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ABSTRACT

The problem for this study was to analyze the relationship between human resource development (HRD) manager empowerment and four organizational conditions. Three research questions guided the study. These were: (a) what was a viable starting point for an operational definition of HRD manager empowerment, (b) what was the dimensional nature of HRD manager empowerment, and (c) what was the relationship between HRD manager empowerment and organizational support, trust, communication, and collaboration?

A review of the literature from management, education, and psychology was undertaken to answer the first research question. From this literature, HRD manager empowerment was initially operationally defined as (a) access and control over resources, (b) understanding of the business operations, (c) leadership that directs the operations of the HRD department to meet the needs of the company, (d) involvement, impact, and control in
the company decision making process, (e) understanding and use of the company's political system for facilitation of company and HRD group goals, and (f) high organizational self-esteem.

The second research question was addressed using data gathered from 126 HRD managers from across the country. Respondents were selected systematically from the 1991 American Society for Training and Development membership directory. Telephone interviews and faxed questionnaires were used to gather data. Principal components factor analysis was employed to analyze the dimensional nature of HRD manager empowerment. HRD manager empowerment formed a two factor solution accounting for 56.5% of the variance. Five of the six components of empowerment i.e., components (b) through (f), loaded on factor one and accounted for 39.2% of the variance. From this analysis, HRD manager empowerment appears to be a multidimensional construct.

The third research question was answered using regression analysis. HRD manager empowerment was the dependent variable and consisted of the sum of the five subscales of empowerment which loaded on factor one in the principal components analysis. Organizational support, trust, communication, and collaboration were the independent variables. Based on the regression analysis, 30.8% of the variance in HRD manager empowerment was explained ($p < .001$). Of the four independent variables,
only organizational support was significant \( (p < .001) \). Multicollinearity was a problem among the independent variables.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Today, the United States is in a human resource development crisis. American industry spends 210 billion dollars on human resource development through formal and informal educational programs. Despite the size of expenditures on human resource development programs, businesses still struggle with productivity declines, integration of technology advancements, changing workplace demographics, global competition, flattened hierarchies, an aging baby boom generation, shortages of entry level employees, worker demands for improved quality of work life, workers not educationally prepared for the work place, and the continued move from a manufacturing to a service economy. In addition, the labor market for the year 2000 will demand 24 million additional workers who are service oriented, skilled, creative, literate, more educated than current workers, adaptable, initiating, honest, culturally tolerant, able to handle cognitive and complex jobs, and skilled leaders to collaborate with these workers (Cohen, 1991).

The business professionals responsible for ensuring that a skilled work force is available to meet the needs and problems faced by American industry are those in the human resource development (HRD) profession.
But what is HRD? This term was first used in the late 1960s by Leonard Nadler to augment and extend the concept of training (Mech, 1984). HRD is defined by the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) as "the integrated use of training and development, organizational development, and career development to improve individual, group, and organizational effectiveness" (McLagan, 1989, p. 52). HRD is a segment of the human resource management function within organizations.

Human resource management consists of "a series of decisions that affect the relationship between employees and employers; it affects many constituencies and is intended to influence the effectiveness of employers and employees" (Milkovich & Boudreau, 1988, p.6). Generally, other elements of the human resource management function include staffing, compensation, benefits, labor relations, industrial health, collective bargaining, performance appraisals, employment planning, and employee relations (Milkovich & Boudreau, 1988).

Starting after the industrial revolution and continuing through the labor and governmental regulation changes of today, HRD has increasingly entered the limelight of management concern (Carnevale, Gainer, & Villet, 1990; Carnevale & Goldstein, 1990). Organizations have discovered that their capability to compete is based on their ability to manage and utilize people within the framework of technological advancements (Cohen, 1991; Ferman,
Hoyman, Cutcher-Gershenfeld, & Savoie, 1990; MacMillian & Schuler, 1985). Recent studies indicate that large companies regard the HRD function as increasingly important to efficient operations and as important as production, finance, and marketing (Bowen & Greiner, 1986; Guest, 1990).

Current literature in the HRD field emphasizes the importance of connecting and integrating this staff role to all planning efforts of companies (Chaiofsky & Reinhart, 1988; McLagan, 1989; Yeomans, 1989). During the next decade, the HRD function and HRD managers will be called upon to:

1. Accept an active leadership role so that companies can survive and/or compete successfully.

2. Assist top management in changing or reaffirming the company culture.

3. Guide top level decisions so that full consideration of HRD issues are addressed in the business planning process (Walker, 1989; Yeomans, 1989).

4. Take responsibility for the successful implementation of company strategies.

5. Provide new and effective methods of managing and leading.

6. Equip employees with the skills needed in the work place to handle new technology, work force diversity, and changing organizational structures.
7. Ensure that the competency levels of company employees meet or exceed those of the competition (Yeomans, 1989).

Because of the increased need for effective HRD, the magnitude of HRD expenditures, and expanded business roles for managers of these departments, HRD managers face numerous problems. In many companies, HRD professionals have low status and power (Benoliel, 1988; Dyson, 1988/1989; Geber, 1991; Stephan, Mills, Pace, & Ralphs, 1988), are excluded from the strategic planning process (Benoliel, 1988; Chalofsky & Reinhart, 1988), lack strategic planning skills (Benoliel, 1988), are not knowledgeable of the business operations (Walker, 1989; Yeomans, 1989), are less able to use their formal position as a source of influence (Dyson, 1988/1989; Kanter, 1979; Ulrich, Brockbank & Yeung, 1989), play a reactive support function (Chalofsky & Reinhart, 1988), are usually the last to promote innovations in their areas of expertise (Kanter, 1979; Phillips, 1983), and lack adequate resources to fulfill their role in the organization (Stephan et al., 1988).

The above mentioned problems result because historically HRD professionals have dealt with organizational problems in a reactive rather than proactive mode and have viewed themselves as a support function within the organization. HRD professionals have not traditionally been perceived, by themselves or by others in the organization, as accountable for
employee and company performance (Mech, 1984). Based on research
created with top management, Benoliel (1988) and Chalofsky and
Reinhart (1988) reported that HRD managers are excluded from planning
because top management discern the function as a support area that
approaches problems in a reactive way. These researchers also reported
that HRD managers lack strategic planning skills and strategic credibility with
top management.

Stephan et al. (1988), in a survey of Fortune 500 companies, found
HRD professionals to be the least credible while Ulrich et al. (1989) found
that HRD managers rated low on their ability to establish a vision, to clarify
business goals, to anticipate outcomes of change, and to establish
relationships necessary for change. A recent study ("Shakespeare vs.
Einstein," 1991) reports that HRD managers are weak in numerical skills,
problem analysis, strategic thinking, and general cognitive ability compared
to other managers. This same study also reported that HRD managers were
rated lower by peers, themselves, and superiors on financial and quantitative
abilities.

Dyson (1988/1989) and Kanter (1979) describe HRD managers as
powerless within organizations. They indicate that because HRD
professionals work as behind the scenes advisors, they usually lack real
business experience, have little to exchange in the way of favors to powerful
others in the organization, have limited developmental opportunities, frequently have their work farmed out to consultants, have to bargain for resources, and are usually the last to promote innovations in their area of expertise.

Notwithstanding the results of the above studies and beliefs on the deficiencies of HRD managers, many companies have HRD managers who are viewed as equal and critical partners to the functioning of the organization. Examples include Corning, IBM, Intel, Phillip Morris, and Motorola among others (Geber, 1991). What do these HRD managers have that others do not? Several researchers believe the difference can be explained by the concept of individual empowerment (Kahnweiler, 1991; Vogt & Murrell, 1990).

**Background**

Over the last 30 years, the idea of empowerment has evolved primarily from theories on employee motivation. Forces driving this evolution include: the refinement of human resource practices, the maturation of management thought, experimentation with organizational structures, accelerated technological changes, and an awakening demand among workers for quality and meaningful work lives (Vogt & Murrell, 1990).
Empowerment emphasizes self, but realizes and reconceptualizes the interrelationships within organizations among self, power, resources, tasks, work, groups, problem solving, and decision making. Motivation has a focus on the self in isolation; while empowerment has a focus of the self intertwined with organizational life. A motivational view accentuates what can be done to workers so that they will contribute to the organization. Empowerment stresses what can be done within the organization to facilitate workers’ contribution to the organization (Vogt & Murrell, 1990). Despite the popularity of the term empowerment, the construct has received limited study.

An examination of the research and definitions of empowerment from management, education, and psychology literature generated six common attributes of manager empowerment. The six attributes anchored the initiation of this study and included: (a) access and control over resources (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Short & Rinehart, 1992b), (b) impact and involvement in decision making (Block, 1989; Bredeson, 1992; Gruber & Trickett, 1987), (c) insight and use of the political situation (Block, 1989; Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988), (d) knowledge of the group or organization (Biegel, 1984; Vogt & Murrell, 1990), (e) high self-esteem (Kieffer, 1984; Maton & Rappaport, 1984), and (f) leadership abilities that generate action.
from others towards larger group goals (Bennis, 1989; Kieffer, 1984; Levin, 1991).

Three prevalent theories of empowerment from the management literature were also examined: (a) Five Stage Model (Conger & Kanungo, 1988), (b) Cognitive Model of Empowerment (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990), and (c) Process Model of Empowerment (Vogt & Murrell, 1990). All three models were similar in that they theorized empowerment as an individual motivational process in which organizational conditions and personal attributes contributed to the empowerment process.

The theories of Conger and Kanungo (1988), Thomas and Velthouse (1990), and Vogt and Murrell (1990) suggest that organizational conditions are critical to the individual empowerment process. In general, the three theories hypothesized several specific organizational conditions as important in the empowerment process. However, empirical evidence on the relationship between empowerment and specific organizational conditions is absent in published research.

Only two empirical studies were identified in the literature that addressed empowerment and organizational conditions (Deci, Connell, & Ryan 1989; Short & Rinehart 1992a). In the study by Deci et al. (1989), empowerment was not measured but inferred. Short and Rinehart (1992a)
measured teacher empowerment as a composite of six dimensions using written questionnaires.

The organizational conditions examined by Deci et al. (1989) and Short and Rinehart (1992a) included the following constructs: (a) trust (Deci et al., 1989), (b) supportive environment (Deci et al., 1989), (c) quality of supervision (Deci et al., 1989), and (d) effective school climate for students (Short & Rinehart, 1992a).

Short and Rinehart (1992a) concluded that an effective school climate for students, age, and years of work experience explained a significant portion of the variance in individual teacher empowerment. Deci et al. (1989) concluded that there is a significant relationship between managers’ support for subordinate empowerment and subordinates feelings of trust, organizational support, and high quality of supervision. Neither Short and Rinehart (1992a), nor Deci et al. (1989) attempted to systematically analyze the relationship between empowerment and specific organizational conditions.

As stated earlier, a variety of specific organizational conditions have been hypothesized to be important in the empowerment process. Past empirical research has provided limited evidence on this relationship. To isolate the organizational conditions most critical in the individual empowerment process, 29 different published articles on the subject were
summarized (see Table A-1 in Appendix A). Almost half of the articles were empirical studies on empowerment; while the other half were opinion or theoretical articles. From these 29 articles, the most frequently cited conditions included collaboration, support systems, trust, and communication.

Further examination of the literature from the fields of management, education, and psychology was then undertaken to ascertain if these four organizational conditions were also considered the most critical or important in the individual empowerment process. Biegel (1984), Block (1989), Byham (1991), Levin (1991), Lightfoot (1986), Maton and Rappaport (1984), and Short and Rinehart (1992b) logically emphasized the importance of collaboration and organizational support. Biegel (1984), Maton and Rappaport (1984), Prawat (1991), Short and Rinehart (1992b), and Vogt and Murrell (1990) logically attested to the importance of trust. Communications was logically cited as critical to individual empowerment by Conger and Kanungo (1988), Thomas and Velthouse (1990), and Vogt and Murrell (1990). Therefore, based on the cited importance of the organizational conditions of collaboration, organizational support, trust, and communications to empowerment; these specific organizational conditions were examined in this study.
Collaboration was the extent to which HRD managers perceive that a friendly and cooperative work environment exists and that there is teamwork between work groups over goals and resources (James & Sells, 1981). Organizational support was the HRD managers’ belief concerning the extent to which the organization values their contribution and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). Trust was defined as "confidence in or reliance on some quality or attribute of a person or a thing" (Simpson & Weiner, 1989, p. 623); while communication incorporated message sending and receiving behaviors of superiors, subordinates, and peers in regard to task, personal, and innovation behaviors within organizations (Rogers, 1987).

Assumptions

The following assumptions provided the starting point for this study.

1. Empowerment was a construct that could be measured using a series of items answered by respondents.

2. The specific organizational conditions of organizational support, trust, communication, and collaboration were theoretically linked to the empowerment process for HRD managers.

3. All HRD managers faced organizational conditions within the work environment which may contribute to their level of empowerment.
Statement of the Problem

Empowerment is a relatively new construct to management researchers and one which has received scant empirical research (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990; Vogt & Murrell, 1990). A total of 18 organizational variables (see Table A-1 in Appendix A) have been postulated to influence empowerment by the various theoreticians cited. From these 18, four were identified as critical to empowerment. From the management, psychology and education literature, only two studies could be identified that empirically examined empowerment and organizational conditions. Neither of these studies attempted to systematically analyze the relationship between empowerment and specific organizational conditions. Thus the procedural problem was to analyze the relationship between four organizational conditions and HRD manager empowerment.

Purpose of the Study

The general purpose of this study was to identify the relationship between four organizational conditions; collaboration, organizational support, trust, and communications, and HRD manager empowerment. To accomplish this purpose, the researcher completed the following:
1. Identified the important and common components of HRD manager empowerment from the literature in management, psychology, and education.

2. Measured HRD manager empowerment based on the important and common components of HRD manager empowerment identified in the literature from management, education and psychology.

3. Used factor analysis to derive an operational definition of HRD manager empowerment from the components identified in the literature.

4. Measured the organizational conditions of collaboration, organizational support, trust, and communication.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions guided the study.

1. What was a viable starting point for an operational definition of HRD manager empowerment based upon definitions and research in the fields of management, psychology, and education?

2. What was the dimensional nature of HRD manager empowerment based upon an analysis process that incorporated factor analysis?

3. What was the relationship between HRD manager empowerment and the organizational conditions of collaboration, organizational support, trust, and communication?
**Delimitations of the Study**

The following delimitations apply to this study.

1. The operational definition of HRD manager empowerment was based on the concept of empowerment in an organizational setting using literature from management, psychology, and education.

2. Empowerment was treated as a unidimensional construct when analyzing the relationship between HRD manager empowerment and organizational conditions.

3. This study focused on the relationship between the organizational conditions of collaboration, organizational support, trust, and communications and HRD manager empowerment.

4. This study analyzed empowerment of HRD managers in work settings located in the continental United States of America who were listed in the 1991 ASTD membership directory.

5. Because of the variations in the titles used in corporate organizations, selected titles were used to indicate a HRD manager position. A complete listing of the organizational titles used to select the respondents are found in Appendix B, Table B-1. The organizational titles used included the following: HRD Manager, Training and Development Manager, Training Manager, Manager of Management Development and Training, Manager of Corporate Training and Development, Manager of Training Administration,
Training and Education Manager, and Manager of Human Resources. Using
the above mentioned organizational titles and the other organizational titles
listed in Table B-1, Appendix B as a basis for selection may have excluded
some HRD managers from inclusion in the study.

**Significance of the Study**

The construct of empowerment has received increased scholarly
attention over the last few years. Despite the popularity of the term, very
few research studies from management, psychology, or education were
identified that systematically researched the construct or its relationship to
other variables. Only five empirical studies were identified that derived some
measure of empowerment. Also, only two studies were identified that
attempted to measure the relationship between empowerment and
organizational conditions. No previous research was detected that
scrutinized empowerment for HRD managers, managers in general, or
educational administrators.

The concept of HRD manager empowerment is a critical one in today’s
business environment. According to Thurow (1992), in Japan’s business
economy, the head of human resource management is the second most
important person in the company after the CEO. In that country, to become
CEO, one must have held the job of head of human resources. This is not
the case in American companies. In our society, "the post of head of human resource management is usually a specialized, off-at-the-edge-of-the-corporation job, and the executive who holds it is never consulted on major strategic decisions and has no chance to move up to chief executive officer (CEO)" (Thurow, 1992, p.54). This philosophical and operational difference in the treatment of those accountable for the development of employees within the corporation is a major reason why American companies have experienced problems competing in today's global economy.

This study was also significant to educational research because HRD managers are the educational leaders in the business and industry community. In the educational arena, empowerment for teachers and local administrators has been advocated as a key factor in educational reform (Lichtenstein, McLaughlin, & Knudsen, 1991; Lightfoot, 1986). Policymakers have begun to realize that unless teachers and local administrators have opportunities for empowerment, they will not be able to sustain such critical reforms as tougher graduation standards, longer school days, back to basics curricula, additional courses, more effective classroom practices, and year round schools. In addition, empowerment for teachers and administrators has been an implicit part of school restructuring schemes and site based management programs (Lichtenstein et al., 1991). The current study parallels the research in education by Short and Rinehart.
(1992a, 1992b) in that empowerment was measured by six similar components.

**Limitations of the Study**

The following limitations apply to this study.

1. Generalizability of the results as they relate to individual empowerment may have been affected by: (a) the selection of only HRD managers for the study, (b) corporate policies against participation in outside research (Duhan & Wilson, 1990; Jobber, 1986; London & Dommeyer, 1990), (c) the selection of subjects from the 1991 ASTD directory, and (d) the selection of subjects who were from only the continental United States of America.

2. The instrumentation for the study may have been affected by: (a) the use of literature from only management, psychology, and education, (b) a lack of empirical testing related to the reliability and validity of the instrument used to measure HRD manager empowerment before its use in the study, (c) the treatment of HRD manager empowerment as a unidimensional construct, and (d) the examination of only four organizational conditions cited in the literature as being important to individual empowerment.
3. Contemporary history of the study may have been affected by the
time delay between the telephone interview and the faxed questionnaire.

4. The use of three different telephone interviewers may have affected
subjects’ responses to the items used to measure HRD manager
empowerment.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions refer to terms as they are used in this study.

1. American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) is the
largest professional society in the U.S. dedicated to the advancement of
issues related to HRD. ASTD currently has over 55,000 members.

2. Collaboration was the degree to which the HRD manager perceives
that a friendly and cooperative work environment exists and that there is
teamwork between work groups concerning goals and resources (James &
Sells, 1981). This construct was measured using a composite measure
based on the raw scores of items from the Subunit Conflict and Workgroup
Cooperation and Influence subscales of the Organizational Climate Index
(James & Sells, 1981).

3. Communication incorporated message sending and message
receiving behaviors of superiors, subordinates, and peers in regard to task,
personal and innovation behaviors within organizations (Rogers, 1987). This
construct was measured using a composite raw score based on a series of items from the Communication Openness Measure designed by Rogers (1987).

4. Human Resource Development (HRD) was defined as "the integrated use of training and development, organizational development, and career development to improve individual, group, and organizational effectiveness" (McLagan, 1989, p. 52).

5. Human Resource Development (HRD) manager was the organizationally recognized supervisor of the HRD function who is a member of ASTD.

6. HRD manager empowerment was initially conceptualized from the literature in management, psychology, and education as a state characterized by (a) access and control over needed resources, (b) an understanding of the business operations of the organization, (c) leadership that directs the operations of the HRD department to meet the needs of the company, (d) involvement, impact, and control in the company decision making process, (e) understanding and using company’s political system for facilitation of company and HRD group goals, and (f) high organizational self-esteem. This state was assumed to be measured by an overall score based on a series of items answered by the HRD manager. The items were based directly on the initial literature based definition for HRD manager empowerment. Items to
ascertain HRD manager empowerment were researcher designed except for items related to organizational self-esteem. Organizational based self-esteem was measured by the Organizational Based Self-Esteem Scale (Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, & Dunham, 1989). HRD manager empowerment was treated as a unidimensional scale with the total score calculated by (a) summing scale item raw scores to obtain subscale scores for each of the six components of empowerment, (b) calculating z scores for each subscale score, (c) calculating principal components factor analysis scores based on the z subscale scores, (d) computing factor scores for the five subscales of empowerment that loaded on Factor 1 in the principal components factor analysis, and (e) computing a total empowerment score based on the sum of the factor scores for the five subscales of empowerment. As noted, principal components factor analysis was used to refine the operational definition of HRD manager empowerment. Only five of the original six components of empowerment formed the unidimensional scale. These were: (b) an understanding of the business operations of the organization, (c) leadership that directs the operations of the HRD department to meet the needs of the company, (d) involvement, impact, and control in the company decision making process, (e) understanding and use of the company’s political system for facilitation of company and HRD group goals, and (f) high organizational self-esteem.
7. **Organizational support** was the HRD managers' belief concerning the extent to which the organization values their contribution and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger et al., 1986). This belief was measured by a composite of the raw scores of 16 items developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986) designed to measure perceived organizational support.

