992). "Criticisms of Rational Choice Models." In Mary Zey, ed. *Decision Making: Alternatives to Rational Choice Models*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 9-31.

Zimmerman, Marc A., Barbara A. Israel, Amy Schulz, and Barry Checkoway (1992).
“Further Explorations in Empowerment Theory: An Empirical Analysis of Psychological
Empowerment.” *American Journal of Community Psychology* 20(6): 707-727.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

FEDERALISM AND THE PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND WORK RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1996

The 1994 Republican “Contract with America” campaign contributed to a dramatic change in the party alignment in both chambers of Congress. A core ideology within that campaign was the concept of “devolution” (or “New Federalism”) – a transformation of the responsibility for government away from the central government and toward (some would say “back to”) state and local governments. State governors wanted more flexibility in designing and operating their welfare programs. “[T]he Contract may come to symbolize the most profound change in the American political landscape in the last half century and, in many respects, determine the character of American government well into the 21st century” (Gayner, 1995). The Contract promised House of Representatives floor votes on a Family Reinforcement Act to address child support enforcement issues and a personal Responsibility Act to deal with welfare reforms (Contract with America, 1994). Out of a total of 302 roll call votes on issues related to the Contract with America, the conservatives prevailed on 299 of them (Gaynor, 1995).

As early as the New Deal it was perceived that government, especially the federal government, had a role to play in solving the problem of poverty. The policies which surrounded welfare and child support ran parallel with the discussions of federalism since the 1930s. The dual federalism of the nineteenth century with its distinct separation of responsibilities between the states and federal government yielded to the cooperative federalism beginning with the New Deal. The states still had considerable responsibility

for the implementation of programs, but more and more of the guidelines and funding were provided by the federal government.

The cooperative federalism reached its zenith, perhaps, in the area of welfare with the Great Society of the 1960s. Welfare and child support received greater attention from the federal government because of a perception that the states and local governments were ill-equipped both financially and intellectually to deal with the massive problems of poverty.

Almost immediately, with the election of Richard Nixon, a new federalism emerged. “Nixon ceded control of policy areas he perceived to be truly local in nature and provided federal funds to boost local capacity” (Cashin, 1999: 570). The election of Ronald Reagan in 1980 began another stage in the devolutionary process. This time, however, there was not only an interest in reducing the involvement of the federal government in social service programs but also in reducing the size of government at all levels. Although President Clinton in his rhetoric as a “new democrat” signaled some shifting of federal control of state and local programming, it was not until the Contract with America and the Republican victory in Congress in 1994 that devolution found what was perceived as a solid backing from Congress. “Where Reagan would have at least retained federal responsibility for Medicaid, House Republicans proposed to give states almost complete control over not just Medicaid, but also food stamps and virtually the entire phalanx of federal programs for the poor” (Cashin, 1999: 574).

Defining devolution is not easy because, like most politicized terms, it is loosely used, “often used interchangeably with ‘decentralization’” (Kincaid, 1998: 14). “There is bipartisan consensus that the federal government should delegate more power to the

states” (Sparer, 1999: 138), but “[t]he salience of devolution increased with the election of a Republican majority in both houses of the Congress in 1994” (Thompson, 1999: 139).

There were three predominant arguments supporting devolution. First, state and local governments are closer to the citizens, so that citizens can participate more in the policy-making process and influence the final decisions. Second, 50 states provide greater opportunity for experimentation – a federal predominance tends more to the “one size fits all” philosophy. “Devolution subscribes to Justice Brandeis’ premise that states are laboratories of democracy” (Tubbesing, 1998: 14). Third, states must be more efficient than the federal government can be both because of their proximity to the voting public and the competition among states. These decisions, as a result, are more consistent with the public’s interests. “The intent of devolution is to enhance the responsiveness and efficiency of the federal system, based on the theory that state and local governments can do a better job of providing services for citizens” (Watson and Gold, 1997; see also Mackey, 1998, and Kincaid, 1998). At least in theory, devolution allowed states to manage their programs for effectiveness and efficiency within the existing funding constraints (Cashin, 1999).

Kincaid (1998) did not believe that devolution can really exist in the American federal system. “The Congress possesses limited enumerated powers delegated to it by the sovereign peoples of the several states; all other powers are reserved to the states or to the people as stipulated by the Tenth Amendment. The U. S. Constitution, therefore, does not contemplate devolution of powers from the federal capital to the state capitals” (14). Instead, the current emphasis was really “delegation” – “one government authorizing

another government to carry out functions on its behalf” (15).

The Personal Responsibility Act of 1995, the Republican version of welfare reform was passed by both chambers of Congress on December 21, 1995 (Congressional Record, December 21, 1995: H15533), but was vetoed by President Bill Clinton on January 9, 1996 (Congressional Record, January 22, 1996: H342).

On June 27, 1996, the House Committee on the Budget reported to the House the Welfare and Medicaid Reform Act of 1996. It contained elements from the vetoed Personal Responsibility Act as well as another piece of legislation, the Child Support Responsibility Act. The proposed legislation moved quickly through both chambers of Congress, passing the House on July 18, 1996, by a 256-170 recorded vote; the Senate passed an amended version by a 74-24 recorded vote on July 23. Following conference committee action to reconcile differences, the Conference Report was submitted to both chambers, passing the House on July 31 by a 328-101 recorded vote and the Senate on August 1 by a 78-21 recorded vote as the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA). The Act was signed by President Clinton on August 22 as Public Law 104-193 (Congressional Record, August 22, 1996: H7105).

Appendix 2

QUANTITATIVE AND CASE STUDIES: EMPOWERMENT AS VARIABLE

Studies are listed in alphabetical order by year of publication.

The letter "S" indicates use of the Spreitzer (1995) empowerment scale either directly or as a foundation.

The letter "T" indicates trust as a variable.

The letter "P" indicates subjects in a public setting.

The letters "DV" indicate empowerment as the dependent variable.

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
Gomez and Rosen (2001) S T DV	manager-employee dyads in 13 manufacturing industries	128 dyads	different questionnaires to manager and employees to measure trust, empower- ment, and leader-member exchange	the quality of the leader-member exchange was related to employee empowerment ($p < .001$) and the employee's experience in the position was related to employee empowerment ($p < .05$); the relationship between managerial trust and employee empowerment was mediated by the quality of the leader-member exchange

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
Kirkman and Shapiro (2001)	employees in two US-based manufacturing companies with multi-national operations that had implemented self-managing work teams for at least one year	461	questionnaire to measure collectiveness, power distance, a “doing” orientation, determinism, resistance to teams, resistance to self-management, job satisfaction, organizational commitment	age was related to organization tenure ($p < .01$) and negatively related to number of team members, collectivism ($p < .01$), “doing” orientation and organizational commitment ($p < .05$); education was related to task interdependence ($p < .01$) and negatively related to power distance and determinism ($p < .01$) and resistance to self-management ($p < .05$); organization tenure was related to job satisfaction ($p < .01$) and power distance ($p < .05$); team tenure was related to “doing” orientation and organizational commitment ($p < .01$) and resistance to change ($p < .05$); team tenure was negatively related to task interdependence ($p < .01$); number of team members was related to collectivism, “doing” orientation, determinism, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment ($p < .01$) and power distance ($p < .05$); number of team members was negatively related to resistance to self-management

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				<p>($p < .05$); task interdependence was related to collectivism ($p < .01$) and job satisfaction ($p < .05$); collectivism was related to “doing” orientation, determinism, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment ($p < .01$) and negatively related to resistance to change and resistance to self-management ($p < .01$); power distance was related to “doing” orientation, determinism, resistance to teams, and organizational commitment ($p < .01$), resistance to self-management and job satisfaction ($p < .05$); “doing” orientation was related to determinism, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment ($p < .01$) and negatively related to resistance to self-management ($p < .01$); determinism was related to resistance to teams ($p < .01$), and resistance to self-management, job satisfaction and organizational commitment ($p < .05$); resistance to teams was related to resistance to self-management ($p < .01$) and</p>

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				negatively related to organizational commitment ($p < .01$) and job satisfaction ($p < .05$); resistance to self-management was negatively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment ($p < .01$); job satisfaction was related to organizational commitment ($p < .01$)
Kirkman et.al. (2001)	employees in organizations (textile, high technology, insurance) with teams	98 teams with 954 employees in 4 companies	questionnaire to measure team empowerment; interviews to measure consensus, team performance and organizational citizenship behaviors	aggregate empowerment was related to consensus empowerment, productivity, customer service, team organizational citizenship behaviors, and proactivity ($p < .01$); consensus empowerment was related to productivity, customer service, team organizational citizenship behavior, and proactivity ($p < .01$); productivity was related to customer service, team organizational citizenship behavior and proactivity ($p < .01$); customer service was related to team organizational citizenship behavior, and proactivity ($p < .01$); and team organizational

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				citizenship behavior was related to proactivity ($p < .01$)
Laschinger, et.al. (2001) <i>S</i> <i>DV</i>	nurses in urban tertiary care hospitals in Ontario (CAN)	404	questionnaire to measure structural empowerment (formal power, informal power, perceived access to work empowerment structures of opportunity information, support, and resources), psychological empowerment (meaning, competence, autonomy, impact) work satisfaction, and job strain	psychological empowerment had a direct positive effect on job satisfaction and a direct negative effect on job strain; structural empowerment had a direct positive effect on psychological empowerment
Leach, et.al. (2001)	paper-finishing dept. employees, photographic paper manufacturing co. (UK)	100	# of "call-outs" (# of times engineers called to rectify operator-correctable faults) and machine utilization (amount of time the machine in use as percentage of planned production time) over 66 weeks; questionnaire administered twice (before feedback intervention and four months afterwards); and interviews	intrinsic job motivation (NS) knowledge dissemination ($p < .01$) production responsibility ($p < .001$) intrinsic job satisfaction (NS) job-related strain (NS)

