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ABSTRACT

The term "empowerment" is frequently used by organizational researchers, management practitioners, and consultants. However, despite the popularity of the term, there is a lack of empirical work and no generally accepted definition. As part of a thorough multidisciplinary literature review, fourteen different conceptualizations for the term empowerment were discovered and classified into four categories: Micro (intra-psychic), Meso (relational-interactive), Macro (structural), and Misnomer (bogus). As a result of this work, both a new definition and a multi-level process model of empowerment are offered. Empowerment is defined here as an enhancing and energizing context specific process that expands an individual's power and feelings of trust, is usually facilitated by another, and results in increased levels of self-esteem, self-efficacy and other characteristics related to personal growth and control, which eventually lead to outcomes such as performance and satisfaction. The proposed multi-level process model postulates that the process of empowerment is driven by changes in information, responsibility, and active belief, and mediated by intra-psychic factors. This model was empirically tested in a between-subject, pre-test, post-test simulation design. Over a period of three weeks 135 graduate students completed a novel application of in-basket exercises, within which an empowerment manipulation was embedded. This manipulation included increasing information, responsibility, and active belief for the empowered manipulation and decreasing these three components for the dis-empowered manipulation. Multivariate analysis of variance revealed that, as predicted, the manipulation had a significant impact on the three mediating intra-psychic factors (self-efficacy, self-esteem, and locus of control) and an analysis of variance found significant results in the predicted direction on the dependent variable of job satisfaction. Regression analyses revealed the predicted mediation relationship between the intra-psychic variables and the dependent variable of
job satisfaction. However, none of the analyses yielded significant results for the performance measures (initiative, sensitivity, planning and organizing, delegation, administrative control, problem analysis, judgement, and decisiveness). Several potential explanations are offered for these results, including a motivational interpretation which focuses on participant's motivation directionality. Theoretical and practical implications for these results are discussed as well as directions for future research.
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INTRODUCTION
THE WIDESPREAD USE OF "EMPOWERMENT"

During the past few years, the concept of "empowerment" has come into vogue among business practitioners. Management writers increasingly address issues related to the "new organization," assuming it will be decentralized (e.g. Drucker, 1989; Snow et al., 1992) and that employees will be more like consultants than full time members (Handy, 1990). It is predicted that these employees will use different sources and tools for power and motivation (Kanter, 1989). As a result, managers will be "reinventing their profession as they go" (Kanter, 1989:85), and these changes will produce "a new agenda for both managers and scholars" (Snow et al., 1992). These trends signal the need to reevaluate several of our widely accepted descriptions and explanations of organizational phenomena. One current concept which requires such reevaluation is empowerment, a recent buzz word used by both organizational researchers and management practitioners (Block, 1987; Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Feschuk, 1993; Rappaport, 1989; Vogt & Murrell, 1990). In spite of the growing popularity of the term, empowerment is a diffuse and misunderstood concept.

The emotional and ideological appeal of empowerment has led to a confusing proliferation of use and definitions. From reading the popular literature and talking with managers, it is clear that empowerment is currently a corporate cliche (Fisher, 1991; Kingston, 1992; Shipper & Manz, 1992). Despite the popularity of the empowerment concept, there is no common agreement as to the meaning of this term. It has been translated to mean anything from customer support (McAuley, 1992), responsibility and accountability pushed down (Edwards, 1992), to being given permission to act without asking for permission (Conrad, 1992; Shipper & Manz, 1992; Wells, 1992). Empowerment is still
"...a term that confuses even as it inspires" (Simon, 1990:27).

From management's perspective, empowerment, like participation, will hopefully increase organizational efficiency and effectiveness (Conger, 1989; Conger & Kanungo, 1988). At a general level, empowerment implies that managers can simultaneously develop others and themselves—both in terms of skill level, task competence, and personal development. From an employee's point of view, empowerment holds promise for greater job satisfaction as well as increased potential for future advancement. Instituting a policy of empowerment within an organization can result in power being more evenly distributed within the organization. Likewise, people can transfer the feeling of empowerment to new organizational situations and even to other realms of life (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990) where it may help them face the unknown. Empowerment may be for the younger workforce what organizational loyalty was for their parents—a means of providing them with a sense of security in their daily lives. The growing popularity of empowerment stems from the constant reminder that we live in a rapidly changing environment and in a world of intense competition and technological advancement (Cummings, 1990; Kizilos, 1990; Srivastva et al., 1990, Stewart, 1989). This turbulence results in our emphasizing both the individual and the community in our attempts to ride the waves of change. As a result, empowerment is a "pervasive positive value in American culture...[since] it implies both individual determination over one's own life and democratic participation in the life of one's community" (Rappaport, 1987:121). Clearly, most believe that empowerment is a positive, healthy process. However, some, such as Gruber and Trickett (1987:370), disagree and proclaim, "Our overall conclusions about the process of empowerment are pessimistic."

There is still no clarification over whether empowerment is a psychological state, a multi-level construct, or an evolving process. Currently, most researchers tend to assume that
empowerment is primarily a psychological state of the individual. Those who see empowerment as a static psychological state or condition are not always clear about the level of the term. For others, this is not even a relevant question, since they see empowerment as a multi-level construct (Murrell, 1985; Rappaport, 1987; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990; Zimmerman, 1990; Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988). Some researchers even take an ecological outlook on empowerment, suggesting that empowerment is a unique process which depends both on the specific goals for which it is initiated and on the context in which it occurs (Kieffer, 1984; Murrell, 1985; Rappaport, 1987; Zimmerman, 1990; Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988).

Viewing empowerment primarily as a state or condition arrests the development of understanding empowerment as a process. Viewing empowerment as a process implies that there is room for learning, management, and development. Empowerment as a process suggests that we can focus on "managing" empowerment rather than just "having" empowerment. It also suggests that there may be direct influence on work outcome enhancement.

Interest in empowerment is developing among scholars in the fields of psychology, social work, counselling psychology, sociology, political science, business policy, and organizational behaviour. However, there is little cross disciplinary work integrating existing research from these areas (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Gruber & Trickett, 1987; Hess, 1983; Kieffer, 1984; Price, 1990; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990; Torre, 1986; Zimmerman, 1990; Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988). This dissertation begins with a comprehensive, cross-disciplinary review. Based on findings from this review empowerment is delineated and defined as a multi-level process. In addition, this dissertation demonstrates empirically how this process is mediated by intra-psychic constructs, and how it influences work outcomes.
Empowerment—Does the Emperor really have new clothes?

Although there is no agreement as to the actual meaning of the term empowerment, its use and its interpretation seem to be increasing widely. From a theoretical and empirical perspective we do not know if empowerment is a worthwhile and meaningful term, a passing fad, or a meaningless word. We need to see if the emperor is wearing new, renewed, or no clothes at all. Thus, the goal of this chapter is twofold: First to illustrate if empowerment exists or if this term is used when other familiar and existing constructs would be more appropriate; and second to integrate and clarify the multitude of approaches and definitions that exist in a variety of academic disciplines and practitioners' work.

The wide-spread use of case methodology (Balcazar et al., 1990; Fawcett et al., 1983-4; Gruber & Trickett, 1987; Katz, 1983-4; Kieffer, 1984; Whitmore, 1990) suggests that the study of empowerment is in its early stages. As a result, it is no surprise that when it comes to definitions, many would agree with Rappaport (1984) who posits that empowerment is easy to explain in its absence. Lack of empowerment results in alienation, powerlessness, and helplessness. The positive side of empowerment is difficult to define because it takes different forms for different people and different contexts. However, "like obscenity, we know it when we see it" (Rappaport, 1984:2). Murrell (1985:36) suggests that, "the reality is that empowerment in its interactive form works in all different ways in all different directions." There is no doubt that "further study is
needed if advances are to be made in the understanding and implementation of empowerment" (Florin & Wandersman, 1990:44). This dissertation has taken a broad-ranging, interdisciplinary approach to the literature on empowerment to summarize its current empirical and conceptual status.

The multitude of distinctions found for empowerment may be a result of the diverse values and viewpoints held by people who work in this area. The empowerment literature contains both psychological and sociological orientations. The psychological orientation is individualistic and tends to focus on intra-psychic components such as motivation and self-efficacy (e.g., Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). Authors within the sociological orientation, on the other hand, seem to share the implicit assumption that people should be equal (e.g., Katz, 1983-4; Kieffer, 1983-4). The sociological approach focuses on how people can increase their social standing, clout, and ability to help themselves. "An overly individualistic conception of empowerment may limit our understanding of the construct...we may unwittingly advance single measures of competence and trait-oriented conceptions of empowerment while failing to consider environmental influences; organizational factors; or social, cultural, and political contexts" (Zimmerman, 1990:173).

This attitude of striving for equality is best seen in work within the "helping" disciplines such as social work, education, and community psychology (Florin & Wandersman, 1990; Rappaport, 1987). Work on empowerment within these disciplines includes topics as diverse as children, grassroots organizations, the elderly, people with physical disabilities, seasonal farm workers, and single expectant mothers (Balcazar et al., 1990; Hegar, 1989; Hoffman, 1978; Whitmore, 1990; Yonemura, 1986). The concern is with the process of developing clients more than with the individual’s process of personal power accumulation. In these disciplines, we frequently see an ecological view of
empowerment (Rappaport, 1987; Wolff, 1985; Zimmerman, 1990; Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988) which focuses on the community as well as the individual and the organization. In addition, the "helping professions" have long been aware of the dilemma between "helping individuals in need and changing the conditions that distribute needs unequally within a population" (Swift, 1984:xi). The early interest in empowerment, within these disciplines, came in response to the social, political, and economic issues of the 1960's (Torre, 1986).

Disciplines that work within an ecological context for empowerment are concerned with the good of people, and are interested in offering help to others which does not foster reliance on the helper (Kieffer, 1984). These disciplines frequently adopt the outlook that "all people possess strengths...that people know what they want and need" (Torre, 1986). However, the management literature has been more concerned in dealing with the organizational layers that hold the power and less concerned with how to spread power. Management seems more interested in empowering people while still maintaining power. Price (1990:166 based on Baritz, 1974) reminds us that social scientists should be wary of pursuing a science "shaped by corporate interests." Empowerment implies involvement in social change (Wolff, 1985). However, business organizations are less likely to be interested in promoting humanitarian social change—which results in the bulk of management scholars also veering away from these issues.

Given these different disciplinary views of empowerment, let us turn to a more careful examination of the separate approaches that currently exist.
Towards Conceptual Clarity and Definitional Compactness

The Four "M"s of Empowerment

The dictionary definition of empowerment can serve as a base level for reviewing the major perspectives in the literature. The American College Dictionary (1958:394) defines "empower" as: "1. to give power or authority; to authorize. 2. to enable or permit."

These formal definitions relate primarily to the granting of power or authority, or as a way of enabling. However, the academic literature views empowerment in terms that seem to be more similar to the dictionary's definition of enabling. "Enable" is defined as "to make able; give power, means, or ability to; make competent; authorize. 2. to make possible or easy" (American College Dictionary, 1958:395). The distinction between these two definitions is similar to the difference between may and can. May suggests that one is allowed to proceed, can implies one is able to do so. Empowerment means that we may—we are allowed to proceed.

The empowerment literature can be grouped into four categories (micro, meso, macro, and misnomer) at three levels of analysis: the individual level (micro), the relational level (meso), and the organizational level (macro). Each of the four categories can be broken

---

1 Note that in this paper the use of the term meso differs from the way it is used by House and Rousseau (1992:9). They define meso as "the simultaneous study of at least two levels of analysis wherein a) one or more levels concern individual or group behavioral processes or variables, b) one or more levels concern organizational processes or variables, and c) the process by which the levels of analysis are related is articulated in the form of bridging, or linking, propositions and tested or inferred." The use of the term here is similar to how it is used within the domain of physics. The meso level of analysis in physics is the level between the quantum mechanics of individual particles (microscopic level) and the statistical mechanics of complex systems (macroscopic level). The difficulties in understanding the meso level is compounded by a bias toward trying to understand the individual components of an interacting system (Meirav & Heiblum, 1990). This difficulty is also true when we refer to empowerment—yet one more reason for the multitude of definitions and descriptions of this construct.
down further, into a total of fourteen different views (for a brief summary see Table 1.1). Below I distill and summarize the interpretations found in the literature. It should be noted that while each perspective is distinct from the rest, they are not mutually exclusive. As a result, an author may appear in more than one category.

1) The Micro Level of Empowerment—The Intra-Psychic Terms
Many authors view empowerment as an intra-psychic concept. In other words, empowerment is something that occurs within the individual, and can be initiated by the individual without an outside catalyst. It is the "psychological energy that activates us" (Kizilos, 1990:48). Within this category there are three approaches: empowerment as a potpourri of related terms, empowerment as self efficacy, and empowerment as motivation.

1a) Empowerment as a potpourri of related terms. Empowerment "has been used, often loosely, to capture a family of somewhat related meanings" (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990:666). For example, Block (1987) describes feeling empowered as including both a sense of responsibility and an underlying purpose. However, he specifies that it is not always necessary to be clear what the purpose is as long as the person believes the purpose is there. In addition, there must be the commitment to achieve the purpose here and now. These aspects of empowerment reinforce the drive for self development and personal independence.

Keiffer's (1984) approach is similar: empowerment is equal to self-efficacy, self-esteem, and a sense of causal importance. Zimmerman and Rappaport (1988:726) suggest that "self and political efficacy, perceived efficacy, perceived competence, locus of control, and desire for control appear logically related to the broader construct of empowerment." They suggest that empowerment is the junction
(overlap) of the three areas of perceived control—locus of control (Rotter, 1966), self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977), and motivation to control one's environment (White, 1959; DeCharms, 1968).

There is a family resemblance\(^2\) between the meanings of the terms used in the intra-psychic context of empowerment. However, each term on its own is not empowerment. Further, not all facets must exist simultaneously for empowerment to occur. In fact, any combination of two or more facets (the situation will dictate which) may be enough to be considered empowerment. Thus, empowerment includes related constructs such as power, self-efficacy, self-esteem, and others.

1b) Empowerment as self-efficacy. Bandura (1982:122) defines self-efficacy as, "concerned with judgments of how well one can execute courses of action required to deal with prospective situations." He suggests that "people are influenced more by how they read their performance successes than by the successes per se...." Note the subjectiveness of self-efficacy, as it is driven by an individual's perceptions. Empowerment is a process which helps a person interpret this performance information. Empowerment is also a process which provides experiences and opportunities to increase self-efficacy and promote belief in one's own capacity (Bandura, 1982; Conger & Kanungo, 1988). Ozer and Bandura (1990) explicitly recognize self-efficacy as the route through which empowerment occurs. Florin and Wandersman (1990:43) view empowerment as: "aspects of personal and collective efficacy related to concepts of empowerment." Kieffer (1984) concluded that for political activists, self-efficacy was one of empowerment's components. Bandura (1977:193) implicitly makes the connection

\(^2\) I would like to thank Warren Bourgeois for suggesting the concept of family resemblance.
for us in his claim that, "The strength of people's conviction in their own effectiveness is likely to affect whether they would even try to cope with given situations." In other words, if you believe in yourself, you will try to act, which in turn implies the ability to influence (i.e., you have the potential to possess power even without a direct transfer of resources.)

However, self-efficacy is a state of self-perception and not an active process. If we take the common view of power as the ability of one social actor to overcome resistance in achieving a desired objective or result (Pfeffer, 1981), self-efficacy does not have any direct relation with power. The difference between self-efficacy and empowerment is somewhat similar to the distinction between ability and power. Ability is a resource that a person may use to do something. Power implies that the person can and will be acting on something else. Having self-efficacy suggests that one believes they can do the task. Becoming empowered may be required before this sense of self-efficacy can surface. For example, the ability to run a marathon does not necessarily imply that the person will feel the power to do so. Self-efficacy implies that the person believes they can run the marathon. Empowerment refers to the process in which someone (including the same person) passed/developed that self-efficacy to them. This distinction suggests that self-efficacy is the understanding that occurs when a person recognizes that they can do something, while empowerment is the recognition that they may.

1c) Empowerment as a derivative of motivation. For those who take this view the implication is that the theoretical roots of empowerment are found in work on motivation (Vogt & Murrell, 1988). For example, Murrell (1985:36) suggests that, "we are all responsible for empowering ourselves, at least enough to get out and have dyadic relationships." These relationships are the start of the process of
empowerment and one needs to be motivated to trigger the process. "People have
to decide for themselves whether they want to be empowered or not" (Kizilos,
1990:50). This is a process which can be "initiated and sustained only...[by those]
who seek power or self-determination" (Simon, 1990:32). It involves the
willingness to "think critically, and dialectically, about the world and one's
position in it" (Torre, 1986:38). Vogt and Murrell (1990) also see the process of
empowerment as one in which the individual’s motivation can be a crucial factor.
Their view stems from the claim that the process can be both self initiated as well
as initiated by others. Others who view empowerment as a construct strongly
related to motivation include: Thomas and Velthouse, 1990; Spreitzer, 1991;
Thomas, Tymon, and Velthouse, 1991. Another less prevalent view is that
empowerment gives the individual the motivation to improve (Kizilos, 1990).

2) The Meso Level of Empowerment—The Relational Category
This category includes perspectives that view empowerment as a construct that exists only
when there are two or more people interacting in a relationship (i.e., something is
transferred between them). The majority of the approaches in the meso category of
empowerment refer to power.

Dahl’s (1957) commonly accepted view on power suggests that power is when one social
actor, A, can get another social actor, B, to do something that B would not have done
otherwise. Salancik and Pfeffer’s (1977:3) note that power implies that a person can
"bring about the outcomes they desire." This distinction does not address the construct
as power "over" another person. Similarly, Nord (1983:11) defines power as "the ability
to influence flows of the available energy and resources towards certain goals as opposed
to other goals."
2a) The dictionary definition cited earlier, fits best in the meso category since it refers primarily to the formal granting of power or authority. In other words, for empowerment to occur there must be at least two individuals: one who can confer power or authority and the other who receives it. The common assumption that empowerment is a solution for the distribution of power in the organization relies on this definition. Frequently the wording is nearly identical. For example: "To empower, implies the granting of power—delegation of authority" (Burke, 1986:51).

2b) Empowerment is the process of spreading power which results in positive outcomes. This process includes distributing resources and experiences that confer power. Conger and Kanungo (1988) note that empowerment is achieved through the removal of conditions that foster powerlessness i.e., the feeling of not being able to determine relevant outcomes related to one’s self (Seeman, 1959). Conditions that foster such situations can be removed using both "formal organizational practices and informal techniques of providing efficacy information" (Conger & Kanungo, 1988:474). Others see empowerment as the act of building, developing, and increasing power, which is more than just the action of authorizing (Murrell, 1977, 1985; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). This view is similar to Mary Parker Follett’s (1941) concept of power-with (rather than power-over).

2c) Empowerment is equivalent to having socialized power [a term coined by McClelland (1970) referring to the "positive" side of power e.g., exercising power for the benefit of others]. This perspective differs from #2b which refers to the process of spreading power; it suggests that empowerment requires a combination of power and motivation (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). In other words empowerment is a ‘friendlier’ term for need-for-power; it is the good side, the socialized type of
power. Some also make the distinction between having more power versus feeling more powerful (Kieffer, 1984), with the latter being empowerment. Block (1987:xviii) takes more of a political outlook and suggests that empowerment is a process we can promote in ourselves by "discovering a positive way of being political."

2d) **Empowerment as the synergistic component of power.** Work that falls within this approach relies on the view that effective organizational power and control grows by sharing power and control with subordinates (Kanter, 1979; Tannenbaum, 1968). The basis for this notion, the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1963:274), suggests that "each party has rights and duties" and each will follow the guidelines to help and not injure those that have helped them. The synergistic aspect of empowerment differs significantly from the norm of reciprocity since the issue of equivalence is a non-issue. The norm of reciprocity suggests that there should be equivalence in the exchange. However, synergy does not require equivalence or even exchange. The norm of reciprocity is "a concrete and special mechanism involved in the maintenance of any stable social system" (Gouldner, 1963:277); the synergistic characteristic of empowerment is a mechanism for enhancing stable social systems. The norm of reciprocity "engenders motives for returning benefits even when power differences might invite exploitation" (Gouldner, 1963:277); empowerment goes beyond repayment to invite growth, development and enhancement. In addition, synergy implies no feelings of indebtedness. This implies that empowerment can reproduce itself and create more than the sum of its components. "A synergistic pattern brings phenomena together, interrelating them... In this pattern phenomena exist in harmony with each other, maximizing each other's potential" (Katz, 1984:202). The process of maximizing a person's potential is part of the process of empowerment. Overall, the more a synergistic
resource is used, the more there will be to use.

This synergistic view of empowerment suggests that power is activated by individuals who function as its guardian and not as its possessor. Katz (1983-4:204) suggests that "empowerment is not limited to or identifiable with individuals; it becomes a resource beyond the self."

Vogt and Murrell (1990:52) use Argyris’s (1982) concept of double loop learning to suggest that learning takes place in the empowerment process. They suggest that empowerment is a creative act that breaks the initial frame which then allows for new behaviours to develop. Synergy continues to occur as individuals search for viable and meaningful ways of applying their new ability and insights (Kieffer, 1984), both of which are examples of resources that are neither scarce nor finite (Florin & Wandersman, 1990; Katz, 1984; Rappaport, 1987; Stewart, 1989; Zimmerman, 1990).

2e) Empowerment as infinite power. The power literature has not resolved whether power is a finite or infinite commodity. Currently, both views exist. There are those who consider power as a zero-sum commodity in organizations. For example, in Salancik and Pfeffer's (1977:9) view power is "organized around scarce and critical resources." On the other hand, others view power as infinite (Tannenbaum, 1968; Kanter, 1979). In his later writings, Pfeffer (1981:156) acknowledges that power games vary. When describing coalition behaviour, he compares the situations in which the total rewards to be distributed are fixed, or have varying sums. In the latter case one party’s gain is not necessarily the other party’s loss. The increasing sum situation is also considered as one type of varying situation (Walton & McKersie, 1965).
Conceptually, empowerment supports the idea that power can vary. By empowering one's employees, an executive does not give away power but adds power to the sum total in the organization (Kanter, 1979; Tannenbaum, 1968). In other words empowerment, "leads towards the creation of power and the decrease of powerlessness" (Murrell, 1985:35).

2f) Empowerment as trusting relationships. Although few writers explicitly address the issue of trust with regard to empowerment, many scholars seem to inherently believe and accept that the empowerment process requires trust and confidence in those with whom you are working (Murrell, 1985). In addition, in conversations with both consultants (e.g., Thier, 1992) and managers (e.g., Edwards, 1992) I have been told that, although trust takes time to build, it is necessary for empowerment to occur. Reports of the erosion of trust within the business world (Fisher, 1991) suggest that it is an essential factor in any study of empowerment, including this one.

Culbert and McDonough (1985:224) define trust as:

"A confidence people extend to others whom they see as having the ability to view them in the proper context, and the willingness to search out and respect that context at moments when differences in self-interests and job orientation place them in competition."

Trust is so critical that "promoting trusting relationships...is the most efficient management tool ever invented" (Culbert & McDonough, 1985:4). This assumes that people also trust themselves and "recognize that the knowledge and experience they have acquired throughout life are valid (Torre, 1986:22). Overall, it appears that trust is a critical element for empowerment to succeed.
Trust is important because it implies better communication, i.e., telling others both what you want and what you need (which is at the root of what you want). Needs that are communicated make it is easier for others to understand your aspirations and plans for achieving them, and help you to do so. The need for communication is an example of empowerment's many relational and interactive implications. Like communication, empowerment can not occur (as effectively) in passive situations. For good communication to occur, communicators must be proactive in identifying and expressing their own needs and position with regard to work (Kizilos, 1990), while at the same time they must actively find out what others are thinking. This latter part of communication is where management frequently fails (Fisher, 1991).

The importance of openly expressing one's needs and goals is nested in the assumptions that people interpret organizational events differently (Culbert & McDonough, 1985), and that people frequently assume that others see things in the same way they do. However, since this is often not the case, it is a person's responsibility to communicate their own position coherently to others. This, in turn, will allow for mutual adjustment and support, which are at the root of the empowerment process.

This type of open communication can occur only when trust exists within the system as "nothing can erode organizational effectiveness more quickly than a relationship that lacks trust" (Culbert & McDonough, 1985:17). A person offers trust only to those who provide basic support and who seem to value his/her ways of contributing to the organization's effectiveness. In other words, trust is given only to those who provide some "validation," even on the occasions when actual performance (but not intention) is flawed. The knowledge "that associates are
looking to identify the context that accurately reflects one's intentions can give an individual a feeling of power and the confidence to perform his or her best" (Culbert & McDonough, 1985:26).