8. **Trust** was defined as "confidence in or reliance on some quality or attribute of a person or a thing" (Simpson & Weiner, 1989, p. 623). This variable was measured using a composite of raw scores from 13 items from the Organizational Trust Measures Scale (Scott, 1981).

**Organization of the Study**

Chapter 2 contains a review of the literature related to the construct of empowerment. Sections of this chapter include definitions of empowerment from other research, a description and comparison of three theories of empowerment, the definition of empowerment adopted for this study, organizational conditions critical to empowerment, and relevant research on empowerment from the fields of management, education, and community psychology. Chapter 2 concludes with a comparison of the current study to the strengths and weaknesses of previous research and a brief chapter summary.
Chapter 3 presents the methodology utilized in this study. This chapter addresses sample selection, instrumentation, data collection procedures, pilot study, data summary techniques, other issues related to data collection and analysis, and a chapter summary.

An analysis of the data collected and the results of the analysis are presented in chapter 4. Chapter 5 provides an interpretation of the findings, conclusions of the study, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This section contains a review of pertinent literature for this study and is organized into four main segments. The first main segment details the formal definition and then numerous definitions of empowerment from the management, psychology, and education literature. This section concludes with a summary of the important concepts of empowerment frequently found across the various definitions.

The second main segment describes and contrasts three theories of empowerment from the management literature. The third section then outlines the initial definition of empowerment used in this study. The initial definition for the current study is based on the definitions and theories reviewed.

The fourth main section discusses which organizational conditions are critical to empowerment. The last main section of the chapter summarizes relevant empirical literature from the fields of management, education, and community psychology. The last section concludes with a part that contrasts the current study with the strengths and limitations of previous
research on empowerment. The chapter then concludes with a brief summary.

**Definitions of Empowerment**

Empowerment is defined and conceptualized in numerous ways by authors from the fields of community psychology, education, mental health, management, organizational development, and training and development. Definitions from these various fields are presented, and the key attributes of the construct are summarized at the end of this section.

**Formal Definition**

The *Oxford English Dictionary* (Simpson & Weiner, 1989) refers to two components in explaining empowerment: (a) to give, to invest, to grant legal, formal power, or authority; and (b) to enable, to impart, or to bestow power to an end or for a purpose. The first component emphasizes sharing power. The second component, which is dominant in current empowerment research, concentrates more on the development of a state of mind or a motivational construct.

Generally, empowerment refers to positive activity in which the power balance between individuals at different levels of power is altered and power for all increases. The concept of empowerment does not operate on the
assumption of an absolute quantity of power. Empowerment refers to the relative distribution and ever increasing creation of power within systems. Empowerment creates synergy and additional power within systems. When individuals are empowered, the strength, health, effectiveness, and functioning of a system is enhanced (Block, 1989; Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Fawcett, Seekins, Whang, Muiu, & Suarez de Balcazar, 1984; Kanter, 1979; Katz, 1984; Murrell, 1985; Rappaport, 1981, 1987; Swift & Levin, 1987; Vogt & Murrell, 1990).

Management, Organizational Development, and Training and Development Definitions


1. The collective effects of self-leadership and hierarchical leadership that result in individual feelings of significance, excitement about work, and the interconnectiveness of all those in the organization (Bennis, 1989).
2. Positive political action that stimulates entrepreneurial activity within organizations (Block, 1989).

3. A continuing effort involving individuals managing themselves and maintaining choice, control, impact, and involvement in their work (Carr, 1991).

4. "A process of enhancing feelings of self-efficacy among organizational members through the identification of conditions that foster powerlessness and through their removal by both formal organizational practices and informal techniques of providing efficacy information" (Conger & Kanungo, 1988, p. 474).

5. Productive power which results in "open channels to supplies, support, and information" (Kanter, 1979, p. 65).


7. Actions taken to reduce dependence on more powerful groups or individuals (Mainiero, 1986).

8. Creation of power through political processes between people and within organizations (Murrell, 1985).

9. Intrinsic task motivation leading to activity, concentration, initiative, resiliency, and flexibility (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990).

11. People in control and responsible for their destiny with the means, skills, and resources to realize that destiny (Von der Embse, 1989).

Found within this body of management related literature is the collective belief that empowerment is a process, and that it is motivational in nature. Taken as a whole, this literature base distinguishes an empowered manager as someone who has access and control over resources, knowledge of the organization, impact and involvement in decision making, political proficiency, high self-esteem, and leadership skills that connect activities to higher level organizational goals.

Community Psychology and Mental Health Definitions

Writing in the community psychology literature, Zimmerman (1990) asserts there should not be one definition of empowerment. This author suggests that empowerment takes on different forms for different people in different environments but generally consists of an interaction between the individual, the culture, and a specific context. Empowerment is easy for researchers to identify in its absence--alienation, powerlessness, and helplessness--but difficult to define or observe in a proactive manner.

Zimmerman (1986/1987) views empowerment as a process, a proactive approach to life where individuals believe in their ability to control outcomes, have the desire to control certain outcomes, and actively seek to
exert control in the social and political environment. Other writers from this literature base view empowerment as a process containing the following elements:

1. Increasing individual capacity to utilize power to solve problems and gain access to significant organizational support and resources (Biegel, 1984).

2. Wielding decision making power in an organization (Gruber & Trickett 1987).

3. Increasing control over consequences that are important (Fawcett et al., 1984).

4. Exhibiting multidimensional participatory competence which includes traits such as high self-esteem, sense of importance, and self-efficacy (Kieffer, 1984).

5. Exhibiting "interpersonal change in the direction of group ideals" (Maton & Rappaport, 1984, p. 40).

6. Capitalizing on opportunities to enhance a power base (O'Sullivan, Waugh, & Espeland, 1984).

7. Gaining mastery over daily and long term affairs (Rappaport, 1987).

8. Reaching potential by removing hurdles and exhibiting an increased capacity to act in goal directed ways (Swift & Levin, 1987).
The community psychology empowerment literature contains themes similar to those found in the management literature. Authors in the community psychology and mental health fields also view empowerment as a process. Collectively these authors differentiate an empowered individual by their access and control over resources, impact over decision making processes, skillful use of the political and social environment, knowledge of the community or other social system, and high self-esteem.

The concept of leadership is not generally addressed in this literature base. However in a study of 15 community grassroots leaders, Kieffer (1984) found that these empowered leaders generated action from other individuals toward group goals. In a study of organizational factors that affected the empowerment of parents and students on a policy council of an alternative high school, Gruber and Trickett (1987) concluded that one reason parents and students failed to become empowered was their inability to generate leadership within the policy council. O’Sullivan et al. (1984) examined the development of empowerment among Native Americans faced with the threat of loss of tribal lands. The authors concluded that leadership was a critical factor in the development of empowerment for the Yavapai Indians.
Educational Definitions

Empowerment is discussed in the education literature by Bredeson (1992), Coll (1986), Levin (1991), Lichtenstein et al. (1991), Lightfoot (1986), Rodman (1984/1985), and Short and Rinehart (1992a). These authors envision empowerment as follows:

1. A redefinition of power within schools, participatory decision making, job enrichment, professional development that builds individual capacity to participate in a larger system, and autonomy and efficacy (Bredeson, 1992).

2. Increased ability to direct the course of ensuing experience (Coll, 1986).

3. A process that promotes professional integration into critical aspects and decisions of daily school life, opportunities to access and control resources, and the participatory capacity to use responsibility in productive ways (Levin, 1991).

4. Increased opportunities for participation in issues affecting professional life, access and control over resources, self-efficacy, professional self-esteem, and the knowledge and abilities to affect the larger system beyond the regular classroom (Lichtenstein et al., 1991).

5. A dynamic process that creates opportunities for individual autonomy, responsibility, choice, and authority (Lightfoot, 1986).
6. The rediscovery of creativity, talents, and power by using local resources, traditional institutions, and practices in new ways to create experiences of developmental impact (Rodman, 1984/1985).

7. Involvement in decision making, opportunities for professional growth, status, self-efficacy, autonomy, and impact in decision making (Short & Rinehart, 1992a).

As with the management and psychology literature, writers in the field of education emphasize certain concepts about empowerment. Educational researchers picture empowerment as a dynamic motivational process. At the individual level of analysis this process results in access and control over resources, participation and impact in decision making, high self-esteem, knowledge of school operations, and the ability to use the social and political system to reach goals.

The majority of the writings from education focus on teacher empowerment. However, in addressing empowerment from the perspective of school leaders; specifically principals, Bredeson (1992), Levin (1991), Lightfoot (1986), and Short and Rinehart (1992b) recognize that for principals to be empowered they must provide leadership that mobilizes teachers and staff into positive action to meet the larger objectives of the organization.
Summary of Definitions

Table 1 summarizes the important shared dimensions of empowerment discussed by each author in the management, organizational development, training and development, community psychology, mental health, and education literature. These dimensions are (a) access and control over resources, (b) impact and involvement in decision making, (c) insight and use of the political situation, (d) knowledge of the group or organization, (e) high self-esteem, and (f) leadership abilities that generate action from others towards larger group goals.

Theories of Empowerment

Explanations of the empowerment process have also been incorporated into various theoretical frameworks. In this section, three theories of empowerment are explained and compared. All come from the management literature base and include theories by Conger and Kanungo (1988), Thomas and Velthouse (1990), and Vogt and Murrell (1990). Each theory proposes that organizational conditions are a critical factor in the individual empowerment process.
Table 1

Important and Shared Dimensions of Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field/Author</th>
<th>Dimensions of Empowerment&lt;br&gt;a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennis (1989)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block (1989)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr (1991)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conger &amp; Kanungo (1988)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanter (1979, 1983)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kizilos (1990)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainiero (1986)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murrell (1985)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas &amp; Velthouse (1990)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vogt &amp; Murrell (1990)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Von der Embse (1989)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Psychology</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biegel (1984)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fawcett et al. (1984)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruber &amp; Trickett (1987)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kieffer (1984)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maton &amp; Rappaport (1984)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field/Author</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O’Sullivan et al. (1984)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rappaport (1987)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swift &amp; Levin (1987)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmerman (1986/87, 1990)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field/Author</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bredeson (1992)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coll (1986)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levin (1991)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichtenstein et al. (1991)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightfoot (1986)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodman (1984/1985)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short &amp; Rinehart (1992a &amp; 1992b)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 = access and control over resources; 2 = involvement and impact in decision making; 3 = insight and use of the political situation; 4 = knowledge of the organization or group; 5 = leadership that mobilizes action towards larger group goals; 6 = high self-esteem.
Conger and Kanungo: Theory of Empowerment

Conger and Kanungo (1988) view empowerment as an individual motivational construct involving a five stage sequential process. This model is presented in Figure 1. These authors define empowerment as "a process of enhancing feelings of self-efficacy among organizational members through the identification of conditions that foster powerlessness and through their removal by both formal organizational practices and informal techniques of providing efficacy information" (Conger & Kanungo, 1988, p. 474).

Stage 1, antecedent conditions, centers on the circumstances leading to a psychological state of powerlessness and includes four main conditions. These are organizational factors, supervision, reward systems, and the nature of the job. These authors specify an extensive list of contextual variables for the four conditions listed in stage 1 (see Appendix C, Table C-1).

Generally organizational factors include such variables as climate and communications. Supervisory style incorporates variables related to control over work and communications from the supervisor. The reward systems portion of the model emphasizes the relationship between effort and rewards in organizations. This relationship is low in most organizational structures or consists of low incentive awards. Job design addresses variables related to the design of the work, task variety, and meaningful tasks.

Copyright 1988 by The Academy of Management. Reprinted by permission.
Stage 2 also addresses antecedent conditions and involves the use of managerial strategies and techniques to produce empowerment by counteracting and removing organizational conditions that lead to powerlessness. Techniques used include participatory management, goal setting, feedback systems, job enrichment, and competency-based rewards. Management strategies utilized in stage 2 focus on creating organizational conditions that emphasize collaboration, open communications, access to resources, self-determination, high performance, risk taking, trust, support, use of power in a positive manner, job enrichment, and nondiscrimination. These strategies are hypothesized to establish the necessary conditions for stage 3.

Stage 3 involves providing individual employees with self-efficacy information using inactive attainment, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and emotional arousal. Inactive attainment refers to job mastery information and vicarious experience is obtained by observing others perform successfully on the job. Verbal persuasion occurs when employees are provided words of encouragement about job related tasks. Emotional arousal refers to job and nonjob related stress, fear, anxiety, and depression. If stage 3 is managed correctly, stage 4 brings forth empowerment as a result of receiving self-efficacy information.
With increased empowerment, the subordinate moves to stage 5. This stage is empowered behavior and is characterized by initiation and persistence in accomplishing task objectives. During the literature review, no study was identified that tested the theory of empowerment as proposed by Conger and Kanungo (1988).

**Thomas and Velthouse: Theory of Empowerment**

Thomas and Velthouse (1990) proposed a cognitive model of empowerment that views empowerment as a nontraditional motivational construct. Their theory focuses on the intrapersonal processes which lead to an empowered state. This model is presented in Figure 2.

These authors define empowerment as "increased intrinsic task motivation" (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990, p. 666). Their model is based on the social learning cycle of stimulus, organism, behavior, and consequence. The model contains the three core constructs of (a) environmental events, (b) tasks assessments, and (c) behavior. Factors outside of the core loop affecting the model include interventions, interpretive styles, and global assessments. Interpretive styles and global assessments are hypothesized to affect task assessments. Interventions are hypothesized to affect environmental events and interpretive styles.
In the first core of the model, environmental events are defined as conditions and information that shape individuals’ present and future task behavior. Environmental events are equivalent to self-efficacy information and include variables such as feedback from others in the organization, training sessions, direct experiences, and performance evaluations. In the second core, task assessments are envisioned as individual judgements about a specific task. These judgements are based on the degree to which the individual feels that he/she (a) can impact the task, (b) can perform the task in a competent manner, (c) views the task as personally meaningful, and (d) perceives the behavior as self-generated. Task assessments are regarded as an internal state of empowerment that produces self-fulfilling prophecies which energize and sustain behavior in the third core of the model.

The third core of the model, empowered behavior, results when intrinsic task motivation is generated in the task assessment phase. Empowered behavior is believed to encompass the activity, concentration, initiative, resiliency, and flexibility shown by the individual during task performance.

Element four, global assessments, represents generalized beliefs regarding the individual’s capability to (a) impact tasks, (b) perform tasks in a competent manner, (c) experience meaningfulness from tasks, and (d)
experience a sense of self-determination from tasks. Global assessments are formed over time by individual assessments concerning multiple tasks and are viewed as stable beliefs. They form a reciprocal moderating relationship with element two, task assessments.

Element five, interpretive styles, also moderates task assessment. These styles represent an individuals’ cognitive interpretation of reality. Interpretive styles involve subjective processing of events using evaluation, attribution, and envisioning. Attribution involves constructing reasons for success or failure. Evaluation comprises individual task standards and envisioning centers on mental images of what can happen.

The last element of the model, interventions, moderates both the environmental events and interpretive styles portions of the model. Interventions are deliberate attempts to produce empowerment by changing the sources of self-efficacy information or by changing the manner in which individuals interpret events.

**Vogt and Murrell: Theory of Empowerment**

The sequential model proposed by Vogt and Murrell (1990) is presented in Figure 3. These authors define empowerment as the "act of building, developing, and increasing power through cooperation, sharing, and working together" (Vogt & Murrell, 1990, p.8). They further state that
Empowerment is a process and a multidimensional construct with several foundations as follows:

1. Empowerment is the growth of power.
2. This growth of power creates synergy, producing more power.
3. Empowerment enables individuals, groups, and organizations to enhance achievement.
4. Empowerment is a process based on well-tried activities.
5. Empowerment is fueled by actions that lead to advanced achievement of highly valued goals.
6. The drive for empowerment is created in others by sharing ones’ abilities with them.

Vogt and Murrell center their discussions on what organizations can do to empower employees. The core of their model includes four elements. These are (a) organizational culture, (b) organizational communications, (c) the self, and (d) the empowered self.
Figure 3. Process Model of Empowerment. Note: From Empowerment In Organizations
The first element of the model, organizational culture, is the formal and informal norms, values, rules, and regulations that govern everyday organizational life. Vogt and Murrell assert that specific aspects of culture create opportunities for individual empowerment. These include values which emphasize openness, individual contribution, interdependence, personal well-being, and leadership that promotes empowerment. These authors contend that six categories of empowering behavior are necessary at the organizational level to foster individual empowerment. These are (a) education and information sharing, (b) leadership that excites and energizes, (c) mentors and organizational support, (d) adequate resources, (e) organizational structures permitting individual growth and development, and (f) creation of a self-actualized state by the individual.

The second element of the model, organizational communications, refers to the flow of information within the organization. To be empowering, communications must be multilevel, honest, encourage input from all, flow to and from the employees, and provide feedback that fosters growth and promotes participation.

The third element of the model, self, refers to the individual person. The self is hypothesized to be empowered through communication, trust, and participation at the organizational level. At the individual level, the self is empowered by a variety of self-awareness variables such as self-esteem,
growth orientation, interpersonal competency, ability to link self to groups, ability to relate and contribute to ones’ environment, negotiation skills, a proactive problem solving orientation, and cross cultural sensitivity.

The fourth element of the model, the empowered self, refers to the behavior exhibited by an empowered individual. This behavioral stage can be characterized by individuals who feel they are an integral part of the system, are willing to commit to group and organizational goals, want to be part of the team, care about the quality of work, take responsibility to cooperate with others, break from locked and linear thinking, and have a sense of self-fulfillment. No published research was identified that tested this model of empowerment.

Comparison of the Three Theories

All three theories (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990; Vogt & Murrell 1990) view empowerment as an individual motivational process. While their definitions of empowerment appear to be somewhat different, the three theoretical models are very similar.

All three theories consist of three basic sections: organizational conditions, the self, and the behavior exhibited by the empowered self. In each, organizational conditions constitute the starting point and are assumed to directly impact the self. Organizational conditions are labelled antecedent
conditions in the Conger and Kanungo (1988) model. Thomas and Velthouse (1990) refer to these as environmental events, and Vogt and Murrell (1990) refer to the specific organizational conditions of culture, communications, trust, and participation.

Conger and Kanungo (1988) and Vogt and Murrell (1990) focus heavily on the types of organizational conditions that affect empowerment, and the types of organizational, managerial, and job strategies that can alter these conditions. Conger and Kanungo (1988) do not explicitly include the effect of individual cognitive processes on empowerment. Instead, individual cognitive processes are implicit in their model due to the nature of the self-efficacy construct. In contrast, Thomas and Velthouse (1990) include organizational conditions as an important portion of the model. However, they explicitly propose that individuals modify the objective reality of organizational conditions through both interpretations of the present conditions and generalizations from the past. Vogt and Murrell (1990) also explicitly include the effect of the individual’s internal states on the self, but they discuss this in very general terms.

All three theories include empowered behavior as the outcome of individual empowerment. This is manifested through initiation and/or persistence of behaviors to accomplish tasks (Conger & Kanungo, 1988); postulated as activity, concentration, initiation, resiliency, and flexibility
during task accomplishment (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990); and viewed as commitment to organizational goals, quality work, responsibility, and self-fulfillment in the third theory (Vogt & Murrell, 1990).

**Initial Definition of Empowerment for This Study**

Based on the three theoretical models and the definitions from the previous section, the common, frequently mentioned specific behaviors and cognitions that would be exhibited by an empowered individual would include access and control over resources, involvement and impact in decision making, understanding and use of the political system, knowledge of the organization, and high organizational self-esteem. Vogt and Murrell (1990) discuss at great length empowered leadership, even though the concept is not a distinct part of their visual model. In this manner, their emphasis is different from the other two models.

However, if the models by Conger and Kanungo (1988) and Thomas and Velthouse (1990) were recast in terms of a manager empowerment, not just individual empowerment, then an additional common characteristic of an empowered manager would be leadership that generates actions from others toward group and organizational goals. This additional attribute of an empowered manager is also consistent with the work of Bennis (1989), Block (1989), Bredeson (1992), Kieffer (1984), Lightfoot (1986), and
O’Sullivan et al. (1984). Building on these important themes from the literature in management, psychology, and education, there are six specific attributes that distinguish an empowered HRD manager.

1. An individual who has control and access over needed resources.
2. An individual who is knowledgeable about the business.
3. An individual who provides leadership that integrates the HRD function into the strategic direction of the company.
4. An individual who is involved and has impact in the company decision making process.
5. An individual who understands and uses the political system within the organization for promotion of the HRD department to the benefit of the company.
6. An individual who has high organizational self-esteem.

**Organizational Conditions Critical to Empowerment**

The three models and many of the definitions suggest that external factors can promote empowerment in individuals (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990; Vogt & Murrell 1990). Numerous conditions are cited by various authors as affecting individual empowerment. Conger and Kanungo provide an extensive list with their model (see Appendix C, Table C-1 for this list). Others cite variables such as communications (Vogt
& Murrell, 1990), trust (Vogt & Murrell 1990), cohesive groups (Mainiero, 1986), and promotion of risk taking (Block, 1989).