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
Niehoff et.al. (2001) <i>P</i>	employees of a federal government research facility that had downsized and implemented team empowerment and their supervisors	203; 172 matched employee-supervisor	questionnaire to measure job characteristics and empowerment, some administered in small groups or by mail	empowerment is related to loyal boosterism ($p < .01$), perceptions of skill variety, perceptions of task identity, perceptions of task significance, perceptions of autonomy, feedback from job ($p < .001$)
Peccei and Rosenthal (2001)	supervisors and general employees at Shopko stores	54; 663; 7 stores	questionnaire to measure customer-oriented behavior, empowerment (internalization of service excellence, job competence, job autonomy) and management behavior and HR practice variables	all three empowerment variables were related to customer-oriented behavior ($p < .001$); internalization of service excellence was related to customer contact, participation in service excellence training, supportive and customer oriented management, and supportive and customer oriented supervision ($p < .001$) and age ($p < .01$); job competence was related to customer contact and supportive and customer oriented supervision ($p < .001$) and participation in service excellence training ($p < .05$); job autonomy was related to age, work status, supportive and customer oriented supervision ($p < .001$), hierarchical level ($p < .01$), age, sex, and supportive

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				and customer-oriented management ($p < .05$) customer-oriented behavior was related to age, customer contact, supportive and customer-oriented supervision ($p < .001$), supportive and customer oriented management ($p < .01$), and participation in service excellence training ($p < .05$); customer oriented behavior was negatively related to organizational tenure ($p < .05$)
Ramus (2001)	middle and low-level employees in companies with sustainable environmental policies in twelve countries	353	questionnaire to measure supervisory support for eco-innovative employee initiatives	there was a difference between support behaviors in the general management versus the environmental management responses; the respondents believed that their managers were applying less supportive behaviors to environmental activities than other business activities; there is a tendency for managers in these environmentally proactive firms to not care about environmental management; managers who generally use rewards and recognition, manage goals and responsibilities, and encourage

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				employees to experiment with new ideas when managing the business are more likely to have direct reports who have tried eco-initiatives than managers who are not good at using supportive behaviors; having a democratic, participatory, and open style of communication was the single most important set of management behaviors; managers who encouraged employees to attend environmental training and education by freeing up the time and the resources necessary for these activities were more likely to have employees who had tried an eco-initiative
Seibert et.al. (2001)	business, MBA, and engineering school alumni of a private midwestern university	448	questionnaire to measure social capital, access to information and resources, career sponsorship, and career success, and control variables	contacts in other functions was related to contacts at higher levels access to information, proportions, weak ties, structural holes, network size, having an MBA, and general management ($p < .01$), years since graduation and number of employers ($p < .05$); contacts in other functions was negatively related to metropolitan

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				<p>sponsorship, salary, promotions, career satisfaction, and general management ($p < .01$); career sponsorship was related to salary, promotions, career satisfactions, and general management ($p < .01$), and negatively related to weak ties and number of employers ($p < .05$); salary was related to promotions, career satisfaction, years since graduation, married status, having an MBA, number of employees, metropolitan area, and general management ($p < .01$); salary was negatively related to gender and employment gap in weeks ($p < .01$) and network size ($p < .05$); promotions was related to career satisfaction, years since graduation, marriage status, having an MBA, number of employers, and general management ($p < .01$) and structural holes ($p < .05$); promotions was negatively related to gender ($p < .01$) and employment gap in weeks ($p < .05$); career satisfaction was related to gender, number of</p>

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				<p>employees, and general management ($p < .01$) and network size ($p < .05$); weak ties was related to structural holes and network size ($p < .01$); structural holes was related to network size ($p < .01$) and number of employers ($p < .05$); network size was negatively related to years since graduation ($p < .01$); years since graduation was related to marriage status, employment gap in weeks, number of employers, and general management ($p < .01$); years since graduation was negatively related to gender ($p < .01$); gender was related to spouse employment ($p < .01$) and employment gap in weeks ($p < .05$); gender was negatively related to marriage status and general management ($p < .01$) and having an MBA and number of employers ($p < .05$); marriage status is related to spouse employment ($p < .01$); having an MBA was related to number of employees ($p < .01$) and number of employers ($p < .05$);</p>

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				number of employees was related to metropolitan area ($p < .01$) and negatively related to number of employers ($p < .01$); metropolitan area was natively related to number of employers ($p < .05$)
Siders et.al. (2001)	sales executives in the orthopedic implant industry attending an annual meeting of the American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons and organization records	389	two stages: first stage was a questionnaire to measure commitment foci (commitment to organization, supervisor, and customer); second stage was review of organizational records to measure performance (sales volume, growth rate, new accounts, product breadth, and market share); control measures were tenure, gender, and race	tenure was related to growth rate, product breadth, and market share ($p < .001$); tenure was negatively related to new accounts ($p < .001$); gender was related to customer focus ($p < .01$); sales volume was related to organizational focus, supervisor focus ($p < .001$), and growth rate ($p < .05$); growth rate was related to supervisor focus ($p < .001$), new accounts ($p < .01$), and product breadth ($p < .05$); new products was related to market share and supervisor focus ($p < .001$); market share was related to customer focus ($p < .001$); supervisor focus was related to customer focus ($p < .01$)

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
Bradley and Sparks (2000)	study 1: students in an introductory psychology course	108	three scenarios with different types of service breakdowns to measure service provider empowerment (scenarios were videotaped using real actors), problem resolution, and customer satisfaction	full empowerment resulted in higher satisfaction ratings than did either limited empowerment or no empowerment ($p < .001$); full empowerment was related to feelings the procedures were fair ($p < .001$), the outcome was likely to be personalized ($p < .01$), the outcome was likely to be fair, and views were listened to by staff ($p < .05$)
	study 2: students in psychology and marketing classes	239	three scenarios with different service delivery breakdowns to measure service provider empowerment and communication (same process as study 1)	when accommodating communication style was used, full empowerment resulted in higher satisfaction ratings ($p < .001$); no empowerment and full empowerment resulted in greater satisfaction ratings than limited empowerment ($p < .01$); the service provider was perceived to be more concerned when fully empowered than when in the no-empowerment or limited-empowerment conditions ($p < .001$); when the under-accommodating style was used, no empowerment and full empowerment both resulted in

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				higher concerned ratings than did limited empowerment ($p < .01$); subjects gave higher concerned ratings for all three levels of empowerment if an accommodating rather than an unaccommodating style of communication was adopted ($p < .01$)
Carless et.al. (2000) <i>T</i>	branch managers and their subordinates and district managers of a retail bank (AUS)	695; 1,440; 66	questionnaire to evaluate a seven-item scale (the GTL – Global Transformational Leadership scale) against a Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) and a Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)	the seven items (communicates a clear and positive vision of the future, treats staff as individuals, gives encouragement and recognition to staff, fosters trust, involvement and co-operation among team members, encourages thinking about problems in new ways and questions assumptions, is clear about values and practices, instills pride and respect in others and is highly competent) is highly reliable; high correlations between the GTL and LPI (correlations between .76 and .86) and the GTL and MLQ (correlations between .83 and .88) provide evidence of convergent

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				validity; the GTL discriminates between highly motivated subordinates compared with less motivated subordinates, between high and poor performing managers, and between effective leaders compared with less effective leaders ($p < .001$)
Conger et.al. (2000) <i>T</i>	managers in a large company	252	questionnaire to measure charismatic leadership, reverence for the leader, trust in the leader, satisfaction with the leader, and follower focus variables (collective identity, perceived group performance, empowerment)	charisma is related to reverence, satisfaction, collective identity, group performance, and empowerment ($p < .001$); charisma is related to trust ($p < .01$); reverence is related to trust, satisfaction, collective identity, group performance, and empowerment ($p < .001$); trust is related to satisfaction ($p < .001$); trust is related to collective identity ($p < .01$); trust is related to group performance and empowerment ($p < .05$); three components have a direct relationship with charismatic leadership: leader reverence, follower collective identity, and follower perceptions of group task performance; trust and

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				satisfaction with the leader were mediated by reverence rather than being directly related to charismatic leadership; collective identity related to charismatic leadership largely through the subscales of vision and sensitivity to member needs; perceived group task performance is influenced by charismatic leadership through leader sensitivity to the environment and formulation of a strategic vision; feelings of empowerment are mediated through collective identity and perceived group performance
Drehmer et.al. (2000)	CEOs of manufacturing and service companies	326	questionnaire: employee participation	25 items used to define employee participation shared a common underlying scale; successful employee participation relates to creation of an environment and the use of techniques within that environment (confirmation of Thomas and Velthouse); the implementation and success of commonly used and well-researched employee participation