When people lack trust in each other, they divert energy from the task and instead focus on getting others to listen to them. While empowerment or effectiveness can be achieved in situations where trust is lacking, the best situation occurs when individuals see organizational goals as their own and the individual's and organizational needs do not conflict. This process can be cultivated by offering people the opportunity to simultaneously do things that will help themselves, others and the organization as a whole. Initial steps towards this goal may be achieved by establishing the connection between the person's own personal interests and their organizational assignment. To do so, the person's frame of reference, including their choices and barriers, must first be recognized and acknowledged (Culbert & McDonough, 1985; Simon, 1990). In addition, one must visualize how the person can relate to the project on hand, in terms that are acceptable to them.

Moore (1992:125) observes: "In general, we keep our power when we protect the power of others" (one may find that power is actually gained in the process of giving power away). Clearly, if this is practised, trust develops naturally. Trust originates in "the dialectic between people's hopes and fears" (Holmes & Rempel, 1989:187). Trust develops as actions and messages are exchanged, uncertainty decreases, and assurances that the relationship will endure increase (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978). Viewing trust as "confidence that one will find what is desired from another, rather than what is feared" (Deutsch, 1973:149), we realize how significant this concept of trust is for a successful process of empowerment. It would seem that at the relational/interactive level trust is an underlying mechanism
for empowerment.

Establishing the connection between the individual and the organization, which in turn enables the person to develop his/her own needs and goals, while concurrently working on and achieving organizational goals, has implications for the organization's structure that will be explored in the following section on the macro level of empowerment.

3) The Macro Level of Empowerment—Organizational Structure

This section on the macro level of empowerment will address structure as a critical antecedent for empowerment to occur, and as a consequence of empowerment.

3a) Organizational structure as a critical antecedent of empowerment. The notion that the organization's structure is a critical factor in enabling the process of empowerment is quite prevalent (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Fawcett, 1984; Murrell, 1990; Rappaport, 1987; Spreitzer, 1991; Zimmerman, 1990). Hegar (1989:378) warns against viewing empowerment as merely a state of mind, which may in turn result in viewing empowerment-based practice as only a matter of helping others adopt new attitudes: "Such an approach ignores inequities in the distribution of resources and experiences that confer power." In general, Hegar (1989) views empowerment-based practices as both trying to help some individuals in making real gains, while also helping others who want to change their perceptions and use of power and thus make structural changes. It is not enough that management say they want to take part in empowering. Overall organization design and management practices need to be changed for "real empowerment rather than temporary flurries of activity" (Kizilos, 1990:48).
Viewing empowerment at the organizational level requires an investigation of the organizational system and whether it can adapt to meet many of a person’s needs. However, the very process of empowering others is paradoxical, for the structure that puts one group in a position to empower others, also works to undermine the equalization of power that is implied by empowerment (Gruber & Trickett, 1987; Kizilos, 1990; Simon, 1990). In other words, positions that provide one group with power over another, implies that others can not have those same resources.

To overcome this paradox, management must promote an effective organization that allows individuals with different needs to succeed (Culbert & McDonough, 1985). This is in line with Well’s (1992) view that frequently, organizational members view empowerment as equivalent to the ability of resolving problems without needing to seek counsel from above. An organization needs to strive for a structure that will allow its members the authority and control to perform essential functions of their job. This view was validated by the results of a questionnaire administered to hotel employees who were undergoing an in-house empowerment training program (Edwards, 1992) in which many of the employees described a strong desire to be able to perform more roles without requesting permission.

However, empowerment is more than just removing structural controls. It also involves a constant reassessment of a person’s "fit" with the organization. Maximal fit should utilize a person’s skills while at the same time appreciating the importance of the person’s role and function to the productivity of the organization. This requires a global view of the organization’s goals and structure. Findings from the field support this logic: As a result of a recent transfer, an engineer (Edwards, 1992) observed that in his previous "bad" department he
wasn't involved in the direction of the department as a whole. However, in his new department, which he considers empowering, he is not only involved in his specific job, but his manager encourages him and his cohorts to take an active part in setting goals and managing the direction of their department. Another example, cited by Shipper and Manz (1992:60) in their complimentary article on Gore Inc., relates that part of Gore's success is due to "providing multiple opportunities for everyone to participate in the organization and multiple ways for them to be rewarded for their participation." It is not enough to partially introduce empowerment. Empowerment will succeed only when "the company's practices reinforce and are aligned with the content" (Kizilos, 1990:50).

The macro level of analysis includes the possibility that organizational structure will act as both an antecedent and a consequence of empowerment. "Organizational effectiveness depends on people modifying the structure of situations so that their own subjective needs can be met" (Culbert & McDonough, 1985:65). Just as the micro approach suggest that empowerment can change peoples's needs, the macro approach suggests that it can (and should) change an organization's structure. For example, people for whom the process of empowerment has been successful may need fewer formal boundaries or rules to constrain and direct their behaviours. As a result they may also be less hesitant in venturing out to work across units or departments (Culbert & McDonough, 1985). Changes in a person's needs may necessitate changes in the need for intermediators between the person and his/her work, which clearly has structural implications. Surprisingly, empowerment's impact on structure (rather than vice versa) has not been elaborated or investigated, and there has not been much thought given to this direction of causality. So far, most of the academic focus has been on the micro and meso levels of empowerment. Scholarly work that has referred to organizational
structure, in the context of empowerment, has looked only at structural issues as antecedents for empowerment.

The distinction between empowering organizations and empowered organizations is relevant here. An empowering organization is one in which an empowering process is occurring; an empowered organization has completed enough of the empowering process to influence its surroundings. Empowering organizations facilitate the confidence and competencies of individual members, while empowered organizations have the ability to influence their environment (Florin & Wandersman, 1990; Zimmerman, 1990).

3b) Empowerment as used by political movements. Empowerment can be (and has been) used by deviant or minority groups to control their destiny. In this way, empowerment is "the process of coming to feel and behave as if one has power [in the sense of autonomy, authority, or control] over significant aspects of one’s life or work" (Kizilos, 1990:49). However, since the focus of my research is at the organizational level and not at the social-political level, I will not expand on the work in the political area.

4) The Misnomers—Bogus Empowerment
The Misnomer category includes approaches which profess to be empowerment but are not. It is discouraging to see how much of the literature actually falls into this category. There appear to be three primary approaches which misuse the term. The first, and most prevalent, occurs primarily in the lay literature; the second is a classic example of "old wine in new bottles;" and the third fits the prevailing trend of being "politically correct." All three categories misuse this term and lack a clear reference to a specific and well defined empowerment construct or process.
4a) *Empowerment as a lay management cliche*. Empowerment is "almost universally acclaimed as a necessary fact of life for a competitive work force in the 1990s" (Kizilos, 1990:51). As with power several decades ago (March, 1966), empowerment is frequently used as an explanation for almost everything. Indeed, empowerment is sometimes used as the new term which explains and resolves many of the social and economic problems we are currently experiencing. For example, empowerment is offered as a solution for increasing customer service (McAuley, 1992) or as a way to reduce the workforce (Conrad, 1992). It is also used as a generic term for attacking subordination of every description (Simon, 1990) and for describing those who shape their own destiny (Kizilos, 1990). Empowerment has become the magic potion for new life, the way to strength for meeting any business challenge. It is prescribed as a treatment to increase creativity, dedication, risk taking, and other organizational performance outcomes. And as enthusiasts believe, industry and competitiveness will be revitalized (Kizilos, 1990).

4b) *Empowerment as old wine in new bottles*. Empowerment is also viewed, sometimes only implicitly, as either an elaboration or a new form of participative management. As the new fad of the 90's, empowerment is similar to what unions were in the 30's, what the human relations movement was in the 50's, what "social action" was in the 60's, what the "self-help" perspectives (Kieffer, 1984) and "participation" were in the 70's, and what "power sharing" was in the 80's. In other words, it is old wine in a new bottle.

One example of this *old wine in a new bottle* use of empowerment is seen in Florin and Wandersman (1990), where they suggest that we can learn about empowerment from studies of citizen participation. Citizen participation is a
process in which "individuals take part in decision making in the institutions, programs and environments that affect them" (Florin & Wandersman 1990:43). Most simply, citizen participation is being renamed empowerment.

Stewart (1989) observes that: "The term 'participatory' crops up again and again as the leaders of corporate America discuss power." Indeed, when some top managers in large organizations describe their empowerment techniques, there is little or no difference between how quality circles or other forms of participation were portrayed and described (Kizilos, 1990). Kizilos (1990:48) quotes Lawler as saying that many of these ideas have been heard before. However, Lawler does suggest that: "there is some evolution in some of the practices that companies are using to support participative management—or democratic management, which it used to be called."

Empowerment is also used in the context of participation in decision making (Zimmerman, 1990; Gruber & Trickett, 1987). Zimmerman and Rappaport (1988:727) suggest that "participation may be an important mechanism for the development of psychological empowerment." They explain the connection between participation and empowerment: "participants can gain experience organizing people, identifying resources, and developing strategies for achieving goals." In their study they found that participation in a community's activities is associated with psychological empowerment. However, others (Rappaport, 1987; Prestby et al., 1990) recognize that participation is only one of the ways toward achieving empowerment. Byham (as cited in Kizilos, 1990:49) attempts to draw a clearer distinction between participative management and empowerment, when he suggests that, "participative management is just that: You ask for people's help. But empowerment is getting them to help themselves." Thus, even though
participating in decision making may be a step along the way to empowerment, it cannot be considered empowerment by itself. Referring to empowerment only as participation results in the paradox that empowerment can mistakenly be viewed as the "CEO who vests power in his subordinate for all to see is, in effect, cloning himself" (Stewart, 1989). Empowerment is far more than cloning one’s employees!

4c) Empowerment as a euphemism for power. The popularity of empowerment is a result of efforts to veer away from the negative connotations of power, but without actually being willing to put in too much effort. In reality, few companies are willing to make the long-term commitment that empowerment implies (Kizilos, 1990). As Reuben Mark from Colgate-Palmolive said: "You should consolidate and build power by empowering others....I don't like to talk about power" (Stewart, 1989:56; emphasis added). Kanter (1979:145) sums up the current general attitude towards power: "Power is America’s last dirty word." Overall, people find the concept of power quite troublesome, "because of its [negative] implications and connotations" (Pfeffer, 1981:2), as a result, they prefer to talk about empowerment.

The use of empowerment as a euphemism for power stems from management’s concern about being politically correct, and does not reflect a real concern about the process or results of empowerment. Block (1987:xviii) takes a more political outlook and suggests that empowerment is a process of "...discovering a positive way of being political" which implies, again, that the term may sometimes be used as a vehicle for a currently unacceptable concept.
Summary
These fourteen empowerment approaches are the main ones found in the empowerment literature. Several themes are repeated across researchers and disciplines including viewing empowerment as related to power, trust, support, and access to resources. In addition, as the three levels of analysis show above, it is clear that empowerment is indeed a multi-level construct (Murrell, 1985; Rappaport, 1987; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990; Zimmerman, 1990; Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988). A common assumption (outside the misnomer category) is that empowerment can be costly and labour-intensive (Kieffer, 1984; Kingston, 1992; Kizilos, 1990) which partially explains why it requires a risk taking commitment (Wolff, 1985). When we keep these issues in mind, the following conclusion is not surprising: "In the struggle towards empowerment, conflict and growth are inextricably intertwined" (Kieffer, 1984:25).

Empowerment has been viewed both as an umbrella term for a multitude of concepts and as a process. The next section explores this distinction and concludes that empowerment is a process. In the following chapter a process model of empowerment will be introduced as well as specific propositions and hypotheses which will then be empirically tested.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Micro Level of Empowerment</th>
<th>The Meso Level of Empowerment</th>
<th>The Macro Level of Empowerment</th>
<th>Empowerment Misnomers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E₁ as a potpourri of family related terms (e.g., Block, 1987; Keiffer, 1984; Zimmerman &amp; Rappaport, 1988).</td>
<td>E₄ as the dictionary defines: Empowerment = granting of power; delegation of authority.</td>
<td>E₁₀ as related to organizational structure (e.g., Conger &amp; Kanungo, 1988; Fawcett, 1984; Murrell, 1990; Rappaport, 1987; Zimmerman, 1990).</td>
<td>E₁₅ as a management cliche (e.g., Allard, 1992; Kizilos, 1990).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E₂ as self-efficacy (e.g., Conger &amp; Kanungo, 1988; Florin &amp; Wandersman, 1990; Kieffer, 1984; Ozer &amp; Bandura, 1990; Spreitzer, 1991).</td>
<td>E₅ as spreading power which results in positive outcomes (e.g., Conger &amp; Kanungo, 1988; Murrell, 1977, 1985; Thomas &amp; Velthouse, 1990).</td>
<td>E₁₁ as political ideology.</td>
<td>E₁₆ as participative management (e.g., Florin &amp; Wandersman, 1990; Gruber &amp; Trickett, 1987; Kizilos, 1990).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E₃ as a derivative of motivation (e.g., Kizilos, 1990; Murrell, 1985; Simon, 1990; Spreitzer, 1991; Thomas &amp; Velthouse, 1990; Thomas, Tymon &amp; Velthouse, 1991; Vogt &amp; Murrell, 1990).</td>
<td>E₆ as socialized power i.e., the positive aspects of power (e.g., Block, 1987; Kieffer, 1984).</td>
<td>E₁₃ as a euphemism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E₇ as the synergistic component of power (e.g., Katz, 1984; Thomas &amp; Velthouse, 1990).</td>
<td>E₈ as infinite power (e.g., Kanter, 1979; Murrell, 1985).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E₉ as trusting relationships (e.g., Culbert &amp; McDonough, 1985; Torre, 1986)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: The Four "M"s of Empowerment
CHAPTER 2
A PROCESS MODEL OF EMPOWERMENT

The prevailing view of empowerment is that it represents an umbrella term for two or more state related constructs (e.g., self-efficacy and self-esteem) which together result in the achievement of personal adjustment, adaptation, mastery, performance, control, and satisfaction. Most of these umbrella terms would fall under the micro level approach of empowerment as a potpourri of related terms (#1a). Basically, this view uses the term empowerment as a personal state or collection of related personal states. As a result, most of the work on empowerment which uses this view focuses on empowerment outcomes, rather than on how to achieve them. Empowerment is often used as though it were synonymous with concepts as varied as "coping skills," "mutual support," "natural support systems," "community organization," "neighbourhood participation," "personal efficacy," "competence," "self-sufficiency," and "self-esteem" (Kieffer, 1984; Price, 1990). Several researchers suggest that empowerment is best defined as the area in which all these ideas intersect (Kieffer, 1984; Zimmerman, 1986; Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988). Within this outlook we find researchers focusing on identifying subsets of concepts and results and calling such a subset empowerment. For example, concepts of perceived personal capacity (e.g., coping skills, competence, self-esteem, etc.) as well as concepts representing externally perceived outcomes (e.g., customer service, performance, adaptation, mastery, etc.) are included. Overall there seems to be a tendency to focus on achieving outcomes when distinguishing if a person has achieved the state of being ‘empowered.’ In other words, the focus tends to be on acquiring a certain situation, condition, or state of some sort either internally or in terms of achieving some external outcome.
However, others, such as Torre (1986:38), claim that: "empowerment is not simply a new term used to describe psychological states marked by positive perceptions of self worth or esteem, self efficacy, and an internal locus of control." Rather, it is a process, and despite the multitude of interrelated concepts, it is important to distinguish that not all forms of support activate the process of empowerment.

The Process Model

This model suggests that empowerment is a process which, in turn, may cause other processes to occur. Process models work at both the individual and community levels (Kieffer, 1984; Rappaport, 1987; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990; Wolff, 1985). Unlike the state model of empowerment, there has been very little work done on empowerment as a process (Price, 1990). The existing process models view empowerment as a process of some sort that brings about achieving goals such as mastery over work or one's general environment (Balcazar et al., 1990; Rappaport, 1984; Swift, 1983-4; Wolff, 1985; Torre, 1986; Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988). Figure 2.1 presents a generic model of how empowerment has been viewed as a process. The process models suggest that there are three main phases to empowerment: antecedents, a process of change, and results. The focus tends to be on psychological, sociological, or business related results, with attempts to explain what and how to change to achieve the process of empowerment.

More specifically, it has been suggested that the empowerment process includes the:

a) generation and distribution of power primarily in the form of access to and control of resources (Rappaport, 1977, 1981; Katz, 1983-4);

b) process of increasing internal locus of control and external responsibility (Hegar, 1989);
c) process of encouraging competencies to emerge (Rappaport, 1984; Balczar et al., 1990);
d) long term process of learning, development, and transformation (Kieffer, 1984); and
e) intra-psychic, interpersonal, and organizational processes that are based on
empowering mechanisms, such as organizational structure, in order to foster
empowerment (Conger & Kanungo, 1988).

The process view of empowerment suggests that more is at stake than just acquiring new
skills. *Empowerment is a transforming and reorienting process constructed through action* (Kieffer, 1984). It is an interactive process through which people with little or no power experience a change which develops their ability to influence decisions and others (Whitmore, 1990). The process models in the literature share the assumption that empowerment is *more than just a state of mind* (Hegar, 1989). However, some (e.g., Zimmerman, 1990) view empowerment as both process and outcome. Nevertheless, both for conceptual clarity and to aid in implementation, we should distinguish between the
empowerment process and its outcomes. In other words, it is important to distinguish between the actual process of change and the results of such change. To do so, a multi-level process model of empowerment will be presented and empirically tested.

**A Multi-Level Process Model of Empowerment**

As a result of the diversity discovered in the empowerment literature, I believe there is a need for a clearer definition of empowerment. We need a definition that will allow people with different perspectives to work together and to further our understanding of the empowerment construct. The following definition of empowerment incorporates some of these perspectives and adds to them.

*Empowerment* is an enhancing and energizing context specific process that expands an individual’s power and feelings of trust, is usually facilitated by another, and results in increased levels of self-esteem, self-efficacy and other characteristics related to personal growth and control, which eventually lead to outcomes such as performance and satisfaction.

Empowerment’s key components are:

1. an interpersonal-interactive process which does not always include direct transfer of resources,
2. a process that develops increased levels of self-growth, which are also mediators for outcomes such as performance, satisfaction, and uplifting experiences,
3. a process resulting in enhanced power, trust and energy to the individual and, with time, to the system as a whole,
4. a process that brings to realization a person’s existing positive potential,
5 - a process that is context specific. Particular contexts may involve different components that are related to the empowerment process; e.g., empowering different organization position holders such as first-line supervisors, staff professionals, etc. (Kanter, 1979).

The empowerment process definition presented here, developed as a result of integration and assimilation of literature from several disciplines, is relatively close to Torre's (1986:18) definition. Her work relies on investigating both academic and laymen's perceptions of the term. She suggests that empowerment is "a process through which people become strong enough to participate within, share in the control of, and influence events and institutions affecting their lives...[It] necessitates that people gain particular skills, knowledge, and sufficient power...."

However, Torre's (1986:36) work is quite global and relates explicitly to political systems: "The empowerment process appears to involve the micro system (interactions between individuals), mediating structures (interactions within collectives, neighbourhoods, communities), and the macro structure (economic system, and cultural ideology)." Such a broad outlook does not serve us well for investigating and understanding the meaning of empowerment within a work context. It is primarily at the meso level (as defined here) that we will gain the most insight and benefit for understanding the process of empowerment within the workplace. For these reasons we retain the currently proposed definition, which also considers key parts of the empowerment process itself.

A successful empowerment process requires changes in the organization's structure, in its communication system and content, and in its pattern of functioning. Clearly, this is a complex process. The process model of empowerment proposed here differs from
current models, primarily in its comprehensiveness. This model belongs to the family of process models but focuses on both how the empowerment process achieves the outcomes and how currently known constructs interact in this context.

This definition of empowerment emphasizes that empowerment is a process that expands an individual’s power, and that is mediated by constructs such as self-esteem and self-efficacy. The process results from changes in contextual and environmental variables such as information, structure, and responsibility. These variables exist only within interactive relations. The process of empowerment involves, in general, the relations and interactions with people, as well as the structural issues, that are part of a person’s environment.

Structural issues are basic to the process of empowerment; without them, previous reinforcement pressures will continue to mold people and their feelings. In addition, inherent to the successful process of empowerment is a sharing of enabling values (Florin & Wandersman, 1990; Rappaport, 1987). It has already been suggested (Kizilos, 1990) that, for the process of empowerment to occur, employees should be encouraged to examine their own values and beliefs. However, this is not a top-down process (Beer, 1991) and such values must also be embraced by the organization as a whole. Overall, structure and values are critical to the process of empowerment in the workplace; without them, any attempt for change will be quickly blocked, either for structural reasons or for lack of support at the both the inter (meso) and intra-personal (micro) levels.

In addition to these two environmental components of structure and values, three

---

3 As mentioned, such intra-psychic constructs have been considered by some (e.g., Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Spreitzer, 1991) as part of the construct of empowerment. However, here they are considered as mediators and not as an integral part of the construct.
relational factors were identified as comprising the impetus for the empowerment process. These three elements—responsibility (i.e., being in charge of making something happen), information (i.e., the transfer of knowledge and data), and active belief (i.e., expressed trust and confidence)—are underlying themes in much of the work relating to empowerment, primarily in an interactive context such as we would find in an organization. For the purposes of this dissertation, only these three components will be manipulated. This focus is necessary as both organizational structure and organizational values are global aspects of an organization and constitute a myriad of different elements. Organizational structure and values are influenced by factors such as technology, culture (both corporate and national), and industry, which at this early stage may be difficult to segregate. In addition, since the empirical part of this dissertation attempts to investigate causal relations in the empowerment process, it would have been tricky, at this early stage, to manipulate and measure all components of the model.

Information, responsibility, and active belief are, relatively speaking, amenable to change. While structure and values are important factors, changes in the empowerment components of information, responsibility, and active belief are sufficient for instigating the empowerment process, so long as the more global factors are not constraining. These three components all share in common the fact that, while they are usually achieved in interactive relationships, a person can also influence them personally. This last consideration—of the individual’s ability to play an important role in the empowerment process—is an important and meaningful element to consider in the process of empowerment (e.g., Murrell, 1985).

The Multi-Level Process Model of Empowerment (see Figure 2.2) includes the empowerment process, its outcomes, as well as how the process is mediated. The model’s intra-psychic mediators help explain why the results of the empowerment process
Empowerment Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Belief</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intra-psychic Mediators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Work Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.2: The Multi-Level Process Model of Empowerment

may not be uniform across all individuals. For, as Bernard recognized, despite the tendency to try and depersonalize the individual in an organizational setting, the individual "brings his whole self to the organization" (Wolf, 1974:68). Thus, the individual’s intra-psychic situation will be the conduit of the empowerment process. In contrast, previous models have included only parts of this present model. As mentioned, some models have focused on related states, while others have focused more specifically on empowerment as a process (Figure 2.1).

As some models of empowerment suggest (e.g., Britt, 1991; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990), empowerment is cyclical in nature. Once the process is activated, it then triggers a subset of other processes, such as enhancing self efficacy. These mediating processes enable the achievement of other outcomes, such as satisfaction and performance, which in turn influence the intra-psychic mediators, as well as affecting how the process of empowerment will continue (see Figure 2.3). Note, however, that for work outcomes to be affected the mediators must also be changed, even though the work outcomes may directly influence the components that instigated the process of change. However, in this
dissertation the focus is on the process: Empowerment → Mediators → Work Outcomes. This conceptualization of empowerment leads to the following proposition:

P1: The process of empowerment leads to increased levels of:
   1a. intra-psychic mediators such as self-efficacy and self-esteem, as well as changes in locus of control;
   1b. performance and job satisfaction.

It is important to recognize that directly manipulating only the intra-psychic mediators may result in changes in short term work outcomes. The overall process of empowerment involves a change in the person’s interactive/relational settings. A change in only the intra-psychic mediators will result in less effective outcomes. If the change is only internal the environmental process which continually influences the intra-psychic components may overcome the positive internal process, or at the very least cause dissonance or dissatisfaction. However, a change in the organizational or interpersonal structure will lead to more effective changes in the work outcomes. The environmental
change leads to the positive process that continually acts to build and strengthen the intra-psychic factors, which, in turn, influence work outcomes.

The process of empowerment affects work-related outcomes via the intra-psychic mediators. The change in the mediators is not the process of empowerment; rather, this is a sub-process. The mediators are only part of the process explaining why changes in the work context cause developments in the work outcomes. Once the work outcomes change, the mediators will remain at the new levels only if the environmental settings continue to evolve in the new state (which occurred as a result of the process of empowerment). These changes in the environmental settings can not be static if the empowerment outcomes are to be maintained. In addition, changes in the person's work environment must continue to be dynamic and adaptive to new needs and requirements, since a one-time occurrence of organizational change is not sufficient for changes in intra-psychic mediators and work outcomes to be maintained. Thus:

P2: For the process of empowerment, and for increased levels of intra-psychic mediators and work outcomes to occur and remain, the person's work environment must continually change.