A review of the literature was undertaken to determine the organizational conditions that were reported most frequently as impacting empowerment. The summary of this review is found in Appendix A, Table A-1. Collaboration, organizational support, trust, and communications were the variables mentioned most often in this review.

These were the most frequently mentioned organizational conditions, but are they the most critical variables for promotion of individual empowerment? Further analysis of the empowerment literature indicates that Block (1989), Byham (1991), Levin (1991), Lightfoot (1986), Maton and Rappaport (1984), O’ Sullivan et al. (1984), and Short and Rinehart (1992b) emphasize the critical nature of collaboration and organizational support to empowerment. Trust is delineated as a decisive element by Maton and Rappaport (1984), Prawat (1991), Short and Rinehart (1992b), and Vogt and Murrell (1990). Conger and Kanungo (1988), Thomas and Velthouse (1990), and Vogt and Murrell (1990) cite open communications as critical to empowerment. Based on this literature, the organizational conditions examined in this research study include collaboration, organizational support, trust, and communications.
Past Empirical Research on Empowerment

The construct of empowerment has received increased scholarly attention over the last several years. An indication of the popularity of the construct is the number of times the word is used as a descriptor in database abstracts such as PSYLIT or Dissertation Abstracts. For example, in PSYLIT from January 1987 till September 1992, the term “empowerment” was used in 324 abstracts. However this term was only used 48 times from January 1974 till December 1986 in this same database. In Dissertation Abstracts, this term was used 541 times from January 1988 till December 1992, and only used 103 times from January 1982 till December 1987.

Despite the popularity of the term, very few empirical studies were identified that systematically researched individual empowerment or its relationship to other variables. Based on a review of the literature in management, education, and psychology; community psychology appears to have undertaken the most extensive research effort on the construct. Rappaport (1987) proclaimed that empowerment should be the major research focus of all work in the community psychology field. He stated that empowerment “is the ‘bottom line’ for Community Psychology. When we [Community Psychology] study children, adults, the elderly, organizations, neighborhoods, or social policies, what holds these diverse efforts together is a concern for empowerment” (Rappaport, 1987, p. 129).
To locate past empirical studies from the management, education, and psychology fields, four databases were reviewed. These were ERIC, PSYLiT, Dissertation Abstracts, and ABI/Inform. ERIC is an abbreviation for Educational Resources Information Center. This database contains abstracts for over 700,000 documents and journal articles from the field of education. PSYLiT is the database name used for the paper version of Psychological Abstracts. This database contains abstracts from over 1,300 journals from the field of psychology. ABI/Inform denotes Abstracted Business Information and carries abstracts from over 1,200 journals from the field of business and management. One print abstract, the Business Periodicals Index, was also reviewed in an effort to locate other research in the management field.

In keeping with the focus of this study, previous research identified for review focused on individual not group empowerment. The following sections detail relevant research on individual empowerment from the fields of management, education, and psychology. Table 2 provides a brief summary of all the studies discussed in these sections.
Table 2

Summary of Past Relevant Research on Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s), Year, Field</th>
<th>Purpose of Study</th>
<th>Definition of Empowerment</th>
<th>Population, sample size, and sample characteristics</th>
<th>Dependent Variable(s)</th>
<th>Independent Variable(s)</th>
<th>Data Collection Method(s)</th>
<th>Ho Tested</th>
<th>Data Analysis Methods</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biegel (1984) Community Psychology</td>
<td>To develop and implement a community mental health individual &amp; group empowerment model.</td>
<td>The capacity of the individual to utilize power to solve problems, gain access to institutions designed to serve them, and gain access to social support.</td>
<td>A white ethnic neighborhood in Milwaukee, WI with a population of about 66,000, 99% white, 32% foreign, high percent of the population is 65 or older.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Surveys, historical data, input from two community groups, and individual interviews</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics from needs analysis only</td>
<td>Trust, social support, informal networks, access to resources, &amp; community control in problem identification and resolution were critical to empowerment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s), Year, Field</td>
<td>Purpose of Study</td>
<td>Definition of Empowerment</td>
<td>Population, sample size, and sample characteristics</td>
<td>Dependent Variable(s)</td>
<td>Independent Variable(s)</td>
<td>Data Collection Method(s)</td>
<td>Ho Tested</td>
<td>Data Analysis Methods</td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grober &amp; Trickett (1997) Community Psychology</td>
<td>To describe the organisational factors affecting the empowerment of students and parents</td>
<td>&quot;...extent of decision making power that people actually wield in an organization.&quot; p. 354</td>
<td>Students (n=5), parents (n=5) and teachers (n=5) on the policy council for an alternative public high school from 1970-1974. Plus individual interviews with teachers (n=20-23 depending on school year) at the school.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>1. Historical notes of all policy council meetings from 1970-74. 2. Historical yearly interviews with students, parents, and teachers on the policy council. 3. Historical yearly interviews with all teachers in the school. 4. Retrospective interviews (1983-84) with teachers on the role of the policy council.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Analysis of interview data. Details not provided in the article on process utilized.</td>
<td>Concluded that: 1. Empowerment was difficult to obtain for parents and students because they were at an advantage compared to the teachers. 2. Actual policy decisions were not made at the policy council level, but at the school level by the faculty. This undermined the ability of students and parents to be empowered in governing the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kieffer (1984) Community Psychology</td>
<td>Describe the stages of empowerment in community grass roots leaders</td>
<td>Long-term process of adult development. Continuing construction of multi-dimensional participatory competence including the ability to proactively affect the social and political environment.</td>
<td>15 grass roots organization leaders, 5 male &amp; 10 female, ages 30-65; basically working class individuals</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Interviews in natural settings</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>1. Respondents had the opportunity to review and comment on the interview transcript. 2. Detailed analysis of transcripts</td>
<td>Empowerment is was 4 stage process 1. entry 2. advancement 3. incorporation 4. commitment Each stage took approximately 1 year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s), Year, Field</td>
<td>Purpose of Study</td>
<td>Definition of Empowerment</td>
<td>Population, sample size, and sample characteristics</td>
<td>Dependent Variable(s)</td>
<td>Independent Variable(s)</td>
<td>Data Collection Method(s)</td>
<td>Ho Tested</td>
<td>Data Analysis Methods</td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason &amp; Reppaport (1984) Community Psychology</td>
<td>Analyze the relationship between psychological-religious variables and empowerment.</td>
<td>&quot;...perceived interpersonal behavior change in the direction of group ideals.&quot; p. 40</td>
<td>100 members of one church in Illinois. 86 were the sample for the study. Mean age = 29. Race = 99% white. Females n = 38. Males n = 48. Variety of occupations.</td>
<td>Empowerment - Based on measures of self-esteem and interpersonal qualities. Using factor analysis, derived 4 criteria measures from these scales. (1. Dominance-Submission, 2. Hostility- Caring, 3. Giving-Open, and 4. Self Esteem.)</td>
<td>8 variables based on factor scores from scales on (1. Commitment, 2. God-not man, 3. Life crisis, 4. Consistency, 5. Guidance, 6. Instrumental orientation, 7. Living situation, 8. Encounter.)</td>
<td>1. Self-report questionnaires n = 77</td>
<td>1. Empowerment scores of the individual are the same for the past and the present. 2. There is no relationship between empowerment and the eight predictor variables. (1. Commitment, 2. God-not man, 3. Life crisis, 4. Consistency, 5. Guidance, 6. Instrumental orientation, 7. Living situation, 8. Encounter.)</td>
<td>1. T-tests on the 3 sub-scales of the interpersonal qualities scale and the self-esteem measure. 2. Multivariate canonical correlation</td>
<td>1. Individuals were more empowered today than prior joining the church. 2. Those who become empowered were those who describe themselves as deeply committed to God, tended to have had a life crisis that caused them to reevaluate their life, and had developed a sense of community (bonding) with those from the church. 3. Organizational conditions were important in the process of individual empowerment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s), Year, Field</td>
<td>Purpose of Study</td>
<td>Definition of Empowerment</td>
<td>Population, sample size, and sample characteristics</td>
<td>Dependent Variable(s)</td>
<td>Independent Variable(s)</td>
<td>Data Collection Method(s)</td>
<td>Ho Tested</td>
<td>Data Analysis Methods</td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainiero (1986), Management</td>
<td>To test if: 1. Gender is associated with the use of different empowerment strategies 2. Men hold more powerful jobs than women? 3. The relative power of a job affect the type of empowerment strategies used in a powerless situation. 4. The use of empowerment strategies based on job power or gender socialization?</td>
<td>&quot;...actions taken by individuals to reduce their dependency on a more powerful person.&quot; p. 638.</td>
<td>Population at 196 professional, technical, clerical, skilled, and nonskilled employees from 2 companies. Sample size 98. Evenly divided between females and males. Majority age for females 22-35. Majority age of males 36-55.</td>
<td>Empowerment Strategies; codes based on interview data.</td>
<td>1. Gender 2. Job dependency</td>
<td>1. Critical Incident interview methodology using one interviewer 2. All interviews were tape recorded</td>
<td>1. Females and males use the same empowerment strategies. 2. Females and males hold equally powerful jobs. 3. Job dependency does not affect empowerment strategy usage. 4. Gender and job dependency do not affect empowerment strategy usage.</td>
<td>1. Tape recordings of the interviews were transcribed. 2. Two raters coded the interviews into strategies. 3. Used percentages, tabulations, correlations, and chi square to test the hypothesis.</td>
<td>1. Females and males did not use the same empowerment strategies. Females tend to predominately use acquiescence while males use a wider range of strategies. 2. Females and males held equally powerful jobs. 3. Individuals in high power jobs used a wider range of empowerment strategies. Individuals in low power jobs were more likely to acquiesce. 4. Women tend to acquiesce when holding low power jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s), Year, Field</td>
<td>Purpose of Study</td>
<td>Definition of Empowerment</td>
<td>Population, sample size, and sample characteristics</td>
<td>Dependent Variable(s)</td>
<td>Independent Variable(s)</td>
<td>Data Collection Method(s)</td>
<td>Ho Tested</td>
<td>Data Analysis Methods</td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrum (1992) Education</td>
<td>Identify the perceived positive and negative effects of teacher empowerment on the power of the principal based on an experimental teacher empowerment program in six North Carolina schools.</td>
<td>Involvement in decision making.</td>
<td>1. Six schools from the North Carolina Project Design Program. This two year program involved an empowerment intervention designed to give teachers a greater role in decision making. (n=146 teachers, n=14 administrators). 2. A control group of six schools from the same districts matched with experimental schools on school size, grade levels, socio-economic status of student body, and leadership styles of the principal (n=137 teachers, n=11 administrators).</td>
<td>Empowerment; not measured but assumed based on involvement in the empowerment intervention.</td>
<td>Teachers influence in the school, the school system and with the principal. Teacher job satisfaction, and job performance. Teachers' perceptions of principal power. Type of school (elementary, secondary)</td>
<td>Questionnaires distributed and collected by principals at each school. (99% return rate).</td>
<td>When comparing teachers from schools with and without the empowerment intervention: 1. There is no difference in perceived teacher influence. 2. There is no difference in perceived principal influence. 3. There is no difference in teachers job satisfaction. 4. There is no difference in teachers job performance. 5. There is no difference in the principal's power base.</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Teachers from empowered schools rated their influence within the school, with the principal, and within the school system significantly higher.
2. There is no difference in perceived principal influence.
3. There was a significant interaction between teacher role and school level. Teachers at the empowered elementary schools expressed the greatest job satisfaction.
4. Teacher performance was not significantly different at the two types of schools.
5. There was no difference in the power base of the principal at the two types of schools.

(Cont. on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s), Year, Field</th>
<th>Purpose of Study</th>
<th>Definition of Empowerment</th>
<th>Population, sample size, and sample characteristics</th>
<th>Dependent Variable(s)</th>
<th>Independent Variable(s)</th>
<th>Data Collection Method(s)</th>
<th>Ho Tested</th>
<th>Data Analysis Methods</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short &amp; Rinchart (1992a) Education</td>
<td>Analyze the relationship between perceptions of school climate, participant characteristics, and empowerment</td>
<td>Perceived sense of self-efficacy, impact within the school, collaborative relationships, high status, work competence, and opportunities for professional growth.</td>
<td>257 teachers from 8 school districts across 6 states, 67% of respondents were females.</td>
<td>Empowerment at a composite of six dimensions. 1. Self efficacy 2. Professional growth 3. Impact 4. Collaboration 5. Status 6. Knowledge base</td>
<td>School climate, age, gender, years of experience, educational level, job satisfaction, and type of school</td>
<td>Questions using 5 point Likert type scale (disagree to strongly agree)</td>
<td>$\text{H}_0: B_1=B_2=B_3=B_4=B_5=B_6=0$</td>
<td>Stepwise multiple regression</td>
<td>Climate, experience, and age were significantly related to empowerment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short &amp; Rinchart (1992b) Education</td>
<td>Research described 3 studies</td>
<td>Opportunities for decision making, control over schedule, teaching competency, opportunities for professional growth, high status, influence, autonomy, impact on the school, choice, collaboration, and subject matter knowledge.</td>
<td>Study I: 79 teachers from all over the USA, 4 experts in school empowerment, and the 2 authors. Study II: 211 secondary teachers from 3 high schools in 3 states. Study III: 176 secondary teachers from 3 schools in 3 states. Teachers from 2 schools involved in a project to create empowered schools. Teachers in 3rd school had not been involved in any intervention related to empowerment.</td>
<td>Study I and II: none Study III: Decision making.</td>
<td>Study I: Questionnaires mailed to respondents, ratings of items by panel of experts. Study II and III: Questionnaires mailed to principals in each school for distribution in faculty meetings.</td>
<td>Study I: none Study II: What is the interrelationship of these variables Study III: $X_1=X_2$</td>
<td>Study I: Authors judged individual items to assess if they fit the literature on empowerment. Panel of experts rated and classified the items generated to measure empowerment. Study II: Principal components analysis with oblique rotation. Study III: Comparison of means between teachers in two schools involved in empowerment projects and teachers in one school without any intervention.</td>
<td>Study I: Generated 68 item instrument Study II: Derived 6 statistically significant factors representing 50.5% of the variance. These included: involvement in decision making, opportunities for professional growth, status in the school, self-efficacy-autonomy and impact within the school. Resulted in 38 item instrument. Study III: Teachers from schools with empowerment interventions rated themselves significantly higher on the empowerment scale. F(1,172)=4.84, p&lt;.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s), Year, Field</td>
<td>Purpose of Study</td>
<td>Definition of Empowerment</td>
<td>Population, sample size, and sample characteristics</td>
<td>Dependent Variable(s)</td>
<td>Independent Variable(s)</td>
<td>Data Collection Methods</td>
<td>Ho Tested</td>
<td>Data Analysis Methods</td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tynon (1988/1989) Management</td>
<td>Test of the Thomas and Velthouse (1990) cognitive model of empowerment.</td>
<td>Employees from 3 Northeast firms 215 managerial, technical, and professional employees and 76 supervisors. Data actually collected from 165 employees and 41 supervisors.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Job performance</td>
<td>1. Interpretive styles &lt;br&gt; 2. Task assessments</td>
<td>Questionnaires from employees and supervisors</td>
<td>1. The relationships among interpretive styles and task assessments are zero. &lt;br&gt; 2. The relationships among task assessments and outcomes are zero. &lt;br&gt; 3. The relationships among interpretive styles and outcomes are zero when controlling for task assessments.</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1. Interpretive styles formed a moderately strong relationship with the task assessments of competence and impact. &lt;br&gt; 2. Task assessments formed a moderately strong relationship with job satisfaction and low relationship with job stress and performance. &lt;br&gt; 3. Interpretive styles did not explain any variance in performance, only a very small variance in job satisfaction and a moderate amount of variance in job stress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s), Year, Field</th>
<th>Purpose of Study</th>
<th>Definition of Empowerment</th>
<th>Population, sample size, and sample characteristics</th>
<th>Dependent Variable(s)</th>
<th>Independent Variable(s)</th>
<th>Data Collection Method(s)</th>
<th>Ho Tested</th>
<th>Data Analysis Methods</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zimmerman &amp; Rapaport (1988) Community Psychology</td>
<td>Series of three studies to examine the difference among empowerment and participation among college students and community residents.</td>
<td>Combination of personality, cognitive, and motivational aspects of personal control and competence - a composite of self-acceptance, self-confidence, social and political understanding, and the ability to play an assertive role in controlling resources and decisions.</td>
<td>In all studies there was an almost even split between males and females. Study I and II: Random sample of students enrolled in Introduction to Psychology. N=392; mean age = 19 years; 88 percent were white middle class. Study III: 176 individuals belonging to 1 of 5 community groups and 22 individuals selected at random from the community. Mean age = 42; mostly middle class.</td>
<td>Empowerment measured with 11 different scales 1. internal locus of control 2. chance control 3. belief in powerful others 4. control ideology 5. self-efficacy 6. internal political efficacy 7. external political efficacy 8. sense of mastery 9. perceived competence 10. desire for control 11. civic duty</td>
<td>Study I: Willingness to attempt change based on personal and community relevant scenarios Study II and Study III: Involvement in community activities and membership in voluntary organizations.</td>
<td>Study I: Questionnaires and scenarios given at large group meetings Study II: Questionnaires, activity checklist given at large group meeting Study III: Questionnaires, activity checklist given at community group meetings. Also 22 mailed to those not belonging to a community organizations.</td>
<td>Study I: (a) There is no difference on the measures of empowerment, for those who are willing and not willing to attempt changes in a personal and community scenario. (b) r=0 for the 11 dependent measures. Study II and III: There is no difference, on the measures of empowerment, for those involved in community and voluntary organizations and those not involved in these activities. (b) r=0 for the 11 dependent measures.</td>
<td>Study I: MANOVA and ANOVA Study II: MANOVA and ANOVA Study III: MANOVA and ANOVA</td>
<td>Study I: (a) There was a significant difference on the measures of self-efficacy, perceived competence, desire for control, civic duty and internal locus of control. Those willing to attempt change scored higher on these measures of empowerment. (b) Average correlation = .29 Study II: (a) All of the dependent variables were significant except internal locus of control. Those more involved in community activities and voluntary organizations scored higher than those not involved in these activities. Study III: (a) All of the dependent measures were significant except self-efficacy and control ideology. Those more involved in community and volunteer activities scored higher than those not involved in these types of activities. (b) Average correlation = .29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Studies Examined From Management

Studies examined from the field of management include work by Mainiero (1986), Deci et al. (1989), and Tymon (1988/1989). Mainiero (1986) equated empowerment with the use of influence strategies on the job when the respondent was in a powerless situation. She interviewed 98 different employees from two different companies to determine if differences exist in the ways those in powerful and non-powerful jobs use influence in organizations. Participants were asked to recall and describe a frustrating work situation in which they found themselves to be dependent upon others and the influence actions they took to cope with the dependency.

From this research Mainiero concluded that the less powerful the individuals' jobs the more likely they were to acquiesce. Particularly, women were more likely to acquiesce when holding a low power position within the organization. However, both men and women in more powerful jobs used a wider range of influence strategies and were better at seeking alternative resources to empower themselves.

This study by Mainiero reinforces the importance of organizational conditions in the empowerment process as outlined in the theories by Conger and Kanungo (1988), Thomas and Velthouse (1990), and Vogt and Murrell (1990). Traditionally, individuals in more powerful positions have had greater opportunities for empowerment because they had greater access
and control over resources, involvement in the decision making process, and knowledge about the organization. Mainiero concluded that those higher up in the organization are in a better position to become empowered. This conclusion reinforces the importance of the job design portion of the Conger and Kanungo (1988) model. Refer to Appendix C, Table C-1 for the specific aspects of job design that Conger and Kanungo outline as affecting empowerment.

A concern with the research by Mainiero is the apparent use of a very narrow definition of empowerment i.e., only influence strategies. However, this behavior would be affected by the respondent’s ability to understand and use the political system, understand the organization, access and control resources, achieve self-esteem, and become involved in decision making. These elements are all part of the definition of empowerment adopted for this study.

Given that the sample for the Mainiero study came from only two companies in one narrow geographic region, generalizations to other populations are difficult. Other problems within the study that limit generalizability include the following points:

1. Interviews were the only source of data collection.

2. The age range for the majority of the males was different than the age range of the majority of the females.
3. Participants were asked to recall and describe past behavior to a researcher. During this process, passage of time may have affected their recall. Also, social desirability may have affected the manner in which they recalled the events for the researcher in a personal interview setting.

Another dimension of empowerment, self-determination, was examined by Deci et al. (1989). Self-determination was defined as promotion of individuals’ sense of choice and personal initiative in the workplace. This definition would relate to both the access and control of resources; and the involvement and impact in decision making elements of the empowerment definition used in the current study.