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				techniques are likely to involve far greater levels of complexity than one might assume from the prevailing sentiment in management literature
Eylon and Bamberger (2000)	business administration students (CAN)	135	3 (treatment: empowered, control, disempowered) X 2 (sex) between-subjects factorial design; in-basket “hands-on” exercise to measure empowerment, work performance, and job satisfaction	disempowerment/empowerment acts have the expected impact on empowerment cognitions, but there is no moderating effect of gender; job satisfaction for women revealed significant results ($p < .05$); disempowered and empowered groups differed significantly ($p < .05$)
Hartline et.al. (2000)	customer-contact employees and managers at three hotels	743; 236	questionnaire: for managers to measure customer-oriented strategy, organizational structure, use of empowerment, and emphasis on behavior criteria in employee evaluations; for employees to measure work group socialization, level of organizational commitment, and the extent they shared customer-oriented	the adoption of customer-oriented strategy does not have an effect on the use of empowerment; formalization of the structure has a negative effect on the use of empowerment; the adoption of a customer-oriented strategy and the use of empowerment are both associated with increases in behavior-based evaluation; the use of empowerment depends more on the alignment between customer-oriented strategy and

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
			values of organization	formalization than on the alignment between customer-oriented strategy and empowerment
Kahnweiler and Thompson (2000)	non-managers from cross-section of organizations	826; 55	questionnaire to measure levels of employees' desired, actual and perceived control over decision making	gender is not related to any of the five dimensions of decision making; age was found to have an effect on employees' desire for involvement in decision making processes (wants to be asked opinion/input about non-coworker issues and decisions ($p < .001$) and wants to be asked opinion/input about coworkers ($p < .05$); a higher level of education is an indicator or wanting and asking to be involved in decisions about job issues (how much the employee is asked for opinions/input regarding non-coworker issues and decisions ($p < .001$), wants to be asked opinion/input about non-coworker issues and decisions ($p < .001$), wants to be asked opinion/input about coworkers ($p < .001$), and employee perceived control ($p < .001$)

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
Kaminski et.al. (2000)	local union activists who are safety worker-trainers	14	case study; interviews; examines Kieffer (1994) four stages of empowerment	data lend tentative support to hypothesis that there is a positive relationship between stage of empowerment and success at initiating training programs
Labianca et.al. (2000)	employees of a university health center	112	case study; semi-structured interviews; organizational observation over 27-month change period, questionnaire to measure job attitudes	the proposed empowerment effort boosted morale, but it also introduced problems: employees who had never been consulted on anything were suspicious of management's current intentions to solicit their input, there was skepticism about the likelihood of real change, input was illusory – decisions were predecided and management was only engaging in a show; upon completion, the change process, employees rated their jobs as higher in autonomy and in input ($p < .05$) and supported by organizational policies ($p < .001$)
Liden et.al. (2000) S	employees and immediate supervisors of 60 intact work groups in a large service organization in three Midwest states	337	questionnaires for the employees; interviews for the supervisors to measure job characteristics, leader-member	job characteristics are related to LMX, TMX, meaning, impact, competence, self-determination, work satisfaction, and organizational commitment ($p < .05$); LMX

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
			exchange (LMX), team-member exchange (TMX), empowerment, work satisfaction, job performance, and organizational commitment	is related to impact and job performance ($p < .01$) and TMX, meaning, self-determination, work, satisfaction, and organizational commitment ($p < .05$); TMX is related to competence ($p < .01$) and meaning, impact, self-determination, work satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job performance ($p < .05$); meaning is related to impact, competence, self-determination, work satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job performance ($p < .05$); impact is related to competence, self-determination, work satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job performance ($p < .05$); competence is related to work satisfaction ($p < .01$) and self-determination, organizational commitment, and job performance ($p < .05$); self-determination is related to work satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job performance ($p < .05$); work satisfaction is related to organizational

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				commitment and job performance (p<.05)
McDonough (2000)	members of the Product Development and Management Association	776	questionnaire to measure the use of cross-functional teams	cross-functional team approach was not correlated with age or size; the use of cross-functional teams is scattered across widely differing organizations; the use of cross-functional teams is statistically associated with performance (p<.01); clear, unchanging goals, team leadership, and cooperation most frequently cited for cross-functional team success
Ramus and Steger (2000)	mid- and low-level managers in six companies headquartered in Europe with strong environmental commitment	353	questionnaire to examine the relationship between environmental policies and employee self-described environmental initiatives the relationship between supervisory behaviors and employee self-described environmental initiatives	environmental innovation is related to supervisor innovation, supervisor competence building, supervisor communication, supervisor information dissemination, supervisor rewards/recognition, and supervisor management of goals and responsibilities (p<.001); environmental competence building is related to supervisor innovation, supervisor competence building, supervisor communication, supervisor

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				<p>information dissemination, supervisor rewards/recognition, and supervisor management of and responsibilities ($p < .001$); environmental communication is related to supervisor innovation, supervisor competence building, supervisor communication, supervisor information dissemination, supervisor rewards/recognition, and supervisor management of goals and responsibilities ($p < .001$); environmental information dissemination is related to supervisor innovation, supervisor competence building, supervisor communication, supervisor information dissemination, supervisor rewards/recognition, and supervisor management of goals and responsibilities ($p < .001$); environmental rewards/recognition is related to supervisor innovation, supervisor competence building, supervisor communication, supervisor information dissemination, supervisor rewards/recognition,</p>

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				and supervisor management of goals and responsibilities ($p < .001$); environmental management of goals and responsibilities is related to supervisor innovation, supervisor competence building, supervisor communication, supervisor information dissemination, supervisor rewards/recognition, and supervisor management of goals and responsibilities ($p < .001$)
Siegall and Gardner (2000)	lower-level manufacturing employees (Midwestern US)	203	questionnaire to examine organizational factors that can affect employees' inner states (general relations with company teamwork, concern for performance) and pay system (hourly v. salaried	communication with supervisor related to meaning ($p < .01$), self-determination ($p < .01$), and impact ($p < .01$); general relations with company related to meaning ($p < .01$), self-determination ($p < .05$), and impact ($p < .01$); concern for performance related to concern for performance related to meaning ($p < .01$) and self-determination ($p < .05$); teamwork related to meaning ($p < .01$) and impact ($p < .01$); for hourly employees, meaning was associated with communication

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				<p>with supervisor, general relations with company, and teamwork ($p < .01$) and concern for performance ($p < .05$); for salaried employees, meaning is associated with general relations with company ($p < .01$); for hourly employees and salaried employees competency was not associated with any of the elements of psychological empowerment; for hourly employees, self-determination is associated with concern for performance ($p < .05$); for salaried employees, self-determination is associated with communication with supervisor, general relations with company, and team-work ($p < .01$); for hourly employees, impact is associated with communication with supervisor ($p < .05$), general relations with company and teamwork ($p < .01$); for salaried employees, impact is associated with communication with supervisor ($p < .01$)</p>

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
Vardi (2000) <i>S</i> <i>DV</i>	professionals from different organizations in Tel Aviv (ISRAEL)	120	questionnaire to measure psychological empowerment (meaning, competence, self-determination, impact) and personality traits (achievement, endurance, locus of control, self-esteem)	meaning was related to impact ($p < .001$), self-determination, competence ($p < .01$), achievement, and self-esteem ($p < .05$) and negatively related to locus of control ($p < .05$); competence was related to meaning and endurance ($p < .01$) and impact ($p < .05$) and negatively related to locus of control ($p < .05$); self-determination was related to impact ($p < .001$) and meaning ($p < .01$) and negatively related to locus of control ($p < .001$); impact was related to self-determination and meaning ($p < .001$), achievement ($p < .01$), and competence ($p < .05$) and negatively related to locus of control ($p < .001$)
Aquino, et.al. (1999) <i>S</i> <i>P</i>	employees of a public utility	197	questionnaire to measure negative affinity, hierarchical status, victimization (direct and indirect), self-determination (one of the four cognitions of empowerment)	self-determination was negatively related to direct victimization ($p < .001$) and indirect victimization ($p < .01$)
Aycan et.al. (1999) <i>P</i>	study 1: employees in public and private sector	647	questionnaire to measure sociocultural dimensions,	India scored higher than Canada in paternalism, power distance,

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
	organizations in India and employees in organizations also attending part-time MBA programs in Canada		work culture, human resource management practices, and demographic characteristics (rated by statement agreement)	uncertainty avoidance, and loyalty toward community in both studies; India scored higher in self-reliance in study 2; India scored higher in futuristic orientation and reactivity in both studies; India scored higher in internal locus of control in study 1 but lower in study 2; Canada scored higher in proactivity in study 2; India scored higher in obligation to others in study 1; India scored higher in participation orientation in study 1; Canada scored higher in autonomy, skill variety, and self-control; India scored higher in goal setting; Canada scored higher in experiencing lower performance-extrinsic reward contingency in study 2; India scored higher in laissez-faire management style in study 1; power distance was related negatively with internal locus of control in India ($p < .001$); loyalty toward community was related to obligation toward others in both countries ($p < .01$); paternalism
	study 2: employees attending MBA programs in Canadian and Indian universities	127	questionnaire to measure same variables (rated by belief that majority within culture would agree)	

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				was related to participation in both countries ($p < .001$); paternalism was related to goal setting in both countries ($p < .001$); paternalism was related to empowerment on both countries ($p < .001$); self-reliance was related to responsibility seeking ($p < .001$ in Canada, $p < .05$ in India)
Carson et.al. (1999)	members of the Medical Library Association	130	questionnaire to measure career commitment, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, career satisfaction, career withdrawal cognitions, empowerment, willingness to engage in service recovery, and social power (legitimate, reward, coercive, referent, expert)	reported levels of empowerment by group (in order) was dually committed, organizationists, careerists, and committed ($p < .01$)
Corsun and Enz (1999) <i>DV</i>	service employees in private clubs	292 in 21 clubs	questionnaire with items to measure empowerment (meaningfulness, personal influence, self-efficacy), peer-helping behavior, supportive organizational environment, customer supportiveness, employee-	meaningfulness is related to peer helping behaviors, supportive organizational environment, customer supportiveness, and employee customer value congruity ($p < .001$); personal influence is related to peer helping behaviors, supportive