In research terms, the dependent variables are work outcomes (e.g. effectiveness and performance) and job satisfaction. The mediating variables are the intra-psychic variables. In other words, we have outcomes at two levels: The first level empowerment outcomes are intra-psychic, and can be viewed as mediators of the empowerment process; the second level empowerment outcomes are work level outcomes, such as satisfaction and job performance. Thus, the proposed model can be operationalized as shown in Table 2.1, after which the three components of information, active belief, and responsibility will be discussed.
Information Availability/Restriction

The idea that information is important to the well-being of both the individual and the system is not new. Eric Trist and his associates at the Tavistock Institute have contributed to developing our understanding of the importance of 'open socio-technical systems.' Under this conceptualization, the organization is seen as an organism engaged in a dynamic interchange with its environment. This view requires a focus on the larger, external system of the organization, which essentially depends on frequent and open flow of information within the organization. The more complex the system, the more it depends on the transmission of information (Scott, 1992:77) and on the fact that information helps to reduce uncertainty (Scott, 1992:134). Trist suggested that, in turbulent environments (a condition many companies are currently experiencing)
individuals and units will achieve the best results if they are self-regulating and carry redundancy within them. In other words, individuals and units should have access to the flow of information within the organization—regardless of their specific job. The result of this is that "for the individual they create roles rather than mere jobs...." (Pugh, Hickson, and Hinnings, 1988:89). In turn, superior results, both in terms of organizational performance and quality of working life, will be achieved.

The American College Dictionary (1958) defines information as "knowledge communicated or received concerning some fact or circumstance; knowledge on various subjects, however acquired; the act of informing; the state of informing." This definition includes both the transfer of information and the actual action of providing or acquiring information. Daft (1989:309) also adds the distinction between data and information. In his view, data are tangible and can be counted and do not become information unless people use them to improve their understanding, while information "alters or reinforces understanding...is not tangible or measurable... provides insight and is perceived as useful by the receiver" (Daft, 309). Here, we will use a broad concept of information that combines data and information. In other words, information is important to the process of empowerment, even if there is no immediate or direct impact on the understanding or on the insight of the receiver. For information to contribute to the process of empowerment it does not need to influence the receiver directly. On the contrary, frequently the information may be of no value to the receiver other than the very value of having access to it.

Information relates to both power and trust. The possessor of information has power over others who do not possess that information. The person who receives information needs to trust the source of information, since this information may influence how s/he views a certain issue/problem/situation. In addition, since information is a source of power
(Pfeffer, 1992), and, as a result the "owner" of such information has power, there must be a relationship of trust that such power will not be abused. A truthful sharing of information may develop trust and the sharing of power. Withholding or misrepresenting information can result in sabotaging trust. With respect to empowerment as a process that relates to both power and trust the following propositions are presented:

\[ P3a_{(i)}: \text{Increasing the information available to the individual promotes the process of empowerment.} \]

The converse is also true:

\[ P3a_{(ii)}: \text{Decreasing and restricting the information available to the individual will reduce and inhibit the process of empowerment. At times, reducing information will result in an inhibition of the process of empowerment, and may result in dis-empowerment.} \]

**Active Belief**

Active belief is defined as actively sending both verbal and behavioral signals expressing one's "trust or confidence in some person or thing" (Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, 1987:142). It includes being actively engaged in expressing faith, optimism, implicit encouragement, and is non-defence evoking. Specifically, the importance of one's positive expectation on another's performance has been shown within a variety of contexts (e.g., Eden & Shani, 1982; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968). These studies of self-fulfilling prophecies focus on what has been termed the "Pygmalion effect" which, in the organizational context, occurs when a subordinate's performance improves as a result of a manager's rising performance expectations (Eden, 1990). This effect entails several variables, including interpersonal expectancy, communication, leadership, self-expectancy, motivation, and performance (Eden, 1984). In addition, perceptions of control over outcomes directly relate to the size of the effect (Jussim, 1986). Thus, the self-fulfilling prophecies at work include these key components: the supervisor's
expectations, the subordinate’s belief that his/her behaviour will lead to the desired outcome, and, in addition, the subordinate’s belief in his/her ability to achieve the necessary behaviours (i.e. self-efficacy). When one considers that learned helplessness occurs when a person believes their actions do not affect outcomes (Abramson et al., 1978), it becomes apparent just how important these issues are for empowerment.

In one of the few application papers on the topic, Eden (1990:38) emphasizes the importance of consistency in raising performance expectations. In addition, he warns that "merely telling clients to raise their expectations will not work. Expectation-raising must be embedded in a consulting process." This implies that words, on their own, especially when randomly and erratically applied, will not achieve the goal of higher performance. What is necessary are deliberate and systemic approaches aimed at revealing untapped skills and abilities among subordinates.

However, focusing only on the Pygmalion effect implies that employees are somewhat passive and easily manipulated. Indeed, increasing employees’ self-expectations is also necessary for empowerment. Eden (1990) called this the Galatea’ effect. Thus we have a dual process: the Pygmalion-Galatea effect. Pygmalion achieves higher performance as a result of supervisors’ higher expectations of subordinate performance while Galatea achieves the same result by increasing subordinates’ self-expectations. To do both, managers must "purposely fulfil the role of Pygmalion and effectively treat their subordinates as Galateas" (Eden, 1990:41). This can be done by setting realistic and challenging objectives, as well as "clearing the record" (Eden, 1990:44). In a sense, a new shared positive vision, created and maintained by high, yet realistic, expectations is being created.

---

5 The term is coined after the ivory image of Aphrodite, created by Pygmalion, which came to life after Pygmalion’s pleadings and prayers (Graves, 1960).
The importance of support from significant others (which has also been well documented in other contexts, e.g., House, 1981) seems to be an underlying theme in the empowerment literature. However, it is not always clear who the significant others are. Part of social support is the concept of collective positive image (Cooperrider, 1990) which supports the notion of support as having a gestalt-like quality.

Walter and Marks' (1981:91) definition of social support lends itself well to the work presented here: They define social support as "physical, emotional, or symbolic contribution to individuals increasing their net stockpile of emotional capacity to cope with change." They view support as enabling change. This is not to say that social support causes change, but rather that it allows and facilitates change. As defined here, empowerment is a process of change. Thus it should come as no surprise that one of the key components to this process is the availability of social support—i.e., the availability of contributions to an individual's positive coping and growth adapting capabilities.

Developing trust in empowerment has strong ties with this component of active belief. For example, Holmes and Rempel (1989) suggest that trust develops in relationships with behavioral predictability, particularly if the partners send each other stable, positive messages regarding convergent interests. However, it is not enough that Person A is nice, Person B must also perceive that Person A is acting in such a way because Person A cares. In addition, it is important to acknowledge people's particular needs and affirm their sense of worth. Although Holmes and Rempel (1989) refer to close relationships (e.g., a couple), the same may be true in work relationships. Reducing uncertainty in the working relationship can make people more responsive.

P3b(i): Having members of the individual's environment actively expressing their belief in the person and showing encouragement and faith in the individual's potential and capabilities, will enhance the process of empowerment.
If members of the individual's environment do not actively express their belief in the person, or if they express their doubts in the individual's capabilities, the process of empowerment will be stunted.

Responsibility

Several categories at the meso level of empowerment refer to the different aspects of both power and trust. Power is clearly a relational construct. One cannot have power without two people, or objects upon whom/which one can act. The same is true for trust. Both power and trust include a component of responsibility. Responsibility refers to the state of being in charge of making something happen, it is the "personal causal influence upon an event" (Cummings & Anton, 1988:2). Responsibility has two parts: (1) felt responsibility, which is the cognitive and/or emotional acceptance of responsibility, or (2) accountability. Accountability is the "calling to give accounts (excuses or justifications) to another (or others) for deviation between the event for which one is responsible and organizational expectations or norms."

In situations where one person has responsibility for all decisions and actions, that person automatically has power over others. Trust depends on agreement as to how responsibility is divided. For example, a subordinate who does not think that his/her manager is able to make a certain technical decision will not trust whatever decision is made—unless s/he is part of the decision making process.

The role of responsibility in the process of empowerment has been neglected by academics and is recognized here primarily in response to and as a result of the emphasis of practitioners. However, its roots can also be found in the organizational literature. McGregor (1957) suggested that individuals not only accept responsibility, but also seek it. In his work on "Theory Y," McGregor emphasized that this readiness is present in all people and that "it is a responsibility of management to make it possible for people to
recognize and develop" (Shafritz & Hyde, 1987:260). He also adds that, "the essential
task of management is to arrange organizational conditions and methods of operation so
that people can achieve their own goals." This last statement clearly strengthens the view
taken here that it is management's role to ensure that the organization does not inhibit,
but rather, promotes the process of empowerment.

An additional factor which contributes to the importance of responsibility in the context
of empowerment is trust. Consider the assertion that trust (which is key to
empowerment) increases as one sees the other making a sacrifice of self-interest, or
accepting risk (Holmes & Rempel, 1989). Thus, giving a subordinate responsibility
within an organization sometimes necessitates the supervisor assuming some
risk—especially in the initial stages of a job. If the subordinate realizes that risk is being
incurred, directly or indirectly for their personal development, trust may develop. In turn,
the likelihood that the subordinate will be willing to take gambles (e.g., as one would in
innovative behaviours) should increase.

Thus, when we refer to responsibility in the context of empowerment, we can easily see
how it relates to all three levels. At the micro level, the individual is, at the very least,
responsible for being open to opportunities. At the macro level, the organization is
responsible for being open to risk and creating opportunities for its members. As
previously mentioned, power and trust (both occurring at the meso level) contain elements
of responsibility. There is an element of responsibility in all interactive relations.
Responsibility and accountability have direct influence on power and trust (e.g., if there
is no agreement as to how responsibility or accountability are divided). However, as
Thier (1992) found in her work with managers, responsibility and accountability do not
always have to be equally weighted in all situations. Managers need to refrain from
overwhelming subordinates with immediate full accountability for all their new areas of
responsibility. The following propositions relate responsibility to empowerment:

P3c(i): Providing the individual with opportunities for increased responsibility (without burdening them with too much accountability) will enhance the empowerment process.

P3c(ii): Not providing the individual with opportunities for increased responsibility will inhibit the empowerment process.

However, at the current stage of exploration we are unable to predict if each of the above components is enough to trigger and sustain the process of empowerment. As a result, this study will investigate only the following propositions:

P3a(i),b(i),c(i): The three empowerment components—information, active belief, and responsibility—together will produce and enhance the process of empowerment.

P3a(ii),b(ii),c(ii): Without the three empowerment components—information, active belief, and responsibility—we will not see the empowerment process occurring.

Proposition 3a,b,c, together with proposition 1, lead to the main hypotheses of this research investigation:

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Increasing the three empowerment components (information, active belief, and responsibility) will result in an increase in the levels of three key mediating mechanisms and in the work outcome levels.

This hypothesis can be broken down to the following sub-hypotheses:

H1a: Increased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility will result in an increase in the measured intra-psychic mediators: self-efficacy, self-esteem, and locus of control.

H1b: Increased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility will result in an increase in the measured level of work outcomes: initiative, sensitivity, planning
and organizing, delegation, problem analysis, decisiveness, judgment, administrative control, and job satisfaction.

H1a(0): Decreased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility will result in a decrease in the measured intra-psychic mediators: self-efficacy, self-esteem, and locus of control.

H1b(0): Decreased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility will result in a decrease in the measured level of work outcomes: initiative, sensitivity, planning and organizing, delegation, problem analysis, decisiveness, judgment, administrative control, and job satisfaction.

This study tests these hypotheses in a simulation, described in detail in the next chapter, on three groups: the Empowered group, the Dis-empowered group and the Control group. The Empowered group will receive increased levels of the independent variables (information, active belief, and responsibility) and the Dis-empowered group will receive decreased levels of these variables. The control group will also be observed over time, with no changes in the independent variables. The manipulation of the three independent variables will be accomplished through the use of a series of in-basket tasks. The above hypotheses predict that the best results will be achieved by the Empowered group, the worst in the Dis-empowered group.

These hypotheses can be further broken down by the eight specific work outcome measures (1) initiative; (2) sensitivity; (3) planning and organizing; (4) delegation; (5) administrative control; (6) problem analysis; (7) judgement; and (8) decisiveness as collected by the in-basket tasks, as well as by job-satisfaction. Thus hypotheses H1b and H1b(0) can each be further subdivided into nine hypotheses, as follows:

H1b1: Increased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility will result in an increase in the measured level of initiative.

H1b(0)1: Decreased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility will result in a
decrease in the measured level of initiative.

H1b_2: Increased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility will result in an increase in the measured level of sensitivity.

H1b_02: Decreased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility will result in a decrease in the measured level of sensitivity.

H1b_3: Increased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility will result in an increase in the measured level of planning and organizing.

H1b_03: Decreased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility will result in a decrease in the measured level of planning and organizing.

H1b_4: Increased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility will result in an increase in the measured level of delegation.

H1b_04: Decreased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility will result in a decrease in the measured level of delegation.

H1b_5: Increased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility will result in an increase in the measured level of problem analysis.

H1b_05: Decreased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility will result in a decrease in the measured level of problem analysis.

H1b_6: Increased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility will result in an increase in the measured level of decisiveness.

H1b_06: Decreased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility will result in a decrease in the measured level of decisiveness.

H1b_7: Increased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility will result in an increase in the measured level of judgement.

H1b_07: Decreased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility will result in a decrease in the measured level of judgement.

H1b_8: Increased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility will result in an increase in the measured level of administrative control.
H1b(08): Decreased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility will result in a decrease in the measured level of administrative control.

H1b(9): Increased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility will result in an increase in the measured level of job-satisfaction.

H1b(09): Decreased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility will result in a decrease in the measured level of job-satisfaction.

Activating the Empowerment Process

Frequently the process of empowerment is activated by a crisis. The crisis serves to 'unfreeze' the situation (Lewin, 1958). This is the first step in the process of change. An example of such an 'unfreezing' crisis could be a career transition. All transitions lack ready solutions, while at the same time place demands on the person to cope with new people, tasks and situations. Only after the career transition occurs (i.e., the change which allows for unfreezing to take place) will the person begin the adaptation and stabilization process. It is during the period of unfreezing that empowerment should begin.

Another widespread crisis event which provides opportunities to instigate an empowerment process are economic difficulties. For example, in 1986 when the Ste-Therese General Motors plant was about to be closed down, major changes by both union and management occurred. Since then, both sides are aware that "a committed work force and a flexible factory offer the best hope of a future" (Pritchard, 1992:B28). For effective empowerment to occur, it is best that the process begin immediately or in close proximity to the crisis event. Empowerment is an appropriate response to crisis events since it is "a process, a mechanism by which people...gain mastery over their affairs" (Rappaport, 1987:122).
Companies have generally tried the following three approaches to empowering employees (Kizilos, 1990:49):

a) Encourage information sharing, resource sharing and participative management through formal and informal changes in organization design,

b) Encourage employees to examine their own values and beliefs concerning autonomy and behaviour,

c) Teach employees to enhance their communication and influencing skills.

However, as already suggested, few companies are willing to make the long term commitment that is necessary for an empowerment process to be successful, and there is very little work that actually documents empowerment, even in the short-term. It is not within the scope of this dissertation to investigate and elaborate on all components of the full empowerment cycle. Nevertheless, a brief description of how the proposed research fits within the cycle of empowerment is in order.

In general, the empowerment process will most likely occur at the meso and macro levels, while most of the initial outcomes occur at the micro level (see Figure 2.4). Most of the overt components of the empowerment process occur in the interactive (meso) realm which is the level at which subordinate-leader interactions occur. For example, Ansari and Kapoor (1987:47) found that how individuals respond to their managers depends on the interaction between the manager and the individual. They conclude that individuals "receive messages and cues from different sources in the social environment, which form the basis for their perception." They also found that individuals vary their strategies on the basis of the specific goals they seek—yet another relational issue.

For the empowerment process to occur at the meso level, the surrounding structures (macro) must not inhibit their emergence. The results, such as aspects of self-growth, are
first seen within the individual. However, as Torre (1986) suggests, empowerment is an iterative developmental process, involving change at all ecological levels. With time we will also find the empowerment outcomes at both the meso and macro levels. In other words, we will observe a cycle of empowerment.

P11: Under the proper conditions (e.g. no structural constraints) empowerment is a cyclical process which, with time, will bring change to all levels of the organization.

The empowerment cycle should lead to synergistic outcomes. Empowerment is a commodity that should grow with use; the more the process occurs, the more people will be affected. Again, with time these effects at the meso level should spread to the macro level and affect the organization’s structure. This staggered process of outcome development may be part of the reason why empowerment is such a lengthy process. Empowerment is a continual cycle with interdependence among the different levels (see Figure 2.4) and for a complete understanding of the empowerment process all levels need to be considered (Rappaport, 1987). However, as the description above suggests, these reciprocal and interdependent influences (presented in Figure 2.4 as two-headed arrows) are not always active at the same time or to the same extent. For example, in the initial stages of the process, we will probably find that connections A and C are primarily uni-directional from the meso and macro levels to the micro level.

P12: The synergistic characteristics of empowerment results in increased levels of the whole process. In other words, if we were to draw a function of empowerment it would be an exponential curve.

For a complete understanding of the empowerment cycle all three reciprocal relations (i.e., the double headed arrows A, B and C in Figure 2.4) need to be investigated. Such a study would require a longitudinal investigation at all three levels of analysis. However,
initially we can benefit by exploring the influence of the interactive relational variables (within an individual’s work environment) on the individual’s intra-psychic and work related outcomes.

![Figure 2.4: The Interactive Nature of the Process of Empowerment](image)

This would be but the first stage in a stream of research on understanding how empowerment works and the impact it has on individuals and organizations. As we increase our understanding of the process, we should also explore the influence empowerment has on the organization’s structure (rather than what we focus on now—the influence of organizational structure on empowerment), and on the organization’s human resource management practices.

However, first we must empirically investigate the influence of the meso level (interactive/relational) on the micro level (intra-psychic mediators) and on the work outcomes. As described in the next chapter, to control for the multitude of possible
competing hypotheses (i.e., experimental noise), this model will be examined within a simulation setting.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

Design Overview

A managerial simulation was used to investigate the empowerment model presented in the previous section. The hypotheses were tested in a between-subjects, pre-test post-test design. The experiment included three groups: a control group and two manipulation groups. The manipulation groups included an "empowerment" group and a "dis-empowerment" group. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the three groups. The empowerment and dis-empowerment manipulations consisted of manipulating information, active belief, and responsibility within the context of an in-basket simulation. The dependent variables consisted of work outcomes as identified by the in-basket task dimensions and by a short job satisfaction questionnaire. In addition, the intra-psychic mediators (self-efficacy, self-esteem, and locus of control) were measured prior to and at the very end of the experiment. In total, participants completed three in-baskets during three sessions over a span of three weeks. Using Cook and Campbell's (1979) notation the design was as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
R & \quad O_1 & \quad O_2 \\
R & \quad O_1 & \quad X_1 & \quad O_2 \\
R & \quad O_1 & \quad X_2 & \quad O_2
\end{align*}
\]
Subjects

Participants were recruited from the University of British Columbia MBA student population. Students were informed, via posters and notices in their mailboxes (or in the case of the evening MBA students, a mailing to their home address) that they would be provided with the opportunity to participate in a new "hands-on" experience for developing managerial effectiveness. The initial notice for the program was written following Dillman's (1978:165) guidelines for cover letters. Care was taken to compose the letter in a short, catchy, and bias free manner (see Appendix 1).

Class announcements of the program were made in early February (1993). During the class announcements the program was presented as an opportunity provided exclusively to the students by the Professional Development Programs and MBA offices in conjunction with researchers from the faculty. Using the table in the pamphlet (see Appendix 2), the presenter briefly explained and described the several stages of the program. Participants were informed that in order to take part in this developmental experience they must commit to all three management simulation sessions. In addition, it was explained that only those who completed all three management simulation sessions would be eligible for the half-day effectiveness workshop and personal feedback. As part of the sign-up process, students were requested to commit to three time slots from the available choices as well as to record their phone numbers.

In total, it is estimated that all 280 full-time MBA students and approximately half of the 160 part-time MBA students were informed directly and provided with an opportunity to sign-up for this program. The remaining portion of the part-time students received the original notice but may not have received a class-time sign-up opportunity. Due to the high response rate, participants were encouraged to write more than one preferred time
per session. In total, 189 students signed-up for the program, 177 arrived for the first session (6%) attrition, 165 completed the second session (7% attrition), and 135 completed the third and final session (18% attrition), for a total attrition rate of 29%. During the last week of the data collection period, it was discovered that the students had received several unexpected assignments, which explains in part the increased attrition rate. The 135 participants who completed all three session had a mean age of 27.13, 38% were female and 62% were male.

Several important precautions were taken in order to ensure the planned course of the study:

a. All students received a phone call prior to each upcoming session;
b. At the end of each session students were reminded that a master list of session appointments was in the room, should they wish to verify their next session;
c. Two back-up people were trained to step in as data collection administrators at any time throughout the program, should the need arise; and
d. Participants received a contact number which they could use should they need to change their scheduled sessions. Since participants could go to any of the available sessions, regardless of the manipulation group they had been randomly assigned to, no complications arose as a result of the requested session changes.

The first and last precautions were very important, especially for the third session. Because of the unexpected time pressure many students felt at school, a higher attrition rate was avoided by being able to recognize the problem and make the necessary scheduling adjustments.
Procedure

In general, participants took part in three session over three weeks, for a total of four hours. In order to increase ecological validity, an attempt was made to simulate as much as possible, a business setting. Since this program was presented as a MBA-PDP program, permission was secured to use the Executive Training facilities for the first two weeks of the program. Since most of the procedure focuses on the in-basket, a description of the nature of this instrument will be provided here.

In-basket exercises are a popular assessment, training, selection, and research tool (Schippmann et al., 1990). Since the first in-basket exercise was developed by Frederiksen, Saunders, and Wand (1957), this tool has been used in a variety of settings and has been carefully examined. In general, during an in-basket procedure the individual is cast in the role of a supervisor or manager of a fictitious organization. The participant is then requested to respond, within a limited time period, to a set of letters and memos that have accumulated on the fictitious person’s desk. Information regarding the role and the organization are also provided (Tett & Jackson, 1990). Despite the debate in the literature regarding in-basket validity and reliability (for a review see Schippmann et al., 1990), the major weakness of this research and evaluation instrument seems to be its "complex, tedious scoring process" (Harlos, 1992:4), which is also the main impediment to the widespread use of in-baskets (Hakstian et al., 1986). However, one of the biggest assets of in-baskets as managerial simulation is their high face validity (Hakstian et al., 1986) which makes it easier for subjects to become involved in the situation and to assume the role presented to them (Crooks, 1968; Hakstian et al., 1986). As a result, "behaviour elicited in this situation is more likely to be a projection of the subject’s usual response in real life" (Crooks, 1968:5). It may be of interest to the reader that despite the wide and broad use of the in-basket technique, to the extent of the
In this study, the sensitivity of the in-basket exercise was used to demonstrate the subtle effects of the manipulation process. In-baskets can be so sensitive that "one item can introduce stress that will affect responses on all the other items" (Crooks, 1968:5). For example, Crooks (1968) describes one in-basket exercise which included a confidential memo from the new manager's superior suggesting that the plant was in trouble and was being considered for shutdown. Because the mention of a plant shutdown introduced a significant bias on subject's responses, the memo was subsequently revised to delete the mention of plant shutdown, and instead merely asked the new manager to explore the problem and come up with a recommendation. This change was enough to substantially reduce the bias.

Returning to the sequence of events participants experienced in this study: Upon arrival for the initial session all participants were greeted and instructed to choose a seat where paper clips and blank paper were provided. This approach was used as a method to space the participants for maximum comfort. After all participants were seated a brief introduction was given which reminded them of the sequence of three sessions and of the task they would be doing as well as some of the benefits they could receive. Participants then received their individualized envelopes (each person had an envelope allocated to them, with his or her name on it) and were instructed to begin with "Packet 1." Packet 1 included, a request for confidentiality and consent, demographic information (in order to determine whether there were any cultural biases), a short written description putting the participant in a specific organizational setting which was essentially a summary of the
role s/he would be assuming during the simulation sessions⁶, and mediator scales (an amalgamation of self-efficacy, self-esteem, and locus of control instruments). (A complete version of Packet 1 is presented in Appendix 14.) After all participants completed this packet they were instructed to begin with the in-basket exercise, for which a total of 45 minutes was allotted.