According to Deci et al., promotion of individual self-determination in the workplace requires that significant others i.e., managers or supervisors, support the individual’s autonomy, provide noncontrolling positive feedback, and take that person’s frame of reference for the situation or issue at hand (Deci et al., 1989). This strategy relates to stage 2 and 3 of the Conger and Kanungo (1988) model shown in Figure 1. Stage 2 involves changing the organizational conditions via managerial strategies and techniques to provide self-efficacy information, and stage 3 involves actually providing the self-efficacy information to the subordinate. Feedback from supervisors is part of the environmental events portion of the model by Thomas and Velthouse
(1990), and the organizational communication element in the model by Vogt and Murrell (1990) (refer to Figure 2 and Figure 3 for more information).

Deci et al. examined the relationship between managers' attitudes towards self-determination and workers' job related attitudes and evaluated the effect of training managers to promote self-determination in their employees. Respondents were all part of a large office equipment company.

To assess managers' support for self-determination, each manager answered a series of questions about eight different vignettes. This format was tested with 46 managers from another location prior to use in the study. Employees answered questions pertaining to work climate and employee attitudes. The Work Climate Questionnaire contained items designed to measure trust, quality of supervision, description of the work environment, workers' feelings about their work environment, and employee satisfaction with 10 job characteristics. The employee attitude questionnaire was designed to measure employee global satisfaction.

Following a baseline data collection period, a training intervention was utilized in a branch office. Measures were collected before and after the training intervention from employees and from supervisors. The authors concluded that "the relation between managers' support for self-determination and workers' job related attitudes was significant and important when the more general corporate variables related to job security
and pay were not overly salient. When security and pay were threatened, these variables (along with trust in top management, who were presumably responsible for the threat) were most predictive of job-related attitudes" (Deci et al., 1989, p. 586). These authors also concluded that training managers to support self-determination in their subordinates is possible and can result in positive changes in workers’ job related attitudes.

The value of this study is that it again supports the importance of organizational conditions in promoting empowerment. The results from this study seems to support the notion that a change in organizational conditions creates opportunities for individual empowerment in the work place. This conclusion supports the theories of empowerment by Conger and Kanungo (1988), Thomas and Velthouse (1990), and Vogt and Murrell (1990). Some limitations of the study include the fact that employee empowerment was not directly measured, but was inferred using managers’ attitudes towards self-determination. The small sample size and the fact that all the employees were from one company make it difficult to generalize the conclusions to other workers in other settings.

Tymon (1988/1989) tested part of an earlier version of the model of cognitive empowerment by Thomas and Velthouse (1990) (refer to Figure 2 for a visual of this model). This was the only research study identified in the empowerment literature that attempted to test a specific model.
Tymon focused his research efforts on interpretive styles, task assessments, and behavior. Tymon expanded the behavior construct to include job satisfaction and job stress. He used job performance, as rated by the employees’ supervisor, to measure the behavior portion of the original model. Two additional variables, job characteristics and organizational type, were included to represent and control for the environmental events portion of the model. Job characteristics were meant to represent job complexity and were rated by the supervisors.

Due to a lack of data from the supervisors, the researcher was able to only use job characteristics as a control variable on a subgroup of 93 employees. Therefore, job characteristics was used only as a control variable when examining job performance. Organizational type was assigned by the author to represent nonprofit and for-profit organizations. Other organizational conditions, interventions, and global assessments were not included in this research study.

Using a combination of researcher designed and previously published questions, Tymon collected data from 164 managerial, technical, and professional employees and from 41 of their supervisors who worked at one of three different Northeast firms. The employees provided information on all variables except job characteristics and job performance. Data were collected from the supervisors of the employees on these two variables.
Using a series of regression equations, Tymon found support for the relationships as summarized in Table 3. The first series of equations tested the relationship between interpretive styles and task assessments. The second series of equations tested the relationship between task assessments and outcomes i.e., behavior. The third series of equations tested the relationship between interpretive styles and outcomes i.e., behavior, when the effect of task assessments were controlled.

There are several problems with the study by Tymon.

1. Canonical correlation would have been a more powerful method of testing the model than the regression approach adopted.

2. All items to assess interpretive styles and task assessment were researcher designed. These items were not tested prior to use in the study. After gathering data from the employees, factor analysis generated different scales than those originally conceived. The new scales were used for all calculations.

3. Job satisfaction and job stress are questionable measures of the behavioral components of empowerment.

4. Except for job performance, all measures were collected at the same time from the employees.
Table 3


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First Regression Analysis; relationship between interpretive styles and task assessments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretive Styles</th>
<th>Task Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envisioning</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envisioning</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envisioning</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envisioning</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second Regression Analysis; relationship between task assessments and behavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Assessments</th>
<th>Outcomes (Behaviors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningfulness</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Second Regression Analysis; relationship between task assessments and behavior.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Assessments</th>
<th>Outcomes (Behaviors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Third Regression Analysis; relationship between interpretive styles and behavior, controlling for task assessments.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretive Styles</th>
<th>Outcomes (Behaviors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envisioning</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributing</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envisioning</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envisioning</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Note. Refer to Figure 2 for the theoretical relationships tested from Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An "interpretive" model of intrinsic task motivation. Academy of Management Review, 15, 666-681.
5. There were inconsistencies in how the questionnaires were distributed and collected at all three firms.

6. Data collection involved only managerial, technical, and professional employees from three firms. This makes generalization to other employees difficult.

Results of the research by Tymon on the cognitive model of empowerment (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990) can lead to several competing conclusions. These include that (a) only a small portion of individual empowerment can be explained by internal states in the individual, (b) the theoretical relationships proposed in the model are not correctly stated, (c) measurement of the various components of the model by Tymon was not adequate to provide a test of the model and/or, (d) interactions among the various components of interpretive styles and task assessments would provide a better explanation of empowerment. The research by Tymon did not begin to answer any questions as to the nature of the relationships among organizational conditions and individual empowerment.

Studies Examined From Education

Studies examined from the field of education include those by Schrum (1992), Short and Rinehart (1992a), and Short and Rinehart (1992b). Schrum (1992) gathered data from 146 teachers in six schools after their
involvement in a two year project on empowerment. Their responses were compared to 137 teachers from six schools not involved in any empowerment intervention. Schrum concluded that teachers from schools with the empowerment intervention rated their influence within the school, with the principal, and within the larger school system significantly higher than teachers from schools without the empowerment intervention. When comparing responses of those from the empowered and nonempowered schools, Schrum also concluded that (a) the principal’s influence and power base was not significantly different and (b) the job performance of teachers was not significantly different.

This study is important to the current research effort because it supports the notion that changing organizational conditions results in significantly more opportunities for employee empowerment. The study by Schrum also supports the assumption by Conger and Kanungo (1988), Thomas and Velthouse (1990), and Vogt and Murrell (1990) that employee empowerment results in the generation of more power within the organization. This assumption is supported by the Schrum conclusion that there was not a significance difference in the influence and power base of the principals in the two types of schools.

However, there are several limitations to the study by Schrum.

1. The majority of the scales consisted of only one item.
2. Validity and reliability estimates of the measures were not reported.

3. Empowerment was not measured directly, but was inferred based on school involvement in an empowerment intervention.

4. The sample size of the administrators was very small, with an \( n = 14 \) in the empowered schools and an \( n = 11 \) in the nonempowered schools.

5. The researcher did not conduct appropriate post hoc tests in conjunction with ANOVA, or use the appropriate statistical test for data based on ranks.

6. Standard deviations for the data were not reported. It could not be determined if they met the homogeneity of variance assumption for ANOVA.

In another study, Short and Rinehart (1992a) analyzed the relationships between empowerment, school climate, teacher age, gender, years of experience, educational level, job satisfaction, and type of school. These researchers collected data from 257 teachers in eight states.

Based on prior literature from education and psychology, Short and Rinehart (1992a) developed a **School Participant Empowerment Scale** involving six subscales. These six dimensions were: (a) self-efficacy, (b) opportunities for professional growth, (c) opportunities to impact the school, (d) opportunities to collaborate with peers, (e) status, and (f) knowledge base for teaching.
Using the ideas of parents, teachers, students, administrators, and prior literature; the researchers also developed a School Climate Questionnaire. This instrument was designed to measure teachers’ perceptions of an effective school climate for students along nine dimensions. These nine dimensions were: (a) strong leadership, (b) dedicated staff, (c) high expectations, (d) student monitoring, (e) identification of student learning, (f) learning climate, (g) curriculum continuity, (h) multicultural education, and (i) sex equity.

Using stepwise multiple regression, Short and Rinehart concluded that three variables, effective school climate for students, teacher age, and years of experience, were significantly related to empowerment and explained 61% of the variance. However, they found that two variables, effective school climate for students and age, were negatively related to teacher empowerment. The study by Short and Rinehart was significant for the current research because the empowerment subscales used for their study appeared to tap several of the same components as those in the current study.

However, there are several problems with the study by Short and Rinehart (1992a). The authors designed all of the questions and did not pilot the items or the questionnaires prior to use. Respondents answered all items for the dependent and independent measures at the same time. The authors
did not report (a) the number of items per component of empowerment, (b) the number of items per component of school climate, (c) means, standard deviations, or scale internal reliabilities (d) how the scales for empowerment or school climate were summed, (e) correlation coefficients, or (f) the t-values for the regression coefficients. Also, the measured climate dimensions did not match those identified in the current literature search as important to empowerment (refer to Appendix A, Table A-1).

In a closely related study, Short and Rinehart (1992b) outlined additional efforts to develop the School Participant Empowerment Scale. In this study, 211 teachers from three schools in three states rated 68 statements about what makes them feel empowered in schools. Principal component analysis with oblique rotation revealed six statistically significant factors accounting for 50.5% of the variance. Thirty-eight items were retained to represent the six dimensions of (a) involvement in decision making, (b) opportunities for professional growth, (c) high status, (d) self-efficacy, (e) autonomy, and (f) impact in the school.

As a next step, Short and Rinehart distributed the 38 item questionnaire to teachers in three states. Two of the schools had participated in a three year national project to create empowerment for school employees. The teachers in the third school had not participated in any empowerment intervention. Teachers from schools who had
participated in the empowerment intervention scored significantly higher on the empowerment measure than teachers from the third school, $F(1, 172) = 4.84, p < .02$.

The importance of this study is that it systematically attempted to identify and measure the components of teacher empowerment in a school environment. An examination of the items and dimensions by Short and Rinehart resulted in the following comparisons. Some of the questions by Short and Rinehart pertaining to decision making and impact relate closely to the involvement and impact in decision making and access and control over resources components used in this study. Also, other items from their subscale on decision making are very similar to items used in this study to measure understanding of the business operations. Some of their items pertaining to high status, professional growth, and self-efficacy are very similar to those measuring organizational based self-esteem in this study. Other items from their subscale on impact are closely aligned to the current researcher’s questions on understanding and use of the political system. A leadership component of empowerment was not identified by these authors. This is understandable given that their instrument was designed and tested on classroom teachers. In summary, it appears that there are many items from the School Participant Empowerment Scale that are similar to the wording and intent of items used in this study to measure HRD manager
empowerment. The main difference appears to be the lack of a leadership component in the instrument by Short and Rinehart (1992b).

Studies Examined From Community Psychology

Studies examined from the field of community psychology included those by Biegel (1984), Gruber and Trickett (1987), Kieffer (1984), Maton and Rappaport (1984), and Zimmerman and Rappaport (1988). Using an action research approach, Biegel (1984) described a four-year mental health intervention research study. This study was funded by the National Institute of Mental Health and endeavored to increase empowerment by addressing individual obstacles to seeking and receiving mental health services in a white ethnic working class neighborhood. The goal of the project was to increase individual utilization of mental health services by fostering individual and community involvement in needs identified and problem resolution. Biegel documented the underutilization of community mental health services and the need for these services in traditionally ethnic neighborhoods.

The neighborhood in this study had a population of approximately 66,000 and was located in a large urban area of Wisconsin. The residents of the neighborhood were 99% white, 32% foreign born and included a high percent of individuals over the age of 65.
As part of the needs assessment phase of the project, data were collected using surveys, historical data from mental health agencies, individual interviews, and conclusions from a series of meetings involving two community groups. Based on the observations and experiences of the researchers, the author concluded that community conditions of trust, informal networks, and social support were decisive in the empowerment process. Biegel also concluded that for an individual to be empowered they must have access to resources, knowledge of available mental health services, and be involved in the decision making process.

Shortcomings of this study include the fact that empowerment was not measured, but was inferred based on the increased implementation and utilization of mental health programs. Also, the conclusions of the study were not based on any type of measured data. The conclusions were based on the experiences of the author/researcher over a four-year period.

The study by Biegel contributes to the current research by supporting the importance of environmental conditions in individual empowerment. An important conclusion from the study was that empowerment is not something dispensed to another but is a natural process facilitated when environmental conditions are altered to support the process. The four-year intervention described by Biegel spotlighted a community situation in which environmental conditions were altered to facilitate individual empowerment.
by access to resources, involvement in decision making, and increased knowledge of services available. This intervention approach is consistent with the models by Conger and Kanungo (1988), Thomas and Velthouse (1990), and Vogt and Murrell (1990). In addition, Biegel accentuated certain characteristics of an empowered state. According to Biegel, empowered individuals are characterized by their access to resources, knowledge of services, and involvement in decision making. These elements are consistent with the definition of empowerment adopted for this study.

Using a case study approach, Gruber and Trickett (1987) investigated empowerment of students and parents in a small Northeast alternative public high school. This study was part of an evaluation of the first four years of the school’s operations and concentrated on the all volunteer policy council. This council was created during the first year of the school’s operations and included five students, five parents, and five teachers as the governing body. As originally conceptualized, this policy council was to empower parents and students by providing equal opportunities for them to impact decisions about the school.

Data collection sources included historical documents from the 1970-1974 period. These consisted of policy council meeting notes, yearly interviews with all policy council members, and regularly scheduled yearly interviews with the 20 to 23 teachers at the school. These historical
documents were supplemented by additional retrospective personal interviews with teachers still working at the school during the 1983-1984 school year.

This qualitative study did not test any hypothesis, but attempted to determine why parents and students on the policy council were not empowered when they were provided with the opportunity to participate in the decision making process of the school. The authors concluded that the policy council structure failed to empower parents and students because they [parents and students] lacked educational expertise. Another force that worked against parent/student empowerment was their lack of knowledge and involvement in daily school life. Both of these factors put the parents/students at a disadvantage when attempting to negotiate decisions and policies with the teachers. Because parents and students were not directly involved in managing daily school life, they were not able to (a) understand and use the political system within the school, (b) access and control school resources, (c) generate strong leadership to mobilize others to larger group goals, and (d) impact the decision making process within the school.

In addition, organizational dynamics and structures in the school's operations made these inequities insurmountable for parents and students. These dynamics and structures created power for the teachers because they
(a) were fully responsible for implementing the decisions of the policy council, (b) had more formal authority in the school, (c) had access and control over the school’s resources, (d) provided leadership for the school, and (e) were able to bypass the authority of the policy council without any sanctions. Gruber and Trickett concluded that additional attention to organizational inequities would have increased parent/student opportunities for individual empowerment. Yet, they noted that traditional organizational structures work to undermine opportunities for empowerment.

This study is relevant to the current research in two important ways. One, Gruber and Trickett emphasized the importance of organizational conditions in the empowerment process. Two, even though empowerment was defined only as decision making power within organizations, these authors detailed four other meaningful components of the empowerment construct. These were (a) access and control over resources, (b) knowledge of the organization, (c) understanding and use of the political system, and (d) leadership that generates action to larger group goals. These components are included in the definition of empowerment in the current study.

Gruber and Trickett reinforced the extent to which empowerment is facilitated by involvement and impact in decision making. They identified that it is not just the opportunity to participate that leads to empowerment, but the opportunity to participate and impact decision making. Limitations of
the study include using a small intact group as respondents, a long time lag between the period described and the current interviews, and only using teachers for the retrospective interviews.

Kieffer (1984) conducted individual interviews with 15 grassroots leaders to clarify the meaning of empowerment. These leaders came from various areas of the country and ranged in age from 30-65 years old. The interviews were held in the natural setting of the respondent. Interviews were transcribed, and then for additional clarification the grassroots leaders were asked to review and comment on the transcripts. From these interviews, Kieffer concluded that empowerment is "an ordered and progressive development of participatory skills and political understandings. It refers both to a longitudinal dynamic of development and to attainment of a set of insight and abilities best described as 'participatory competence' " (p. 17).

From this research, Kieffer described empowerment as a process with four stages. He labelled these stages (a) entry, (b) advancement, (c) incorporation, and (d) commitment. Entry is invoked when individuals with a strong sense of pride, determination, commitment to self-reliance, and a strong sense of community are faced with a "tangible and direct threat" (p. 18) that violates their sense of self, community, or family. During the period of entry, which lasts approximately one year, the individual’s participation is
"exploratory, unknowing, and unsure" (p. 19) and demands a transformation of his/her sense of power and authority systems.

The second stage, advancement, also requires approximately one year, occurs in the context of a mentoring relationship, supportive peers, and advancing analytical understanding of social and public relationships. The third one year period, incorporation, is marked by maturing management and strategic skills, and a further understanding of how people operate in society. A sense of mastery and competence is incorporated into the individual’s self-concept as he/she realize how she/he individually affects the socio-political environment. During the fourth and final stage, commitment, the individual searches for "meaningful ways of applying new abilities and insights" (p. 24) vaulting her/his participatory competence into proactive leadership around community issues. Kieffer notes that organizational/social conditions are key elements in individual empowerment.

The study by Kieffer is important to the current research because it reinforces the concept that empowerment is a process and that organizational/social conditions affect empowerment as depicted in the models by Conger and Kanungo (1988), Vogt and Murrell (1990), and Thomas and Velthouse (1990). Further, this study is prominent because it outlines some of the key attributes of an empowered individual. Limitations
of the study include the small sample size, reliance on personal interviews, 
and the inclusion of only grassroots leaders in the study.

Maton and Rappaport (1984) studied empowerment in a religious 
setting. According to these authors, empowerment helps individuals develop 
a sense of control over important goals, acquire the resources to accomplish 
the goals, and actually achieve or make significant progress towards the 
goals.

These authors gathered data over a one-year period using interviews, 
self-report questionnaires, and member and peer ratings for 86 individuals 
belonging to one church in the Midwest. Empowerment, the dependent 
variable, was measured as a multidimensional construct consisting of self-
esteeem and three types of interpersonal qualities. Eight personal variables 
derived from scales on religious orientation and motivation, locus of control, 
religious history, spiritual life, and demographic variables were the 
independent variables for the study.

Using univariate partial correlations and multivariate canonical 
correlation Maton and Rappaport concluded that those who have become 
empowered were those who describe themselves as deeply committed to 
God, tended to have had a life crisis that caused them to reevaluate their 
life, and had developed a sense of community with others in the church. 
They also reported that individuals rated by their peers as the most
empowered were the ones whose change was the most in the direction of
the group ideals.

According to Maton and Rappaport, the environment surrounding the
individual is critical to the process of empowerment. Environments that
facilitate empowerment contain elements of explicit goals, shared community
life, and interpersonal development. From an organizational structural view,
empowerment was facilitated by decentralization of authority and
responsibility, a friendly and sincere climate, a balance between community
and freedom, and involvement in something meaningful. These authors
concluded that empowerment develops in situations where individuals are
provided meaning, identity, opportunities for personal development, and
access to personal support systems.

The study by Maton and Rappaport is of value to the current research
because it is one of the few studies identified in the literature that attempted
to measure empowerment in a quantitative manner. These authors viewed
empowerment as a process affected by individual attributes and the
conditions surrounding the individual. This approach is consistent with the
models by Conger and Kanungo (1988), Thomas and Velthouse (1990), and
Vogt and Murrell (1990). Even though Maton and Rappaport analyzed the
relationship between empowerment and various personal variables, they
emphasized the critical nature of the church organizational conditions to individual empowerment.

Maton and Rappaport used self-esteem as a component of individual empowerment. This supports and is consistent with the definition used in the current study. An additional strong point of their study was the use of multiple data sources.

However, there are several limitations to the study by Maton and Rappaport. One, they used volunteer individuals from an intact group. Two, the sample size was small for the type of statistical analysis undertaken. Complete data were available for only 49 individuals. Three, several scales consisted of only one item each. Four, there was little evidence of validity for several scales. Lastly, respondents were asked to recall personal behaviors from before the time they joined the church. This created several situations in which respondents were attempting to record behaviors from several years in their past.

Using a sample of college students and community residents, Zimmerman and Rappaport (1988) examined the relationship between psychological empowerment and participation. They viewed empowerment as a blend of personality, cognitions, and motivation resulting in "a combination of self-acceptance and self-confidence, social and political
understanding, and the ability to play an assertive role in controlling
resources and decisions" (p.726).

These authors measured empowerment using 11 different scales to
represent the personality, cognitive, and motivational aspects of
empowerment. Their research was conducted as a series of three studies.

In study one, 392 psychology students responded to two different
scenarios and the empowerment measures. For each scenario they rated
their willingness to try to change the situation described. From these data,
the authors concluded that individuals most willing to attempt change scored
significantly higher on measures of self-efficacy, perceived competence,
desire for control, civic duty, and internal locus of control.