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
			customer value congruity	organizational environment, supportiveness, and employee-customer value congruity ($p < .001$); self-efficacy is related to peer helping behaviors ($p < .001$), customer supportiveness and employee-customer value congruity ($p < .01$), and supportive organizational environment ($p < .05$)
Cunningham and Hyman (1999)	line and supervisory managers and employees in a distribution and delivery service	16 managers; 55 employees	case study; questionnaire	few elements of the employee-centered empowerment prescription were in evidence in this company that had introduced and implemented an extensive empowerment program for line managers; the empowerment process can be directly aligned to managerial pressures to operate low cost, directive systems of employee control; empowerment serves as a device to reinforce rather than reallocate managerial authority
D'Annunzio-Green and Macandrew (1999)	multi-level groups in hotel	four groups of six employees	case study	the successful application of empowerment is contingent on a mix of factors that vary from

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
		(no employee-supervisor in same group)		organization to organization: culture, management style, and internal/external environmental aspects (open communication, multi-skilling, customer care, skills training)
Eby et.al. (1999)	literature review	seven primary sources and author calculations	cross-study meta-analysis and structural equation modeling	intrinsic motivation acts to mediate the relationship of exogenous variables (skill variety, autonomy, feedback, supervisory satisfaction, pay satisfaction) and work attitudes (affective organizational commitment and general job satisfaction)
Eylon and Au (1999)	MBA students (CAN)	189	controlled experimental design: 3 (treatment: empowered, control, disempowered) X 2 (power distance: high, low) between-subjects factorial design; three-session management simulation	manipulation: only the treatment main effect was significant ($p < .01$) job satisfaction: only the treatment main effect was significant ($p < .01$); performance: treatment and power distance main effects were significant ($p < .01$)
Fuller et.al (1999) S	nurses at a regional medical facility in the southeastern US	230	questionnaire to measure transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and empowerment	the empowerment interaction term contributed to the explained variance in job satisfaction ($p < .05$) for idealized influence,

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				inspiration, and individualized consideration
Jayaram et.al. (1999)	CEOs (or their designee) of first tier suppliers to the “Big Three” auto makers in the US	50	questionnaire to measure cost reduction, quality improvement, flexibility and time reduction and 22 human resource management practices	cost performance was related to top level management commitment to cost reduction, formal employee training to support cost reduction and cross functional teams to support cost reduction ($p < .001$), communication of goals relative to cost reduction and cross functional teams to support flexibility ($p < .01$), and top level management commitment to flexibility, communication of goals relative to flexibility, and formal employee training to support flexibility ($p < .05$); quality performance was related to communication of goals relative to TQM ($p < .01$), top level management commitment to time-based competition, formal employee training to support TQM, cross functional teams to support TQM, and labor management relations ($p < .05$), and top level management commitment to TQM

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				<p>($p < .10$); flexibility performance was related to top level management commitment to flexibility, top level management commitment to time-based competition, communication of goals relative to flexibility, formal employee training to support flexibility ($p < .01$), communication of goals relative to time-based competition, formal employee training to support time-based competition, cross functional teams to support flexibility, time-based competition ($p < .05$), and open organizations ($p < .10$); flexibility performance was negatively related to communication of goals relative to TQM ($p < .05$) and communication of goals relative to cost reduction ($p < .10$); time-based performance was related to top level management commitment to time-based competition ($p < .001$), cross functional teams to support time-based competition, and employee autonomy ($p < .01$), communication of goals relative</p>

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				to flexibility, communication of goals relative to time-base competition, broad jobs, cross training, and open organizations ($p < .05$), formal employee training to support cost reduction and labor management relations ($p < .10$)
Joseph et.al. (1999)	managers in businesses (INDIA)	140	questionnaires to determine the underlying dimensions of Total Quality Management (TQM)	there are ten critical factors of TQM: organizational commitment, human resource management, supplier integration, quality policy, product design, role of quality department, quality management information system, technology utilization, operating procedures, training; Quality of Work Life (QWL) is the most influential factor on TQM
Koberg et.al. (1999) <i>S</i> <i>T</i> <i>DV</i>	professional employees in a large, private general hospital	612	questionnaire to measure empowerment, individual characteristics, group and organizational characteristics, and work outcomes; follow-up interviews with randomly selected partici-	empowerment was related to tenure with the organization, worth of group ($p < .001$), leader approachability, organizational rank ($p < .01$), and group effectiveness ($p < .05$); no significant effects for sex,

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
			pants	ethnicity, locus of control, mutual influence, and intragroup trust were found
Kraimer et.al. (1999) S	nursing staff at community hospital (about to implement job redesign program)	183 (1 st survey); 113 (2 nd survey)	questionnaire to measure empowerment, job characteristics (job meaningfulness, task feedback, job autonomy), organizational commitment, and career intentions	confirmatory factor analysis results supported the convergent and discriminant validity of scores on Spreitzer's multi- dimensional scale; job meaning- fulness was related to empower- ment meaning; job autonomy was related to empowerment self- determination; task feedback was related to empowerment impact and empowerment competence; empowerment meaning was related to career intentions; empowerment competence was negatively related to career intentions
Lashley (1999)	service business managers and "empowered" employees	3 companies	case study: semi- structured interviews	there are four distinct but over- lapping managerial intentions for empowerment (participation, involvement, commitment, delaying); there are five dimensions of empowerment (task, task allocation, power,

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				commitment, culture); each form of empowerment is likely to represent different sources of satisfaction to employees and represent different benefits to employers
Proctor et.al. (1999)	middle managers at a national health service trust (UK)	interview 1: 10; interview 2: 20)	case study: structured interviews	managers at a greater distance from the senior executive team were “shielded” from directive style; departments not participating in the empowerment initiative acted “in a way contrary to the idea of empowerment;” written management guides suggested “a degree of control ... inconsistent with attempts at empowerment;” middle managers were given little influence over strategic change; local managers “perceived threats rather than opportunities in seeking to carve out a roll for themselves”
Rees (1999)	employees at a bank and a hotel (UK)	2 companies	case study: task-based teams	although two-thirds of employees describes themselves as working in teams, most work is allocated to each individual within the team

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				by a supervisor and employees report a lack of real authority and autonomy in the team; teams are used to elicit employee ideas rather than being linked to the organization of production and work tasks; managers are seeking to control or limit employee empowerment; there remains a high degree of employee support for teamworking
Spreitzer, et.al. (1999) <i>S</i> <i>DV</i>	mid-level supervisors and their subordinates in a <i>Fortune</i> 500 organization	358	questionnaire to measure empowerment (meaning, competence, self-determination, impact), leadership (inspiration, innovation, upward influence, monitoring)	meaning was related to competence, self-determination, impact, innovation 1, upward influence 2, innovation 2, innovation 4, and upward influence 1 ($p < .01$), upward influence 3 ($p < .05$); competence was related to self-determination, impact, innovation 1, innovation 2, innovation 4, upward influence 2, upward influence 4 ($p < .001$), innovation 3, and upward influence 3 ($p < .01$); competence was negatively related to monitor 1 and monitor 4 ($p < .05$); self-determination was related to

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				<p>impact, innovation 2, innovation 4 ($p<.001$), innovation 1, innovation 3, inspiration 1 ($p<.01$), and upward influence 1, upward influence 2, upward influence 3, upward influence 4, and inspiration 6 ($p<.05$); self-determination was negatively monitor 3 ($p<.01$); impact was related to innovation 1, innovation 2, innovation 3, innovation 4, upward influence 3 ($p<.001$), upward influence 2 ($p<.01$), and upward influence 1, upward influence 4, and inspiration 6 ($p<.05$)</p>
Spreitzer and Mishra (1999) <i>T</i>	top managers in units of firms with ties to U.S. automobile industry	792; 92 units	questionnaire to measure alternative control mechanisms, managers' involvement of lower echelon employees, and performance outcomes	<p>managers' involvement of employees is related to manager trust in employee and performance information ($p<.001$), and incentives ($p<.05$); managerial involvement in lower echelon employees in decision making is related to organizational performance (productivity improvement ($p<.01$) and employee morale ($p<.01$))</p>

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
Campbell and Martinko (1998) <i>P</i> <i>DV</i>	employees in a southeastern state regulatory agency	155	questionnaire to measure empowerment and learned helplessness; semistructured interviews; and interviewer observations	empowered as opposed to learned helplessness employees expressed less tedium, more positive expectations, less depression ($p < .01$) and more persistence ($p < .05$); learned helplessness as opposed to empowered employees attributed negative events to global causes ($p < .05$) and uncontrollable causes ($p < .10$) and expect to have less control over future events ($p < .10$)
Gal-Or and Amit (1998)	NA	NA	principal-agent modeling framework: complete empowerment regime, monitored empowerment regime, forcing regime; three-state game	there are two disadvantages of a forcing (disempowerment) regime: disempowerment implies that the owner must expend resources on monitoring the manager's choice to guarantee that mandated investment levels are executed and the owner cannot adjust quality investment decisions in response to information about consumer's relative evaluation of different quality attributes since this information cannot be communicated effectively; monitored empowerment tends to reduce