This procedure was essentially repeated for all three sessions. The only difference between the first and second sessions was that the second session was shorter, since participants completed only a 45 minute in-basket exercise which was a continuation of the first simulation session. At the end of the second session, participants were reminded not to talk with others about these sessions. In addition, they were reminded that the third session would be longer and would be the critical one for their feedback evaluations.

At the beginning of the third session, participants were again reminded that this was the critical in-basket and the instructions were read aloud. To ensure confidentiality, the in-basket was placed in an unmarked envelope inside a personalized one. The in-baskets were later numbered and then scored. The procedure for the last in-basket also differed in that participants were provided with the company’s memo paper.

After participants completed the in-basket exercise, they were informed where they could sign-up for the feedback session as well as for the final workshop. Next, they were instructed to begin with "Packet 2" which was in their individualized envelopes. This packet included the in-basket’s participant report form, the mediator questionnaire, and the manipulation check. (A complete version of Packet 2 is presented in Appendix 15.)

Participants who completed all three sessions were reminded of the opportunity to

⁶ The purpose of this description was to ensure that the items tapping into the mediating variables would be doing so at the appropriate level, while at the same time not giving them too much information so as not to influence the manipulation.
participate in a Managerial Effectiveness Workshop, as well as receiving their personal feedback information. During the half-day Managerial Effectiveness Workshop participants were fully debriefed. This debriefing included a description of the study as well as a presentation of the theory examined in this dissertation. In addition, two consultants related the in-basket experience and the empowerment process to their experiences in the corporate world. Overall, based on the ratings participants gave both the workshop and the program as a whole, they were satisfied with both the experience and the learning that had occurred. On a 5 point scale, anchored by "Deficient" (=1) and "Excellent" (=5), 24 workshop participants (from a total of 29)\(^7\) gave the Effectiveness Workshop a mean rating of 4.35 (SD=.52). These participants also evaluated the simulation sessions with a mean rating of 3.88 (SD=.59). (A copy of the evaluation form is presented in Appendix 16.) In addition, the overall comments that participants reported at the end of the third session, and before the workshop or personal feedback were provided, were quite positive (question #8 in Appendix 10). Prevalent were comments relating to the relevance and insight gained from the in-basket items. For example, statements such as the following were common:

"I found them (the in-baskets) useful and realistic...they gave an indication of some of the constraints for managers. The program will also be useful in terms of possible attendance at assessment centres."

"I don't have any previous experience and this was a great learning experience."

"Very interesting, reminds me a little of my job except more intense...I liked it."

"Excellent, very good opportunity to see how I responded to time constraints and difficult situations."

"(I) got a feel of what it is like to be a manager in a large corporation."

"Exhausting."

\(^7\) The relatively small number of workshop participants was due to the fact that it was provided after all students completed their final exams by which time many people had left town.
Manipulation

The manipulation for empowerment or dis-empowerment was embedded within the three in-basket exercises. The first two in-baskets were modified combinations of two existing in-basket exercises—creativity (Shalley, 1991) and risk (Tse et al., 1988). These two were chosen because they differ in their format from the Organizational Performance Dimensions (OPD) exercise, which was used in the final session and therefore they would not "prime" participants for the third and final in-basket. The third, and last, exercise was the in-basket in which the dependent variables (job satisfaction and work performance) were measured. This in-basket was developed by Organizational Performance Dimensions\(^8\), its psychometric properties are reported in the Measures section. To increase face validity and to ensure that participants did not recognize that the three in-baskets were developed separately, continuity was built into the three sessions by modifying the in-baskets so that names, rank, and situations fit a common organization. In addition, an attempt was made to vary the writing styles in the memos, including the use of colloquialism, so as to enhance the sense of realism.

Participants took part in three simulations in order to emulate the passage of time, which as suggested in chapter 1 is critical to the process of empowerment. Manipulations were imbedded in all three in-baskets (i.e. they occurred throughout the three sessions). In the last session most of the manipulations were developed by adding items which did not directly affect the in-basket items which were being evaluated. In other words, the manipulations in the forms of information, responsibility, or active belief were presented so there was no relation between them and the decision the participant needed to make on any one specific in-basket item. As a result, the manipulation groups had slightly

---

\(^8\) I would like to thank Organizational Performance Dimensions for their generous assistance in allowing me to use their in-basket exercise for my dissertation research.
longer in-baskets. For this reason the control group received a short article from PC Magazine so that they were kept "busy" while the two manipulation groups read through the additional memos. The manipulations were developed as coming both from people who were above and below the individual in the organizational hierarchy. The manipulations included providing or censoring general company information, sharing or withholding responsibility, and actively providing or reserving indications of trust, faith, and belief in the person’s knowledge and abilities. Some of the manipulations were quite explicit while others were developed primarily using style of response. As a sample, the first of the three sessions can be found in Appendix 13.

Overall, there were multiple manipulations for each of the three components (information, responsibility, and active belief). In the first session the manipulation occurred 18 times during the one hour session. In the second session the manipulation occurred 21 times during the 45 minute session. In the last session the manipulation occurred 27 times during the 90 minute session, as well as every time a memo was written. This last manipulation was created by preparing different memos for each of the manipulation groups. Every time the participant wrote a memo a manipulation occurred because in the dis-empowered group, participants were forced to cross out the former incumbent’s name and to write in their own, while in the empowerment group they had their own personalized memo paper. Since the dependent variables were measured by participants’ performance on this third in-basket, manipulation items were placed towards the beginning of the simulation so that they would have an impact on the entire set of items, and not on only one or two of the items.

As part of developing the manipulation it was both pre-tested and pilot-tested. First the purpose and process of the pre-test will be described and then the reader will be presented with a brief description of the pilot-test.
Pre-test

The purpose of the pre-test sample was to show discriminant validity and to alleviate any concern that the manipulation items were drawing upon constructs other than the ones they were supposed to manipulate. In other words, this pre-test sample was intended to verify that items used in the manipulation truly represented the three categories of active belief, information, and responsibility. To confirm their association with these categories a technique similar to the Q-sort methodology was employed. Two expert judges were chosen. One of the judges was a faculty member in the area of organizational behaviour from an American university in the Pacific Northwest. The other judge was a middle manager with a large American software company. A sample of the manipulation items was randomly selected and each manipulation set (where a set included both the empowered and the dis-empowered version of an item) was presented on a separate sheet of paper. In addition, items were developed for three "bogus" categories (mood, values, and goal setting) and these items were added to the pool of manipulation sets. In total, each judge received 33 item sets, an organizational chart representing the organization's structure, and definitions for all six categories. The definitions were as follows:

1) Mood: A frame of mind or state of feeling during a particular time (from the American College Dictionary),
2) Values: Guiding principles or ideals (from the American College Dictionary),
3) Information: Knowledge communicated or received concerning some fact or circumstance,
4) Responsibility: What one has when they are in charge of making something happen. Can be as a result of an external assignment or as a result of personal choice or feeling,
5) Active Belief: Faith, optimism, implicit encouragement, and positive expectations, all received from others,
6) Goal Setting: The process of developing, negotiating, and formalizing the targets or objectives that an employee is asked to accomplish (from Schermerhorn et al., 1991:201).

Prior to conducting the sorting task the judges received written instructions and an
example. The instructions were as follows:

Attached you will find a number of items addressed to J. Carter. Each item is representative of a memo one may receive at work from a variety of different people, and is expressed in two different ways. Please place each set of items in one of the six categories which you have in front of you. Each set of items is related to one of the six categories. Choose the category which you think identifies the issue on which the two items in each set differ from J. Carter’s point of view. Note that sometimes the differences are subtle and may take careful reading and thought to identify the appropriate category. You may also find that the difference is that one of the two items relates strongly to one of the categories, while the other does not. In other words, the difference may be that one item clearly relates to one of the categories (i.e. contains some element of it) while the other lacks in it. In a few instances you will only receive one item. Place the item in the category it fits best. Always keep in mind the receiver’s (J. Carter’s) point of view, rather than that of the sender.

Initially each judge independently sorted all items into the six categories with which they were presented. During the second stage, the judges met together and in the researcher’s presence discussed their choices and made the final sort. The judges were carefully instructed that they must achieve consensus on where to place each item set. The researcher’s role was to ensure that the process of achieving consensus was followed and that no bartering, bargaining, or swapping occurred between the two.

The results of the Q-sort on the random sample of manipulation items verified discriminant validity. Except for one item, which subsequently was thrown out, all manipulation items were sorted into the categories as expected by the items’ developer. Not surprisingly, the judges sometimes identified that some of the items developed for the three original manipulation categories (information, active belief, and responsibility) also related to the additional categories of mood, goal setting, and values. However, the items developed for the three additional categories were never identified as belonging to one of the study’s original categories. In other words, the study’s three categories may
sometimes trigger additional constructs such as mood. However, since the competing constructs (goal setting, mood, and values) never triggered the core categories, it is safe to say that overall these constructs are significantly distinct.

In addition to demonstrating that the manipulation items represented the categories for which they had been developed and were distinctly different from other categories, as a result of observing the negotiation process between the expert judges, some of the items were slightly re-worded, and a few additional items were added to the manipulation.

Pilot Study

Ph.D. and recently-graduated MBA students were recruited for the pilot tests. These groups were selected, rather than current MBA students, so as not to reduce the potential MBA student population size. As suggested by Dillman (1978), part of the pilot sample included colleagues who knew of the general topic area. Specialists in the areas of Organizational Behaviour, in-basket development and scoring, as well as in Management Information Systems (the simulated organization's area of specialization was related to computers) were part of the pilot sample. In addition, because English as a second language (ESL) students comprise a significant percentage of the University of British Columbia MBA student population, a Ph.D. ESL student was also included in the pilot study. In total, nine people participated in the pilot study during two separate rounds. After the two pilot studies were completed participants took part in a group discussion on the experiment and were also individually interviewed at length by the investigator.

As a result of the pilot study, several minor changes were made to the procedure for the main study:
The results of the pilot study indicated that on all dimensions (change in the mediators, manipulation check, and performance on the in-basket) the two experimental groups (i.e., empowered versus dis-empowered) differed significantly in the expected directions. Considering the small size of the pilot study, the strength of the results were encouraging. Except for one outlier, the results of all participants were as predicted.

**Measures**

**Mediating Variables**

In this study three mediating variables were investigated: self-esteem, locus of control, and self-efficacy. All mediating variable instruments were presented after participants received a short description of the role they would be assuming. These three mediators were chosen since there are good measurement scales that have been widely used and well documented. For all three constructs, pre-existing, validated, and reliable instruments with a Cronbach alpha value of over .6 (the value recommended by Nunnally, 1978) were chosen.

**Self-Esteem**

In a comprehensive review of the employee self-esteem literature, Tharenou (1979:317)
used Coopersmith’s (1977) definition of self-esteem: "...the evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to the self: it expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval, and indicates the extent to which the individual believes the self to be capable, significant, successful and worthy." Self-esteem can be global (a general evaluation), specific (to a situation or role), and task specific (competence in a particular activity). Since the purpose of this study was an investigation of people in the context of their workplace, a measure of self-esteem in the context of the organization (i.e., a specific measure of self esteem) was chosen. The measure used was the Pierce et al., (1989) Organization-Based Self-Esteem (OBSE) scale. This scale consists of 10 items and is presented in Appendix 4. The OBSE scale was chosen both for the level of analysis at which it examines self-esteem and for its psychometric properties. The OBSE scale has an internal consistency of .91 and a test-retest reliability of .87. This specific level of self-esteem is appropriate because it is the same level at which the experimental manipulation occurred.

Locus of Control

Locus of control is the causal relationship a person associates between his/her behaviour and an event or outcome. If an individual attributes an outcome to luck, fate, or powerful others, the person is considered to have an external locus of control. However, if the person believes that the outcome was a result of his/her own characteristics/behaviour, they are considered to have an internal locus of control (Rotter, 1966).

The locus of control scale used here was a modified version of the Spheres of Control Scale (Paulhus & Christie, 1981), in its latest version SOC3 (Paulhus & Selst, 1990). This scale assesses three components of perceived control: personal control, interpersonal control, and socio-political control. However, in this study only the first two components
of perceived control were assessed and the items were re-worded so as to assess personal and interpersonal control in an organizational setting. For the personal control sub-scale items were simply re-worded to focus on the fictitious organization. However, the interpersonal control sub-scale was re-worded to focus more generally on organizational settings. This more general focus on organizational settings was thought to be necessary because the social nature of the interpersonal control sub-scale may result in too jarring a contrast with the limited information available to the participants. These minor changes did not have a significant impact on the scale's properties (Paulhus, 1992)\(^9\). It was assumed that the sociopolitical control scale, unlike the personal and interpersonal control scales, would not change as a result of the manipulation, so as a result, this sub-scale was not included. Typically, the SOC scale is administered with questions from the sub-scales intermixed. Here, the items from the SOC two sub-scales were intermixed with items from the other mediating variable instruments. The SOC scale's items (presented in Appendix 5) are rated on a 7 point scale. The SOC scale has a test-retest correlation of 0.8 at 4 weeks, an alpha reliability of 0.8, and has been shown to measure separate domains of the general construct of perceived control.

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy differs from self-esteem and locus of control. Self-esteem is considered to be a trait reflecting a person's affective self-evaluation. Locus of control is a belief about the general causal relationship between actions and outcomes. Self-efficacy is a judgment about one's capability (Gist et al., 1991); it is the person's expectation about whether they can "successfully execute the behaviour required to produce the outcome" (Bandura, 1977: 192). Key to the mediating role self-efficacy has in the process of empowerment

\(^9\) When instrument modification was necessary the following guidelines were adhered to: (1). keeping the items simple, to insure that all participants will understand them equally, and (2). refraining from placing potentially difficult and/or threatening questions first (Rossi et al., 1983: 212,220). Updated Cronbach alpha reliability scores are reported in the "Results" section.
is that it "affects coping and perseverance in the face of obstacles" (Gist et al., 1991:840).

In this study, scales for generalized self-efficacy (GSE) were used. Generalized self-efficacy is a person’s expectation that he/she can perform well across a wide range of situations (Tipton & Worthington, 1984). The self-efficacy scale used here is the Sherer et al. (1982) general self-efficacy scale and is presented in Appendix 6. This GSE scale consists of 17 items rated on 5 point scales, with a Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of .86. Construct and criterion validities were also shown to be acceptable (Sherer et al., 1982). In one of the validity tests (Sherer & Adams, 1983) a mean of 64.31 and a SD of 8.58 were obtained. These GSE scale items appeared intermixed with the other mediator items in the questionnaire.

Dependent Variables
In this study the dependent variables of interest were work satisfaction as well as eight facets of work performance. The eight work performance variables were measured using an in-basket task’s scales. These measures were gathered during the participants’ third meeting, in which the participant completed a full in-basket. The results of their performance on the in-basket constituted the dependent measures for work performance.

The specific in-basket used here to measure the dependent variables is entitled the "Servcom Corporation," and is produced by Organizational Performance Dimensions. This simulation has a high inter-rater reliability of .93 and a criterion-related validity with supervisory performance ratings of $r = .27$.\textsuperscript{10} In this 90 minute exercise participants

\textsuperscript{10} The validity coefficient, which may seem low at first glance, is at the high end of a range of -.25 to .36 found by Schippmann et al., (1990) in their review of in-basket performance measures. Since, as should be the case with laboratory studies involving simulation (Campbell & Stanley, 1966) the goal of this study is not to provide external generalizability, but rather, to test my model of empowerment, a validity coefficient of .27 is satisfactory.
assume the role of a new manager, and with the aid of background information on the organization, respond to 23 letters, memos, reports, requests, and problems that have accumulated on their predecessor's desk. (An example is presented in Appendix 7.) Participants need to make decisions, take actions, delegate responsibility, write letters, initiate meetings, assign work, plan, organize, and schedule activities based on the material in the in-basket. In addition, upon completion of the in-basket, they are requested to fill out a 15-minute participant report form. This in-basket exercise measures a total of eight work performance dimensions from three different areas. Means, standard deviations, and scoring range for each of the eight work performance dimensions can be found in Appendix 12. These dimensions and areas as defined by the in-basket's author (Nowack, 1988) are summarized below:

1) Personal/Interpersonal:
   Initiative - The individual takes action and makes decisions without waiting for direction from others.
   Sensitivity - The individual takes action and makes decisions that show consideration for the feelings and needs of others.

2) Administrative:
   Planning, Organizing, and Scheduling - Effective scheduling of time and activities, as well as establishing a course of action in order to accomplish specific goals.
   Delegation - Allocating the necessary authority and resources to subordinates so that they can accomplish a task, assignment, or project.
   Administrative Control - Developing procedures to monitor and evaluate the progress of job activities, tasks, and delegated assignments on a regular basis.
3) Decision Making:

Problem analysis - Accurately defining a problem, determining possible causes, analyzing information relevant to the problem, and determining alternative solutions to resolve the problem.

Judgement - Making decisions of high quality and considering alternative courses of action based on available information.

Decisiveness - Ability and willingness to make a decision, render judgements, or take actions when required.

In-baskets were scored using a scoring key developed by Organizational Performance Dimensions. This scoring key provides the raters with a series of over 100 guiding questions that are grouped by the eight dimensions. Once all relevant questions are addressed, the total score for each dimension is tallied. For each question an individual can receive full points, half points, or none at all. For example, one of the questions related to Sensitivity is: "Was an attempt made to respond to the phone call in a prompt, courteous, and sensitive manner?" If the participant responded to this in-basket item by requesting that one of his/her subordinates call the person and politely explain the situation, the participant would receive one point. However, if in their request the participant did not give any guidelines as to how the call should be dealt with, other than that it should be answered immediately, the question would only receive half a mark. If there was no reference to speed or to how the issue should be dealt with no points would be awarded. All the in-baskets were scored by two judges who were trained for over 40 hours until they achieved an inter-rater reliability of .98 and a mean intra-rater reliability of .94.

The satisfaction variable was measured after participants completed the in-basket in the third session. At the same time that respondents were asked to complete the mediator
scale items at the end of the third session, they also completed a short four-item job satisfaction scale. All of these mediator and satisfaction items were presented to the participants within a single questionnaire. The four-item job satisfaction scale has been successfully used previously, and all four items are established facet-free indicators of general job satisfaction (Tymon, 1988:60). This job satisfaction scale has a Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of .87 and is presented in Appendix 11.

The first three job satisfaction items, taken from Hackman and Oldham (1980), have a 7-point scale response category, anchored by "Agree" (=1) and "Disagree" (=7). The fourth item from Quinn and Mangione (1973) asks whether subjects would take the job again, knowing what they now know. This item has five responses: I would definitely take the job again; I would probably take the job again; I am not sure if I would take the job again; I would probably not take the job again; I would definitely not take the job again.

In the next chapter the results of this procedure will be presented.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

In this chapter the results of the analysis will be presented and evaluated in relation to the hypotheses introduced in Chapter 2. However, before these results are offered, statistics describing the participants and the instruments used, as well as the results of the manipulation checks, will be presented.

Descriptive Information

Participants
As mentioned earlier, 135 participants completed all three sessions. Of the 135, 51 (37.8%) were female and 83 (61.5%) were male (one participant did not report gender). The mean age was 27.12 years and 43% of the participants were first year MBA students, 39.3% were second year MBA students, and 17.7% were evening MBA students. Of the 109 participants who reported full time work-experience, 33% had worked for less than two years, 9.2% reported having worked for more than eight years, and the rest of the participants had between two and eight years of full time work-experience. In addition, participants were asked to report their part-time work experience. Of the 105 who responded, 28.6% reported having worked part-time for less than two years, 18.1% reported working part-time for more than eight years, and the rest had between two and eight years of part-time experience. The relatively low response rate on these two work-related questions may be explained in part by their open-ended format, which the participants seemed more likely to omit in comparison to the multiple choice format.
All participants were randomly assigned to the three conditions. At the end of the simulation there were 47 participants in the control group, 46 in the empowerment group, and 42 in the dis-empowerment group who had participated and completed all three sessions. The overall attrition rate of 29% over the duration of the entire study was evenly distributed across the three groups. Given that participants were initially randomly distributed to all three groups and the attrition was evenly distributed across the three groups, it would seem that the manipulation had no effect on the attrition rate per group. Therefore, we can conclude that attrition would not have caused a confound with the independent variable.

**Manipulation Checks**

At the end of the last session participants answered seven manipulation check items. Statistical analysis of this data indicated that these items had a Cronbach alpha reliability score of .85 which is well above the acceptable value recommended by Nunnally (1978). A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) by treatment group was used to test whether there were significant differences between the three groups on the manipulation check items. A significant difference was detected (Wilks' $\Lambda = .267$, $F(14,250)=16.67, p < .001$). These results indicate that the manipulation was successful, inasmuch as the participants experienced the empowerment/dis-empowerment treatments as expected. Since the omnibus MANOVA was significant, the univariate ANOVA tests were conducted and are presented in Table 4.1. As shown in Table 4.1, six out of the seven manipulation check items (which are presented in Appendix 10) were significant.

---

11 The Wilks' Lambda is a likelihood ratio statistic that tests the likelihood of the data under the assumption of equal population mean vectors for all groups against the likelihood under the assumption that population mean vectors are identical to those of the sample mean vectors for the different groups (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989:398).
at least at the $p < .01$ level. The exception was the manipulation check of motivation, where the three treatment groups did not differ significantly from one another. Nevertheless, the overall results of the manipulation check indicate that the treatment groups differed on the manipulated aspects of the simulations.

Anecdotal support for the strength of the manipulation was also found during the half-day Managerial Effectiveness Workshop. During the workshop, participants were encouraged to speculate on the nature of the study. None of the responses correctly identified the topic. (Some of the ideas about the possible nature of the study included decision-making, time-management, and identifying differences between first-year and second-year MBA students.) However, after the purpose of the study was described and participants were asked to identify which group they had been in, those in the empowered and dis-empowered group did so with no difficulty.

Table 4.1: Univariate F-tests for Manipulation Check Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1-Information</td>
<td>2/131</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2-Responsibility</td>
<td>2/131</td>
<td>31.43</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3-Trust and respect</td>
<td>2/131</td>
<td>132.26</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4-Support</td>
<td>2/131</td>
<td>75.40</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5-Empowered</td>
<td>2/131</td>
<td>75.71</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6-Like to work for</td>
<td>2/131</td>
<td>19.21</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7-Motivated to do my best</td>
<td>2/131</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>n/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mediating Variables

The mediating variables were measured using pre-existing intra-psychic scales. Scale reliability scores are reported in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Cronbach Alpha Reliability Scores for Mediator Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reported Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha T1 (pre-manipulation)</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha T2 (post-manipulation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Org. Based Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.91 (Pierce et al., 1989)</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.86 (Sherer et al., 1982)</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control, Personal</td>
<td>Not reported for new version</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control, Interpersonal</td>
<td>Not reported for new version</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control, All</td>
<td>.80 (Paulhus &amp; Selat, 1990)</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mediating intra-psychic variable hypotheses were tested using multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). This was prefaced, however, by an evaluation of the validity of the MANOVA assumptions. Overall, a sample with more than 20 degrees of freedom per cell is considered to assure multivariate normality of the sampling distribution on means, even with unequal sample sizes (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). Further, the variable distributions were plotted, suggesting that there was no cause for concern over the issues of normality or linearity. In addition, no extreme outliers were found (p < 0.05). Univariate homogeneity of variance was also examined using the sensitive Bartlett-Box test which failed to reject homogeneity of variance for each of the four mediating variables (p > 0.05). Similarly, the Box's M test (Box's M test = 24.744, F(20, 59786) = 1.182, p = .258) indicated that there is no violation of the homogeneity of dispersion matrices assumption. Bartlett's test of sphericity (Bartlett sphericity test (6)
suggested that the variables were not independent and that using multivariate techniques was appropriate. The same was true for these variables after the manipulations had occurred (T2) (Bartlett sphericity test (6) = 278.044, p < .001). However, for T2 (i.e., after the manipulations) the sensitive Box’s M test rejected the assumption of homogeneity, and instead the variances of each treatment group were compared so as to confirm that the ratio between the largest and the smallest variance was less than 20:1 (Neter et al., 1990; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). In fact, the largest ratio was about 4:1 for the Locus of Control—Personal Control on the dis-empowered group versus Organizational Based Self-Esteem on the empowered group.