For the second study, the same psychology students responded to
additional questions concerning their level of involvement in community
activities. Respondents were categorized into four different groups reflecting
different levels of community involvement. The authors concluded that
those most involved in community activities scored significantly higher on all
measures of empowerment except internal locus of control.

Follow-up analysis for study two included the use of discriminate
function analysis. Using this technique, Zimmerman and Rappaport reported
finding one dimension of empowerment that explained 16% of the variance.
Elements of empowerment that contributed most highly to group separation
were political efficacy, perceived competence, desire for control, civic duty, and self-efficacy. The high-active group was highest on this dimension. The scales which contributed most highly to group separation represented the cognitive and motivational aspects of empowerment.

Study three was a replication of study two using 198 community residents. One hundred and seventy six of these came from one of five different intact community groups. For the third study, the authors reported that all the empowerment measures were significant ($p < .05$) except self-efficacy and control ideology. Those most involved in community activities scored significantly higher on all the other measures of empowerment than those who were less involved or not involved at all.

Follow-up analysis for study three again involved the use of discriminate function analysis. In study three, one dimension of empowerment explained 18% of the variance. Elements of empowerment that contributed most highly to group separation were political efficacy, perceived competence, and civic duty. The high active group was highest on this dimension. The scales that contributed the most to group separation represented the cognitive and motivational aspects of empowerment. Zimmerman and Rappaport also concluded that socio-economic status was significantly correlated ($p < .01$) with this discriminate function dimension.
Overall, Zimmerman and Rappaport concluded that civic duty, political efficacy, and competence were consistent as measures of empowerment across the three studies. They also concluded that empowerment is a combination of cognitive, personality, and motivational factors in the individual; and that these factors are affected by organizational conditions.

The value of the Zimmerman and Rappaport research is that they viewed empowerment as a complex construct and measured it as multiple components. Further, their measurement of empowerment touched many of the dimensions chosen for this study. This includes understanding and use of the political environment, control over resources, involvement and impact in decision making processes, and self-esteem.

Zimmerman and Rappaport recognized that empowerment contains elements of motivation, cognition, and personality. This view is consistent with the models by Conger and Kanungo (1988), Thomas and Velthouse (1990), and Vogt and Murrell (1990). Even though their study did not involve the effects of organizational conditions on individual empowerment, they discussed the importance of these and the need for research in that domain.

Limitations of their research included reliance on intact groups for respondents, and using different data collection procedures with the student and community samples. Also, only 22 community residents not involved in
community groups were chosen as respondents for the study. This may not have been an adequate sample to offset the effects of the 176 respondents from five different community groups.

**Comparisons of the Current Study With Previous Research on Empowerment**

As discussed in this chapter, past research on empowerment embodies several distinctive elements important to the current research study. These can be summarized into two groups. One grouping includes the common limitations from previous research that are overcome in this study. Grouping two includes aspects from previous research that reinforce the approach chosen for this study.

There are four frequent limitations from past research that are overcome in this particular study. The first encompasses measurement issues concerning empowerment. Three of the studies discussed (Deci et al., 1989; Mainiero, 1986; Schrum, 1992) defined empowerment in a very narrow manner. Also, several previous studies inferred empowerment without measurement (Deci et al., 1989; Biegel, 1984; Gruber & Trickett, 1987; Kieffer, 1984; Schrum, 1992). This limitation is overcome by distinguishing empowerment as a complex unidimensional construct initially measured along six different dimensions.
The second limitation involves utilizing respondents from intact groups (Deci et al., 1989; Gruber & Trickett, 1987; Mainiero, 1986; Maton & Rappaport, 1984; Short & Rinehart, 1992b; Tymon, 1988/1989; Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988). This study uses a systematic sample of HRD managers from across the continental United States.

The third limitation from previous research is the use of very small sample sizes. Deci et al. (1989) and Gruber and Trickett (1987) each had a sample size of about 35; while Kieffer (1984) used only 15 respondents. Data were collected from 126 HRD managers for this study.

The fourth limitation pertains to inconsistencies in data collection methodology (Schrum, 1992; Short & Rinehart, 1992a, 1992b; Tymon, 1988/1989; Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988). For this study, the data collection methodology utilized consistent procedures with all respondents.

1. The theoretical assumptions are consistent with the models by Conger and Kanungo (1988), Thomas and Velthouse (1990), and Vogt and Murrell (1990).

2. Various researchers recognized the importance of organizational conditions in the empowerment process.


4. Several researchers included components in their definitions of empowerment that support one or more of the elements included in the definition used in this study (Biegel, 1984; Deci et al., 1989; Gruber & Trickett, 1987; Kieffer, 1984; Mainiero, 1986; Maton & Rappaport, 1984; Short & Rinehart, 1992a, 1992b; Tymon, 1988/1989; Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988).

**Chapter Summary**

This chapter reviewed pertinent literature for this study and was organized into four main segments. The first segment detailed the formal definition of empowerment and other numerous definitions of empowerment from the management, psychology, and education literature.
Section one concluded with a summary of the first research question: What was a viable starting point for an operational definition of HRD manager empowerment based upon definitions and research in the fields of management, psychology, and education? The initial operational definition included six dimensions of HRD manager empowerment. Those dimensions were (a) access and control over resources, (b) impact and involvement in decision making, (c) insight and use of the political situation, (d) knowledge of the group or organization, (e) high self-esteem, and (f) leadership abilities that generate action from others towards larger group goals.

The second major segment of this chapter described and contrasted three theories of empowerment from the management literature. All three theories (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990; Vogt & Murrell 1990) view empowerment as an individual motivational process. Each theoretical model consisted of three basic sections; organizational conditions, the self, and the behavior exhibited by the empowered self. In each of the three models, organizational conditions constitute the starting point and are assumed to directly impact the self.

According to each model, empowered behavior is the outcome of individual empowerment. This behavior is manifest through initiation and/or persistence of behaviors to accomplish tasks (Conger and Kanungo, 1988); postulated as activity, concentration, initiation, resiliency and flexibility.
during task accomplishment (Thomas and Velthouse, 1990); and viewed as commitment to organizational goals, quality work, responsibility, and self-fulfillment in the model by Vogt and Murrell (1990).

Based on the models of Conger and Kanungo (1988), Thomas and Velthouse (1990), Vogt and Murrell (1990), and the definitions of empowerment reviewed from the management, education, and community psychology literature, an initial definition of HRD manager empowerment was detailed for this study. An empowered HRD manager is an individual who (a) has control and access over needed resources, (b) is knowledgeable about the business, (c) provides leadership that integrates the HRD function into the strategic direction of the company, (d) is involved and has impact in the company decision making process, (e) understands and uses the political system within the organization for promotion of the HRD department to the benefit of the company, and (f) has high organizational self-esteem.

The third section of this chapter discussed organizational conditions critical to empowerment. A review of the literature was undertaken to determine the organizational conditions that were mentioned as the most important and mentioned the most frequently as impacting empowerment. Collaboration, organizational support, trust, and communications were the variables deemed to be the most important and most often mentioned in this review. Further analysis of the empowerment literature indicated several
authors who emphasized the critical nature of collaboration and
organizational support (Block, 1989; Byham, 1991; Levin, 1991; Lightfoot,
1986; Maton & Rappaport, 1984; O’ Sullivan et al., 1984; Short & Rinehart,
1992b). Trust was delineated as a decisive element by Maton and
Rappaport (1984), Prawat (1991), Short and Rinehart (1992b), and Vogt and
(1990), and Vogt and Murrell (1990) cited open communications as critical
to empowerment. Based on this literature, it was determined that the most
important and frequently mentioned organizational conditions theorized to be
related to empowerment were collaboration, organizational support, trust,
and communications. These are the organizational conditions under study in
the current research.

The fourth section evaluated relevant empirical literature from the
fields of management, education, and community psychology. The fourth
section concluded with a summary contrasting the current study with the
strengths and limitations of previous research on empowerment. Chapter 3,
which follows, discusses in greater detail the methodology and instruments
used in this study.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the research procedures employed for the current study. Sections of the chapter include selection of subjects, instrumentation, data collection procedures, explanation of the pilot study, data processing and analysis procedures, and a chapter summary.

The general purpose of this study was to identify the relationship between four organizational conditions and HRD manager empowerment. According to the literature on empowerment, the organizational conditions of organizational support, trust, communications, and collaboration are hypothesized to be related to manager empowerment.

HRD managers listed in the 1991 ASTD membership directory were selected systematically to participate in this study. Data were collected using telephone interviews and a written questionnaire sent by fax. The dependent variable was HRD manager empowerment. The independent variables were organizational factors purported to be critical to empowerment: collaboration, organizational support, trust, and communication within the organization (refer to Table A-1 in Appendix A). The dependent and all the independent variables were considered to be continuous variables.
Selection of Subjects

Subjects were selected from the 1991 membership directory of ASTD. There were approximately 55,000 ASTD members listed in this directory in alphabetical order. The directory included information for each member on organizational title, employing organization, company address, and company phone number.

Using organizational titles as a selection device, 2,152 HRD managers were identified as potential respondents for the study. Only members with a title indicating an HRD manager position were identified for possible inclusion in the study. These titles generally included descriptions such as HRD Manager, Training and Development Manager, Manager of Management Development and Training, and Manager of Corporate Training and Development. A complete list of the titles used to identify these managers can be found in Appendix B, Table B-1.

From those identified as HRD managers, 150 names were selected in a systematic sampling procedure with females and males equally represented. Gender equity was attempted by using first names given in the directory. Potential respondents with initials listed instead of a full first name were classified as male. Almost 52% of the HRD managers were labeled as males and about 48% were labeled as females.
From this population of HRD managers, 75 males were selected as the sample for this study using a random start of 12 and taking every 15th name from the list of male HRD managers. Seventy-five females were selected using a random start of 5 and taking every 14th name from the list of female HRD managers.

Individuals in the original sample of 150 were replaced in the study if (a) after four telephone contact attempts they could not be contacted, (b) they indicated they were not the proper person for the study, (c) the company had eliminated the HRD manager position, or (d) they refused to participate in the study. Using a coin flip, the replacement order for the original sample was in the following order.

1. The same gender HRD manager listed previous to them in the ASTD directory.

2. The same gender HRD manager listed after them in the ASTD directory.

If the above procedure did not generate an HRD manager for inclusion in the study due to the reasons mentioned above, then the replacement order expanded to others from the directory. Using a second coin flip, a second replacement protocol was generated as follows.

1. The same gender HRD manager listed two names previous to the individual originally selected from the ASTD directory.
2. The same gender HRD manager listed two names after the individual originally selected from the ASTD directory.

Instrumentation

The dependent variable, HRD manager empowerment, was conceptualized as a unidimensional composite measure based on a series of items answered during a telephone interview with the HRD manager. Given the lack of research data available on empowerment, treating this construct as unidimensional was consistent with established procedures in the social and behavioral sciences (Jacoby, 1991). The items to measure empowerment were based directly on the general definition for manager empowerment. Items to assess HRD manager empowerment were researcher designed except for items related to organizational based self-esteem. Organizational based self-esteem was assessed using the Organizational Based Self-Esteem Scale (OBSE) by Pierce et al. (1989).

Four components of empowerment were measured with three items each. These were access and control over resources; understanding the business operations; involvement, impact and control in the company decision making process; and understanding and use of the company’s political system. Leadership that directs the operations of the HRD
department to meet the needs of the company was measured with nine items. The OBSE instrument consisted of 10 items.

The HRD managers responded to the researcher designed items and to the OBSE scale during a telephone interview. No evidence for construct validity of the researcher designed items was not collected prior to using these items in this study.

All items related to HRD manager empowerment, except the OBSE scale, were scored using one of four dichotomous formats. These response choices were (a) yes/no, (b) to little or no extent/to a great extent, (c) used very little/used to a great extent, or (d) influence very little/influence a great deal.

Based on the sample for this study, coefficient alpha for the researcher designed empowerment subscales were calculated. The number of items and coefficient alpha for each subscale of empowerment and for total empowerment are contained in Table 8, chapter 4. Researcher designed items to assess HRD manager empowerment are contained in Appendix D.

Organizational based self-esteem was measured using the OBSE scale developed by Pierce et al. (1989). Scale items and written permission to use the scale are contained in Appendix D. Items were scored using a 7-point Likert type agree/disagree format. Pierce et al. (1989) reported an average
coefficient alpha of .91 for this scale across seven studies and a test-retest of .75 using data from the seventh study. Coefficient alpha for the OBSE in this study was .84.

Validity evidence for the OBSE scale was gathered over a series of seven studies involving 2,444 respondents. Respondents came from such diverse groups as summer school teachers, mining firm employees, managers, school employees, state association employees, evening MBA students, and automotive service club employees (Pierce et al., 1989).

Four of the seven studies gathered convergent validity evidence for the OBSE. Convergent validity was suggested by testing the relationship of OBSE to global self-esteem (GSE) and to task specific self-esteem (TSE). The OBSE formed a stronger relationship with the variables of organizational commitment, job complexity, intrinsic motivation, job satisfaction, and organizational satisfaction than did either the GSE or the TSE. In all but one study, the OBSE correlated higher with other self-esteem measures than with the other variables under study. The exception was in the fifth study when the OBSE correlated .77 with organizational satisfaction (Pierce et al., 1989). In that study, the correlation of the OBSE with Rosenberg’s job self-esteem was .54 and was .57 with Beehr’s task self-esteem. The series of studies reported by Pierce et al. indicates that the OBSE measure was relatively stable in its relationship to other self-esteem measures across several
studies, but that in some instances it is not an accurate measure of organizational based self-esteem.

Two of the seven studies reported by Pierce et al. (1989) gathered discriminant validity evidence for the OBSE scale. Discriminant validity was suggested by using factor analysis to analyze all variables. These variables included the OBSE, the GSE, the TSE, organizational commitment, job complexity, intrinsic motivation, job satisfaction, and organizational satisfaction. A two factor solution emerged with the self-esteem measures forming one factor and the other variables forming a second factor. The OBSE scale had factor loadings of .73 and .67 over two studies. The self-esteem measures accounted for 18.2 and 19.5% of the total variance across two studies (Pierce et al., 1989).

Additional validity evidence for the OBSE scale was gathered in three studies by analyzing the relationship between (a) the OBSE and the TSE to organizational commitment, and (b) the OBSE and the GSE to organizational satisfaction. The OBSE was a better predictor of organizational commitment and organizational satisfaction than the GSE and the TSE (Pierce et al., 1989).

For the current research, the independent variables of organizational support, collaboration, communication, and trust were measured by scales developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986), James and Sells (1981), Rogers
(1987), and Scott (1981), respectively. Items from each of these scales were measured using a 5-point Likert type agree/disagree format. All scale items from these four scales and written permissions to use them are contained in Appendix E.

Collaboration was composed of two subscales from the Organizational Climate Scale (James & Sells, 1981). The entire Organizational Climate Scale consists of 16 subscales. The subscales used in this study were Subunit Conflict and Workgroup Cooperation and Influence. Subunit Conflict assessed the extent to which a friendly and cooperative work environment exists; while Workgroup Cooperation and Influence measured the extent of cooperation among various work groups.

These two subscales were composed of 11 items, with four items coming from the Subunit Conflict subscale and seven items coming from the Workgroup Cooperation and Influence subscale. For the purposes of this study, they were treated as one scale with raw scores from the individual items summed to produce one collaboration score.

Coefficient alpha, reliability, for this scale in the current research was .89. These items were developed by Jones and James (1979) based on an extensive review of the literature, and by performing principal components factor analysis on the subscale scores. The authors followed this procedure in three separate studies and found the results to be consistent (Jones &
James, 1979). Scale items and permission to use the items are contained in Appendix E.

Organizational support relates to an individual’s belief concerning the extent to which the organization values their contribution and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger et al., 1986). The short form of the Perceived Organizational Support Scale developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986) was used to assess organizational support. This instrument contained 17 items scored using a 5-point Likert agree/disagree format. The authors reported a coefficient alpha of .97 based on data from 361 employees in two organizations (Eisenberger et al., 1986). In the current study, coefficient alpha for the Perceived Organizational Support Scale was .92. Scale items and permission to use the items are contained in Appendix E.

Validity of the organizational support measure was suggested through analysis of item scores with factor analysis. Data were gathered from 361 employees in two organizations. Principal components analysis yielded a two factor solution. Factor loadings ranged from .43 to .84 on the first factor, organizational support. Items selected for the short version of this instrument were those having the highest loadings on the factor associated with organizational support. The short version of the instrument was used for this research project. For the short version, factor loadings range from .71 to .84 (Eisenberger et al., 1986).
Trust, another independent variable, was measured using 13 items from the Organizational Measures of Trust Scale developed by Scott (1981). The 13 items comprised three subscales; superior trust, work group trust and management trust. Scale items were developed by reviewing relevant literature on trust and through an evaluation of the items by experts familiar with the organizational literature on trust.

The trust scale was then administered to a group of transportation officials. Orthogonal, varimax rotation factor analysis was then performed on the items. The three subscales of the trust scale accounted for 73.2% of the total variance. Eigenvalues were 5.16, 1.97, and 1.39, respectively (Scott, 1981). Coefficient alpha for the Organizational Measures of Trust Scale was .89 in the current study. Items from the trust instrument were scored using a 5-point Likert agree/disagree response scale. The instrument and permission to use the items are contained in Appendix E.

The concept of communications within organizations incorporates message sending and message receiving behaviors of superiors, subordinates, and peers in regard to task, personnel, and innovation with the organization (Rogers, 1987). This independent variable was measured with the Communication Openness Measure (COM) developed by Rogers (1987). A 5-point Likert type response format was used to score the instrument. The COM consisted of 13 items. Coefficient alpha of .88 was reported from
a study involving approximately 500 hospital nurses. A coefficient alpha of .92 was found in the current sample.

Preliminary research on the validity of the COM was gathered by using a panel of expert judges from the Industrial Communication Council, two field tests of the instrument, and another administration of the scale to approximately 500 hospital nurses. Data from the last sample were analyzed using principal components factor analysis with a varimax rotation. A single factor emerged that explained 68.2% of the total variance. From this analysis, 13 items with loadings greater than .60 were chosen for the scale. Rogers further reported that the COM "has been consistent with other measures of communication openness in demonstrating relationships between openness and job satisfaction, organizational performance, and role clarity" (Rogers, 1987, p.59). Individual items from the COM are contained in Appendix E along with written permission to use the scale in the current research.

Data Collection Procedures

Data were collected from the HRD managers using a combination of telephone and fax survey methodology. HRD managers selected as the sample for the current study were initially contacted by telephone by one of three interviewers during March, April, or May 1992. Those contacted were
asked to participate in a national study on the organizational conditions of HRD managers. Contacted HRD managers were told that their participation would take place in two stages. One, they would be asked to complete a 10-15 minute telephone interview and were assured confidentially. Two, the interviewer would get their fax number and fax an additional questionnaire to them later that day or night. Contacted individuals were told that the questionnaire sent by fax would take approximately 15 minutes to complete. After completing the questionnaire, they were to fax their responses back to the researcher.

From the original sample of 150 managers, an additional 176 names were generated through the replacement process explained in a previous section. This yielded a total of 311 HRD managers as the sample for the study. Of this number, 195 were actually contacted, and 135 agreed to participate in the study. Of the 135 who agreed to participate, 126 provided the actual sample for the research. The other nine completed the telephone interview but never returned the faxed questionnaire.

At this point, several tables are presented that summarize pertinent information about the data collection effort. Table 4 delineates the disposition of the 311 HRD managers included in the study. Table 5 highlights the reasons for replacing 176 respondents. Table 6 specifies the reasons given by respondents who refused to participate in the study. In
addition, Appendix F contains three other tables related to the data collection process. Table F-1 specifies the number of contacts and length of time spent on the telephone with the respondents. Table F-2 summarizes the disposition of all telephone calls made to the respondents. Table F-3 indicates the number of business days for the faxed questionnaire to be returned and the mean time reported by respondents to complete the questionnaire.

The telephone interview consisted of questions designed to measure HRD manager empowerment. The faxed questionnaire contained 53 items to measure the independent variables, nine items pertaining to demographics, and one open ended question for comments. The 53 items consisted of four scales; collaboration, organizational support, trust, and communication as discussed in the previous section.

If the completed faxed questionnaire was not received within 10 days, the respondent was faxed a follow-up reminder (refer to Appendix G). If after another week to 10 days, the faxed questionnaire was not returned, the principal researcher called the respondent to ask if there were any questions. In case the researcher was unable to talk to the respondent, a message reflecting this point was left with a secretary or on a voice mail
Table 4

Return Rate and Disposition of Original and Replacement Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Sample</th>
<th>Replacement Samples</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 150</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 62 Responded To Phone and Fax</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 5 Responded To Phone Only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| N = 83 Those Replaced | 50 | 28 | 15 | 176

Effective return rate = 40.51%

Return rate based on the HRD managers contacted = 64.62%

* Additional details concerning the reasons for the sample replacements are provided in Table 5.
Table 5

Reasons for Sample Replacements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number of Calls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Refused to participate in study</td>
<td>60*</td>
<td>34.09</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Problems with phone number listed in ASTD Directory</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27.43</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Unable to contact in four call attempts</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No longer employed by that organization</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. On active call list at end of data collection period</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Out on leave</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 176 100.00 514

Note. N = 176.