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				agency costs to a greater extent than complete empowerment; the benefit of delegating decision powers to managers is directly related to the difficulty of communicating information that pertains to the decisions at hand; intensified empowerment is predicted when decisions must be based upon highly qualitative information; the extent of monitoring of an empowered manager is directly related to the variability in the environmental uncertainty that is communicable between the manager and owner and inversely related to the cost of monitoring
Olshfski and Cunningham (1998) <i>P</i>	active middle managers in a state government who attended summer executive development program	23	case study; interviews where managers told stories of a program, policy, or situation they found challenging	managers who interpreted their bosses' views as discouraging of empowerment told stories that did not contain references to personal initiative; managers who perceived their bosses as accepting or encouraging of doing what it takes to complete the job were generally active in

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				expanding their discretion and acting in an empowered manner; the key figure in middle-manager empowerment is the organization's executive; the scope of the problem addressed by an empowered middle manager is limited by the middle manager's position in the hierarchy; a middle manager can be effective without being empowered
Parker (1998)	study 1: employees in a glass manufacturing company	669	questionnaire to measure self-efficacy, self-esteem, proactive personality, extent of communication briefs, membership in improvement groups, opportunity for involvement within improvement groups, job enlargement, and job enrichment	self-efficacy was related with all the organizational variables (task control, decision-making influence job enlargement, membership of improvement groups ($p < .001$) and communication briefs ($p < .01$); self-efficacy was related to gender ($p < .001$), but not with age of tenure; self-efficacy was related to employment status ($p < .05$)
	study 2: employees in large vehicle manufacturing company (UK)	622 (time 1) 778 (time 2)	questionnaire administered twice (18 months apart) to measure same variables as study 1	self-efficacy was related to all the organizational variables (decision making influence, task control, job enlargement, membership of

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				improvement groups ($p < .001$); self-efficacy related to relevant training, communication quality, ($p < .001$) and communication briefs ($p < .05$); self-efficacy was related to age, tenure, and employment status ($p < .001$) in in time 1
Tjosvold et.al. (1998)	Chinese managers and employees in large companies and local organizations (Hong Kong)	not reported	interviews and questionnaire to measure cooperative goals, competitive goals, independent goals, constructive controversy, and four outcome variables (leadership approach, power, relationship, and productivity)	cooperative goals were related to constructive controversy ($p < .05$); constructive controversy was related to the four outcome measures ($p < .05$); cooperative goals are related to the four outcome goals ($p < .05$); constructive controversy was related to strengthening the relationship, enhancing productivity, power, and democratic leadership ($p < .05$)
Black and Gregersen (1997)	employees in employer involvement groups in a manufacturing company	370	questionnaire to measure decision-making process, degree of involvement, performance, and satisfaction	individuals had the highest involvement in generating alternative solutions and the lowest involvement in evaluating results; work satisfaction is related to evaluating results ($p < .001$), generating alternatives

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				and planning implementation ($p < .01$); performance is related to planning implementation ($p < .001$), generating alternatives ($p < .05$), and evaluating results ($p < .10$)
Burpitt and Bigoness (1997)	principals and project team members in architectural firms	20; 189; 20 firms	interviews with principals; questionnaires with team members to measure leader-empowering behavior and team innovation	team members' evaluations of their team leaders' empowering behavior was related to the principal's evaluations of the degree of innovation among the teams for market-oriented ($p < .05$) and problem oriented ($p < .05$); principal's evaluation of market-oriented innovation was related to the principal's evaluation of problem-oriented innovation ($p < .05$)
Foster-Fishman and Keys (1997)	employees of the SERVE (human service agency)	49	four local field sites selected using the "most similar/most different case study selection technique; interviews, observations, and archival data review	the public bureaucracy contained numerous cultural elements inconsistent with the creation of a more empowering work culture; the absence of the critical preconditions at the organizational system level not only caused most employees to feel disempowered as organizational citizens but also

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				led them to rebuff the system-wide, worker-empowerment initiatives; when the local site contained the preconditions for empowerment, then an empowering environment was available
Morrison, et.al. (1997) <i>S</i>	nursing staff at a regional medical center	275	questionnaire to measure transformational leadership, transactional leadership, empowerment, and job satisfaction	empowerment was related to transformational leadership and job satisfaction ($p < .05$)
Spreitzer et.al. (1997) <i>S</i> <i>DV</i>	study 1: mid-level employees from <i>Fortune 500</i> industrial organization	393	questionnaire, administered over a three-year period to managers who attended a one-week management development program	the meaning dimension of empowerment was related to work satisfaction ($p < .001$); the meaning dimension of empowerment was related to more job related strain ($p < .05$); the competence dimension was related to higher level of effectiveness on the job ($p < .001$); the competence dimension was related to lower levels of strain ($p < .001$); self-determination was found to be related to work satis-

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				faction ($p < .05$); the impact dimension was found to be related to effectiveness ($p < .01$); only age was related to any of the dimensions of empowerment (competence; $p < .01$)
	study 2: lower-level employees from insurance company	128	questionnaire, stratified random sample	the meaning dimension was the strongest predictor ($p < .001$); the competence dimension predicted work satisfaction ($p < .05$); the competence dimension was related to strain ($p < .05$); only gender was related to any of the dimensions of empowerment (impact; $p < .05$)
Guterman and Bargal (1996)	members of the Israeli Association of Social Workers	899	questionnaire to measure worker power, work mastery, job authority, and perceived service delivery variables (perceived service effectiveness, personal accomplishment, emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, intent to leave job)	gender was negatively related to depersonalization and intent to leave job ($p < .01$); age was related to worker power, job autonomy, perceived service effectiveness ($p < .001$), personal accomplishment, leave job ($p < .001$), personal ($p < .01$), and work mastery ($p < .05$); age was negatively related to depersonalization and intent to

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				<p>leave job $p < .001$); marital status was negatively related to work mastery and job autonomy ($p < .05$); worker power was related to work mastery, job autonomy, perceived service effectiveness, personal accomplishment ($p < .001$); worker power was negatively related to intent to leave ($p < .001$), depersonalization ($p < .01$), and emotional exhaustion ($p < .05$); work mastery was related to job autonomy, perceived service effectiveness, and personal accomplishment ($p < .001$); work mastery was negatively related to emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and intent to leave job; job autonomy was related to perceived service effectiveness, and personal accomplishment ($p < .001$); job autonomy was negatively related to emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and intent to leave job ($p < .001$); perceived service effectiveness was related to personal accomplishment</p>

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				($p < .001$) and was negatively related to depersonalization ($p < .001$); personal accomplishment was negatively related to emotional exhaustion and depersonalization ($p < .001$); emotional exhaustion was related to depersonalization and intent to leave job ($p < .001$); depersonalization was related to intent to leave job ($p < .01$)
Hartline and Ferrell (1996)	customer-contact employees and managers in hotel chains	743; 236; 3 hotel chains	questionnaire to measure management commitment to service quality, empowerment, behavior-based evaluation, role conflict and ambiguity, self-efficacy, job satisfaction, adaptability, and perceived service quality	empowerment increases employee self-efficacy ($p < .10$); empowerment increases role conflict ($p < .10$); empowerment has an indirect negative effect on employees' job satisfaction ($p < .001$) and adaptability ($p < .001$); empowerment has an indirect effect on role ambiguity ($p < .001$) (suggests that empowered employees are confident in their job skills but experience increased conflict and ambiguity in their attempt to balance role demands)
Spreitzer (1996)	middle managers in a <i>Fortune</i> 50 organization	393	questionnaire to measure empowerment (meaning,	meaning was related to socio-political support, access to

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
<i>DV</i>			competence, self-determination, impact), social structure (role ambiguity, span of control, unit size), sociopolitical support, access to information, access to resources, work climate; control variables were gender, age and education	information, competence, self-determination, and impact ($p < .01$) and socio-political support ($p < .05$); meaning was negatively related to role ambiguity ($p < .01$); competence was related to sociopolitical support, access to resources, access to information, meaning, competence, self-determination ($p < .01$) and span of control, work climate, age, and education ($p < .05$); competence was negatively related to role ambiguity ($p < .01$); self-determination was related to socio-political support, access to resources, access to information, meaning, competence, impact ($p < .01$); self-determination was negatively related to role ambiguity ($p < .01$); impact was related to sociopolitical support, meaning, competence, self-determination, gender ($p < .01$); impact was negatively related to role ambiguity ($p < .01$) and unit size ($p < .05$)
Thorlakson and	employees of a life	177	questionnaire, adminis-	there were no differences between

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
Murray (1996)	insurance company (CAN)		tered twice (1989-baseline, 1993-follow-up); quasi-experimental with control and experimental groups	the two groups at baseline or follow-up; there was no difference in perceptions of power, management/leadership, and motivation between the two groups at baseline or follow-up; on individual questions, control group members indicated that they had better communication ($p<.001$), experimental group members were more positive regarding work, money rewards, and empowering work culture ($p<.01$)
Johnson (1995) <i>T</i>	managers and employees (both sighted and unsighted) in a private, nonprofit manufacturing operation	2; 29 (5 sighted, 13 legally blind, 8 low vision, 5 totally blind)	questionnaires to measure visual status, education, assessments of trust, resource sharing, and empowerment	60% of the least trusting interactions were reported by workers with low vision; employees with low vision were recipients of the most trust-“not-at-all” interactions of any vision category ($p<.01$); totally blind employees received greater trust than those who were legally blind; the least educated employees reported the greatest proportion of trust-“not-at-all” interactions ($p<.01$); least educated workers reported the