Two multivariate analysis of variance tests were performed on the mediating variables. The first MANOVA looked at the participants’ scores on all mediating variables observed at the very beginning of the simulation (T1). No significant effect was found (Wilks Λ = .965, F(8,256) = .562, p = .808). This result was expected since participants had been randomly assigned to the three treatment groups and at T1 no manipulation had yet occurred. However, the MANOVA test using data collected after the manipulations had occurred was significant (Wilks Λ = .568, F(8,250) = 10.21, p < .001). Since the omnibus MANOVA was significant univariate tests were conducted and found to be significant at least at the p < .05 level for every one of the mediating variables. Intrapsychic variable means and standard deviations are presented in Table 4.3, and the results of the univariate tests can be found in Table 4.4.

All univariate tests shown in Table 4.4 were significant, and the differences between the group means shown in Table 4.3 were all in the expected directions (i.e., empowered > control > dis-empowered). Therefore, post-hoc Scheffe’s multiple range tests were executed on all the intra-psychic variables at T2 to determine which of these differences between group means were statistically significant.
Substantial support was obtained for Hypothesis H1a, which stated that increased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility would result in a significant increase in the three measured intra-psychic mediators (self-esteem, self-efficacy, and locus of control). The mean scores of the empowered group on the three intra-psychic mediators were found to be significantly higher than the mean scores of the dis-empowered group (p < .01). However, the mean scores for the empowered group on the three intra-psychic mediator variables were only slightly greater than the mean scores for the control group, and while these differences between the empowered and control groups were in the expected direction, they were not found to be statistically significant.

Hypothesis H1a(0) was well supported, since decreased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility resulted in a decrease in the three measured intra-psychic mediators (self-esteem, self-efficacy, and locus of control). For all three of the variables (self-esteem, self-efficacy, and locus of control), the mean scores of the dis-empowered group were significantly lower than the mean scores of the empowered group (p < .01 and p < .05 for self-efficacy). For two of the three variables (self-esteem and locus of control), the mean scores of the dis-empowered group were also significantly lower than those of the control group (p < .01). Only for the self-efficacy variable was the mean of the dis-empowered group (66.80) not significantly less than the mean for the control group (68.82); however, this statistically non-significant difference was in the expected direction.

Intercorrelations among the intra-psychic mediators are presented in Table 4.5.
Table 4.3: Mediator Means and Standard Deviations for Both Time 1 and Time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emp (sd)</td>
<td>Control (sd)</td>
<td>Dis (sd)</td>
<td>Emp (sd)</td>
<td>Control (sd)</td>
<td>Dis (sd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Based Self-Esteem</td>
<td>43.19 (3.71)</td>
<td>41.80 (5.28)</td>
<td>43.00 (4.65)</td>
<td>44.60 (4.45)</td>
<td>42.27 (6.16)</td>
<td>33.23 (8.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>68.79 (5.68)</td>
<td>67.65 (7.66)</td>
<td>67.54 (6.51)</td>
<td>71.86 (6.96)</td>
<td>68.82 (8.39)</td>
<td>66.80 (7.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc. of Control, Personal</td>
<td>49.60 (4.99)</td>
<td>48.80 (5.58)</td>
<td>48.85 (5.83)</td>
<td>51.06 (5.86)</td>
<td>49.71 (5.39)</td>
<td>42.07 (10.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc. of Control, Interpersonal</td>
<td>55.71 (5.86)</td>
<td>54.46 (6.45)</td>
<td>55.73 (6.97)</td>
<td>56.65 (5.71)</td>
<td>55.61 (7.36)</td>
<td>50.39 (9.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc. of Control, All(^{\text{12}})</td>
<td>105.32 (9.92)</td>
<td>103.28 (11.40)</td>
<td>104.70 (11.83)</td>
<td>107.71 (10.86)</td>
<td>105.33 (11.86)</td>
<td>92.68 (18.96)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Univariate F-tests for Mediating Variables, Time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Org. Based Self-Esteem</td>
<td>2/128</td>
<td>38.45</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>2/128</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc. of Control, Personal</td>
<td>2/128</td>
<td>18.12</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc. of Control, Interpersonal</td>
<td>2/128</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{12}\) The combined score of both the Personal and Interpersonal scales is reported for the interest of the reader. However, due to their distinct nature (Paulhus & Selst, 1990) the focus throughout the remainder of this discussion will be on the scores of the separate dimensions.
Table 4.5: Mediator Intercorrelations for all Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OBSE T1</th>
<th>OBSE T2</th>
<th>SE T1</th>
<th>SE T2</th>
<th>LOC PC T1</th>
<th>LOC IC T1</th>
<th>LOC ALL T1</th>
<th>LOC PC T2</th>
<th>LOC IC T2</th>
<th>LOC ALL T2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Org. Based Self-Esteem</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.1846</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy T1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.5299**</td>
<td>.2646*</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4754**</td>
<td>.5728**</td>
<td>.6262**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC, Personal Control T1</td>
<td>.6146**</td>
<td>.3062**</td>
<td>.5619**</td>
<td>.5475**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC, Interpersonal Control T1</td>
<td>.5296**</td>
<td>.3207**</td>
<td>.5951**</td>
<td>.5321**</td>
<td>.7094**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC, All T1</td>
<td>.6145**</td>
<td>.3395**</td>
<td>.6269**</td>
<td>.5828**</td>
<td>.9105**</td>
<td>.9374**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC, Personal Control T2</td>
<td>.3052**</td>
<td>.7526**</td>
<td>.3342**</td>
<td>.6518**</td>
<td>.4611**</td>
<td>.3838**</td>
<td>.4531**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC, Interpersonal Control T2</td>
<td>.2829**</td>
<td>.6928**</td>
<td>.3228**</td>
<td>.6371**</td>
<td>.3945**</td>
<td>.5204**</td>
<td>.5003**</td>
<td>.7910**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC, All T2</td>
<td>.3109**</td>
<td>.7642**</td>
<td>.3472**</td>
<td>.6811**</td>
<td>.4526**</td>
<td>.4767**</td>
<td>.5034**</td>
<td>.9478**</td>
<td>.9448**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 130
1-tailed Signif: * - p < .01  ** - p < .001

T1 = Time 1, pre-manipulation
T2 = Time 2, post-manipulation
LOC = Locus of Control
Table 4.6: Correlations Among Mediating and Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Planning &amp; Organizing</th>
<th>Delegation</th>
<th>Admin Control</th>
<th>Problem Analysis</th>
<th>Judgement</th>
<th>Decisive</th>
<th>Z-score Job-Stfn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Org Based Self-Esteem T1</td>
<td>-.0815</td>
<td>.0507</td>
<td>-.0187</td>
<td>.0310</td>
<td>-.0216</td>
<td>-.0455</td>
<td>-.0287</td>
<td>.0551</td>
<td>-.1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy T1</td>
<td>.0856</td>
<td>.2339*</td>
<td>.0060</td>
<td>.1622</td>
<td>.1332</td>
<td>.0360</td>
<td>.0377</td>
<td>.1775</td>
<td>-.2377*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC, Personal Control T1</td>
<td>.0236</td>
<td>.2190*</td>
<td>.1191</td>
<td>.1003</td>
<td>.1162</td>
<td>-.0025</td>
<td>.0023</td>
<td>.2125*</td>
<td>-.2584*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC, Interpersonal Control T1</td>
<td>.0985</td>
<td>.2084*</td>
<td>.1426</td>
<td>.1360</td>
<td>.1339</td>
<td>.0614</td>
<td>.0838</td>
<td>.2233*</td>
<td>-.2444*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC, All T1</td>
<td>.0695</td>
<td>.2306*</td>
<td>.1425</td>
<td>.1294</td>
<td>.1360</td>
<td>.0348</td>
<td>.0503</td>
<td>.2360*</td>
<td>-.2710**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Based Self-Esteem T2</td>
<td>.0382</td>
<td>.0624</td>
<td>-.0097</td>
<td>.0905</td>
<td>.0734</td>
<td>-.1387</td>
<td>.0931</td>
<td>.0730</td>
<td>-.6726**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy T2</td>
<td>.1428</td>
<td>.1879</td>
<td>.0496</td>
<td>.2122*</td>
<td>.1324</td>
<td>.0385</td>
<td>.1058</td>
<td>.1960</td>
<td>-.4672**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC, Personal Control T2</td>
<td>.1040</td>
<td>.1516</td>
<td>.0673</td>
<td>.1639</td>
<td>.1610</td>
<td>-.0365</td>
<td>.0760</td>
<td>.1606</td>
<td>-.7171**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC, Interpersonal Control T2</td>
<td>.0970</td>
<td>.1497</td>
<td>.0887</td>
<td>.1087</td>
<td>.1935</td>
<td>.0448</td>
<td>.1381</td>
<td>.1845</td>
<td>-.6112**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC, All T2</td>
<td>.1062</td>
<td>.1592</td>
<td>.0822</td>
<td>.1444</td>
<td>.1871</td>
<td>.0038</td>
<td>.1126</td>
<td>.1821</td>
<td>-.7028**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=130

1-tailed signif: * - p< .01  ** - p<.001

T1 = Time 1 (pre-manipulation)
T2 = Time 2 (post-manipulation)
LOC = Locus of Control
Table 4.7: Performance Measures Intercorrelations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Delegation</th>
<th>Admin. Control</th>
<th>Problem Analysis</th>
<th>Judgement</th>
<th>Decisive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>.5738**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>.4748**</td>
<td>.3194**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>.3690**</td>
<td>.3364**</td>
<td>.2059*</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Control</td>
<td>.5842**</td>
<td>.4467**</td>
<td>.3035**</td>
<td>.2995**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Analysis</td>
<td>.6156**</td>
<td>.4046**</td>
<td>.5649**</td>
<td>.3176**</td>
<td>.4614**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgement</td>
<td>.7233**</td>
<td>.4754**</td>
<td>.5392**</td>
<td>.3471**</td>
<td>.4499**</td>
<td>.5571**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisive</td>
<td>.7191**</td>
<td>.6287**</td>
<td>.5104**</td>
<td>.4278**</td>
<td>.5503**</td>
<td>.6135**</td>
<td>.7029**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.8105**</td>
<td>.6216**</td>
<td>.7252**</td>
<td>.4975**</td>
<td>.6191**</td>
<td>.8386**</td>
<td>.8283**</td>
<td>.8674**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 135
1-tailed Signif: * - .01  ** - .001
Dependent Variables

To determine whether there were significant differences among the means of the three groups in terms of the dependent variables, the Performance measures were analyzed using multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), in order to take into account the interrelations among the variables. The Job Satisfaction measure was analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOVA). Intercorrelations among the mediating and dependent variables are presented in Table 4.6, and intercorrelations for the Performance measures are in Table 4.7.

The validity of the multivariate assumptions was examined. As mentioned earlier, a sample with more than 20 degrees of freedom is considered to assure multivariate normality of the sampling distribution on means, even with unequal sample sizes (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). Further, the individual variable distributions were plotted and it was found that there was no cause for concern over the issues of normality or linearity. In addition, no extreme outliers were found (p < .05). Univariate homogeneity of variance for each variable was examined using the Bartlett-Box test, which failed to reject homogeneity of variance (p = .068). The sensitive Box's M multivariate test for homogeneity of dispersion matrices (Box's M = 100.016, F(17,47671) = 1.26, p = .06) indicated that there was no violation of multivariate homogeneity. Bartlett's test of sphericity (Bartlett sphericity test (28) = 501.96, p < .001) suggested that the variables were not independent (i.e., there was homoscedasticity).

A MANOVA test was performed on all eight Performance measures (Initiative, Sensitivity, Planning, Delegation, Administrative-control, Problem-solving, Judgement, and Decisiveness) for the three treatment groups (empowerment, control, and disempowerment). Variable means and standard deviations can be found in Table 4.8.
omnibus MANOVA test did not show significant multivariate effects. The Wilks’ $\Lambda$ criterion of .874, $F(16,250) = 1.08$, was not significant ($p > .37$). The results of the univariate tests can be found in Table 4.9. Thus Hypotheses H1b(1 to 8) and H1b0(1 to 8) were not supported; increasing or decreasing levels of information, active belief, and responsibility did not result in significant differences on the performance measures.

Table 4.8: Descriptive Statistics for the Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Dis-Empowerment</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>27.02</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>29.36</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>28.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Control</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-Analysis</td>
<td>20.26</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>25.74</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>24.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgement</td>
<td>20.19</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>22.78</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>21.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>19.26</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>21.70</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>20.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9: Univariate F-tests for Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2/132</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2/132</td>
<td>.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2/132</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>2/132</td>
<td>.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Control</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2/132</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-Analysis</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>2/132</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgement</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2/132</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>2/132</td>
<td>.290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To ensure that these results were not influenced by the lack of participants' ability on the in-basket exercise, it was important to investigate whether participants performed adequately on these measures. Thus, the participants' means and standard deviations on the eight measures were compared with the developer's anchor group (which are presented in Appendix 12). As expected, the MBA participants scored very similarly to the norm group. In addition, despite the fact that the participants were randomly allocated to the treatment groups, an additional analysis was undertaken to verify that participants' ability did not significantly differ by treatment group and thus, confound the results. In order to do so, participants' work-experience was used as a proxy for ability to perform on a managerial exercise.

For the above reason, two MANCOVA tests were performed; one used full-time work experience and the other used part-time work experience as covariates. With the use of the Wilks' criterion it was found that both the full-time and part-time variables did not significantly covary with the dependent measures of performance (Wilks $\Lambda = .916$, $F(8,98) = 1.11$, $p > .363$ and Wilks $\Lambda = .861$, $F(8,94) = 1.88$, $p > .071$). Thus, it was concluded that work-experience did not significantly influence the results of the manipulation.

The model presented in Chapter 2 suggested two sets of dependent variables. The first set of dependent variables, Performance measures, have been examined above. Now we will turn our attention to the Job Satisfaction dependent variable. Since the items were not measured on the same scale, the scores were first transformed to Z-scores and then aggregated. The scale for this variable had a Cronbach alpha reliability score of .85.

An ANOVA test by treatment group for the Job-Satisfaction variable was found to be significant ($F(2,130) = 18.534$, $p < .001$; see Table 4.11), and the differences between the
group means shown in Table 4.10 were all in the expected directions (i.e., empowered < control < dis-empowered, where lower scores mean higher Job-Satisfaction).

Substantial support was obtained for Hypothesis H1b9, which had predicted that higher levels of information, responsibility, and active belief would increase Job-Satisfaction. Using the post-hoc Scheffe's test, it was found that the empowered group did, in fact, have mean Job-Satisfaction scores that were significantly lower (i.e., where low score means high Job-Satisfaction) than the dis-empowered group (p < .01), thereby supporting Hypothesis H1b9. However, the difference in mean Job-Satisfaction scores between the empowered (mean score = 8.13) and control (mean score = 9.08) groups, although in the expected direction, was not statistically significant.

Hypothesis H1b_{o}9 had predicted that decreased levels of information, active belief, and responsibility would result in a decrease in the measured level of Job-Satisfaction. Using the post-hoc Scheffe's test, it was found that the dis-empowered group did, in fact, have mean Job-Satisfaction scores that were significantly higher (i.e., where high score means low Job-Satisfaction) than both the empowered group and the control group (p < .01), thereby supporting Hypothesis H1b_{o}9.

Table 4.10: Job-Satisfaction, Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Means*</th>
<th>Z-means</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Z-SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empowered</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis-empowered</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Lower score means higher job-satisfaction
Baron and Kenny (1986) have suggested that ANOVA provides only a limited test of mediation, and that a series of regressions should be used instead. In order to investigate whether the intra-psychic variables had a mediating effect on the dependent variable of job-satisfaction, three separate regressions were performed: (1) the mediator was regressed on the independent variable; (2) the dependent variable was regressed on the independent variable; and (3) the dependent variable was regressed on both the independent and the mediating variables. Mediation is considered to occur if the independent variable affects the mediator in the first regression, the independent variable affects the dependent variable in the second regression, and the mediator affects the dependent variable in the third equation, with the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable being less in the third regression than in the second. This reasoning is similar to that presented by James and Brett (1984).

As recommended, three regressions equations were performed. In the first equation, the intra-psychic mediator variable, which is a composite index created by aggregating the intra-psychic variables, was regressed on level of empowerment ($r^2 = .21$, $p < .001$, $\beta = -.46$, $p < .001$). The second equation regressed job-satisfaction on level of empowerment ($r^2 = .19$, $p < .001$, $\beta = .44$, $p < .001$). In the third equation job-satisfaction was regressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>161.38</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
on both empowerment and on the intra-psychic mediator index ($r^2 = .50, p < .001$) and both the independent variable of empowerment ($\beta = .15, p < .05$) and the intra-psychic mediating variable ($\beta = -.62, p < .001$) were significant. Regression results are presented in Table 4.12.

There is sufficient evidence to suggest that the intra-psychic variables mediate the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable of job-satisfaction. First, the unstandardized coefficient of the independent variable decreases from when it is in the equation alone ($b = 1.82$) to when the intra-psychic mediator is also in the equation ($b = .62$). We can be reasonably certain that this is not a spurious difference because the unstandardized beta coefficient changes by more than two standard deviations. Hence, we can conclude that the unique impact of the level of empowerment on job-satisfaction is indeed smaller when the intra-psychic variable is included in the equation. This suggests that in the reduced regression equation part of the independent variable’s impact stems from the missing variable, the intra-psychic variable. Second, since we know that temporally the empowerment manipulation occurred beforehand and caused a change in the mediators between T1 (pre-manipulation) and T2 (post-manipulation), we can conclude that the intra-psychic variables had a mediating effect on the dependent variable of job-satisfaction.

Another method for assessing the relative importance of variables is to consider the increase in $R^2$ when a new variable is entered into an equation that already contains other independent variables. A large change in $R^2$ indicates that a variable provides unique information about the dependent variable that is not available from the other independent variables in the equation (Norusis, 1990:B-94).

Table 4.13 shows the results of the hierarchical regression that was executed as an
additional test for mediation. Significant change in $R^2$ is the indicator for a mediator effect. In this regression adding the intra-psychic variables to the equation after level of empowerment led to a $R^2$ change of .31 which was significant at the $p<.001$ level. In other words, after the intra-psychic variables were added the change in the variance explained was significantly different compared to when only the treatment variable was regressed on the dependent variable of job-satisfaction. Again, this suggests that the influence of the intra-psychic variable was above and beyond that of the independent variable of treatment effect.

Table 4.12: Regression Analysis for Mediation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IVs:</th>
<th>Intra-psychic</th>
<th>Job-Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\text{SE}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equation 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manipulation</td>
<td>- .46**</td>
<td>-1.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equation 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manipulation</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>1.82**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equation 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manipulation</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intra-psychic</td>
<td>-.62**</td>
<td>-.78**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = $p<.05$

** = $p<.001$

$\beta$ = standardized coefficients

$b$ = non-standardized coefficients
Table 4.13: Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Mediation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV</th>
<th>Job-satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation. Treatment</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-psychic</td>
<td>.50**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** = p<.001

Summary

The model tested in this research was partially supported. The MANOVA on the intra-psychic variables (self-efficacy, self-esteem, and locus of control) showed that they were all strongly influenced in the predicted directions; the empowered group scored highest on all the mediator scales and the dis-empowered group scored lowest. However, the MANOVA on the eight dependent performance measures was not significant, suggesting that the empowerment manipulation did not have an effect on these variables. Nevertheless, an ANOVA on the dependent variable of job-satisfaction was significant, indicating that the manipulation did influence how participants perceived their simulated job, with the empowered group being most satisfied and the dis-empowered group being least satisfied. It is interesting to note that the conservative post-hoc analyses suggested that the dis-empowered manipulation was more powerful than the empowered manipulation, since dis-empowered group means differed from control group means to a greater extent. There tended to be a much smaller difference between empowered group means and control group means.
With regard to the mediating effect, no attempt was made to investigate the influence of the intra-psychic variables on the performance measures, since there were no significant effects on these variables. However, the mediating influence of the intra-psychic variables was found with regard to the dependent variable of job-satisfaction.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This discussion will begin with a short summary of the results and their implications. An overview of the possible reasons for the lack of significance of the relationship between the empowerment manipulations and the performance measures, based on the organizational behaviour literature, will follow. Experience with the research materials, the subject populations, and the hindsight provided by having seen the results, provides an opportunity to explore the unanticipated contextual factors that may have been important in this research. Potential reasons for the lack of significance include motivation, instrument psychometric properties, the performance-satisfaction relationship, the attitude-behaviour relationship, and the relationship between time and behavioral results. Next, limitations of the study, directions for future research, and revisions to the current model will be explored. Concluding remarks including theoretical contributions as well as practical implications for managers will also be offered.

Overview

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the multi-level process model of empowerment developed in Chapters 1 and 2. To examine this multi-level process model, three intra-psychic mediators and nine dependent variables (eight performance variables and one indicator of job satisfaction) were measured. The manipulation of the empowerment process was achieved by manipulating levels of information, responsibility, and active belief. The results clearly show that the intra-psychic variables (self-efficacy, self-esteem, and locus of control) were strongly influenced by the empowerment
manipulations, primarily for the dis-empowered group. In addition, as predicted, the mediating effect of the intra-psychic variables influenced job satisfaction. However, no statistically significant results were found in relation to the other eight dependent measures of job performance.

Implications

Thus, the empirical results provide only partial support for the multi-level process model of empowerment presented here. Empowerment at work is not the equivalent of the micro level constructs (such as self-efficacy or motivation), nor can it be characterized by simply describing changes within the organization; rather, it is a multi-level construct. In addition, as suggested here and by others (e.g., Kieffer, 1984; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990; Wolff, 1985; Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988), the empirical results of this study indicate that empowerment can be conceived of as a process. As long as there are no organizational structural or value constraints (which were controlled in this study), the empowerment process can begin with increases in enriched information, responsibility, and active belief. However, as this study suggests, the process of empowerment occurs only via changes within the individuals' psyche, at least for situations similar to those studied here. That is, changes within the individual are the mediators for the empowerment process. For this process to occur all three levels (macro, meso, and micro) must be active in a positive manner. The macro level elements of organizational structure and values can not be constraining, preferably, they will be enabling. At the meso level, changes occurring in the degree and amount of responsibility, information, and active-belief that a person receives from his/her surroundings can have a positive influence. After this, changes occur at the micro level, within the individual's psyche, before work outcomes may be observed. The significant results on the outcome measure
of job satisfaction indicate that manipulating empowerment influences at least some work outcomes. The particular work outcome of job satisfaction found here is an important one for the well-being of organizational members as well as for the organization itself. However, it must be kept in mind that the post-hoc analysis indicated that the manipulations had a stronger effect on the dis-empowered group, rather than on the empowered group, both on the intra-psychic variables and on the dependent variable of job-satisfaction.

These findings extend our current understanding of empowerment in several ways. First, this study suggests the importance of intra-psychic factors as mediators in the empowerment process, rather than only as outcomes. Second, we now know that these intra-psychic variables may be activated by changes in levels of information, responsibility, and active-belief found in a person's environment. Third, these changes in the levels of information, responsibility, and active-belief have a significant influence on job satisfaction, at least in contexts similar to the one simulated in this study. In other words, these results support the view that empowerment is a process and not a state. In addition, these findings suggest that the multi-level process model of empowerment proposed in Chapter 2 is a viable model of empowerment and that the unique methodology used here is a valuable technique for studying the empowerment process.

These findings also suggest that the four "M" (micro, meso, macro, and misnomer) categorization of the empowerment literature developed in Chapter 1 is a meaningful framework. This framework can be used for identifying if future work recognizes and includes the micro, meso, and macro aspects of empowerment and steers away from misusing the construct.

As a result of the empirical findings the multi-level process model can also contribute to
the implementation of the empowerment process. First and foremost attention needs to be given to avoiding dis-empowering situations, since the results of this study suggest that they may have a stronger influence than empowering situations. The process model investigated here focuses attention on three factors: information, responsibility, and active belief (assuming no inhibiting influences of structure and values, which should be examined in future research). This suggests that empowerment interventions need to and can be designed to match specific organizational conditions and needs. Designers need to ask what organizational information needs to be conveyed to an organization’s members, what responsibilities should be shared, and how active belief can be provided in a meaningful and consistent manner throughout the organization. Since a significant amount of these elements are not at any specific job level, many (but not all) of the implementation aspects will be similar across a single organization.

In addition, this model suggests that rather than focusing only on work performance outcomes, intra-psychic factors such as self-efficacy can be used as indicators for the success or failure of empowerment process. Identifying changes in the intra-psychic variables suggests that the empowerment process has been activated. These interim indicators may be important for sustaining interest in continuing with the empowerment program, which as suggested here takes time. In addition, focusing on individual intra-psychic outcomes draws attention to the importance and significance of the individual in the organization, one of the important features of active belief. Nevertheless, special attention must be given to the implication of influencing intra-psychic variables such as self-esteem, locus of control, and self-efficacy. It is important to recognize that the model does not suggest that these variables be manipulated globally.