* Additional details for refusals to participate in the study are provided in Table 6.
### Table 6

**Reasons for Refusals to Participate in the Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No longer in HRD position</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Too busy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No reason given for refusal to participate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Felt questions were too sensitive or too long</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Against company policy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Leaving company</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Not interested</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** N = 60.
system. If after another week or 10 days, the faxed questionnaire was still not returned, the respondent was faxed an additional reminder (refer to Appendix G).

A combination of telephone/fax survey methodology was chosen for this study because telephone survey methodology has proven effective with well defined and specific questions (Banach, 1980; Dillman, 1978; Fowler, 1988; Frey, 1983; Lavrakas, 1987). Questions used to measure the dependent variable fit these criteria.

The advantages and disadvantages of employing telephone survey methodology have been noted by many researchers (Banach, 1980; Dicker & Gilbert, 1988; Dillman, 1978; Fowler, 1988; Frey, 1983; Gelles, 1983; Groves, Biemer, Lyberg, Massey, Nichollos, & Waksberg, 1988; Haines, 1985; Lavrakas, 1987; Lindsay, 1982; McKenna, 1983; Piper, 1988). The disadvantages of telephone research methodology were delineated in the literature to include the following items.

1. Increased risk of increased social desirability bias.

2. Increased risk of interviewer distortion.

3. Total reliance on respondents retention of what they hear.

4. Total reliance on verbal communication.

5. Respondent’s work setting conditions may place limits on what and how much can be asked.
6. Survey call may be at an inconvenient time.

7. Interviewer may bias the study by explaining how she/he feels about the topic.

To combat potential problems associated with the disadvantages, all telephone data were collected by only three interviewers using a preset script. A copy of the script is contained in Appendix H.

If the original call was at an inconvenient time, an appointment was scheduled to call the respondent at another time. A separate telephone/fax call-sheet was used to record details about the date, time, and length of each phone contact with potential respondents. The call-sheet also included any special comments made by the respondent, date the initial fax was sent, date the questionnaire was returned to the researcher, and information on follow-up procedures. A sample of the call-sheet is contained in Appendix I.

Most researchers recommend less than 30 minutes for a telephone questionnaire (Banach, 1980; Dicker & Gilbert, 1988; Fowler, 1988; Frey, 1983; Gelles, 1983; Groves et al., 1988; Haines, 1985; Lavrakas, 1987; Lindsay, 1982; McKenna, 1983; Piper, 1988). This study fit this guideline since the average time for the telephone interview was 8.62 minutes for respondents who agreed to participate in the study (refer to Table F-2 in Appendix F).
Research on telephone survey methodology also suggested that three call attempts to a potential respondent resulted in the highest return rate versus cost and time expended (Frey, 1983; Lavrakas, 1987). For the purposes of this research, four calls were made to potential respondents before they were replaced in the sample. Exceptions to this rule involved situations where (a) the telephone number had been disconnected and a new number could not be located using directory assistance, (b) the contacted respondent refused to participate in the study, or (c) the HRD manager position had been eliminated in that organization. In these situations, the selected respondent was replaced immediately in the sample using procedures previously outlined.

**Sample Characteristics**

Data were received from 62 males and 64 females, 49.2% and 50.8% of the sample, respectively. About 31% of the respondents reported that their company was union while 69% worked for nonunion employers.

The median number of employees per company was 2,900. Respondents came from an extensive range of business organizations. Approximately 40% came from a manufacturing environment, 25% from the service sector, 18% from financial institutions, 8% from transportation or
utility related companies, 7% from wholesale/retail environments, and 2% from the construction/mining industries.

Respondents reported an average of 9.4 years of work experience with the current employer, 20.4 years of total work experience, and 11.2 years of work experience in HRD. The average level of educational attainment among respondents was some course work beyond an undergraduate degree but not a Master’s degree. Those responding to the questionnaire for this study reported that they supervised an average of 8.6 employees and a median number of 3 employees.

Appendix J, Tables J-1 through J-7, has additional details on respondent demographic characteristics. Table J-8 includes the written comments made by the respondents on the faxed questionnaire.

**Findings and Conclusions From the Data Collection Procedures**

As previously stated, this study used a combination of telephone and faxed questionnaires to gather data. No other study could be identified in the literature that used this combination of data collection procedures. Therefore, the survey methodology used in this study would be considered to be a departure from other standardized and well researched survey procedures as outlined by Dillman (1978), Fowler (1988), and Frey (1983).
By using an unconventional data collection methodology, several other factors may have affected the quality of the data collected in addition to the ones discussed in the section on Data Collection Procedures. These factors may include, but are not limited to, issues surrounding respondents’ refusals, item responses, confidentially of responses, return rates, inclusion of appropriate subjects, ease of use, and cost. The uncertainty about the effect of many of these factors is related to the lack of research available on the use of fax technology for survey research.

Twenty nine potential respondents, 14.9% of those contacted, refused to participate in the study because they were not interested, too busy, or refused without providing a reason. It is possible that these individuals felt uncomfortable with the survey methodology and chose not to participate on that basis alone. At the time of the data collection effort, respondents were not presented with the option to return the questionnaire by mail to the researcher. In retrospect, this option should have been provided.

In addition, the interviewers did not systematically or deliberately discuss the reactions of potential respondents to the data collection procedures. Unsolicited comments from several respondents indicated that they liked receiving and sending the questionnaire in this manner. They commented that this is how we do business, i.e. telephone and fax, and
therefore they found this process easier. This reaction was originally confirmed during the pilot study phase that included 20 HRD managers.

Seventeen individuals, 13.5% of the respondents, mailed the questionnaire back to the researcher instead of sending it by fax as requested. Two respondents sent the questionnaire by mail because they did not have access to a fax machine at their place of employment. One respondent returned it by mail because of technical problems with the fax machine. It is not known why 14 individuals, 11.1% of the respondents, chose to send the questionnaire back via mail. Some possible reasons for this departure may have included the practice of providing a central drop box at the company fax machine for transmission of documents. Also, all fax transmissions for a company could be handled by clerical employees. These procedures make the questionnaire responses potentially open to others in the company, thus violating the confidentiality of the respondent. If these procedures were in place at a company, the respondent may not have been comfortable or technically competent to return their own questionnaire by fax.

A series of t-tests were undertaken to ascertain if the responses of those who mailed their questionnaire back without a noted reason, N = 14, were different from those who sent their responses by fax, N = 109. These t-tests analyzed differences for these two groups based on the total scores
for empowerment, organizational support, communication, collaboration, and trust. No significant differences were found for any of these variables at the .05 level.

Besides confidentially issues for those who mailed the questionnaire back, confidentially could have also been an issue for the 109 respondents who did return the questionnaire by fax. If these respondents were faced with company procedures that made their responses available to others, they may have altered their responses to the questions.

Several issues have been outlined above that could adversely affect the quality of the data collected in this study. But the telephone/fax data collection process was thought to have the following advantages for this project:

1. This methodology increased the potential to access HRD managers who would not respond to a traditional mail questionnaire. There is no research that confirms the effect of fax technology on survey return rates, but telephone surveys have been shown to produce greater response rates than mail surveys (Banach, 1980; Dicker & Gilbert, 1988; Dillman, 1978; Frey, 1983; Fowler, 1988; Gelles, 1983; Groves, Biemer, Lyberg, Massey, Nichollos, & Waksberg, 1988; Haines, 1985; Lavrakas, 1987; Lindsay, 1982; McKenna, 1983; Piper, 1988). In addition, there is evidence that
HRD/HRM professionals have low response rates to traditional mail surveys (Dyson, 1988/1989).

2. This methodology helped to eliminate and replace respondents who were not appropriate or available for the study. An examination of Table 5 indicates that 22 individuals were no longer employed at a particular company, 5 were out on leave, and 48 could not be contacted because of an incorrect listing of the phone number. An examination of Table 6 reveals three individuals who were leaving the company and four who said it was against company policy to participate in outside research projects. All of these situations would have reduced the response rate of a traditional mail questionnaire.

3. The respondents within this particular population were accustomed to conducting business over the telephone and by fax.

4. Other advantages of utilizing the approach adopted for this study included the fact that (a) data could be gathered more quickly, (b) the cost of data collection was projected to be similar to the cost of mail questionnaires, (c) item non response was potentially reduced, (d) respondents were active participants in the research, (e) respondents were more likely to feel they made a real contribution, (f) respondents viewed the interview as an opportunity to support their values and/or to vent frustrations, (g) the exchange between the respondent and the researcher
was more frank and personalized, (h) the researcher had an opportunity to validate the responses, (i) the researcher had the opportunity to exercise quality control over the entire data collection process, (j) the researcher had an opportunity to gain control over the duration of the interaction with the respondent, and (k) the respondent had an opportunity to engage in a social interaction which was not possible with a mail questionnaire (Banach, 1980; Dicker, 1988; Dillman, 1978; Frey, 1983; Fowler, 1988; Gelles, 1983; Groves et al, 1988; Haines, 1985; Lavrakas, 1987; Lindsay, 1982; McKenna, 1983; Piper, 1988).

The telephone interview for this study took an average 8.62 minutes. Respondents spent an average of 11.85 minutes completing the faxed questionnaire and 4.5 business days to return it by fax to the researcher. The average minutes taken to complete the telephone interview and the faxed questionnaire were within the guidelines recommended by Frey (1983), Fowler (1988), and Lavrakas (1987).

From the initial sample of 150 and the replacement pool of 176, a group of 311 names were identified as potential participants in the study. From this pool, 195 HRD managers were actually contacted by telephone. From these 195, 135 HRD managers agreed to participate in the study, and 126 provided the actual sample. Therefore, the return rate for the study, based on those contacted by telephone, was 64.4%. Respondents in this
study were (a) were almost equally female and male, (b) mainly worked for nonunion employers, (c) had an average of 11 years of work experience in HRD, (d) represented a wide variety of industry types across America, (e) supervised a median of three employees, and (f) had some course work beyond the undergraduate degree level.

As noted, a sample replacement strategy was utilized. This procedure was invoked when an HRD manager could not be contacted or refused to participate in the study. Sixty of the HRD managers contacted by telephone refused to participate in the study. The main reasons for the refusals were (a) no longer in an HRD position, (b) too busy, or (c) they failed to provide a reason for nonparticipation. Also, nine respondents completed the telephone interview, but not the faxed questionnaire and were excluded from the analysis.

Two conclusions can be drawn from the data collection procedures. These are:

1. A combination of telephone interviews and faxed questionnaires was an efficient and effective method of data collection with HRD professionals. This combination of data collection methods resulted in a higher return rate than experienced by other researchers with this same population and eliminated some professionals who were not the appropriate respondents for the study. This methodology appears to have potential as a
useful survey methodological procedure. However, systematic research is needed to fully determine the effect of this methodology versus other accepted methods.

2. The systematic selection process appears to have been effective in generating an adequate sample of HRD managers. Respondents in this study were experienced HRD managers representing a variety of business environments.

**Pilot Study**

A pilot study was undertaken to test and refine the survey research procedures using a combination of telephone and fax technology. The pilot study took place in February 1992 and involved 20 respondents. These individuals were selected in a systematic procedure from the HRD managers identified as the population for this study from the 1991 ASTD membership directory. The purpose of the pilot study was to determine problems in the areas listed below.

1. Wording of the standard call script.
2. Obtaining data by telephone and fax.
3. Wording of researcher designed HRD manager empowerment items.
4. Sending a questionnaire by fax.
5. Receiving a questionnaire back by fax.
6. Wording of items related to the independent variables.
7. Length of time necessary to complete the telephone interview.
8. Length of time necessary to transmit the fax questionnaire.
9. Transmission difficulties with the fax machine.
10. Types of difficulties encountered in attempting to contact HRD managers by telephone.
11. Refusal rates and types of refusals related to participation in the study.
12. Attitudes of HRD managers towards receiving and returning a questionnaire by fax.
13. Willingness of HRD managers to participate in the study.

The pilot study was conducted using the telephone/fax combination used in the actual study. Results from the pilot study indicated few problems with the data collection methodology or with the interview/faxed questionnaire. Based on the pilot test, plans were made to proceed with the actual study.

**Data Processing and Analysis**

Data were entered into a **Quattro Pro** (1992) spreadsheet, rechecked for accuracy of entry and then imported to two different statistical software
packages; **Number Cruncher Statistical System** (Hintze, 1990) and **SPSS-PC Statistical System** (1990). Empowerment was the dependent variable with collaboration, organizational support, trust, and communication treated as independent variables. The dependent variable was measured using a combination of dichotomous and continuous scales as explained above. All of the independent variables were composite continuous scores.

Item scores were reversed as necessary. This included reversing the scores for empowerment questions numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 (refer to Appendix D for the complete items and the reversal designation). For the independent variables, questions numbered 1, 4, 7-9, 11, 12, 15-26, 29, 31-42, 44-46, and 53 were reversed (refer to Appendix E for the complete items and the reversal designation).

Next, missing data were identified and replaced. Missing data comprised a very small portion of the total data collected in this study. Only .39% were missing for the dependent variable and .36% for the independent variables (refer to Appendix K, Table K-1).

For the dependent variable, missing data were replaced with the response that was considered to be nonempowering. For the independent variables, missing data were replaced based on the individual’s raw mean score of the remaining items within that subscale (Little & Rubin, 1990).
At this point, factor analysis was used to derive an operational
definition for HRD manager empowerment. After calculating the total scores
for the dependent and independent variables; means, standard deviations,
reliabilities, correlations, and multiple regression analysis were performed on
the data. The results of these analyses are contained in chapter 4.

Chapter Summary

This chapter enumerated particulars on the selection of subjects,
instrumentation, data collection procedures, pilot study, and data processing
and analysis. The general purpose of the study was to identify the
relationship between HRD manager empowerment and four organizational
conditions. Organizational support, trust, communication, and collaboration
were identified in the empowerment literature as the most important
conditions for HRD manager empowerment.

Using organizational titles as a selection criteria, potential respondents
were selected from the 1991 ASTD membership directory. From the 2,152
HRD managers identified as potential respondents, 150 were selected as the
study sample using a systematic sampling procedure with males and females
equally represented. Also, a sample replacement protocol was established
and used for HRD managers who could not be contacted or refused to
participate in the study.
Instruments used to measure HRD manager empowerment, the dependent variable, included five researcher designed scales. These were (a) access and control over resources, (b) understanding of the business operations, (c) leadership of the HRD department, (d) impact and involvement in decision making, and (e) understanding and use of the company’s political system. An additional scale by Pierce et al. (1989) was used to measure the organizational self-esteem component of HRD manager empowerment. Instruments used to measure the independent variables of organizational support, trust, communication and collaboration were by Eisenberger et al. (1986), Scott (1981), Rogers (1987), and James and Sells (1981), respectively.

Data were collected using a combination of telephone and fax survey methodology. A pilot study with 20 HRD managers was undertaken prior to the actual study to test and refine the survey research procedures used in the study.

Individuals identified as the sample for the study were first contacted by one of three interviewers for a 10-15 minute telephone interview. Using a preset script, the telephone interviewers solicited all responses pertaining to the measures of empowerment. After the telephone interview, respondents were faxed a 63-item questionnaire. The faxed questionnaire contained 53 items to measure the independent variables of organizational
support, trust, communication, and collaboration; nine items to measure various demographic variables; and one item for respondent comments.

The original sample and the replacement process generated telephone contacts with 195 HRD managers. Approximately 65% of these managers provided usable data for the study, N = 126. Sixty of the HRD managers contacted by telephone refused to participate in the study. The main reasons for the refusals were (a) no longer in an HRD position, (b) too busy, or (c) they failed to provide a reason for nonparticipation.

The mean length of the telephone interview was 8.62 minutes, while an average of 4.5 business days were taken by the respondents to return the faxed questionnaire. A combination of fax and telephone follow-up reminders were utilized for respondents who initially did not return the faxed questionnaire after 10 business days. Respondents reported 11.85 minutes as the mean time to complete the fax questionnaire. It was concluded that using a combination of telephone interviews and faxed questionnaires resulted in efficient and effective data collection effort.

In the data analysis process, items scores were reversed as appropriate and missing data were identified and replaced. Total scores for empowerment, organizational support, trust, communication, and collaboration were calculated. Data analysis included factor analysis, means, standard deviations, correlations, and multiple regression analysis.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

To achieve the general purpose of the study, the researcher addressed three research questions. The first one was answered in chapter 2. Chapter 4 answers the other two which were:

1. What is the dimensional nature of HRD manager empowerment based upon an analysis process that incorporated factor analysis?

2. What is the relationship between HRD manager empowerment and the organizational conditions of organizational support, trust, communication, and collaboration?

To address the first research question, principal components factor analysis was the primary analysis method. Regression analysis was the primary analysis strategy used to answer the second research question. Tables 7, 8, and 9 provide the results of the data analysis. This chapter summarizes the results of the study and is organized as follows:

1. Section one outlines the calculation of all scale scores and addresses the first research question.

2. Section two summarizes the correlations, descriptive statistics, and coefficient alpha estimates for the data.
3. Section three provides the results of the regression analysis which addresses the second research question.

4. A brief chapter summary.

**Dimensional Nature of HRD Manager Empowerment and Calculation of Scale Scores**

Based on the literature in management, psychology, and education, the first research question of the study was addressed in chapter 2. This question was: What is a viable starting point for an operational definition of HRD manager empowerment? From the literature, an empowered HRD manager was characterized as an individual who (a) has control and access over needed resources, (b) is knowledgeable about the business, (c) provides leadership that integrates the HRD function into the strategic direction of the company, (d) is involved and has impact in the company decision making process, (e) understands and uses the political system within the organization for promotion of the HRD department to the benefit of the company, and (f) has high organizational self-esteem.

Incorporating these initial six components into an operational definition, the second research question addressed the dimensional nature of the construct. This was accomplished by analyzing the data collected from 126 HRD managers in the following manner:
1. Individual item scores were summed to obtain subscale scores for each of the six components of empowerment.

2. $z$ scores were calculated for each subscale score based on the mean and variance for each subscale.

3. $z$ scores for each of the subscales were used as the basis for a principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation. The factor analysis yielded a two factor solution accounting for 56.5% of the variance. The results of this factor analysis are contained in Table 7. At this point, the total score for HRD manager empowerment was determined as follows:

1. Factor scores were computed for each subscale of empowerment that loaded on Factor 1 in the principal components factor analysis. The empowerment subscale, access and control over resources, was not included in the total empowerment score because of the low reliability of the scale, .25, and its formation of a second factor in the principal components analysis. Factor scores were calculated by multiplying the factor correlation matrix values by the $z$ scores for each subscale. Factor correlation matrix values are contained in Table 7.
Table 7

Factor Loadings for the Dependent Variable: Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empowerment Subscales(^a)</th>
<th>Factor 1(^b)</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Access</td>
<td></td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Understand Business Operations</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Political System</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organizational Self-Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalues

2.35          1.04

Percent of Variance Explained; Total = 56.50

39.20          17.30

Note. \( N = 126 \). Principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation.

Cutoff score of .40 used for factor loadings. Full questions and scoring methods for each subscale can be found in Appendix D.

(table continues)
a 1. **Access** = access and control over resources; 2. **Understand Business Operations** = understanding and knowledge of the business operations of the company; 3. **Leadership** = leadership that integrates the HRD function into the strategic direction of the company; 4. **Impact** = involvement and impact in the company decision making process; 5. **Political System** = understanding and use of the political system within the organization for promotion of the HRD department to the benefit of the company; and 6. **Organizational Self-Esteem** = organizational based self-esteem.

b Factor correlation matrix values were used to compute factor scores for each subscale. Factor correlation matrix values were as follows: 2. **Understand Business Operations** = .259; 3. **Leadership** = .318; 4. **Impact** = .273; 5. **Political System** = .308; and 6. **Organizational Self-Esteem** = .327. These values were generated within the SPSS-PC Factor command procedures.
2. A total empowerment score was computed with the following formula: 
\[ \text{Total empowerment} = (0.259 \times z \text{ score of Understand Business Operations}) + (0.318 \times z \text{ score of Leadership}) + (0.273 \times z \text{ score of Impact}) + (0.308 \times z \text{ score of Political System}) + (0.327 \times z \text{ score of Organizational Self-Esteem}) \]. This formula represents the sum of the factor scores for the five subscales of empowerment that loaded on Factor 1 in the principal components factor analysis. Thus, each of the five components contributed to the total HRD manager empowerment score in proportion to their respective loadings in the principal components factor analysis.

The independent variable scale scores were calculated by summing the raw scores of all the items in each scale. Reverse coded items were adjusted prior to the calculation of these scale sums.