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				<p>greatest proportion of low-trust relationships ($p<.01$); the higher the educational level, the higher the trust accorded to employees by their relational partners ($p<.05$); the most educated workers were trusted the most; the employees with lesser amounts of vision reported smaller proportions of empowering interactions ($p<.01$); the sighted workers reported the most empowering interactions, and the totally blind workers reported the fewest empowering interactions; the totally blind employees were the communication partners in the greatest proportion of empowering interactions and the lowest proportion of disempowering interactions ($p<.01$); respondents with college or graduate degrees reported that less than 6% of either their interactions or relationships were disempowering and that 65% of their interactions ($p<.01$) and about half of their relationships we</p>

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				re empowering ($p < .01$); the more educated employees were more likely to be seen as empowering relational partners ($p < .05$)
Keller and Dansereau (1995)	employees and superiors of a Midwestern computer company in dyads	92 dyads	questionnaire to measure support for self-worth, negotiating latitude, superior satisfaction with subordinate performance, perceived control, locus of control, and supervisory fairness	the exchange variables of support for self-worth, negotiating latitude and superior satisfaction with subordinate performance correlate with each other and create a nomological network ($p < .01$); perceived control, supervisory fairness, dyadic problems, and satisfaction with superior correlate with this network of variables ($p < .01$); subordinates who perceive their superiors as fair are more satisfied with their superiors, report fewer dyadic problems, and report that they perform in accordance with supervisory preferences ($p < .01$); the exchange variables of support for self-worth relates with superior satisfaction with subordinate performance, fewer dyadic problems, and performance appraisal ($p < .01$); superior satisfaction with subordinate perform-

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				ance relates to fewer dyadic problems and performance appraisal ($p < .01$); fewer dyadic problems relates to performance appraisal ($p < .05$)
Klein et.al. (1995)	members of service-oriented organization subunits	823 in 159 subunits	two questionnaires and interviews with participant supervisors	there is a relationship between hierarchical control distribution and passive/defensive employee behavior ($p < .001$); there is a relationship between flat control distribution and constructive employee behavior ($p < .001$); there is a relationship between between total control in an organization and constructive employee behavior ($p < .001$); there is a negative relationship between perceiver quality of services and hierarchical control ($p < .05$); there is a relationship between total control in an organization and perceived quality of services ($p < .001$); there is a relationship between quality of services and constructive employee behavior ($p < .001$); there is a relationship between perceived quality of services and

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				aggressive/defensive employee behavior ($p < .05$); there is a relationship between supervisor's perceptions of employee performance and constructive employee behavior ($p < .05$); there is a negative relationship between supervisor's perceptions of employee performance and passive/defensive employee behavior ($p < .05$)
Kruzich (1995)	directors of nursing, social services and activity therapy; head nurses; nursing assistants in nursing homes	51 (with responses from all five positions in the nursing home	cluster sampling approach; questionnaire to measure staff members' self-perceived influence in resident care decisions	type of ownership was related to self-perceived resident care decision-making by the director of nursing ($p < .01$) and negatively related to self-perceived resident care decision-making by the charge nurse ($p < .05$) and negative related to self-perceived personnel decisions by the activity director ($p < .001$), director of social services and aggregate staff ($p < .01$); unionized employees was related to self-perceived personnel decision-making by the aggregate staff ($p < .05$); the number of facilities owned by the parent

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				<p>corporation was related to resident care decision-making by the aggregate staff ($p<.05$) and to personnel decision-making by the director of activities ($p<.01$); number of licensed beds was related to perceived personnel decisions by the aggregate staff ($p<.001$), director of activities and director of social services ($p<.01$); rotation of licensed nurses was related to self-perceived resident care decisions by the director of nursing ($p<.001$); rotation of nursing assistants was negatively related to self-perceived personnel decisions by the aggregate staff ($p<.01$) and director of social services ($p<.05$); administrator autonomy from the governing board was related to self-perceived resident case decisions by the aggregate staff ($p<.001$) and director of activities ($p<.01$), and to self-perceived personnel decisions by the director of social services ($p<.05$); nurse assistant involvement in shift report was negatively related to self-</p>

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				perceived resident care decision-making by the aggregate staff ($p < .001$) and the director of activities and to self-perceived personnel decisions by the aggregate staff ($p < .01$); frequency of unit staff was related to self-perceived personnel decision-making by the director of activities ($p < .001$) and the aggregate staff ($p < .01$)
Richer and Vallerand (1995)	study 1: French-speaking graduate students (CAN)	125	questionnaire with three scenarios; 2 (sex of participant) X 2 (task: boring v. interesting) X 3 (style: autonomy supportive, non-punitive controlling, punitive controlling) factorial design	supervisory style appears to have influenced the subordinates' feelings of self-determination and competence and intrinsic motivation; punitive-controlling style led to lower levels of subordinate's feelings of self-determination and competence and intrinsic motivation; extrinsic motivation appears unaffected by supervisory style; there is no interaction between supervisory style and type of work
	study 2: French-speaking swim team athletes (CAN)	40	questionnaire with three scenarios; 2 (sex of	intrinsic motivation and associated feelings of competence and

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
			participant) X 2 (motivation profile: high v. low-self-determined motivational profile (SDMP) X 3 (style: autonomy supportive, controlling, and neutral) factorial design	self-determination were lower in a punitive-controlling situation than in a neutral situation; extrinsic motivation was lower in the punitive-controlling condition; high-SDMP participants perceived the supervisor as more autonomy-supportive in the neutral and autonomy-supportive condition; high-SDMP participants perceived the supervisor as more controlling in punitive-controlling condition; high-SDMP participants felt more self-determined in the neutral and autonomy-supportive condition
Schulz et.al. (1995) <i>T</i>	adults in Detroit (race limited to white/black)	916	interviews; random sample developed through multi-stage probability sample	members of organizations were more likely to believe that taking action was effective; members of organizations were more likely to have taken actions in the previous 12 months; members of organizations were more likely to believe they had influence over their personal lives and community events; participation in voluntary

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				organizations is related to levels of perceived control ($p < .01$); race and gender are significant by themselves in the amount of explained variance in perceived control at the individual level ($p < .01$), but became insignificant as other variables are added
Shields (1995) <i>T</i>	university women	15	convenience sampling; interviews; group participation; researcher coding	the women reported the emergence of an internal sense of self involving four basic components (claiming pieces of their identity, development of self-value, development of self-acceptance, development of trust in terms of self-knowledge); the women reported an ability to take action and to participate in life involving several components (the ability to have voice, the ability to take positive risks based on the internal sense of self, the development of a sense of competence with specific skills and abilities, emergence of refined thinking and learning patterns); the women reported a theme of “connectedness” (inter-

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				personal, intrapersonal)
Spreitzer (1995a) <i>S</i> <i>DV</i>	study 1: mid-level employees in a <i>Fortune</i> 50 industrial organization	393	questionnaire to measure empowerment (meaning, competence, self-determination, impact), access to mission information, social desirability, locus of control, effectiveness, and innovation	meaning was related to competence, self-determination, impact, and information ($p < .001$); competence was related to self-determination, impact, self-esteem, and information ($p < .001$); self-determination was related to impact and information ($p < .001$) and self-esteem ($p < .01$); impact was related to self-esteem and information ($p < .001$) and effectiveness and innovation ($p < .01$)
	study 2: employees in an insurance company	128	two questionnaires to measure empowerment, performance information, and rewards; administered twice	meaning (time 1) was related to competence (time 1), self-determination (time 1), and meaning (time 2) ($p < .001$), and impact (time 1), competence (time 2), and self-determination (time 2) ($p < .01$); competence (time 1) was related to self-determination (time 1) and competence (time 2) ($p < .001$), and meaning (time 2) ($p < .01$), and self-determination (time 2) ($p < .05$); self-determin

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				<p>ation (time 1) was related to self-determination (time 2) ($p < .001$), impact (time 1), meaning (time 2) ($p < .01$), and competence (time 2) ($p < .05$); impact (time 1) was related to impact (time 2) ($p < .001$), meaning (time 1) and self-determination (time 2) ($p < .01$); meaning (time 2) was related to competence (time 2) ($p < .001$), and self-determination (time 2) and impact (time 2) ($p < .01$); competence (time 2) was related to self-determination (time 2) ($p < .05$); impact (time 2) was related to performance information and rewards ($p < .01$); performance information was related to rewards ($p < .05$)</p>
Spreitzer (1995b) S	middle managers in a Fortune 50 organization	324	questionnaire to measure empowerment (meaning, competence, self-determination, impact), social structural items (role ambiguity, sociopolitical support, access to strategic information, access to resources),	<p>empowerment was negatively related to role ambiguity ($p < .01$); empowerment was related to sociopolitical support, access to information, access to resources, culture, subordinate assessments of innovative behavior, superior assessments of innovative behavior, subordinate assessments</p>

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
			culture, innovative behavior (subordinate assessments, superior assessments) and effectiveness (sub-ordinate assessments, superior assessments)	of effectiveness, and superior assessments of effectiveness ($p < .01$)
Parker and Price (1994) <i>DV</i>	workers and managers in Michigan group homes	692; 141	questionnaire to measure perceived control over decision making (empowerment) and managerial support	managers' ratings of their own control did predict workers' ratings of their own control when no other independent variables were included in the equation ($p < .001$); managers perception of their own control predicted workers' perceptions of managerial control which in turn predicted workers' perceptions of their own control; the relationship between managers' ratings of their own control and workers' ratings of their own control is mediated through workers' perceptions of managers; none of the control variables (workers' age, workers' education, workers' gender, workers' ethnicity) were significant predictors