Self-esteem is considered by many to be a relatively stable personality trait (Tharenou, 1979), suggesting that it is not malleable. However, Simpson & Boyle (1975) suggest
that self-esteem should be viewed as consisting of specific types: global, specific, and task specific. As a result, certain predictions for change will be observed only when using specific measures. This study focused on only a specific level of self-esteem—organizational based self-esteem (Pierce et al., 1989). As a result changes at the global level were not measured and there is no reason to believe that they had been manipulated.

A similar situation holds true for locus of control since locus of control is also considered to be relatively stable. Nevertheless, this study focused on two specific arenas: the personal and interpersonal locus of control. In addition, Rotter's (1966) original discussion of locus of control was based on elements similar to those considered for self-efficacy (Kirsch, 1986), and overall, self-efficacy is considered to be more transient and specific. Bandura (1982:122) writes: "perceived self-efficacy is concerned with judgments of how well one can execute [specific] courses of action." In other words, one’s self-efficacy changes depending on the task at hand and these judgments are influenced by a variety of situational conditions. Indeed, research has shown that self-efficacy can be influenced (for a review see Gist, 1987). The fact that changes in the participants’ intra-psychic variables were observed is not surprising since the focus was quite specific. In other words, this work does not suggest that manipulating the empowerment components will lead to global changes in the intra-psychic parameters. We can not expect to influence global traits\(^\text{13}\), but only the specific relevant components of intra-psychic variables such as the ones studied here.

This work also serves as a reminder of the need to consider the influence and interaction of different levels when studying organizational phenomena. House and Rousseau (1992) lament the lack of work simultaneously examining micro and macro influences on

\(^{13}\) For ethical reasons we should be alert that the manipulations or interventions do not subject the individual to undue stress in any way.
organizational behaviour. They suggest that "micro and macro researchers, having chosen their preferred level, view the effects of forces from other levels of analyses as 'exogenous' causes, or even error variance" (p.7). In this process model of empowerment, all levels are treated as endogenous components which contribute both equally and significantly to empowerment.

Despite the significant findings with regard to the three mediators and the dependent variable of job satisfaction, the empirical findings did not support the hypothesis that the process of empowerment influences work performance (at least as measured by the work performance measures in the in-basket tasks used here). One approach to science (Popper, 1974) would suggest that the multi-level process model of empowerment must be rejected. However, other outlooks (Duhem, 1962; Lakatos, 1970) would counsel to consider viable alternatives in hopes of stimulating additional related research. Revisions of the model will be approached by using a motivation-based explanation for the findings. In addition, since measurement problems may have contributed to these results, they will be addressed from four possible perspectives: (1) Instrument psychometric properties, (2) The performance-satisfaction relationship, specifically using the Job Characteristics Model (Hackman & Oldham, 1980), (3) The attitudes and behaviour relationship, and (4) Time constraints. Overall, the partial support for the model tested here suggests that alternative models may be viable. Such models will be offered in conjunction with directions for future research.

**Discussion of Findings**

**Motivation and Work Performance**

A potential area that may help to explain the lack of performance results could be inadequacies in the manipulation. Of the seven manipulation check items, the only non-
significant finding was for the motivation item. The six significant manipulation check items indicated that participants responded to the manipulation, by treatment group, in the expected directions. On the motivation item (item 7, Appendix 10) participants reported being moderately unmotivated to do their best during the three sessions (the overall mean of 5.23 was on a seven point scale from 1, "Highly motivated to do my best," to 7, "Not at all motivated to do my best"\(^{14}\)). In addition, the number of individuals requesting feedback \((n=55)\) as well as the number of people who chose to come to the final half-day workshop \((n=26)\) were compared across conditions, and no differences were found. This suggests that regardless of the conditions, participants did not report strong motivational drives to perform well.

The lack of significant differences between the three experimental groups on the eight performance measures, as well as the lack of treatment group differences on the motivation measure, were particularly intriguing in light of the fact that work performance differences had been found between the treatment groups in the pilot study. For this reason it is important to recognize how the pilot and the experimental samples differed.

Unlike the main study, which utilized a sample of MBA students, the pilot study sample was comprised primarily of Ph.D. students. Some may assume that individuals who choose to pursue and are admitted to doctoral studies are those who have superior cognitive skills. This would suggest that the performance of the MBAs may have been constrained by ability. However, the previous chapter reported that ability (as measured by a proxy, i.e. years of work experience) was not a significant factor in the work

\(^{14}\) Other indicators suggest that the participants were quite motivated to do well. For example, despite the fact that this program took place during a very busy period of the semester (in particular the week of the last sessions) the majority of the participants made a concerted effort to be present at all three sessions and to arrive on time. In addition, on several occasions participants asked the administrators questions which suggested that they were seeking information on how they could do better in the next session.
performance measures. As a result, the argument that ability differences may be the cause for difference in results between the two samples is untenable, at least given the available data.

A second difference between the pilot and main study participants was the way they were recruited and why they agreed to take part in the study. As mentioned, the pilot sample was comprised of Ph.D. students, all of whom were doing the author a personal favour by participating. For these participants there was no other visible motive to participate in this study. Even when they were reminded of the opportunity to take part in the final work-shop and to receive their personal feedback, they all declined to do so. Thus, it seemed that in the absence of a strong personal motive, their work performance was more readily influenced by the simulation’s manipulations.

For the MBA participants, motivation stemmed from different sources. The study was promoted to the MBA population as an opportunity to tackle management experiences, to receive feedback, and as an overall opportunity to enhance managerial skills and abilities. Indeed, when asked in the manipulation check (Appendix 10) what they thought of the simulations, it is clear that they were primarily motivated to take part in this study for practical experience and for the opportunity of receiving individual feedback. Comments such as these were typical:

"I am looking forward to the feedback sessions." "...tells me if I am good for this kind of managerial work." "A good chance to have insight of myself as if I was a manager." "I hope to learn from my responses." "Can’t wait for the results." "I’m interested in the feedback." "Looking forward to feedback." "I will reserve judgement until I see some take away from this project."

Current knowledge on motivation points to the importance of considering the distinction between the pilot and the study’s sample and provides us with a theoretical explanation
for the lack of difference in motivation levels between the treatment groups, as well as for the difference in work performance outcomes between the pilot study and the actual study. Pinder (1984) suggests that motivation needs to be conceptualized as including form, direction, intensity, and duration. Citing Katerberg and Blau (1983), he suggests that "one must take into account the specific goals toward which motivation energy is directed in order to fully understand it [work motivation]" (Pinder, 1984:9). It would seem that once the MBAs were motivated to take part in this program for their own utility, they were focused on performing as well as they could (regardless of the circumstances) so they might receive a good and realistic evaluation. Thus, the direction of the MBAs’ motivation seemed to be to receive maximum personal benefit from the exercise. This would suggest that their focus on obtaining an indication of their work performance strengths and weaknesses was stronger than their motivation to participate in and be swayed by the actual simulation. In other words, while the Ph.D. pilot sample participants were motivated to help a colleague, the MBA experimental sample participants were motivated to find out how well they could perform as a manager. Given the equal levels of motivation in all three experimental groups in the main study and the direction in which they were motivated, it is not too surprising that no significant differences were found on the performance measures. Overall, participants received average performance scores with standard variances.

**Measurement Issues**

**Instrument Psychometric Properties**

One simple interpretation for the non-significant results on the dependent measure may be that, unlike the other four measures (Self-efficacy, Self-esteem, Locus-of-control, and Job satisfaction), the instrument measuring work performance was not psychometrically adequate. However, evidence about the psychometric properties of this in-basket task does not support this interpretation. The OPD in-basket exercise selected for this
simulation was carefully chosen from among several potential in-baskets. The OPD in-basket has good psychometric properties with a high inter-rater reliability of .93 (which, as mentioned in Chapter 3 was improved in this study to .98). In addition, it has a criterion-related validity with supervisory performance ratings of .27 (which is at the high end of a range of reported tests on similar measures, from -.25 to .36; Schippmann et al., 1990). Assessment centre ratings were correlated reasonably highly with work performance measures (Nowak, 1992), between the in-basket and managers' ratings on: interpersonal dimensions (.27), administrative dimensions (.45), communication (.49), and the overall managers' rating (.39). These psychometric properties suggest that the measurement tool was both reliable and valid. Therefore, inadequate reliability and validity of the work performance instrument are unlikely to be the cause of the lack of significant findings on the work performance measure. Thus it seems appropriate to rule out psychometric inadequacy as an explanation for the non-significance of the work performance measures.

The Performance-Satisfaction Relationship

There is a large literature on the performance-satisfaction relationship that can be used as a backdrop for the current findings, i.e., a strong satisfaction effect and no performance effect. In addition, work on the Job Characteristic Model (Hackman & Oldham, 1980) provides a potent research analogy for the current results.

The lack of correspondence between performance and satisfaction in this study is not new to the field. Considerable work has been invested in studying the performance-satisfaction relationship and reviews from as early as the 1950s conclude that there is no simple significant relationship between the two constructs (March & Simon, 1958). Indeed, subsequent empirical reviews found very low correlations between measures of performance and satisfaction. For example, Vroom (1964) reported a median correlation
of .14 and, more recently, Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985) found a mean correlation of .15. Thus, it is hard to conclude that there is a strong positive relationship between the two constructs (Silvers, 1992). (Overall, the correlation between the performance and the satisfaction measures used here was .02.) Hence the results found in this study are not unusual. In fact, both performance and satisfaction were viewed as dependent variables with no suggested causality between them (rather, both were predicted to be affected by the process of empowerment).

The Job Characteristics Model (JCM; Hackman & Oldham, 1980), one of the most popular models in the task-design literature (Silvers, 1992), has found a lack of relationship between these two constructs that is similar to the pattern of findings reported here. Job characteristics are consistently and positively related to worker satisfaction, but not to work performance (Brass, 1985). Considering the similar findings it is interesting to note that methodological criticism directed towards the JCM points to improper measurement (for comprehensive reviews see Griffin, 1987; Roberts & Glick, 1981). These concerns may shed light on the empowerment performance-satisfaction findings here.

Overall, the multi-level process model of empowerment proposed here goes beyond the JCM by suggesting that we not stop at developing or re-designing specific jobs. Hence, providing task-related variety, identity, significance, autonomy, and feedback may be ineffective if other variables (Griffin, 1987) are ignored. It may be at least as important (possibly more so) to provide a frequent and open flow of information, within the organization; information that entails knowledge that is beyond specific jobs, roles, or tasks. In addition, the Hackman and Oldham (1975, 1980) model does not consider the significance of active belief; rather it focuses only on feedback from the job. This distinction is also true for how responsibility has been considered here versus the more specific job conceptualization found in the JCM. These differences suggest that the JCM,
while aware of the organizational context, is most appropriate for specific job re-design situations. However, as the multi-level process model of empowerment presented here suggests, it is not appropriate to focus solely on micro issues even if the dependent variables are at the micro level. Rather, more global factors such as general information and responsibility need to be considered. However, despite these contributions, the multi-level empowerment model shares the concerns of the JCM, making it easy to understand the performance-satisfaction pattern found here.

Like the current results, JCM results rarely find a significant relationship regarding performance and satisfaction. Reviews of the JCM research often express concern about the compatibility of measures of job characteristics and job outcomes. For example, Roberts and Glick (1981) suggest that in the JCM model, confusion exists over the different types of relationships, as well as over distinctions between objective aspects of the job and subjective perceptions.

Overall, the lack of a performance-satisfaction relationship, as well as the measurement findings cited in reference to the popular JCM model, may indicate that there is an underlying problem with how behaviours (work performance) and attitudes (satisfaction and the mediators\textsuperscript{15}) are conceptualized in this study. Both the empowerment process model and the JCM model depend on the more general relationship between attitudes and behaviours. Thus, a brief discussion of these underpinnings seems warranted.

\textsuperscript{15} Ajzen (1988:4) defines attitude as the "disposition to respond favourably or unfavourably to an object, person, institution, or event." This definition clarifies why job satisfaction (evaluation of job), self-esteem, and self-efficacy (evaluations of self) can be considered as attitudes. However, with regard to locus of control (perceptions about the causal relationship between actions and outcomes) the connection is not as clear unless we consider Allport’s (1935:810) definition. Allport suggests that an attitude is a "mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual’s response to all objects and situations...." Using this definition, locus of control can be viewed as an attitude since the view a person holds of relations between action and outcomes will exert a directive influence upon the individuals response to a situation.
Attitudes and Behaviour
The attitude and behaviour literature, based primarily on the Fishbein and Ajzen Theory of Reasoned Action, indicates that "it is considerably more likely that attitudes will be unrelated or slightly related to overt behaviours than that attitudes will be closely related to actions" (Wicker, 1969:68). Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) suggest a theory for why such a relationship exists. The underlying model of their theory is presented in Figure 5.1.

![Diagram](attachment:image.png)

Figure 5.1: Theory of Reasoned Action (adapted from Ajzen, 1988:118)

This theory conceptualizes attitude as the amount of affect or evaluation for or against some object. Attitudes differ from a person’s beliefs (which consist of the information a person has about the object), and from behavioral intention (which is the person’s decision to act in a certain way). One’s behaviours are only the overt observable acts of the individual. As depicted, the Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) model suggests that beliefs and subjective norms (a person’s perception about whether others think s/he should engage in the behaviour) influence attitudes which, in turn, influence intentions, which can lead to behaviours. This model can be stated algebraically as follows:

\[ B \approx BI = w_1A_B + w_2SN \]

where \( B \) is behaviour, \( BI \) is behavioural intention, \( A_B \) is attitude, \( SN \) is subjective norm,
and w₁ and w₂ are the weights indicating relative importance. Attitudes are a function of beliefs (bᵢ) and evaluations (eᵢ) of these beliefs and can be represented as: Σbᵢeᵢ. Subjective norms are a function of how the person perceives social pressure in relation to engaging in this behaviour (i.e., normative beliefs, bⱼ) and the person’s motivation (mⱼ) to comply with their opinion and can be represented as: Σbⱼmⱼ.

When examining why attitudes and behaviours may not closely correspond, Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) recommend focusing on several measurement issues. First they suggest that to find a relationship between attitude and behavioral change, both need to be measured at the same level of specificity. Ideally, the target and the action measured for the attitudinal component correspond with the target or action element of the behaviour entity (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977). For example, as with most attitude-behaviour research, the mediators in this study were measured at a global level of general self-perceptions of the job; they may not necessarily correspond to how the individual will actually perform on a specific performance (behaviourial) measure. In addition, Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) suggest that, to understand the attitude-behaviour relationship, we need to distinguish between habitual behaviours versus those under volitional control. Thus, we might speculate that MBA students, having spent considerable time as students, have been conditioned to do their best under all "test-type" situations, regardless of any external or internal inhibitors such as the difficulty of the test, the character of the instructor, or any lack of self-confidence they feel in the topic area (i.e., self efficacy)¹⁶. Thus, because of the simulation setting, what normally may be a volitional behaviour in a true work environment may have been perceived by students as yet another test situation in which

¹⁶ In addition, students have a strong view regarding the importance of doing well on tests and as Ajzen (1988:109) suggests, "people are more likely to perform a specific behaviour if they view its performance favourably, and they are unlikely to perform it if they view its performance unfavourably." Thus, the participants, all of whom were students, could not "allow" themselves to perform poorly, regardless of the situation.
one always does one's best. This interpretation implies that an empowerment intervention in the workplace may be most effective for volitional rather than habitual behaviours.

More recently, Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) point to the fact that people often do not distinguish between behaviours and events that may be the outcomes of these behaviours. Thus, some of the performance measures used here may not be the actual performance behaviours that were influenced: rather, they may be outcomes that are influenced by a myriad of other factors. In other words, the definition and measurement of the specific performance constructs here may have been contaminated (i.e., problems with both content and construct validity). For example, the Judgement dimension includes several underlying factors. It was defined by the developer as:

The ability to make decisions of high quality and to consider alternative courses of action based upon the available information. Individuals who scored high on this dimension made decisions on the in-basket exercise that appeared to be the most logical and appropriate given the available information. These individuals tended to make decisions and take actions that resolved conflicts and solved problems in the most efficient and expedient manner (e.g., disapproved vacation requests, investigated possible ethical conflicts, etc.). Those with low scores tended to take actions and make decisions that, although possible, were not as strongly justified or logically related to the available facts and information (Nowak, 1988:16).

As we can see from this description, behaviours related to this dimension are outcomes that stem from other behaviours. The scoring key\textsuperscript{17} indicates that, indeed, other behaviours and events are used to evaluate participants' score including:

- Decisiveness (e.g., "Did Carter decide not to direct Nelson to return the money or any software to Dahl's son at this time?"
- Problem solving (e.g., Was some action taken to account for

\textsuperscript{17} At the developer's request a copy of the complete scoring key is not provided; instead, a few examples will be quoted. 
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Washington's inability to cover for Cunningham during the audit?  

- Time-management (e.g., "Was a decision made to meet with Watson instead of attending the Strategic Planning Committee meeting on October 9th?"
- Action orientation (e.g., "Was some action taken to investigate or address these productivity problems?"
- Ethical norms (e.g., "Was Rhodes informed about the possible ethical issues involved?"

This confusion between dimension relevant behaviours and outcomes from other behaviours may have contributed to the lack of significance in the work performance results. Overall, Ajzen and Fishbein (1977) report that the lack of correspondence between action and/or target elements is typical of most studies, including those trying to predict work-related behaviours from attitudes towards work and effort on the job. The authors recognize that "it may sometimes be quite difficult to determine correspondence in a given instance" (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977:911). Nevertheless, to guarantee proper measurement of work-empowerment outcomes, the measured behaviour must be influenced primarily by the empowerment process and not by other behaviours or outcomes. Clearly, then, more work is necessary to tease out the relationship between the process of empowerment and specific work-outcomes.

The last issue presented here is not as directly related to the simulation study; however, it serves as an important point to keep in mind when designing potential empowerment interventions. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) indicate that the stability of intention is an important consideration for predicting behavioral change. The greater the number of intervening steps, the weaker the intention-behaviour relationship. Since the process of empowerment is one which requires considerable time, implementers need to be aware

---

18 To take action on this item participants had to *first* recognize that Washington's suggestion to cover for Cunningham was not feasible (i.e., problem recognition), *then* to identify and shift through the possible solutions (problem analysis), and only subsequently could any judgements be made.
of competing interventions or other circumstances which may occur during the change process. The longer the length of the intervention the more intervening, and possibly conflicting, factors can intercede the process. For example, if an organization is in the process of implementing an extensive empowerment process when downsizing occurs, intentions will be influenced by the news as well as the beliefs and subjective norms associated with such tidings. These beliefs and subjective norms may influence the behavioural intentions diametrically to the influences resulting from the empowerment process.

Time as a Constraining Factor
Chapter 1 noted the empowerment process is one which needs time. For this reason, the simulation was designed to span three weeks. By extending the time of the simulation, more extraneous intervening factors can appear; however, a process such as empowerment requires time for the beliefs and attitudes to translate to behavioral intention and then to behaviours. As Senge (1990:63) suggests: "it is a fundamental characteristic of complex human systems: 'cause' and 'effect' are not close in time and space." He suggests that the sooner we come to terms with the fact that "delays between actions and consequences are everywhere in human systems" (p.89), the more likely it will be to see successful program implementation. Failure to anticipate delays can lead to "overshooting" (Senge, 1990) or "undershooting."

Both overshooting and undershooting are a result of not waiting long enough to observe the result. Overshoots occur when, due to a lack of patience, more and more resources and effort are invested in the direction of the hoped-for outcome. It is considered to be overshooting since, had more time been allowed to elapse, the results would have occurred regardless of the additional efforts. It is also conceivable that the additional effort may even harm the process by producing instability and oscillation. Undershooting
occurs when, as a result of impatience, the intervention program is terminated before it has come to fruition. As was suggested earlier and by others (e.g., Bowen & Lawler, 1992; Kizilos, 1990) part of the difficulty in implementing empowerment programs is the length of time necessary before results can be seen. If the program is prematurely terminated, all benefits may be lost. Thus, despite the tendency in the field of organizational behaviour to take on the short-term (Staw, 1984), it will be important to consider longitudinal studies for further investigation of the process of empowerment.

The results of the study presented here, in combination with the Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) model of behavioral change, suggest that the effects of empowerment on behavioral outcomes may take some time to surface. In this study this time lag can be specifically observed by investigating the results on the Job satisfaction measure. As indicated in Chapter 4, the manipulation affected individuals' attitudes regarding how they perceive themselves in the context of work (the intra-psychic measure). In addition, the job satisfaction measure also picked up on attitudinal change. Moreover, within the job satisfaction measure, two items also captured behavioral intent (items 2 and 4 in Appendix 11).

Behavioral intentions can be closely linked to overt actions. They are considered to be immediate determinants of behaviours and, as such, can predict them (Ajzen, 1988; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). To be assured that the behavioral intention items were significantly affected, the items were analyzed separately. An analysis of variance by treatment group was significant ($F(2,130)=20.23, p < .001$). A post-hoc Scheffe test indicated that the mean of the dis-empowered group was significantly lower compared to both the empowered and the control group means. This suggests that the dis-empowered group was significantly less interested in continuing with the job; on the contrary, they preferred to quit and reported that they would not take a similar job again ($p < .01$). Means and
standard deviations are reported in Table 5.1 and results of the ANOVA are presented in Table 5.2.

Table 5.1: Job satisfaction Behavioral Intention. Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Z-Means*</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empowered</td>
<td>-.776</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>-.364</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis-empowered</td>
<td>1.239</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The lower the score the more interested in remaining with the job.

Table 5.2: Anova Summary for Job satisfaction Behavioral Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48.15</td>
<td>20.23</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result of this analysis, we can suggest that behavioral intentions were influenced by the manipulation. However, the lack of behavioral performance results implies that not enough time had elapsed between the attitudinal and behavioral intention changes and the measurement of work performance behaviours. In addition, however, the behavioral intention items (items 2 and 4 in Appendix 11) seemed to refer primarily to exiting the organization.

March and Simon (1958) have made a distinction between two types of employee decisions: (1) whether to participate in the organization or to leave, and (2) whether to
produce or to refuse to produce at the demanded rate. The behavioral intention measure in this study focused on the decision of whether to remain in the organization. Thus, it may have had little relationship to work performance. Instead, the findings suggest that turnover and tenure are important dependent variables when empowerment is investigated. However, it is too early to definitively conclude that empowerment does not affect March and Simon’s (1958) second type of decision: whether to produce at the demanded rate. For example, the constraining factor here may have been ability. As Ajzen (1988) points out, skill and abilities can constrain the positive relationship between behavioral intent and actual behaviour. In other words, it is possible that beliefs, attitudes, and behavioral intentions will be influenced by the process of empowerment, and yet the individual will not be able to translate resulting intentions to actual behaviour because of skill and ability limitations. This last point, however, does not apply to the current study since, as presented in Chapter 4, the issue of ability constraints was investigated and a constraint was not found. Nevertheless, as mentioned in the context of empowerment and performance, ability is an important consideration to always keep in mind, as is the need to be aware of competing interventions which may occur during the empowerment process.

The time limitation of this study may have constrained the opportunity to observe performance outcomes for an additional reason. Early performance-satisfaction theorists, primarily those belonging to the human relations school, suggested that satisfaction causes performance (e.g., Mayo, 1945). Even though it was also suggested that performance causes satisfaction (Lawler & Porter, 1967) and that no meaningful relationship between the two constructs exists (Silvers, 1992), we should consider the implications of the first point of view. If, as Organ (1977) suggests, the "satisfaction causes performance" point of view has been prematurely discarded, we need to consider that changes in the satisfaction measure found in this study may have been a step towards change on the
performance measures which would suggest the possibility that satisfaction precedes performance (see Figure 5.2). In other words, using the Fishbein & Ajzen (1975) model, not enough time had elapsed for the job satisfaction attitude to influence the work behaviours which were measured here. In sum, had more time elapsed, significant results on the performance measures may have been achieved.

Figure 5.2: Satisfaction Preceding Performance

The explanations suggested above have focused primarily on measurement issues. However, the non-significant results on the performance measures may also indicate that the work performance aspect of the multi-level process model of empowerment is not valid. The tested model suggested that both satisfaction and performance are relevant outcomes. However, the results found here may illustrate that performance is not an appropriate outcome for this process. In other words, when engaging in the empowerment process, anticipating work performance outcomes may not be an applicable expectation. In addition, since no significant results were found on the performance dependent variables one must also consider the possibility that the model presented here is not viable. Nevertheless, considering that partial support was found for the model there is room to investigate research alternatives and revised models. These alternatives and revisions will be offered next.