**Correlations and Descriptive Statistics**

Table 8 provides a summary of the scale correlations, means, standard deviations, possible raw scale score ranges, internal reliabilities, and the number of items per scale. For the five subscales of empowerment used to form the total empowerment score, all of the intercorrelations were positive and significant at the $p < .01$ and $p < .001$ levels. The correlations between the empowerment subscale, access and control over resources, with any of the other empowerment subscales was not significant.
Table 8
Correlations, Internal Reliabilities, and Descriptive Statistics for Empowerment Organizational Support, Trust, Communication, and Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Access</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Understand Business Operations</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leadership</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Impact</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td>0.32*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Political System</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organizational Self Esteem</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.43*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Total Empowerment</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td>0.63*</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>0.68**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Organizational Support</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Trust</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.73**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Communication</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Collaboration</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>59.44</td>
<td>63.71</td>
<td>49.67</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible Raw Score Range</td>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>9-18</td>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>10-70</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>17-85</td>
<td>13-65</td>
<td>12-60</td>
<td>11-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient Alpha</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.70*</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Items</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Note: N=126 for all items and scales. *p<.01; **p<.001. Full correlation matrix found in Appendix L, Table L-1. Individual item means and standard deviations for empowerment measures found in Table L-2. Table L-3, contains the item means and standard deviations for the scales on organizational support, trust, communication, and collaboration. Complete questions are in Appendix D and Appendix E.

* 1. Access = access and control over resources; 2. Understand Business Operations = understanding and knowledge of the business operations; 3. Leadership = leadership that integrates the HRD function into the strategic direction of the company; 4. Impact = involvement and impact in the company decision making process; 5. Political System = understanding and use of the political system within the organization for promotion of the HRD department to the benefit of the company; 6. Organization Self-Esteem = organizational based self-esteem. All items to measure empowerment, except organizational based self-esteem, were measured with a dichotomous format of either very little/influence a great deal or used very little/not at all/used to a great extent. Items to measure organizational self-esteem were scored using a 7-point Likert type scale with 1=strongly disagree and 7=strongly agree.

* Total Empowerment consists of the sum of the factor scores from empowerment subscales 2-6.

* All independent variables measured with a 5-point Likert type scale with 1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree.

* Based on factor scores.
As predicted by the theoretical frameworks of Conger and Kanungo (1988), Thomas and Velthouse (1990), and Vogt and Murrell (1990); the correlations between total empowerment, the dependent variable, and the independent variables of organizational support, trust, communication, and collaboration were positive. These correlations were also significant at the $p < .001$ level and ranged from .28 to .54. In addition, the correlations among the independent variables were all significant at the $p < .001$ level. The correlations among the independent variables ranged from .38 to .73. Overall, the four independent variables had a higher average correlation with each other than their average correlation with the dependent variable; total empowerment. Also, the four independent variables had a higher average correlation with each other than the average correlation among the subscales of empowerment used to form the total empowerment score.

Reliabilities for the dependent and independent variables ranged from .70 to .92. According to Cooper and O’Connor (1993), reliabilities in the range of .70 or higher are sufficient for basic research. Reliabilities for the five subscales of empowerment used to form the total empowerment scored ranged from .31 to .84.
Results of the Regression Analysis

Table 9 presents the results of the regression analysis with total empowerment as the dependent variable and organizational support, trust, communication, and collaboration as the independent variables. The $F$ ratio for the regression equation was significant at the $p < .001$ level. The percent of variance explained in total empowerment by the independent variables was 30.80.

An examination of the individual regression coefficients reveals that only organizational support was significant, $p < .001$. Because of the multicollinearity among the independent variables, organizational support accounted for variance that may have been attributed to trust, communication, and collaboration.
Table 9

Results of the Regression Analysis With Values and Tests of the Regression Coefficients for the Independent Variables of Organizational Support, Trust, Communication, and Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Regression Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Regression Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t-value (b=0)</th>
<th>Sequential R-Squared</th>
<th>Simple R-Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-3.438</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>-5.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>5.54**</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.199</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.308*</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p<.001

Note. N=126.

a F (4,121) = 13.44, p < .001
Chapter Summary

This study was designed to answer three research questions. The first question was answered in chapter 2, while chapter 4 contained data designed to answer the following two research questions:

1. What is the dimensional nature of HRD manager empowerment?
2. What is the relationship between HRD manager empowerment and the organizational conditions of organizational support, trust, communication, and collaboration?

Chapter 4 contained three sections that addressed (a) the first research question and the calculation of scale scores for the dependent and independent variables, (b) correlations, internal reliabilities, and descriptive statistics for the data, and (c) the second research question with the results of the regression analysis.

Independent variable scale scores were calculated by summing the raw scores of all the items in each scale. The initial six components of empowerment formed two factors when subjected to factor analysis. The five components that loaded on Factor 1 formed the basis of the total empowerment score. Therefore, empowerment was treated as a unidimensional scale and calculated by summing the factor scores from five subscales of empowerment.
The correlations among the empowerment subscales used to form the total empowerment score were positive and significant. The correlations between the dependent and the independent variables were also positive and significant, as were the correlations among the independent variables. Scale reliabilities for the dependent and independent variables ranged from .70 to .92.

Results of the regression analysis with total empowerment as the dependent variable and organizational support, trust, communication, and collaboration as the independent variables was significant at the $p < .001$ level. The percent of variance explained in total empowerment by the independent variables was 30.80%. Further examination of the tests of the regression coefficients indicated that only organizational support was significant. Multicollinearity was evident among the independent variables.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter is divided into five main sections. Section one provides a brief review of the study. Section two details a summary of the findings and conclusions for the three research questions. Section three provides a critique of the current study, while section four examines how the findings and conclusions have implications for future research. Lastly, section five supplies a brief chapter summary.

Brief Review of the Study

The general purpose of this study was to identify the relationship between HRD manager empowerment and the organizational conditions of organizational support, trust, communication, and collaboration. To accomplish this general purpose the researcher (a) identified six important components of HRD manager empowerment from the management, psychology, and education literature, (b) developed a measure of HRD manager empowerment based on the six components of empowerment identified in the literature, (c) measured HRD manager empowerment, (d) used factor analysis to derive a unidimensional scale for the operational definition of HRD manager empowerment, and (e) measured the
organizational conditions of collaboration, organizational support, trust, and communication using previously published scales.

The study addressed three research questions. These were:

1. What was a viable starting point for an operational definition of HRD manager empowerment based upon definitions and research in the fields of management, psychology, and education?

2. What was the dimensional nature of HRD manager empowerment based upon an analysis process that incorporated factor analysis?

3. What was the relationship between HRD manager empowerment and the organizational conditions of collaboration, organizational support, trust, and communication?

Using the 1991 ASTD membership directory and organizational titles, 2,152 HRD managers were identified as potential respondents. By employing a systematic sampling procedure, 75 male and 75 female HRD managers were initially selected for inclusion in this study. From this original sample, an additional 176 names were generated as sample replacements when potential respondents would not or could not participate in the study.

Data were collected from HRD managers in the study using a combination of telephone and fax survey methodology. Using a preset script, one of three telephone interviewers solicited all responses pertaining to the measures of empowerment. After the telephone interview,
respondents were faxed a questionnaire designed to measure the independent variables and assorted demographic data.

To test and refine the survey research procedures, a pilot study with 20 HRD managers was undertaken prior to the actual study.

HRD manager empowerment was the dependent variable. This variable was measured with five researcher designed scales and the OBSE. Scoring schemes included a combination of dichotomous and continuous formats.

The independent variables were organizational support, trust, communication, and collaboration. Instruments used to measure these variables were by Eisenberger et al. (1986), Scott (1981), Rogers (1987), and James and Sells (1981), respectively. All of the independent variables were composite-continuous scores.

In the data analysis process, items scores were reversed where appropriate and missing data were identified and replaced. Total scores for empowerment, organizational support, trust, communication, and collaboration were calculated for use in the regression analysis. The total score for empowerment was constructed based on the sum of the factor scores for the five components of empowerment that loaded on Factor 1 from a principal components factor analysis. The total scores for
organizational support, trust, communication, and collaboration were based on the sum of the raw scores for the items within each of these scales.

**Findings and Discussion**

This section reviews the findings and conclusions for the current study and is organized into three main sections. Each section addresses one research question.

**Research Question One: What was a Viable Starting Point for an Operational Definition of HRD Manager Empowerment From the Literature?**

An analysis of the literature in management, psychology, and education was undertaken to determine the initial components of HRD manager empowerment for use in the current study. This analysis yielded six components. These components comprised the most important and frequently mentioned aspects of manager empowerment. Refer to Table 1 for a summary of the literature.

There were several observations that can be derived from the literature reviewed. One was that no other research study was identified that examined literature from management, psychology, and education to establish an empowerment definition. This study adopted the most interdisciplinary approach in defining the construct.
Two, only a few empirical studies were located that examined individual empowerment in a work environment. These included the research by Deci et al. (1989), Mainiero (1986), Schrum (1992), Short & Rinehart (1992a, 1992b), and Tymon (1988/1989). Short and Rinehart (1992a, 1992b) and Schrum (1992) examined teacher empowerment in eight and six school districts, respectively. Deci et al. (1989) researched employee empowerment in one large firm, Mainiero (1986) analyzed the empowerment of various classes of employees from two companies, and Tymon (1988/1989) examined the empowerment of various employees at three different firms. No studies were detected that researched HRD manager empowerment.


Four, elements of the empowerment definition chosen for this study were similar to all or parts of the definitions of empowerment used by Maton and Rappaport (1984), Short and Rinehart (1992b), and Zimmerman and Rappaport (1988). The components chosen to represent HRD manager
empowerment appeared to overlap the most with the components specified by Short and Rinehart (1992b). This deduction was made based on a comparison of the scale items from their study and the current study.

The self-esteem component used in this study was also present in the study by Maton and Rappaport (1984). In another study, Zimmerman and Rappaport (1988) used three components that tapped an individuals’ understanding and use of the political system. Their use of measures to gauge political understanding appeared similar to one component of HRD manager empowerment used in this study.

Therefore, it appeared that the elements chosen for the initial operational definition for HRD manager empowerment were appropriate and consistent with the theories, research, and writings of authors from management, education, and psychology. The definition adopted for this study was a synthesis across various disciplines, theories, and studies on individual empowerment and appeared to be a sound starting point for this study.

**Research Question Two: What was the Dimensional Nature of HRD Manager Empowerment?**

As detailed in Chapter 4, a principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation resulted in a two factor solution explaining 56.5% of the
variance in HRD manager empowerment. All subscales of empowerment, except access and control over resources, loaded on factor one and accounted for 39.2% of the variance. A single subscale, access and control over resources, loaded on a second factor and accounted for 17.3% of the variance.

Despite this two factor solution, HRD manager empowerment was scored as a unidimensional scale by dropping the subscale, access and control over resources. This procedure was followed because access and control over resources a) had low reliability, b) had nonsignificant correlations with all other subscales of empowerment, and c) HRD manager empowerment was conceptualized as unidimensional. Conceptualizing empowerment in this manner was consistent with established procedures for new scales in the social and behavioral sciences (Jacoby, 1991).

Little previous research has been undertaken to clarify the measurement of empowerment. Short and Rinehart (1992a; 1992b) have completed two studies in which they attempted to measure teacher empowerment. However, few comparisons were possible between their 1992a study and the current study because they did not report coefficient alphas, detail the individual items, report correlations among the subscales, or conduct factor analysis on the six subscales.
For the 1992b study, Short and Rinehart used principal components factor analysis to derive six factors in a measure of teacher empowerment while accounting for 50.5% of the variance. This compares favorably to the 56.5% of the variance explained in the current study. Comparisons between the 1992b study and the current study revealed similar scale items, but different subscale naming conventions. Other comparisons with the 1992b study were difficult because these authors did not report subscale correlation coefficients. Therefore, comparisons on this dimension were not possible. Finally, using subscale names as a guide for comparison, the six components of empowerment in their two studies appeared somewhat different from each other (Short & Rinehart, 1992a, 1992b). This made it more difficult to fully compare the current study with their two studies.

In other studies on empowerment, Maton and Rappaport (1984) derived three factors and accounted for 64.4% of the variance in their measurement of individual empowerment using principal components analysis. Zimmerman and Rappaport (1988) and Tymon (1988/1989) did not use factor analysis to clarify the empowerment construct used in their studies. Both implicitly treated the construct as multidimensional by utilizing numerous previously published intact scales to measure empowerment. Zimmerman and Rappaport (1988) did report an average correlation of .29 and a correlation range of .02 to .56 among the subscales of empowerment.
used in their study. This compares to an average correlation of .32 and a range of .21 to .57 among the subscales for HRD manager empowerment.

There were several conclusions that can be inferred from the above. These were:

1. HRD manager empowerment appears to be a multidimensional construct. However, further work is needed to refine the measurement of the construct. Relevant future research on the construct must include systematic scale development protocols as outline by DeVellis (1991) and Jacoby (1991).

2. The components chosen for analysis in this study account for a substantial amount of the variance in HRD manager empowerment and are comparable to the results reported by Maton and Rappaport (1984) and Short and Rinehart (1992b).

3. Other elements need to be added to the definition of HRD manager empowerment to more fully account for the construct. These might include components such as access and control over resources, enhanced problem solving abilities, self efficacy, divergent thinking abilities, initiation and persistence of behavior, professional autonomy, continuous learning behavior, job attachment, organizational commitment/attachment, and job competence.
Research Question Three: What was the Relationship Between HRD Manager Empowerment and the Organizational Conditions of Collaboration, Organizational Support, Trust, and Communication?

As stated by the theories of Conger and Kanungo (1988), Thomas and Velthouse (1990), and Voigt and Murrell (1990), there was a positive relationship between empowerment and the organizational conditions examined in the current study. Based on regression analysis, 30.80% of the variance in HRD manager empowerment was explained ($p < .001$). From the four specific organizational conditions examined in this study, only organizational support was significant ($p < .001$). Refer to Table 9 for further details on this analysis.

The average correlation among the independent variables was .56. Because of these intercorrelations, the unique effect of the four organizational conditions on HRD manager empowerment was not ascertained using regression analysis. This multicollinearity among the independent variables resulted in regression coefficients with larger standard errors. These larger standard errors produced smaller $t$ values, which decreased the likelihood that the regression coefficients would be significant (Schroeder, Sjoquist, & Stephan, 1986).

To overcome the multicollinearity problem among the independent variables, a LISREL analysis was undertaken (Joreskog, & Sorbom, 1993).
Organizational support, trust, and communication were treated as manifest measures of a latent variable representing the individual’s relationship with the company. Collaboration was treated as a manifest measure of a latent variable representing the individual’s relationship with colleagues. Based on the LISREL analysis, 27% of the variance in HRD manager empowerment was explained (Chi-Square (4) = 17.95, p < .001). The t test of the regression coefficient for the individual’s relationship with the company was t = 4.73, p < .001; while the t test of the regression coefficient for the individual’s relationship with colleagues was nonsignificant.

Short and Rinehart (1992a) explained 61% of the variance in a measure of teacher empowerment with the variables of (a) effective school climate for students, (b) years of work experience, and (c) age. Because of the flaws in their study and the lack of a theoretical basis in their work, years of work experience was not included as a variable in the current study. Also, Short and Rinehart (1992a) found effective school climate and age to be negatively related to teacher empowerment. In other words, their results indicated that an effective school climate for students reduced teacher empowerment and that younger teachers were more empowered. In another study, Deci et al., (1989) used a sample of 23 employees from one company and found trust to be significantly and positively related to an inferred measure of employee empowerment.
The results of the current study are significant in that they confirm the importance of organizational conditions to empowerment. Specifically, those surrounding the employee's relationship with the company. Therefore, this study supports the theories of empowerment as conceptualized by Conger and Kanungo (1988), Thomas and Velthouse (1990), and Vogt and Murrell (1990).

The finding of a significant relationship between specific organizational conditions and HRD manager empowerment is important in the current competitive environment faced by employers. Current literature on empowerment touts the concept as important to corporate success because organizations have discovered that their ability to compete is based on their ability to manage and utilize their human resources better than the competition (Cohen, 1991; Ferman et al., 1990).

As previously outlined, HRD managers are the staff personnel within organizations responsible for employee training and development, career development, and organizational development. These managers are the educational leaders of the company. Because HRD managers are seen as instrumental in the organization’s drive to manage and utilize the human resources of the firm, many large companies have come to regard this function as important as any other within the organization (Guest, 1990). Empowerment is particularly important to HRD managers because they are
being called upon to (a) ensure that a skilled and educated work force is available, (b) accept an active leadership role within companies, (c) assist top management in molding company culture, (d) provide new and effective methods of managing and leading, (e) take responsibility for the successful implementation of company strategies, and (f) influence executive decisions so that HRD issues are addressed in the business planning process (Chalofsky & Rinehart, 1988; McLagan, 1989; Yeomans, 1989). To proactively assume the above roles and affect the above mentioned issues, empowerment is an imperative for these managers. Therefore, research which produces knowledge on the specific organizational factors that affect HRD manager empowerment will enable organizations to focus their individual HRD manager developmental efforts and organizational change efforts on conditions that do make a difference.

The practical significance of this research for HRD manager empowerment is twofold. One, it is imperative to realize that HRD manager empowerment is an extremely complex notion. It is erroneous to believe that all an organizations must do to promote HRD manager empowerment is to provide opportunities for these managers to be involved in decision making. This approach will not work. To promote HRD manager empowerment, employers must consider an individual’s (a) understanding of the work of the organization, (b) leadership abilities and how these abilities
connect their work to the goals of the company, (c) involvement, impact, and control in the organizations’ decision making process, (d) understanding and use of the organizations’ political system for goal attainment, and (e) organizational self-esteem. Current practices in many organizations do not consider what can be done to develop HRD managers on these various dimensions. Job rotation, job enrichment, total quality management programs, and self-directed work teams provide a few examples of the types of management practices which would aid in the development of the various dimensions of HRD manager empowerment.

Which brings up the second point. Even if changes are made within the organization to nurture the dimensions of HRD manager empowerment within the individual, attention must also be paid to the context in which these developmental activities take place. The conditions of the organization, i.e. organizational support, trust, and communications; must be aligned with the growth of the individual HRD manager to support the empowerment process. Failure for this to take place lessens the opportunities for HRD manager empowerment and the gains organizations realize from these empowered managers.

Therefore, for HRD manager empowerment to become a reality within work organizations, employers must pay attention to two different contexts. One involves the development of the individual HRD manager along the
important components of empowerment and two relies on the organizational conditions that constitute the employee’s relationship with the organization.

**Critique of the Current Study**

In retrospect, there are several aspects of this study that could have been done differently to result in an improved final product. This critique is offered so other researchers may improve future research related to empowerment. Aspects of the current study that could have been improved involved (a) sample selection, (b) sample replacement procedures, (c) sample size, and (d) pilot test, reliability, and validity of the empowerment scale.

**Sample Selection**

After reviewing the titles used to select HRD managers for the study, it was determined that the titles HR manager, Human Resources manager, and Manager of Human Resources did not necessarily indicate an individual who was responsible for the HRD function in the organization. A total of 19 individuals, 15.1% of the respondents, had one of these three titles. A series of t-tests were performed to determine if there were any differences between those with an Human Resource manager title, N = 19, and the other respondents whose titles more directly reflected an HRD manager position,
N = 107, on the total scores for empowerment, organizational support, trust, communication, and collaboration.

An examination of the means for the two groups showed that Human Resource managers scored higher than HRD managers on all five scales. However, calculated t values showed a statistically significant difference only on the scale for organizational support. The calculated t value for organizational support was 2.89 (p < .01). Therefore, it was concluded that the initial questions for the telephone interview should have included better screening for individuals whose primary responsibility was for the HRD function in the organization. The inclusion of Human Resource managers may have altered the nature of the relationship between empowerment and the four organizational conditions under study.

Sample Replacement Procedures

A second issue in sample selection involved the use of procedures to chose males and females separately to achieve gender equity. This procedure was unnecessary. Almost 48% of the HRD managers from the ASTD directory were identified as female. Because of the natural approximate gender equity in the population, one systematic selection protocol would have been sufficient.
Another issue involved the use of a sample replacement procedure. After some discussion with the dissertation committee, it was determined that the use of replacements selection methodology was inappropriate. Using this method prevented each individual in the population from having an equal probability of selection. A better way to handle this would have been to select the replacements by using a random start and taking every nth name from the list of HRD managers. To evaluate for possible sample bias resulting from the replacement procedure, t-tests were calculated to determine if those from the original sample (N = 62) were significantly different from the sample replacements (N = 64) on the total scores for empowerment, organizational support, trust, communication, and collaboration. No significant differences were found.