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
Parnell and Bell (1994)	undergraduate business majors; management research experts; employees	110; 5; 220	creation of a scale to measure propensity for participative decision making (PPDM); factor extraction and expert evaluation; confirmatory analysis of final scale	10-item scale to measure the propensity of a present or prospective manager to employ participative decision making; coefficient alpha of .75 shows the scale has a moderate level of internal consistency (.78 for the organizational effectiveness subscale and .70 for the superior's power subscale); intracorrelations were moderately high and consistent (.59 for the organizational effectiveness subscale and .72 for the superior's power subscale) and intercorrelations within the scale were lower and consistent (.15) suggesting discriminant validity; shared variance between the two subscales was .02, suggesting discriminant validity; convergence of the items on the two factors demonstrated convergent validity; variance extracted was .48 for the organizational effectiveness subscale and .56 for the power subscale (benchmark of .50)

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
				suggest some degree of convergent validity
Marshall and Stohl (1993) <i>DV</i>	employees of a manufacturing firm that uses self-managing workgroups	148 in 14 teams	questionnaire to measure participation (empowerment and prominence), involvement, worker satisfaction (satisfaction with work, satisfaction with coworkers, satisfaction with the availability with opportunities, worker performance (autonomy, dependability, overall performance)	perceived empowerment was related to perceived participation, network key, perceived involvement, satisfaction with work, satisfaction with coworkers, and satisfaction with opportunity ($p < .001$), job performance ($p < .05$), and network size ($p < .10$)
Zimmerman et.al. (1992)	adults in Detroit (race limited to white/black)	916	interviews; random sample through multi-state probability sample	both high-participation blacks and whites also felt high levels of personal and community control; blacks had lower scores in low-participation groups, but higher scores in middle- and high-participation groups; whites in the high-participation groups reported the lowest level of perceived difficulty; perceived effectiveness did not differ across groups
Maynard-Moody	“street-level” workers	239	on-site interviews	street-level influence on policy

<u>Author (Date)</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Design</u>	<u>Results and IVs (Significance)</u>
et.al. (1990) <i>P</i>	in corrections in Colorado and Oregon		with 50 key workers; questionnaire to entire population	decisions is an important ingrediant of successful policy implementation in policy areas where where street-level bureaucrats deliver the service to clients

Appendix 3

STATE PARTICIPATION STATUS

Maine	Declined (first round of states)
New Mexico**	Inadequate Response (18)
North Carolina	Inadequate Response (37)
Vermont	Adequate Response (207)
Wisconsin	Inadequate Response (25)
Johnston County	Accepted (23)
Durham County	Accepted (44)
Guilford County	Accepted (56)
Mecklenburg County	Accepted (42)
New Hanover County	Declined
Forsyth County	Declined (5/10)

**No Budget Shortfalls according to the National Association of State Budget Officers

Alabama	Declined (3/28)
Alaska**	Asked (3/25), No response
Arizona	Declined
Arkansas	Not Asked
California	Not Asked
Colorado	Asked (3/25), No response
Connecticut	Declined (4/15 - requires union approval)
Delaware	Not Asked
Florida	Not Asked
Georgia	Not Asked
Hawaii	Not Asked
Idaho	Not Asked
Illinois	Not Asked
Indiana	Not Asked
Iowa	Declined (4/10 - budget cuts/potential layoffs)
Kansas	Not Asked
Kentucky	Declined
Louisiana**	Asked (3/25), No response
Maryland	Not Asked
Massachusetts	Not Asked
Michigan	Not Asked
Minnesota	Not Asked
Mississippi	Not Asked
Missouri	Not Asked
Missouri	Not Asked
Nebraska	Not Asked
Nevada**	Declined (4/5 - no layoffs, but greatly increased workload with current staff)

New Hampshire	Not Asked
New Jersey	Not Asked
New York	Not Asked
North Dakota**	Declined (4/25 - conducting two internal surveys, concerned with employee response)
Ohio	Not Asked
Oklahoma**	Asked (3/25), No Response
Oregon	Not Asked
Pennsylvania	Not Asked
Rhode Island	Not Asked
South Carolina	Declined (4/3)
South Dakota	Not Asked
Tennessee	Not Asked
Texas**	Not Asked
Utah	Asked (3/25), No Response
Virginia	Not Asked
Washington	Not Asked
West Virginia	Not Asked
Wyoming**	Asked (3/25), No Response

Appendix 4

QUANTITATIVE AND CASE STUDIES: PROCEDURAL AND INTERACTIONAL JUSTICE USING NIEHOFF AND MOORMAN (1993)

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
Cable and Parsons (2001)	recent graduates of a large southeastern university in two waves	251; 161	questionnaire to measure distributive justice, procedural justice, school badmouthing, perceptions of professors, perceptions of computers, and perceptions of library administered at a one year interval	procedural justice was related to perceptions of computers and perceptions of library ($p < .05$); procedural justice was negatively related to school badmouthing ($p < .05$); distributive justice was related to perceptions of professors, perceptions of computers, perceptions of library, and procedural justice ($p < .05$); distributive justice was negatively related to school badmouthing ($p < .05$)
Douthitt and Aiello (2001)	undergraduate students in a large northeastern university	148	students were assigned to one of six conditions in a 3 (computer monitoring approach: monitoring, monitoring with control over the monitoring, no monitoring) X 2 (participation: high voice or low voice) and given a directed	procedural justice was related to participation and task performance ($p < .05$)

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
			task to perform with task performance determination; questionnaire to measure procedural justice perceptions, and task satisfaction	
Haworth and Levy (2001)	undergraduate students at a urban, Midwestern university who were employed at the time of the study	113	questionnaire to measure organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) beliefs, beliefs about OCB, altruistic OCB, conscientious OCB, total OCB, perceived system knowledge, and procedural justice	procedural justice was related to perceived system knowledge, OCB beliefs, conscientious OCB, total OCB ($p < .01$) and altruistic OCB ($p < .05$)
Kickul (2001)	part-time students in an MBA program at a midwestern university and their supervisors	322; 165	questionnaire for employees to measure assessment of psychological contract, procedural justice, interactional justice, and work related attitudes; questionnaire for supervisors to measure deviant work behavior	procedural justice was related to psychological contract breach, interactional justice, negative affect toward the organization, and deviant work behavior ($p < .01$); interactional justice was related to psychological contract breach, negative affect toward the organization, and deviant work behavior ($p < .01$)
Ryan (2001)	public accountants and	116	questionnaire to measure	procedural justice was related to

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
	professional personnel of a regional accounting and consulting firm		organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), procedural justice, moral reasoning, social desirability, age, sex, and tenure	OCB-civic virtue, OCB-sportsmanship ($p < .01$) and OCB-helping ($p < .05$)
Tepper, et.al. (2001)	sample 1: students in management classes at two large, public universities, who were employed, and their supervisors	160 dyads	questionnaire for students to measure role definitions of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) and procedural justice; questionnaire for supervisors to measure the students' performance of OCBs	procedural justice was related to interpersonal helping, personal industry, and loyal boosterism ($p < .01$); procedural justice was negatively related to role definitions for individual initiative, role definitions for loyal boosterism ($p < .01$) and role definitions for personal industry ($p < .05$)
	sample 2: employees in several large automobile manufacturing companies, and their supervisors	110 dyads	questionnaire for employees to measure role definitions of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) and procedural justice; questionnaire for supervisors to measure the employees' performance of OCBs	procedural justice was related to interpersonal helping and loyal boosterism ($p < .01$); procedural justice was negatively related to role definitions for interpersonal helping and role definitions for loyal boosterism ($p < .01$)

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
Lee, et.al. (2000)	Chinese-speaking employees of a university (Hong Kong)	615 to 645	questionnaire to measure procedural justice, interactional justice, distributive justice, trust in the supervisor, psychological contract fulfillment, power distance, gender, salary, job tenure, and negative affectivity	procedural justice was related to trust in supervisor, contract fulfillment, interactional justice, and distributive justice ($p < .01$); procedural justice was negatively related to job tenure and negative affectivity ($p < .01$); interactional justice was related to trust in supervisor, contract fulfillment, procedural justice, distributive justice, power-distance, and salary ($p < .01$); interactional justice was negatively related to job tenure and negative affectivity ($p < .01$); distributive justice was related to trust in supervisor, contract fulfillment, procedural justice, interactional justice, salary ($p < .01$), and power-distance ($p < .05$); distributive justice was negatively related to negative affectivity ($p < .01$)
Kurland and Egan (1999)	telecommuters from organizations who are members of the National Telecommuting Trade Association	191 in 11 organizations	questionnaire to measure telecommuting, distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, outcome-based evaluations, formal com-	distributive justice was related to procedural justice, interactional justice, formal communication ($p < .001$), and job formalization ($p < .05$); procedural justice was related to distributive justice,

Author (Date)	Population	Number	Design	Results and IVs (Significance)
			munications, and job formalization	interactional justice, and job formalization ($p<.001$), and telecommunicating ($p<.05$); interactional justice was related to distributive justice, procedural justice, formal communication, job formalization ($p<.001$) and telecommuting ($p<.01$)
Niehoff and Moorman (1993)	employees and general managers of a national movie theater management company	213	questionnaire to measure monitoring behaviors (informal discussions, observations, formal meetings), distributive justice, formal procedures [procedural justice], interactional justice, organizational citizenship behavior (altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, civic virtue)	distributive justice was related to formal procedures, interactional justice, courtesy, sportsmanship, civic virtue ($p<.01$) and altruism and conscientiousness ($p<.05$); formal procedures was related to observation, interactional justice, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, civic virtue ($p<.01$) and formal meetings and altruism ($p<.05$); interactional justice was related to observation, formal meetings, altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and civic virtue ($p<.01$)

Appendix 5

EMPLOYEE TRUST AND EMPOWERMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Departments which deal with health and social service issues have seen a considerable amount of change both in the legal guidelines for service delivery and the discretion given to employees who provide those services. The need for flexibility and speed of response helps to create an environment of constant change. Agencies have tried to give employees the tools and discretion to participate in the identification and implementation of process improvement.