In this section, possible explanations for the lack of a significant relationship between the
empowerment level and the performance measures were suggested. As with all non-significant results it is hard to identify the exact cause for such an outcome. However, future research will be able to empirically investigate and shed more light on this issue. 

In the following section both limitations and future investigation will be discussed. This discussion will also include model modifications. These changes will all build on the original three stage model investigated here.

Limitations of the Study, Directions for Future Research, and Revised Models

Overall, executives and management scholars tend to be primarily interested in "bottom-line" outcomes (Staw, 1984). Yet, it is quite possible that the process of empowerment may influence factors other than the prevailing direct bottom-line indicators. This consideration, in conjunction with the view that now is a time of "re-engineering" (a process that questions traditional assumptions and procedures), would suggest a focus on new performance dimensions (Gleckman et al., 1993). For example, work performance outcomes such as risk-taking behaviour, creativity, and group performance (rather than the individual performance measured in this study), could be among those that we may wish to consider. In addition, decreases in destructive deviant behaviours as well as turnover and tenure may be important (see Figure 5.319).

It is important to emphasize that the non-significant results found here in relation to work performance may indicate that, overall, performance is not a viable outcome in relation to empowerment—an important consideration for both researchers and practitioners. It is imperative that appropriate outcome variables be recognized before costly

---

19 As presented in the previous section the performance-satisfaction link is unclear. For this reason the revised models depict these dependent variables as separate entities with no causal relations between the two constructs.
empowerment programs are implemented. As Rappaport (1987:121) suggests, empowerment is a "pervasive positive value in American culture." As such, and because of its increasing popularity in practitioner publications (e.g., Allard, 1992; Fisher, 1991; Kingston, 1992; Port & Carey, 1991; Woodruff, 1992), it is easy to be tempted to want to do the right thing or the "in" thing. However, caution and discretion with regard to expected outcomes is important, not only because of the expense involved in such programs, but also to avoid creating false expectations that an extensive program of change will affect certain outcomes (such as initiative or productivity). The unfulfilled anticipations of the empowerment program may, in turn, lead to costly confusion and potential resentment, and thus could conceivably escalate the original problems which led to the attempt to implement an empowerment program. In addition, premature expectations can lead to ethical problems similar to the ones suggested by Pinder (1977) with regard to application of motivation theories. Among the most concerning issues is the potential negative impact on the "usual 'guinea-pigs'—the lower participants of organizations...[since] changes in reporting relationships, status systems, working procedures...can be threatening for the individuals involved (Pinder, 1977:389).
An additional reason to investigate the appropriateness of certain performance outcomes is based on Fishbein and Ajzen’s (1975) theory of reasoned action, which suggests that we need to distinguish between habitual and volitional behaviours. As mentioned earlier, we should expect volitional rather than habitual behaviours to be changeable. This suggests that relevant work performance outcomes must first be classified as being either habitual or volitional. Idealistically, people who are aware or are made aware of their habits may make them volitional. In other words, before changes can be expected we need to insure that behaviours are at the volitional level, even if this necessitates an additional intervention (see Figure 5.4). However, this idea requires its own investigation, especially in the context of the empowerment process. Without it we run the risk of disregarding the empowerment process due to the unnecessary observation of inappropriate outcome variables or of behaviours that have not yet been brought to an appropriate level of awareness.

Figure 5.4: Awareness Intervention
This study was a simulation with MBA participants and, as such, care must be taken in generalizing the results to field settings (Campbell & Stanley, 1966). For this reason it is strongly advised that this model be tested in an organizational context, preferably as a quasi-experiment. Such an endeavour might re-examine commonly used dependent variables in the context of empowerment and include additional, more creative or relevant dependent variables (e.g., risk-taking behaviour). In addition, this study did not empirically investigate the influence of different organizational structures and values. However, in a field setting these factors may vary significantly between locations and their enabling or constraining influence needs to be realized.

As suggested earlier, the fact that this study was a simulation probably had an effect on participants’ motivation. This unanticipated factor may have inadvertently influenced the results on the performance measures so that no significant differences were found, regardless of empowerment level. A field study will enable an examination of empowerment with committed organizational members which may reduce the problem of participant’s direction of motivation. Nevertheless, the lesson learned here can be extrapolated to field settings by investigating and recognizing the directionality of employees’ motivation to be part of the organization and more specifically, to be part of the empowerment process.

![Figure 5.5: The Role of Motivation](image)

Figure 5.5: The Role of Motivation
The influence of motivation's directionality suggests that motivation may be a moderator\textsuperscript{20} of the empowerment process. Viewing motivation as having a moderating effect differs from past work which suggests that empowerment is similar to motivation (e.g., Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). Future research might tease out if and how motivation directionality acts as a moderator in the process of empowerment. For example, does motivation directionality affect only work performance outcomes, as suggested by the results of this study, or will it also affect job satisfaction or even the mediating intra-psychic variables? (See Figure 5.6.) This latter option suggests that the mediation relations are contingent on the directionality of motivation (i.e., the moderator), thereby implying a moderated mediation model (James & Brett, 1984:314). For now, of these three possibilities it seems most likely that the directionality of motivation primarily influences work performance outcomes, since significant differences were found between the three manipulation groups on the mediators and on the dependent variable of satisfaction but not on the performance measures.

As outlined in Chapter 1, the process of empowerment takes time. For this reason, the simulation was designed to take place over three weeks. This period was sufficient to influence the mediating variables as well as the dependent variable of job satisfaction. However, this time-frame may not have been long enough for the effects of empowerment to appear in work performance. Overall, as previously mentioned, care must be taken in designing and implementing empowerment programs so that "undershooting" does not occur. How much time needs to elapse before we can expect to see results is an important question that future research could, and should, address (see Figure 5.6).

\textsuperscript{20} A moderator variable delineates when certain effects will occur and what their direction and strength will be. This differs from a mediating variable which actually accounts for the relationship between the independent and dependent variables by explaining how or why this IV-DV effect occurs (Baron & Kenny, 1986)
One last issue that would greatly benefit from further investigation is the distinction between empowerment and dis-empowerment. Results reported in Chapter 4 indicated that the average levels of the dis-empowered group for self-esteem, locus of control (mediators) and job-satisfaction (dependent variable) measures differed from the average levels of both the empowered and the control groups on these measures. The empowered group’s average levels differed significantly only from the dis-empowered group’s average levels, not from the control group’s average levels on all three mediator measures (self-esteem, locus of control, and self-efficacy) and on the dependent variable measure of job satisfaction. This finding implies that the dis-empowerment treatment may have had a stronger effect than the empowerment treatment. Such a finding may indicate that overcoming elements of dis-empowerment might be a primary concern and that implementing empowerment might be of a secondary concern. In other words, before a process of empowerment can work, all elements of dis-empowerment may need to be eradicated first. This reasoning is similar to elements in Herzberg’s Two-Factor

\[21\] The average level on the intra-psychic measure of self-efficacy differed from the empowered group’s mean, but not from the control group’s.
(Herzberg, 1968) formulation with regard to satisfaction and dis-satisfaction. To date, such a distinction has not been recognized in the writings on empowerment.

At this point, establishing the relationship between empowerment and dis-empowerment remains an open question. Bobko (1985) warns organizational scholars of the implicit bipolarity assumptions prevalent in both measurement and theory construction. He suggests that removing these assumptions may pave the way for new construct conceptualizations. These new constructs may be able to simultaneously embrace opposite characteristics—a novel yet powerful idea for the domain of empowerment which may suggest the need for further conceptualization of the construct. However, without further research, it is too early to identify if empowerment and dis-empowerment are equivalent mirror images of each other or if they are part of a more intricate construct structure. Nevertheless, practitioners may benefit by already considering the possibility that dis-empowering elements may suppress the chances for successful empowerment programs. For example, if an organization provides organizational members with more responsibility but insufficient information or active belief, an enhancement program may not be successful.

Overall, in this last section several options for future research were considered. These research alternatives were offered based on the fact that current results indicated that revisions to the current model may be necessary. Combining the different suggestions presented here results in the following revised model of empowerment (see Figure 5.7). The major change from the original model is to break performance outcomes away from satisfaction, and to suggest that issues of motivation and awareness may be necessary for empowerment interventions to affect performance.
Figure 5.7: The Revised Multi-Level Process Model of Empowerment

Contributions and Conclusions

The impetus for this dissertation was the recognition of the need to clarify the increasingly popular term of empowerment (Simon, 1990), to learn if and how empowerment influences organizational outcomes (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990), and to explore how empowerment could be implemented. Specifically, this dissertation was designed: first, to develop a better understanding of the empowerment construct and, second, to empirically test the causal relations in the proposed multi-level process model of empowerment. As part of the process of construct development, a multi-level classification of work in the area was constructed and a new definition of empowerment was offered. The classification framework will be a useful tool for avoiding confusion caused by different levels of analysis. It also helps identify work that may not even be relevant to the construct i.e., work that falls under the misnomer category. This framework can facilitate the recognition of how new developments are related to previous work and thus, decrease the prevailing confusion
in the area of empowerment research.

Overall, the empirical findings suggest the importance of information, active belief, and responsibility for the process of empowerment, as well as the significance the intra-psyche has in the process. This research is particularly timely since there has been a scarcity of work conceptualizing and investigating empowerment as a process (Price, 1990). In addition, these results point to the importance of viewing empowerment as a multi-level process spanning the three levels of analysis (Micro, Meso, and Macro) presented in Chapter 1. Now, with the empirical indications that empowerment can be conceived as a process, we can focus on "managing" empowerment rather than only hoping to "have" empowerment.

This dissertation is a first attempt to empirically investigate the direction of causality with regard to empowerment in the work-place. The application of in-basket simulations used here provided experimental methods that allowed for control and the manipulation of variables that could test causal hypotheses (Emory, 1985). Although empowerment is very popular, its business applications have outpaced any logical attempts to analyze its effectiveness. Thus, this study should provide interventionists with cause for caution: Empowerment is not a panacea for all organizational ills. If these results are directly applicable, empowerment interventions can foster increased satisfaction and even more so, dis-empowerment may foster decreased satisfaction. However, more must be done to increase performance.

This empirical investigation documented the importance of distinguishing between work performance versus job satisfaction outcomes in the context of work-empowerment. This finding should clarify the importance of choosing relevant outcomes (and correct measures for them) when implementing empowerment programs. Moreover, the findings
regarding motivation suggest that before designing such programs, it is critical to recognize the direction of employees' work motivation. Furthermore, this study highlights the importance of examining the effects of the empowerment changes over a considerable length of time. These findings and their implications have been incorporated in a revised model of the empowerment process which is offered for future research. In addition, the results of the study suggest the importance of identifying and eradicating dis-empowering elements which may be critical to the success of the empowerment process.

In addition, even before we find answers to all the questions raised here for future research, we already know that, at least in this case, empowerment affected job satisfaction. This, in and of itself, is a contribution, since a positive influence on job satisfaction has a significant role in organizational life. For example, we know that job satisfaction is related to work job stress (Norbeck, 1985) and it has already been established that stress and mental health are important organizational outcomes that need to be considered (Ivancevich et al., 1990; Staw, 1984; Staw & Oldham, 1978).

Overall, this dissertation has contributed to developing a better understanding of an organizational process, which as Staw (1984) suggests, is as important as learning about how to improve organizational outcomes. It is hoped that the theoretical development of empowerment in the workplace, as well as the empirical test of the model in a controlled environment, will reduce the misuse and abuse of the term and contribute to a better understanding of how to implement the empowerment process.
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APPENDICES
Many MBA students have expressed an interest in having more of an opportunity to participate in hands-on management issues. **We are pleased to announce such an opportunity!**

We have acquired a program that simulates organizational settings and requires problem solving and managerial decisions on topics such as: planning and organizing, managerial control, and time management. Participants will work through a set of organizational situations and be debriefed by experts in the field of managerial effectiveness. The benefit of this program lies in the opportunity to tackle management experiences and to receive constructive feedback to enhance your managerial skills and abilities.

Together with the Professional Development Programs Office, we intend to offer this opportunity at no charge to MBA students. Please note that currently there are no plans to repeat this workshop.

We believe this Program offers an excellent opportunity to explore management problems, issues, and solutions in realistic settings. Within the next few weeks you will receive information on when, where, and how this program will be run. Enrolment is limited and applications will be processed on a first come, first serve basis.
Appendix 2 - Notice of Program

NAME: 

PHONE NUMBER: 

SESSION DATES: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Session Dates</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 1</td>
<td>Max I to 4</td>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>11 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 2</td>
<td>Max I to 4</td>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>11 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 3</td>
<td>Max I to 4</td>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>11 hr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SIGNATURE: 

MASTERING MANAGEMENT: The MBA Managerial Effectiveness Workshop

Many MBA students have expressed interest in having more of an opportunity to participate in hands-on management issues. We are pleased to announce such an opportunity!

We have a research project that simulates organizational settings and includes problem solving and managerial decisions on topics such as planning and organizing, managing control, and time management. Participants will work through a set of organizational situations and be expected to develop and present written solutions in the area of managerial effectiveness. The benefits of this program lies in the opportunity to enhance your performance on selection and performance instruments, tackle management exercises, and receive constructive feedback to enhance your managerial skills and abilities.

Together with the Professional Development Programs and the Masters' Programs Offices, we have decided to offer this opportunity at no charge to MBA students. Please note that there is no commitment to repeat this workshop. In other words; this is the only time current students will have the opportunity to gain considerable insight into their basic managerial skills in a simulated decision situation and practice with the in-basket instrument, which is frequently used for hiring and promotion purposes.

The program consists of three sessions and a workshop. The first two weekly sessions will take no more than two hours to complete and the third session (which will be done in the third week) will be approximately two hours. The half day beginning and effectiveness workshop will be offered at convenient dates towards the end of the semester.

Commitment to the first three sessions is essential. If you are unable to agree to this, please do not apply. The success of this Mastering Management Program is dependent on full participation throughout all three sessions.

Workshop participants may choose between two time slots for each of the first three stages and between two time slots for the final stage. If you are interested in attending the Program, please select your preferred time slots on the following page. Please note your phone number and return this sheet to the Study Abroad and Exchange Office, M BA Office, or to Craig Pinder's office (416 552) by February 13, 1993.

We believe this Program offers an excellent opportunity to explore management, issues, and solutions in realistic settings. Enrolment is limited and applications will be processed on a first-come, first-served basis. If you require further information or wish to participate, please contact Ethel Davis at 622-8832,39 Catherine Veretski at 622-8837, or Craig Pinder at 622-8837.

For your own schedule please note your committed times and dates below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MBA Managerial Effectiveness Workshop

Please detach on dotted line and return completed section to the Envelopes provided in the MBA Office (Room 132); or to Craig Pinder's office (622 552). This section of the brochure can be posted for you records.
Appendix 3 - Opening Description

During the next three sessions you will take part in several tasks which simulate managerial activity. In each session you will receive a series of different items and problems recreating a variety of typical managers' tasks. In order to be successful, you need to put yourself in the manager's shoes. In other words, try to respond as you would in this particular manager's specific situation. Use your own experience and judgement as the basis for your responses.

During the next two sessions you will be J. Carter, Manager of the PC Software Development Department in General Software Products. You have three group managers under you. In each of the three groups there are between three and seven programmers. Your boss is the VP of Software Development, who reports to the CEO of the company. In addition, there is a Software Steering Committee. Please start by answering the questions listed below. Since this work will later be used for your own developmental purposes, please respond as you would in such a situation, and not as you think one "should." Remember, you are to use your own experience and judgement as the basis for your responses.

Please think about the messages you receive in organizations and indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the statements...

MEDIATING ITEMS (Appendices 4, 5, and 6) WERE PLACED HERE
Appendix 4
Pierce et al. (1989) Organization-based Self-esteem Scale

The following items are measured on a 5-point scale.

Please think about the messages you receive in organizations and indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the statements.

1. I count around here.
2. I am taken seriously around here.
3. I am important around here.
4. I am trusted around here.
5. Around here there is faith in me.
6. I can make a difference around here.
7. I am valuable around here.
8. I am helpful around here.
9. I am efficient around here.
10. I am cooperative around here.
Appendix 5
Paulhus and Van Selst’s (1990) Spheres of Control Scale

Modified version:

**Personal Control**
1. In this organization I can usually achieve what I want when I work hard for it.
2. In this organization once I make plans I am almost certain to make them work.
3. In this organization I can learn almost anything if I set my mind to it.
4. My major accomplishments in organizations such as this one are entirely due to my hard work and ability.
5. In this organization I usually do not set goals because I have a hard time following through on them. *
6. In organizations such as this, bad luck has sometimes prevented me from achieving things. *
7. In this organization almost anything is possible for me if I really want it.
8. Most of what will happen in my career is beyond my control. *
9. In this organization I find it pointless to keep working on something that is too difficult for me. *

**Interpersonal Control**
1. In my organizational relationships, the other person usually has more control over the relationship than I do. *
2. In organizations I have no trouble making and keeping friends.
3. In organizational settings I am not good at guiding the course of a conversation with several others. *
4. In organizations I can usually develop a close personal relationship with someone I find appealing.
5. In organizational settings I can usually steer a conversation toward the topics I want to talk about.
6. In organizations when I need assistance with something, I often find it difficult to get others to help. *
7. In an organization if there is someone I want to meet I can usually arrange it.
8. In an organizational setting, I often find it hard to get my point of view across to others. *
9. In organizational setting, in attempting to smooth over a disagreement I sometimes make it worse. *
10. In organizations I find it easy to play an important part in most group situations.

* indicates items which are reversed in scoring.
Appendix 6
Sherer et al. (1982) Self-Efficacy Scale

1. When I make plans, I am certain I can make them work.
2. One of my problems is that I cannot get down to work when I should. *
3. If I can't do a job the first time, I keep trying until I can.
4. When I set important goals for myself, I rarely achieve them. *
5. I give up on things before completing them. *
6. I avoid facing difficulties. *
7. If something looks too complicated, I will not even bother to try it. *
8. When I have something unpleasant to do, I stick to it until I finish it.
9. When I decide to do something, I go right to work on it.
10. When trying to learn something new, I soon give up if I am not initially successful.*
11. When unexpected problems occur, I don't handle them well. *
12. I avoid trying to learn new things when they look too difficult for me. *
13. Failure just makes me try harder.
14. I feel insecure about my ability to do things. *
15. I am a self-reliant person.
16. I give up easily. *
17. I do not seem capable of dealing with most problems that come up in life. *

* indicates items which are reversed in scoring.
Appendix 7
Sample of In-basket item

SERVCOM ROUTING SLIP

DATE: October 3

FROM: D. Marino

TO: P. Andrews

Action [ ] File [ ] Read and Return [ ]
Comment [ ] See Me [ ] See Remarks Below [X]

REMARKS:

I understand that S. Lee was interviewed by one of the big television journal magazines. I don't know which one (I think it was 60 Minutes) about discrimination at Servcom Corporation. Based on previous encounters with Lee, I doubt that anything good was said about our company.

As you know, Lee has been a union steward for the last two years and has always been critical of management. We don't need any adverse publicity of this sort, particularly in light of our previous EEOC complaints. I thought you should know about this.
REQUEST FOR CONFIDENTIALITY and CONSENT

As part of this program on managerial effectiveness, you will be exposed to a series of managerial tasks. These tasks are adaptations of a real manager's tasks. It is very important that until the first three sessions are completed by all participants, you maintain confidentiality about all of the information you will receive.

Since there are several time slots for each session it is important that you do not discuss any of the information with others until AFTER 30/3/93.

Please note that the data you provide will also be used for research purposes; however, all such material will be kept confidential. As mentioned, you will be taking part in three managerial simulations for a total time of under four hours. If you participate in all three simulations you will be eligible to take part in a managerial effectiveness workshop. In addition, should you be interested, you will also receive individual feedback on your performance during the simulation as well as a summary of the purposes and results of the research component of this project. The benefit of this program lies in the opportunity to tackle management experiences and to receive constructive feedback to enhance your managerial skills and abilities. If you have any questions please contact Professor Craig Pinder at 822-8374 (H.A. 552).

I ____________________________ (please print name) agree to maintain the confidentiality of the information I will encounter during this managerial effectiveness program. I will not discuss this information with any other UBC students until the study is over (30/3/93). I also consent to having the information collected during the managerial simulations to be used for research purposes. I understand that such information is confidential and will not be used for other purposes or be transferred to other sources.

___________________________ (Signature)

___________________________ (Date)
Appendix 9

PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Name (Please print):

Phone Number:

Sex: (Please circle the appropriate answer)
   Male / Female

Age:

Year (Please circle the correct answer):
   1st year MBA / 2nd year MBA / Evening MBA / Other (Please specify) _______

Ethnic group (Please circle the correct answer):
   Hispanic / Asian / Native Indian / White / Black / Other (Please specify) _______

Is English your native language? If not: (1) what language is, (2) where are you from, and (3) how many years have you lived in North America?

How many years have you worked full time?

How many years have you worked part time?

Please indicate the highest position/title you achieved at work:
Appendix 10
Post Experiment Manipulation Check

The purpose of this last set of questions is to identify what *you* thought and felt throughout this managerial development program. Please answer these questions as truthfully as you can. If you would like to add additional comments, please feel free to do so. Please be sure to write your responses in a clear and legible manner.

For the next few statements, please circle the answer that best describes what you think.

1) In my organizational role as J. Carter I felt that the information I had access to was:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Restricted                  Sufficient

2) As J. Carter I felt that I had:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Sufficient                  Insufficient
responsibility             responsibility

3) In my organizational role as J. Carter I felt:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Trusted & respected         Not trusted & respected

4) I felt that I was working with people that were behind me and supportive of my efforts and work:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Supportive                  Not supportive
5) As J. Carter I felt:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Empowered Not empowered

6) I found General Holding Company (which both Servcom and General Software are part of) to be an organization I would:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Like to work for Not like to work for

7) During the three sessions of the managerial effectiveness program I was:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Highly motivated Not at all motivated
to do my best to do my best

8) Overall, what did you think of the three management simulation sessions you were exposed to? Please explain.

9) During the time between the first session of this program and today, did you tell anybody about the content of these exercises, or did anybody tell you about it? If so, what was the information that was exchanged? (Please note that you are still requested not to talk about the management simulation program until 30/3/93.)
Appendix 11
Tymon’s (1988) General Job Satisfaction Scale

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

1. I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do on this job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. I frequently think of quitting this job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with this job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the job you now have, what would you decide?

1) I would definitely take the job again.
2) I would probably take the job again.
3) I am not sure if I would take the job again.
4) I would probably not take the job again.
5) I would definitely not take the job again.
Appendix 12
OPD's In-basket Dimension Means, S.D.s, and Scoring Ranges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INITIATIVE</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENSITIVITY</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>9-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0-16</td>
<td>17-35</td>
<td>36-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELEGATION</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>5-17</td>
<td>18-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOLLOW-UP</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>4-12</td>
<td>13-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROBLEM-ANALYSIS</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>0-12</td>
<td>13-33</td>
<td>34-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDGEMENT</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>15-32</td>
<td>33-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECISIVENESS</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>0-18</td>
<td>19-37</td>
<td>38-44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Norms are based on 834 first-line supervisors, managers, and executives in diverse industry groups including aerospace, manufacturing, health care, finance, education, communications, and retail.
Appendix 13
Session 1

General Software Products, Ltd.

In this booklet you are asked to take the role of a Personal Computer (PC) Software department manager in General Software Products Ltd., one of the companies owned by General Holding Corporation. You are requested to respond to several letters and memos that have been left in your in-basket. General Holding Corp. is a large company which competes in the computer industry and its headquarters are located in Toronto, Canada. Please act as if you are J. Carter, department manager in General Software Products Ltd.

General Software develops a wide variety of software products. Its organizational chart is given in the figure below. You, J. Carter, have just been promoted from the position of Computer Games Group manager. {This new promotion represented a natural progression for someone fast tracking through management levels at General Software Products} [Despite being pleased with your promotion, you are concerned that there were no prior indications that management was pleased with your work.] {Your new position as PC Software Department manager also carries with it the membership on the firm’s Software Steering Committee.) [Your new position as PC Software Department manager also carries with it the possibility of membership on the firm’s Software Steering Committee. However, to your dismay, there are rumours that you will not be appointed to the Committee.] {This Committee meets with the firm’s Chief Executive Officer, David Brown, to discuss key strategic policy decisions.} The previous department manager for PC Software, Sam White, <{died suddenly of a heart attack three weeks ago}> [was fired] and {as many predicted, including yourself;} [to your surprise] you were appointed to the position.

ORGANIZATION CHART HERE

---

24 Manipulation items are presented in the following order: {empowered}, <control>, and [dis-empowered].
Today is Wednesday, June 5th. Even though you have already talked with Pat Morgan on issues specific to this job, you have now just arrived at your new office for the first time. It is 5:45 p.m. and you must leave promptly at 8:20 p.m. to catch the 9:30 p.m. plane to San Francisco for important meetings. You will not be back until Friday, June 14. As you walk in you remember the CEO's words when he called shortly after you were notified of your new appointment. \{[In his brief conversation with you he expressed]\} \{his delight that you were available for this promotion and expressed his belief that you will fit in quickly. In addition, he also offered his assistance, should any be needed.\} \{his concern that he had to transfer you to this position, before you had a chance to gain the necessary experience. He also directed you that should the job be more than you could handle to please let him know as soon as possible\].

The letters and memos were left in the in-basket on your desk by Nancy, your secretary. Please read through the set of materials carefully and decide which actions you believe are appropriate in each situation. Your responses should be both novel and appropriate. Carefully specify every action you wish to take in the form of a memo or letter. You are to use your own experience and judgement as the basis for your decisions and responses in the role of J. Carter. Blank sheets have been provided for this purpose. Be sure to indicate to whom each letter or memo is addressed. Please make sure that when you respond to a given memo you attach all relevant materials with the provided paper clips. Your assistant will take care of the final drafting of the correspondence so please be sure that your handwriting is clear. At the end of some situations there are also several additional questions to answer. Please answer these questions after you have written your relevant letter or memo.

Your meetings in San Francisco will take up most of your time between now and June 14th so you will not have much of an opportunity to take care of these matters while you are there. You have therefore decided to handle these items to the extent possible before you leave your office at 8:20 p.m.
General Software Products, Ltd.
Memorandum

To: J. Carter
From: Nancy
Date: June 5

These are the letters and memoranda that require your immediate attention. From past experience I would say that all of these items fall under your jurisdiction. I am sorry that I will not be around tonight to help you before you leave for San Francisco. However, if you need my assistance on anything, I can be contacted at 320-5906.

Have a nice trip and see you when you return on the 14th.

Nancy

General Software Products, Ltd.
Memorandum

To: J. Carter
From: Nancy
Date: June 5

These are the letters and memoranda that require your immediate attention. From past experience I would say that all of these items fall under your jurisdiction. I am sorry that I will not be around tonight to help you before you leave for San Francisco.

Have a nice trip and see you when you return on the 14th.

Nancy

General Software Products, Ltd.
Memorandum

To: J. Carter
From: Nancy
Date: June 5

These are the letters and memoranda that require your immediate attention. From past experience I would say that all of these items fall under your jurisdiction. I am sorry that I will not be around tonight to help you before you leave for San Francisco, but I’ve made other plans. See you when you return on the 14th.

Nancy
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May 14, 1991

Mr. Sam White, Manager
PC Software Department
General Software Products, Ltd.

Dear Sam:

Last week the VP of Marketing at Tak On's called me to see whether General Software Products might be interested in a joint venture in the area of Databases. I am not surprised at this suggestion because they must still be hurting from the major losses they incurred in their failed venture in the area of word-processing. Tak On is General Software Products' closest competitor and we haven't been in a joint venture with them in quite some time.

However, remember that Tak On helped us out with our spreadsheet products in the late 1980s and we have had good relations with their management for many years. So far they have always competed with us fairly.

The proposed joint venture sounds quite promising. We would share the development efforts of the new database package with Tak On and market this new product under a single new brand name. All costs, revenues, and profits would be shared equally and both firms would put up half of the estimated initial investment of $100,000. Tak On said they needed our participation in the joint venture in order to obtain the needed investment capital and to share the risks of new software development. They also had heard that we have been considering an independent entry into the database market and believe a cooperative joint venture would make both companies better off than a competitive battle for this new market.

Our analysis shows that a joint venture would yield a 20% return on investment for both firms. Tak On has already acquired experience and hired one of the best programmers in the
database field. We have the necessary production capacity and we would be helping Tak On to get back on its feet after the difficult period it has been facing.

Alternatively, we can enter this market alone as we have been planning. In a competitive venture against Tak On, however, there is uncertainty about how much of the market we could capture. If Tak On doesn’t have the resources to make a strong independent entry, we should gain a large market share. In this case we would earn a 25% return on our somewhat higher investment. On the other hand, Tak On might focus its energy on this new market because we had rejected their offer of a joint venture. Under this scenario, we could get only a small share of the market and perhaps only 10% return on investment. Because of Tak On’s situation, we believe the chances are two out of three that we could get a larger market share in a competitive venture and there is a one-third chance of getting a small market share.

Tak On has asked us to decide on their offer of a joint venture by June 12. Please let me know your thinking on this question so a formal reply can be made.

Yours truly,

Alan Summers
VP Marketing
General Software Products, Ltd.

added as a hand written comment:
{I rely on your input on this matter, somehow, you always seems to make the correct decisions in matters of this kind.} [We will be making our decision regardless, however, the CEO wants us to gather input from all involved.]
Put an X on each scale below to indicate how you perceive this situation:

a. Situation is very risky to General Software Products
   
b. I can exert great control over the outcome of this situation
   
c. Suppose the chances of achieving a high market share after entering the market alone were unknown. What is the lowest chance of achieving a high market share that you would require to enter the database market alone?
   
   Answer: ___ out of 100

d. Accept whatever outcomes occur from the decision
   
e. Gain as much additional information as possible
   
f. Decide among the options currently available
   
g. Make decision in consultation with my superior
   
Suppose your recommendation is adopted by your organization and the outcome is unfavourable. Put an X on each scale below to indicate how you perceive the situation:

h. My organization would hold me responsible
   
i. I can still develop plans to modify the unfavourable outcome
   
   My organization would not hold me responsible
   
   I cannot develop plans to modify the unfavourable outcome
Sorry, so far I have not been successful in finding the information you wanted regarding performance appraisals. However, I asked Bob Davis to take a look into it and see if he can find the answer for you in our personnel manual.

Look you really shouldn't be asking me for information on performance appraisals. It is all somewhere in the personnel manual.
Carter, I just want you to know that you may hear some negative remarks from somebody here. However, I would like you to rest assured that I am completely behind you and have assured them that you are the best person we could have found for this job. I hope that my conversation with them was the end of this subject, but just in case it isn’t I want to make sure that you know where I stand.

Carter, I just want you to know that you may hear some negative remarks from somebody here. However, I would like you to rest assured that I have already spoken with them.

Carter, I just want you to know that you may hear some negative remarks from somebody here. I would suggest that you make sure they don’t have any reason to repeat their comments again.
I have just found out that we have some "slack" money in our budget. As a result I can give you $10,000 for you to allocate at your discretion.

I have just found out that we have some "slack" money in our budget. As a result, I would like to suggest that you forward some suggestions on how your department could use some additional funds. I can go up to $10,000.

I have some "slack" money in our budget and want you to send some of your people to trade shows and conferences. I will be forwarding their names and the dates they will be away within the next few days.
May 30, 1991

J. Carter, Manager
PC Software Department
General Software Products
500 West Dearborn Street
Toronto, Ont. M6S 1W4

Dear J. Carter:

Congratulations on your new appointment. {I am sorry to greet you with a problem so early in your new position, but} we have a pressing situation in the word-processing group that requires {your expertise and recommendation} <a solution> [a solution NOW].

Six months ago the group began negotiating a contract to develop a new word-processing package for artists. During this period we have been investigating two alternative designs for the package. One design is the standard one we have used successfully in several word-processors. The technology for producing this standard package is well-known and we are sure to make a return of about 25% on our investment because the market for this design is large and stable. The vast majority of the programmers as well as the adjunct marketing people in the word-processing group recommend going with this standard design.

However, a couple of very knowledgeable people from the steering committee support a new design they have extensively researched; but there is little experience in developing and marketing the new design even though the costs in producing both designs are roughly the same. They argue the market for the standard design is not expanding and the PC department needs to produce innovative products. The new design has its problems also. The major uncertainties seem to be whether this design will allow the package to run under the OS/2 operating system and whether the market will accept the new design. Advocates of both designs agree that the new design has a much greater potential than the standard design. If it is accepted in the market and is viable under OS/2, the new design could lead to a 40% return on investment. If not, the new design would yield only a 10% return, well below our Division’s average return of 20%.
Both groups also agree that the chances of success for this new design are 50-50.

The urgency on this issue is caused by the wholesaler’s requirement that we complete the contract (with the design specified) no later than June 10, 1991. Starting production later than this date would jeopardize Christmas sales. The wholesaler has no preference on the two designs because its fees are fixed.

Shall we go with the standard design that has the support of the majority of our programmers and marketing people, or with the new design even though it has few advocates? {Since you are the expert, I are waiting until I receive your recommendation on this matter.} [Please come up with a solution on this issue as soon as possible and submit it to me for review well before the next committee meeting.]

Yours truly,

Susan Lee
Head of Software Steering Committee
General Software Products Ltd.
Put an X on each scale below to indicate how you perceive this situation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Situation is very risky to General Software Products</th>
<th>Situation is not risky to General Software Products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. I can exert great control over the outcome of this situation</td>
<td>I can exert no control over the outcome of this situation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Suppose the chances of a success with the new design were unknown. What is the lowest chance that the word-processing package is accepted in the market that you would require to use the new design?

Answer: ____ out of 100

d. Accept whatever outcomes occur from the decision | Try to influence situation through bargaining and spending resources |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|

e. Gain as much additional information as possible | Use the available information to make the decision |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
f. Decide among the options currently available | Try to develop new options before deciding |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
g. Make decision in consultation with my superior | Make decision by myself without consulting my superior |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|

Suppose your recommendation is adopted by your organization and the outcome is unfavourable. Put an X on each scale below to indicate how you perceive the situation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>h. My organization would hold me responsible</th>
<th>My organization would not hold me responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. I can still develop plans to modify the unfavourable outcome</td>
<td>I cannot develop plans to modify the unfavourable outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Sam White
FROM: Pat Morgan
SUBJECT: R. Davis
cc: J. Carter

I have heard from some reliable sources that Ron Davis, software engineer, has an outside job offer on which he is going to give a firm answer next week. I don’t think anyone else knows this yet. I understand he has been offered more money than we can offer now based upon present wage and salary policy. As you know, Ron has been with us for only two years and holds a computer science undergraduate degree.

I know that you and J. Carter feel that Ron is one of the most valuable men in the software division and I thought I would let you know about this for whatever action you might want to take.

****************************

TO: J. Carter
FROM: Pat Morgan
SUBJECT: R. Davis

I have heard from some reliable sources (which I am not at liberty to disclose) that Ron Davis, software engineer, has an outside job offer on which he is going to give a firm answer next week. I understand he has been offered more money than we can offer now based upon present wage and salary policy. As you know, Ron has been with us for only two years and holds a computer science undergraduate degree.

Despite your opinion of him, I feel that Ron is one of the most valuable men in the software division and I thought I would let you know about this so that you can try and do something before it is too late for any action. However, before you do anything, make sure you clear it with me. I want to be clear that we should not lose this guy!
(Emp. and Control)

Attention: J. Carter

I am writing to you because Mr. White would have never understood. Three months ago, he reached into the ranks and promoted me. He said I was doing a great job. But I don't see it that way. I enjoyed my three years as a programmer here more.

It's not the same with the group any more. They don't ask me out for drinks on Friday night. I got dropped from their bowling invitations. The pay and responsibility difference doesn't seem worth it. Also my replacement is slow and it's hard to stand by and watch him do in a week what I did in a day. I'm tempted to criticize instead of helping him.

I know the job is tough, but I think I would like a change - or advice. I would really appreciate you getting back to me soon.

Ben Barker

*******************************************************

Attention: J. Carter

I am writing to you because there really isn't anybody else. I know Mr. White would have understood, however, as we both know, he is gone. Three months ago, he reached into the ranks and promoted me. He said I was doing a good job. But I don't see it that way. I enjoyed my three years as a programmer here more.

It's not the same with the group any more. They don't ask me out for drinks on Friday night. I got dropped from their bowling invitations. The pay and responsibility difference doesn't seem worth it. Also my replacement is slow and it's hard to stand by and watch him do in a week what I did in a day. I'm tempted to criticize instead of helping him.

I know the job is tough. I don't expect you to understand, but thought you should know.

Ben Barker
TO:          J. Carter  
FROM:       Terry O’ Conner 
SUBJECT:    Lunch Breaks 

It has come to my attention that many of our employees are abusing lunch time. They are taking too long a lunch break, some by up to double the allowable time.

I have talked with the group managers who think it is better we leave things as they are. However, I felt it important to receive your input on this. Do you think anything should be done about this?

*******************************************************************************

TO:          J. Carter  
FROM:       Terry O’ Conner 
SUBJECT:    Lunch Breaks 

It has come to my attention that many of our employees are abusing lunch time. They are taking too long a lunch break, some by up to double the allowable time.

I have talked with the group managers who think it is better we leave things as they are. What should we do about this?

*******************************************************************************

TO:          J. Carter  
FROM:       Terry O’ Conner 
SUBJECT:    Lunch Breaks 

It has come to my attention that many of our employees are abusing lunch time. They are taking too long a lunch break, some by up to double the allowable time.

I have talked with the group managers who think it is better we leave things as they are. They felt that you wouldn’t do anything about this. However, I wanted to give you a chance. Should I ignore all of this or will you do something about this.
TO: J. Carter

Just thought you’d want to know that one of your employee’s is copying software packages from our computer and selling them to high school kids. I have reason to believe that one of the Group Managers knows about this and may have even supplied them with software manuals.

Since I think you are the right address to be telling this to, I haven’t told anybody else about this. I feel very strongly about this issue, so please let me know if there is anything I can do to help you with this.

********************************************************************************

TO: J. Carter

Just thought you’d want to know that one of your employee’s is copying software packages from our computer and selling them to high school kids. I have reason to believe that one of the Group Managers knows about this and may have even supplied them with software manuals.

Is this practice going to be allowed to continue?

********************************************************************************

TO: J. Carter

Just thought you’d want to know that one of your people is copying software packages from our computer and selling them to high school kids. I have reason to believe that one of the Group Managers knows about this and may have even supplied them with software manuals.

Oh, by the way, I also informed the CEO about this.
General Software Products, Ltd.
Memorandum

To: J. Carter
PC Software Development

From: P. Morgan
VP Software Development

Date: May 31, 1991

Thanks for your Computer Games Department progress report. Your format was not quite our usual style, however, I like it and am considering recommending that others follow your example. Would you be willing to coach them?

((in pen "keep up the good work!"))

********************************************

General Software Products, Ltd.
Memorandum

To: J. Carter
PC Software Development

From: P. Morgan
VP Software Development

Date: May 31, 1991

Even though your report was not written in the standard format, I read it this time. Your format isn't a bad idea, but around here we prefer working the standard way. So next time, please make sure that you are following standard procedure -- we can not have everybody coming up with changes! From now on, just focus on what you are asked to do.
REQUEST FOR CONFIDENTIALITY and CONSENT

As part of this program on managerial effectiveness, you will be exposed to a series of managerial tasks. These tasks are adaptations of a real manager's tasks. It is very important that until the first three sessions are completed by all participants, you maintain confidentiality about all of the information you will receive.

Since there are several time slots for each session it is important that you do not discuss any of the information with others until AFTER 30/3/93.

Please note that the data you provide will also be used for research purposes; however, all such material will be kept confidential. As mentioned, you will be taking part in three managerial simulations for a total time of under four hours. If you participate in all three simulations you will be eligible to take part in a managerial effectiveness workshop. In addition, should you be interested, you will also receive individual feedback on your performance during the simulation as well as a summary of the purposes and results of the research component of this project. The benefit of this program lies in the opportunity to tackle management experiences and to receive constructive feedback to enhance your managerial skills and abilities. If you have any questions please contact Professor Craig Pinder at 822-8374 (H.A. 552).

I ___________________________ (please print name) agree to maintain the confidentiality of the information I will encounter during this managerial effectiveness program. I will not discuss this information with any other UBC students until the study is over (30/3/93). I also consent to having the information collected during the managerial simulations to be used for research purposes. I understand that such information is confidential and will not be used for other purposes or be transferred to other sources.

__________________________ (Signature)

__________________________ (Date)
PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Name (Please print):

Phone Number:

Sex: (Please circle the appropriate answer)
    Male / Female

Age:

Year (Please circle the correct answer):
    1st year MBA / 2nd year MBA / Evening MBA / Other (Please specify) __________

Ethnic group (Please circle the correct answer):
    Hispanic / Asian / Native Indian / White / Black / Other (Please specify) __________

Is English your native language? If not: (1) what language is, (2) where are you from, and (3) how many years have you lived in North America?

How many years have you worked full time?

How many years have you worked part time?

Please indicate the highest position/title you achieved at work:
During the next three sessions you will take part in several tasks which simulate managerial activity. In each session you will receive a series of different items and problems recreating a variety of typical managers' tasks. In order to be successful, you need to put yourself in the manager's shoes. In other words, try to respond as you would in this particular manager's specific situation. Use your own experience and judgement as the basis for your responses.

During the next two sessions you will be J. Carter, Manager of the PC Software Development Department in General Software Products. You have three group managers under you. In each of the three groups there are between three and seven programmers. Your boss is the VP of Software Development, who reports to the CEO of the company. In addition, there is a Software Steering Committee. Please start by answering the questions listed below. Since this work will later be used for your own developmental purposes, please respond as you would in such a situation, and not as you think one "should." Remember, you are to use your own experience and judgement as the basis for your responses.

Please think about the messages you receive in organizations and indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the statements using the 5 point scale. For example, if you completely agree with the statement circle 5 and if completely disagree circle 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I count around here.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am taken seriously around here.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am important around here.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am trusted around here.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Around here there is faith in me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I can make a difference around here.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am valuable around here.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am helpful around here.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am efficient around here.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am cooperative around here.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. When I make plans, I am certain I can make them work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>One of my problems is that I cannot get down to work when I should.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>If I can’t do a job the first time, I keep trying until I can.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>When I set important goals for myself, I rarely achieve them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I give up on things before completing them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I avoid facing difficulties.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>If something looks too complicated, I will not even bother to try it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>When I have something unpleasant to do, I stick to it until I finish it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>When I decide to do something, I go right to work on it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>When trying to learn something new, I soon give up if I am not initially successful.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>When unexpected problems occur, I don’t handle them well.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I avoid trying to learn new things when they look too difficult for me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Failure just makes me try harder.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I feel insecure about my ability to do things.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I am a self-reliant person.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I give up easily.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I do not seem capable of dealing with most problems that come up in life.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As J. Carter, please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 7. Circle 7 if the statement is totally accurate and 1 if the statement is totally in-accurate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In this organization I can usually achieve what I want when I work hard for it.</th>
<th>In-accurate</th>
<th>Accurate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>In this organization once I make plans I am almost certain to make them work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>In this organization I can learn almost anything if I set my mind to it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My major accomplishments in organizations such as this one are entirely due to my hard work and ability.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>In this organization I usually do not set goals because I have a hard time following through on them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>In organizations such as this, bad luck has sometimes prevented me from achieving things.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>In this organization almost anything is possible for me if I really want it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Most of what will happen in my career is beyond my control.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>In this organization I find it pointless to keep working on something that is too difficult for me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>In my organizational relationships, the other person usually has more control over the relationship than I do.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>In organizations I have no trouble making and keeping friends.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>In organizational settings I am not good at guiding the course of a conversation with several others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. In organizations I can usually develop a close personal relationship with someone I find appealing.

14. In organizational settings I can usually steer a conversation toward the topics I want to talk about.

15. In organizations when I need assistance with something, I often find it difficult to get others to help.

16. In an organization if there is someone I want to meet I can usually arrange it.

17. In an organizational setting, I often find it hard to get my point of view across to others.

18. In organizational setting, in attempting to smooth over a disagreement I sometimes make it worse.

19. In organizations I find it easy to play an important part in most group situations.

Please return this packet to your envelope and wait for instructions before starting "Packet 2."
Please answer the questions on the following two pages only in relation to the in-basket which you have just completed.
Please respond to the following questions as J. Carter in all three in-baskets.

Think about the messages you received in all the organizations you worked in as J. Carter (i.e., all three in-baskets) and indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the statements using the 5 point scale. For example, if you completely agree with the statement circle 5 and if completely disagree circle 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I count around here.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am taken seriously around here.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am important around here.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am trusted around here.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Around here there is faith in me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I can make a difference around here.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am valuable around here.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am helpful around here.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am efficient around here.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am cooperative around here.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. When I make plans, I am certain I can make them work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. One of my problems is that I cannot get down to work when I should.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. If I can’t do a job the first time, I keep trying until I can.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. When I set important goals for myself, I rarely achieve them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I give up on things before completing them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I avoid facing difficulties.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. If something looks too complicated, I will not even bother to try it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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18. When I have something unpleasant to do, I stick to it until I finish it. 

19. When I decide to do something, I go right to work on it.

20. When trying to learn something new, I soon give up if I am not initially successful.

21. When unexpected problems occur, I don't handle them well.

22. I avoid trying to learn new things when they look too difficult for me.

23. Failure just makes me try harder.

24. I feel insecure about my ability to do things.

25. I am a self-reliant person.

26. I give up easily.

27. I do not seem capable of dealing with most problems that come up in life.

As J. Carter, please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 7. Circle 7 if the statement is totally accurate and 1 if the statement is totally inaccurate.

1. In this organization I can usually achieve what I want when I work hard for it.

2. In this organization once I make plans I am almost certain to make them work.

3. In this organization I can learn almost anything if I set my mind to it.

4. My major accomplishments in organizations such as this one are entirely due to my hard work and ability.
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>In this organization I usually do not set goals because I have a hard time following through on them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>In organizations such as this, bad luck has sometimes prevented me from achieving things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>In this organization almost anything is possible for me if I really want it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Most of what will happen in my career is beyond my control.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>In this organization I find it pointless to keep working on something that is too difficult for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>In my organizational relationships, the other person usually has more control over the relationship than I do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>In organizations I have no trouble making and keeping friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>In organizational settings I am not good at guiding the course of a conversation with several others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>In organizations I can usually develop a close personal relationship with someone I find appealing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>In organizational settings I can usually steer a conversation toward the topics I want to talk about.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>In organizations when I need assistance with something, I often find it difficult to get others to help.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>In an organization if there is someone I want to meet I can usually arrange it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. In an organizational setting, I often find it hard to get my point of view across to others. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. In organizational setting, in attempting to smooth over a disagreement I sometimes make it worse. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. In organizations I find it easy to play an important part in most group situations. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do on this job. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. I frequently think of quitting this job. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with this job. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the job you now have, what would you decide?
1) I would definitely take the job again.
2) I would probably take the job again.
3) I am not sure if I would take the job again.
4) I would probably not take the job again.
5) I would definitely not take the job again.
YOU HAVE NOW COMPLETED
YOUR ROLE AS J. CARTER

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE AND
ASSUME YOUR OWN
IDENTITY TO COMPLETE THIS
PACKET.
The purpose of this last set of questions is to identify what you thought and felt throughout this managerial development program. Please answer these questions as truthfully as you can. If you would like to add additional comments, please feel free to do so. Please be sure to write your responses in a clear and legible manner.

For the next few statements, please circle the answer that best describes what you think.

1) In my organizational role as J. Carter I felt that the information I had access to was:

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

   Restricted  Sufficient

2) As J. Carter I felt that I had:

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

   Sufficient  Insufficient
   responsibility  responsibility

3) In my organizational role as J. Carter I felt:

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

   Trusted & respected  Not trusted & respected

4) I felt that I was working with people that were behind me and supportive of my efforts and work:

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

   Supportive  Not supportive

Name ____________________
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5) As J. Carter I felt:

```
Empowered
```

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not empowered

6) I found General Holding Company (which both Servcom and General Software are part of) to be an organization I would:

```
Like to work for
```

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not like to work for

7) During the three sessions of the managerial effectiveness program I was:

```
Highly motivated
to do my best
```

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all motivated to do my best

8) Overall, what did you think of the three management simulation sessions you were exposed to? Please explain.

9) During the time between the first session of this program and today, did you tell anybody about the content of these exercises, or did anybody tell you about it? If so, what was the information that was exchanged? (Please note, that you are still requested not to talk about the management simulation program until the 30/3/93.)
NOW, after you have completed the Effectiveness Workshop we would like to ask you for some feedback. We would appreciate if you could take a few moments and let us know:

1. Overall, how would you evaluate the Effectiveness Workshop?

   Deficient 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

   **Additional Comments:**

2. Overall, how would you evaluate the three simulations sessions of the Mastering Management Program?

   Deficient 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

   **Additional Comments:**

3. In your opinion, how can we improve the overall program?

   **THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.**