This research is to learn about the role of organizations and supervisors in improving employee discretion.

Thank you for participating in this study. All responses will be kept confidential. Data will be stored securely and will be made available only to persons conducting the study. No reference will be made in oral or written reports that could link you to the study. This questionnaire should take less than 15 minutes of your time. If you have any questions or problems filling out the survey, please feel free to email Sam Shelton at stshelto@unity.ncsu.edu.

Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Because this is an Internet-based survey, completed responses cannot be returned or destroyed. You may decline to answer any individual question, but completed questions will remain in the study's database.

Sam Shelton
Department of Political Science and Public Administration
North Carolina State University

[E-MAIL ADDRESS OF RESPONDENT]
(*REQUIRED TO PROCEED WITH QUESTIONNAIRE*)

Rate the statements based upon a seven-point scale of

- (1) very strongly agree*
- (2) strongly agree*
- (3) agree*
- (4) no opinion*
- (5) disagree*
- (6) strongly disagree*
- (7) very strongly disagree*

[CODE] (FOR CREATION OF THE RESPONSE TABLE ONLY)

[P-1]	Job decisions about employees in general, or me in particular, are made by my agency/department in an unbiased manner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[EM-1]	The work I do is important to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[I-1]	When decisions are made about my job, my supervisor treats me with respect and dignity.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[EC-1]	I am confident about my ability to do my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[P-2]	My agency/department makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before job decisions are made.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[ES-1]	I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[I-2]	When decisions are made about my job, my supervisor is sensitive to my personal needs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Rate the statements based upon a seven-point scale of

- (1) very strongly agree*
- (2) strongly agree*
- (3) agree*
- (4) no opinion*
- (5) disagree*
- (6) strongly disagree*
- (7) very strongly disagree*

[P-3]	All job decisions by my agency/department are applied consistently across all affected employees.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[EM-2]	The work I do is meaningful to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[I-3]	Concerning decisions made about my job, my supervisor discusses the implications of the decisions with me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[P-4]	To make job decisions, my agency/department collects accurate and complete information.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[EI-1]	My impact on what happens in my department is large.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[I-4]	My supervisor offers adequate justification for decisions made about my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[I-5]	When making decisions about my job, my supervisor offers explanations that make sense to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[I-6]	My supervisor explains very clearly any decisions made about my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Rate the statements based upon a seven-point scale of

(1) very strongly agree

(2) strongly agree

(3) agree

(4) no opinion

(5) disagree

(6) strongly disagree

(7) very strongly disagree

[EM-3]	My job activities are personally meaningful to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[I-7]	When decisions are made about my job, the supervisor treats me with kindness and consideration.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[EC-2]	I am self-assured about my capabilities to perform my work activities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[I-8]	When decisions are made about my job, my supervisor shows concern for my rights as an employee.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[EC-3]	I have mastered the skills necessary for my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[P-5]	My agency/department clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[O-1]	There are laws and regulations that limit my authority to get my job done.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[ES-2]	I can decide on my own how to go about doing my work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Rate the statements based upon a seven-point scale of

(1) very strongly agree

(2) strongly agree

(3) agree

(4) no opinion

(5) disagree

(6) strongly disagree

(7) very strongly disagree

[P-6]	Employees are allowed to challenge or appeal job decisions made in my agency/department.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[ES-3]	I have considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[I-9]	When decisions are made about my job, my supervisor deals with me in a truthful manner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[EI-2]	I have a great deal of control over what happens to my department.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[O-2]	The way my supervisor interprets laws and regulations limits my authority to get my job done.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
[EI-3]	I have significant influence over what happens in my department.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

The respondents are asked to provide the following information about themselves.

1. What is the respondent's state?

- ☐ New Mexico
- ☐ North Carolina
- ☐ Vermont
- ☐ Wisconsin
- ☐ Durham County (NC)
- ☐ Guilford County (NC)
- ☐ Johnston County (NC)
- ☐ Mecklenburg County (NC)

2. The kind of work I am doing currently is directly involved with the clients for my agency?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

3. The kind of work I am doing currently is generally considered:

- ☐ Administrative/Support
- ☐ Social Services
- ☐ Health
- ☐ Facility Maintenance
- ☐ Other (*Please specify:* _____)

4. What is the respondent's total number of years in this agency (in all positions)?

- ☐ 0-1 years
- ☐ 2-5 years
- ☐ 6-10 years
- ☐ 11-15 years
- ☐ 16-20 years
- ☐ 20+ years

5. **Optional question:** Please describe briefly any efforts that your agency/department has made to "empower" or provide you with additional discretion in your work.

Thank you for your participation in this survey.

If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions for participation, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Matthew Zingraff, Chair of the NCSU IRM for the Use of Human Subjects in Research Committee, Box 7514, NCSU Campus, Raleigh, NC 27696 (919/513-1834) or Mr. Matthew Ronning, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Research Administration, Box 7514, NCSU Campus, Raleigh, NC 27696

Appendix 6

“INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE” EMAIL

[Date]

Dear [State/County Department/Agency] Employee:

YOUR HELP IS VERY IMPORTANT TO RESEARCH that will help better understand the importance of the supervisor-employee relationship in improving employee participation. The questionnaire responses should take you less than 15 minutes. Employees from several [state/North Carolina departments/agencies] will participate in this study. Your participation will add to an understanding of trust and employee empowerment. I hope that you will agree to join in this research, but your participation is absolutely voluntary.

If you agree to participate, you will be emailed an address for a webpage that contains the questionnaire for this study. Unfortunately, completion of the questionnaire can only be accomplished through the webpage. There are built-in safeguards to ensure that your answers to the questions will be help in strict confidence and your answers cannot be connected to you or your email address. A very few demographic questions will be included. You can discontinue completion of the questionnaire at any time.

- 1) If you agree to participate, please send an email to me at stsncsu@aol.com within 3 days with a simple statement of "I agree to participate in this study" and your name in the body or as the subject.
- 2) If you would prefer that future communication with you be sent to a different email address, please identify that new address with your statement of participation.
- 3) If you are unable to send an email to me but still wish to participate, you may write the statement of "I agree to participate in this study," an email address at which you can be contacted, and your signature at the bottom of this page and mail it to me, Sam Shelton, at Campus Box 8102, NCSU, Raleigh, NC 27695-8102.

This study is conducted under the supervision of Dr. Elizabethann O'Sullivan and the NCSU Institutional Review Board for the Use of Human Subjects in Research. If you have any questions or problems, please feel free to email Sam Shelton at stsncsu@aol.com.

Many thanks in advance for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Sam Shelton

Appendix 7

“WEBPAGE NOTIFICATION” EMAIL

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study.

The questionnaire is located at the following webpage
(cut and paste address into your browser):

<http://www2.chass.ncsu.edu/Shelton/>

Please try to complete the questionnaire before Friday, June 14.

Appendix 8

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

Table 8.1 Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Empowerment Components for State Data

Component	Competence	Impact	Meaning	Self-Determination
Competence	1.00			
Impact	.100	1.00		
Meaning	.314**	.258**	1.00	
Self-Determination	.320**	.378**	.243**	1.00

** Statistic is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Table 8.2 Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Empowerment Components for North Carolina County Data

Component	Competence	Impact	Meaning	Self-Determination
Competence	1.00			
Impact	.117	1.00		
Meaning	.358**	.136	1.00	
Self-Determination	.193*	.385**	.113	1.00

* Statistic is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

** Statistic is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Table 8.3 Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Variables for State Data

Variable	Empowerment	PJ	IJ	RE	RI	Years with Agency	Work with Clients	A/S	Social Services	Health
Empowerment	1.00									
PJ: Procedural Justice	.469**	1.00								
IJ: Interactional Justice	.447**	.702**	1.00							
RE: Regulatory Environment	-.049	-.015	.076	1.00						
RI: Regulatory Interpretation	-.347**	-.323**	-.429**	.227**	1.00					
Years with Agency	.199**	-.061	-.025	.082	.003	1.00				
Work with Clients	-.044	-.073	-.074	.002	-.031	.120*	1.00			
A/S: Administrative/Support	-.099	-.005	.046	.155**	.127*	-.054	-.322**	1.00		
Social Services	.007	.019	-.072	-.155**	-.030	-.065	.226**	-.558**	1.00	
Health	.093	.009	.049	-.016	-.103	.105	.093	-.459**	-.442**	1.00

* Statistic is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

** Statistic is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Table 8.4 Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Variables for North Carolina County Data

Variable	Empowerment	PJ	IJ	RE	RI	Years with Agency	Work with Clients	Type of Work
Empowerment	1.00							
PJ: Procedural Justice	.610**	1.00						
IJ: Interactional Justice	.559**	.662**	1.00					
RE: Regulatory Environment	.081	.040	.127	1.00				
RI: Regulatory Interpretation	-.236**	-.199*	-.454**	.034	1.00			
Years with Agency	.163*	-.015	-.038	.009	-.065	1.00		
Work with Clients	.065	-.017	-.037	-.077	-.041	.036	1.00	
Type of Work	-.125	-.108	-.089	.105	.028	.018	-.610**	1.00

* Statistic is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

** Statistic is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).