**Sample Size**

At this point, several comments pertaining to the sample size for this study are noted. With N = 126 for this study, the sample size was not sufficiently large to generalize the findings to HRD managers in the population. To generalize to a population of about 2,150 HRD managers at the 95 percent confidence level, the sample size should have been N = 325 (Issac & Michael, 1987). This study was not designed with that N size in mind. Because of a lack of specific research on HRD manager empowerment
and a general lack of research on empowerment, this study was designed to explore the relationship between HRD manager empowerment and four organizational conditions. As such, the sample size for the study was determined to be sufficient for that purpose.

**Pilot Test, Reliability, and Validity of the Empowerment Measure**

Another weakness of this study was the failure to use the pilot study to test the validity and reliability of the empowerment measure. In the absence of any previously published and validated scales designed to measure HRD manager empowerment, the researcher developed all items except those involving organizational self-esteem. The current study would have been improved had the scale used to measure HRD manager empowerment been subjected to greater testing prior to use.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Empowerment is an extensively cited concept in the management, education, and psychology literature; yet few research studies were found that attempted to measure the construct. The current study further confirms the need for basic research on the nature of the construct. This same reflection has been stated by Conger and Kanungo (1988), Keiffer (1984),

The current research study provided support for conceptualizing empowerment as a multidimensional construct. Future research could expand understanding of the construct with studies that continue to explore the nature of the construct on a unidimensional or multidimensional level.

Construct complexity is another important area for future research in empowerment. The current research identified six components of empowerment. These six accounted for about 56% of the variance in a measure of HRD manager empowerment. This was similar to the results achieved by Short and Rinehart (1992b). Future research could explore other components critical to empowerment. Besides the six identified in this study, other possible components of manager empowerment may include job competence, problem solving abilities, self-efficacy, creativity, ability for divergent thinking, visionary skills, initiation of behavior, and persistence of behavior.

Research is also needed that addresses the stages of empowerment. Kieffer (1984) identified four stages of empowerment in his work with community grassroot leaders. No other research was identified that addressed the notion of stages of empowerment, even though empowerment was widely viewed as a process. Future research could determine if HRD
manager empowerment in a work setting follows similar stages to those discussed by Kieffer.

From the published literature, an important catalyst to empowerment appears to be some type external event or situation that strikes a nerve within an individual and violates their sense of justice, ethical behavior, and/or concern for the common good. The individual’s reaction to the situation tends to result in actions to generate greater control and produce positive changes in the dominate social structure. This process is evident in the research of Kieffer (1984), Mainiero (1986), Maton and Rappaport (1984), O’Sullivan et al. (1984), Zimmerman and Rappaport (1988), and in the popular press book by Byham (1991).

Convergent with this notion, Zimmerman and Rappaport (1988) found civic duty to be an important ingredient in empowerment among individuals involved in community action activities. From an organizational perspective this could be translated into an important empowerment component named commitment to organizational goals, commitment to organizational success, belief in organizational mission, or concern for organizational success. In addition, since the empowerment process appears to often be initiated when an individual’s sense of justice or ethical standards are violated, an important component in empowerment may be individual ethical standards. The implications of this for organizations concerned with employee
empowerment is that employees must care deeply and be committed to
growth, development and change in the organization.

An additional consideration for future research will be to determine the
effect of the environment on the critical components of empowerment. In
other words, do the important components of empowerment change with
the environment or are the components of empowerment stable across
situations? Research is also needed to determine if all the components of
empowerment are equally important.

Based on this study, research is needed that addresses the problem of
reliabilities for the subscales of empowerment and for the total
empowerment scale. Validity and reliability research will be critical to further
research on empowerment. This same concern was voiced by previous
researchers (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990; Tymon,

The theories of Conger and Kanungo (1988), Thomas and Velthouse
(1990), Vogt and Murrell (1990), and other writers (see Appendices A and
C), mention numerous organizational conditions as critical to empowerment.
A productive avenue for future research would be to identify the relationship
between empowerment and other organizational factors outlined in the
various theories. Future research could delineate which organizational
factors are the most critical to empowerment, the contribution of each to

Further research could test the theories of empowerment by Conger and Kanungo (1988) and Thomas and Velthouse (1990). Several researchers cite the need for research that is longitudinal and field based (Deci, et al., 1989; Mainiero, 1986; Maton & Rappaport, 1984; Zimmerman, 1990; Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988).

Other critical research issues cited in the literature reviewed included the effect of empowerment on productivity (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Deci et al., 1989; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990), individual differences in empowerment (Deci et al., 1989; Gruber & Trickett, 1987; Mainiero, 1986; Prestby et al., 1990; Zimmerman, 1990; Zimmermann & Rappaport, 1988), and the effects of organizational interventions on empowerment (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Deci et al., 1989; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990; Tymon, 1988/1989).
Chapter Summary

This chapter contained five sections. Section one provided a brief review of the study, while section two covered the findings and conclusions from the three research questions. The third section provided a critique of the current study and suggested ways in which this study could have been improved. This section was included to help guide other researchers as they undertake the study of individual empowerment. The fourth section outlined recommendations for future research and emphasized the need for research on the measurement of empowerment. The chapter summary constituted the fifth section.
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Table A-1

**Organizational Conditions Theoretically Linked to Empowerment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors Writing About Empowerment</th>
<th>Type of Article</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biegel (1984)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blau &amp; Alba (1982)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block (1989)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byham (1991)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark (1989)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conger &amp; Kanungo (1988)</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fawcett, et al. (1984)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florin &amp; Wandersman (1990)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giamartino &amp; Wandersman (1983)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruber &amp; Trickett (1987)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kastner (1979)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katz (1984)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kieffer (1984)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kizilos (1990)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainiero (1986)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maton &amp; Rappaport (1984)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors Writing About Empowerment</th>
<th>Type of Article&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O'Sullivan, et al. (1984)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestby, Wandersman, Florin, Rich, &amp; Chavis (1990)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestby &amp; Wandersman (1985)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riger (1984)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts (1986)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swift &amp; Levin (1987)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torre (1986/1987)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas &amp; Veithouse (1990)</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tymon (1988/1989)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vogt &amp; Murrell (1990)</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitmore (1988)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmerman (1990)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmerman &amp; Rappaport (1988)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> E = Empirical article; O = Opinion article; T = Theory article

(table continues)
A = Collaboration; B = Organizational Support Systems; C = Communications; D = Trust; E = Cohesive Group; F = Creativity; G = Leader Support; H = Political Environment; I = Resource Allocation; J = Individual Commitment; K = Job Design; L = Vision of Company; M = Build Work Knowledge; N = Distribution of Power; O = Position in Company; P = Organizational Transitions; Q = Risk Taking; R = System Open to Change
APPENDIX B
Table B-1

**Job Titles Used to Select HRD Managers for the Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVP/ Training Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Training Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Training Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR and Training Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Corporate Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager HR Staffing and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager HRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Human Resource Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Human Resource Development and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Organizational Development and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Personnel Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager QA and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Training Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Training and Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager of Corporate Training and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager of Management Development and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager of T &amp; D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager of Training and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Training and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Training and Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Training and Organizational Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Training Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Education Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Division Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Division Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

178
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table C-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Specific Context Factors for Empowerment: Conger and Kanungo (1988)**

1. **Organizational Factors**
   - a. Significant organizational changes/transition
   - b. Start up ventures
   - c. Competitive pressures
   - d. Impersonal bureaucratic climate
   - e. Poor communications/network forming systems
   - f. Highly centralized organizational resources

2. **Supervision**
   - a. Authoritarian
   - b. Emphasis on failures and shortcomings of employees
   - c. Lack of reason for actions/consequences

3. **Reward Systems**
   - a. Lack of innovation based awards
   - b. Lack of competence based awards
   - c. Arbitrary reward allocations
   - d. Low incentive value of rewards

4. **Job Design**
   - a. Lack of clarity
   - b. Lack of training and technical support
   - c. Unrealistic goals
   - d. Lack of appropriate authority/discretion
   - e. Low task variety
   - f. Limited participation concerning factors affecting job performance
   - g. Lack of resources to accomplish job
   - h. Lack of networking opportunities
   - i. Highly established work routines
   - j. High rule structure
   - k. Low advancement opportunities
   - l. Lack of meaningful goals and tasks
   - m. Limited contact with senior management
APPENDIX D
Questions answered during telephone interview. Questions 1-15 were designed by the researcher for this study. Questions 16-25 are from the Organizational Based Self-Esteem scale by Pierce et al. (1989).

Please respond to these questions with either:

(1) YES  
(2) NO

_____ 1. Do you prepare the budget in your department?  
_____ 2. Have projects in your department been terminated due to lack of funds?  
_____ 3. Is your department adequately staffed?  
_____ 4. Does your department have a written set of objectives for the year?  
_____ 5. Do you participate in wage and salary decisions for your department?  
_____ 6. Do you know who to see to get what your want for your department?

Please answer this next series of questions with either:

(1) to little or no extent  
(2) to a great extent.

_____ 7. To what extent are you involved in meetings where decisions about company operations are discussed?  
_____ 8. To what extent are you involved in company long range planning?  
_____ 9. To what extent are you involved in company wide policy decisions of your company?

continued on next page
10. To what extent are you meeting the objectives defined for your department?

11. To what extent are you consulted about training decisions by other departments in the company?

12. To what extent are you involved in decisions that affect training programs at your company?

13. To what extent can you influence the political system at your company?

Please respond to the next question with either one of the following:

(1) influence very little
(2) influence a great deal

14. Do you generally influence the outcomes of decisions in favor of your department?

The next question has several parts. I will ask you one general question followed by specific items. For each item, please respond with either one of the following:

(1) used very little or not at all
(2) used to a great extent

15. To what extent is the following information used to justify training projects? Rate item each as either:

a. productivity?

b. profit ratios?

c. cost savings?

d. competitive demands?

e. needs assessment?

continued on next page
f. work force flexibility?
g. organizational goals?

Please respond to this next series of questions using the following scale:

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

In your opinion:

16. do you matter around your company?

17. are you taken seriously at your company?

18. are you important at your company?

19. are you trusted at your company?

20. is there faith in you at your company?

21. do you make a difference at your company?

22. are you valuable at your company?

23. are you helpful to your company?

24. are you efficient at your company?

25. are you cooperative at your company?

Questions that relate to each component of empowerment:

Access and control over resources: Q1, 2, and 3.

Understanding of the business operations: Q7, 8, and 9.

continued on next page
Leadership of the HRD department: Q4, 10, and 15.

Involvement in decision making: Q5, 11, and 12.

Understanding the company political system: Q6, 13, and 14.

Organizational based self-esteem: Q16-25.
Dr. Jon L. Pierce  
Department of Management  
The University of Minnesota-Duluth  
Duluth, MN 55812  

Dear Dr. Pierce:  

This is a follow up letter from our recent conversation regarding permission to use your Organization-Based Self-Esteem scale in my dissertation research. This scale was discussed in your 1989 article in the *Academy of Management Journal*, volume 32, pages 622-648.  

Please sign below to indicate formal consent for my use of this scale. I have provided a return, stamped envelop for you to use in mailing a signed copy of this letter to me and a second copy of this letter for your files.  

If you have any questions, I may be reached at the above address or at 419-353-4408. Thank you.  

Sincerely  

Janice Black  
Ph.D. Candidate  
Virginia Tech, Blacksburg VA  

[Signature]  
signed; Jon L. Pierce  

Good luck
Cover letter sent with fax

Number of pages in fax transmission including this one: Six

Janice Black
College of Education
Department of Educational Research
Virginia Tech
310 East Eggleston Hall
Blacksburg, VA 24061-0302

Potential Respondent Name Here

Thank you for participating in this research project on the organizational conditions encountered by Human Resource Development Managers. Your input is important to the success of this research effort.

As we discussed, I am accompanying this letter with a questionnaire for you to complete in the next day or two. It will take approximately 15 minutes for you to respond to these questions. Please return the completed questionnaire by fax to me at 703-231-7826.

Approximately 150 Human Resource Development Managers from across the country are part of this research project. All responses you make will be kept in strictest confidence and will only be used in combination with responses from other managers like yourself for research purposes.

Thank you for taking time from your busy schedule to participate in this study. If you have any questions regarding the questionnaire or the research, please contact me at 703-552-0054.

Sincerely,

Janice Black
Researcher
Human Resource Development Project
Questionnaire that were sent to HRD managers by fax. Questions 1-17 are from the *Organizational Support Scale* by Eisenberger et al. (1986). Questions 18-30 are from the *Trust Scale* by Scott (1981). Questions 31-42 are from the *Communication Openness Measure* by Rogers (1987). Questions 43-53 are the *Workgroup Cooperation* and *Subunit Conflict* subscales from the *Organizational Climate Scale* by James and Sells (1981). Demographic questions are numbered 54-63.

**Questionnaire for Human Resource Development Managers**

Listed below are a series of statements that represent possible feelings that individuals might have about the company for which they work. With respect to your own feelings about the particular organization for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by responding with one of the five alternatives. Indicate your response beside each question in the space provided.

1 - strongly agree; 2 - agree; 3 - neutral;

4 - disagree; 5 - strongly disagree

**Organizational Support**, Eisenberger et al. (1986).

_____ 1. The company values my contribution to its well-being.

_____ 2. If the organization could hire someone to replace me at a lower salary, it would do so.

_____ 3. The company fails to appreciate extra effort from me.

_____ 4. The company strongly considers my goals and values.

_____ 5. The company would ignore any complaint from me.

_____ 6. The company disregards my best interests when it makes decisions that affect me.

continued on next page
1 - strongly agree; 2 - agree; 3 - neutral; 4 - disagree; 5 - strongly disagree

7. Help is available from the company when I have a problem.
8. The company really cares about my well-being.
9. The company is willing to extend itself in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.
10. Even if I did the best job possible, the company would fail to notice.
11. The company is willing to help me when I need a special favor.
12. The company cares about my general satisfaction at work.
13. If given the opportunity, the company would take advantage of me.
14. The company shows very little concern for me.
15. The company cares about my opinions.
16. The company takes pride in my accomplishments at work.
17. The company tries to make my job as interesting as possible.

Trust, Scott (1981)

18. I feel free to discuss work problems with my immediate supervisor without fear of having it used against me later.
19. I have complete trust that my immediate supervisor will treat me fairly.
20. If I make a mistake, my supervisor is willing to "forgive and forget".

continued on next page
1 - strongly agree;  2 - agree;  3 - neutral;  
4 - disagree;   5 - strongly disagree

_____ 21. My supervisor is friendly and approachable.

_____ 22. I can count on my immediate supervisor for help if I have difficulties with my job.

_____ 23. There is trust in one another among members of my workgroup.

_____ 24. I can share sensitive information with members of my workgroup because I know group members will hold it in strictest confidence.

_____ 25. I have complete trust that members of my workgroup will treat me fairly.

_____ 26. I can rely on members of my workgroup to help me if I have difficulties getting the job done.

_____ 27. Management has little regard for the well being of people who work for this company.

_____ 28. At this company, management cannot be trusted.

_____ 29. When management must make decisions which seem to be against the best interest of the employee, I believe that management’s decisions are justified by other considerations.

_____ 30. Management seldom follows through with what they say they are going to do.

**Communication Openness, Rogers (1987)**

_____ 31. Supervisors ask for suggestions.

_____ 32. Supervisors act on criticism.

_____ 33. Supervisors listen to complaints.

continued on next page
1 - strongly agree; 2 - agree; 3 - neutral; 4 - disagree; 5 - strongly disagree

34. People ask for supervisor’s opinions.
35. Supervisors follow up on people’s opinions.
36. Supervisors suggest new ideas.
37. Supervisors listen to bad news.
38. People listen to new ideas from co-workers.
39. Supervisors listen to new ideas.
40. Supervisors follow-up on suggestions.
41. Supervisors ask for personal opinions.
42. People listen to supervisors’ suggestions.

Collaboration from the Organizational Climate Scale, James and Sells (1981).

For this next set of questions, please circle your response.

43. Generally, there are friendly and cooperative relationships among the different departments in this company?

4. Agree                   5. Strongly Agree

continued on next page
44. To what extent is the communications poor among the departments in this company?

1. Less than 20% of the time  2. 20-40% of the time
3. 40-60% of the time       4. 60-80% of the time
5. 80-100% of the time

45. To what extent is there conflict among the departments in the company?

1. Less than 20% of the time  2. 20-40% of the time
3. 40-60% of the time       4. 60-80% of the time
5. 80-100% of the time

46. It takes longer than necessary to coordinate important actions with other departments in the company?

4. Usually                 5. Almost Always

47. There is a feeling of cooperation among the people in my workgroup?

4. Agree                   5. Strongly Agree

48. Communication is good among the people in my workgroup?

4. Agree                   5. Strongly Agree

continued on next page
49. To what extent do people in the work group trust each other?
   1. Less than 20% of the time  2. 20-40% of the time
   3. 40-60% of the time        4. 60-80% of the time
   5. 80-100% of the time

50. To what extent is there a friendly atmosphere among the people in your workgroup?
   1. Less than 20% of the time  2. 20-40% of the time
   3. 40-60% of the time        4. 60-80% of the time
   5. 80-100% of the time

51. To what extent do the people in your work group cooperate to get the job done?
   1. Less than 20% of the time  2. 20-40% of the time
   3. 40-60% of the time        4. 60-80% of the time
   5. 80-100% of the time

52. When I face a difficult job, the people in my workgroup help me out?
   4. Usually             5. Almost Always

53. How often is there friction among the people in your work group?
   4. Usually             5. Almost Always

continues on next page
Demographic Questions

54. Approximately how many employees does the company have at all locations?

55. What is the central product of the company? ________

56. How many years of experience do you have with this company?

57. How many years of work experience do you have?_______

58. How many years of work experience do you have in HRD/HRM?

59. What is your educational attainment beyond high school? circle one
   a. 2 year degree
   b. Some college, but no degree
   c. B.S. or B.A. degree
   d. Some beyond undergraduate, but not a Masters degree
   e. Masters degree
   f. Course work beyond Masters degree
   g. Doctorate

60. Is this company unionized? (circle one) YES NO

61. How many employees do you supervise? ____________

62. How long did it take for you to complete this questionnaire?

63. Additional comments about your situation at your company?

Thank you for your time and help on this research project. Please fax this questionnaire to Janice Black, Patton Hall; FAX NUMBER 703-231-7826.
Dr. Robert Eisenberger  
Department of Psychology  
The University of Delaware  
Newark, DE 19716-0001  

Dear Dr. Eisenberger:

This is a follow up letter from our recent conversation regarding permission to use your Perceived Organizational Support scale in my dissertation research. This scale was discussed in your 1986 article in the Journal of Applied Psychology, volume 71, pages 500-507.

Please sign below to indicate formal consent for my use of this scale. I have provided a return, stamped envelop for you to use in mailing a signed copy of this letter to me and a second copy of this letter for your files.

If you have any questions, I may be reached at the above address or at 419-353-4408. Thank you.

Sincerely

Janice Black  
Ph.D. Candidate  
Virginia Tech, Blacksburg VA

[Signature]  
signed; Robert Eisenberger
Dr. Dow Scott  
Department of Management  
Virginia Tech  
Blacksburg, VA 24061  

Dear Dr. Scott:  

This is a follow up letter from our recent conversation regarding permission to use your Organizational Measures of Trust scale in my dissertation research. This scale was discussed in your 1981 article in the Proceedings of the Southern Management Association, pages 107-109.

Please sign below to indicate formal consent for my use of this scale. I have provided a return, stamped envelop for you to use in mailing a signed copy of this letter to me and a second copy of this letter for your files.

If you have any questions, I may be reached at the above address or at 419-353-4408. Thank you.

Sincerely

Janice Black  
Ph.D. Candidate  
Virginia Tech, Blacksburg VA

[signature]

signed: Dow Scott

197
Dr. Donald P. Rogers  
Business Department  
Rollins College  
1000 Holt Avenue  
Winter Park, FL 32789-4499

Dear Dr. Rogers:

This is a follow up letter from our recent conversation regarding permission to use your Perceived Communication Openness scale in my dissertation research.

Please sign below to indicate formal consent for my use of this scale. I have provided a return, stamped envelop for you to use in mailing a signed copy of this letter to me and a second copy of this letter for your files.

If you have any questions, I may be reached at the above address or at 419-353-4408. Thank you.

Sincerely

Janice Black  
Ph.D. Candidate  
Virginia Tech, Blacksburg VA

Donald P. Rogers  
May 11, 1993

signed; Donald P. Rogers
Dr. Lawrence James  
The University of Tennessee  
College of Business  
Department of Management  
408 Stokely Management Center  
Knoxville, TN 37996-0545

Dear Dr. James:

This is a follow up letter from our conversation during November 1991 regarding permission to use portions of your Organizational Climate scale in my dissertation research.

Please sign below to indicate formal consent for my use of this scale. I have provided a return, stamped envelop for you to use in mailing a signed copy of this letter to me and a second copy of this letter for your files.

If you have any questions, I may be reached at the above address or at 419-353-4408. Thank you.

Sincerely

Janice Black  
Ph.D. Candidate  
Virginia Tech, Blacksburg VA

signed: Lawrence R. James
Table F-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Number</th>
<th>Number of Respondents Contacted</th>
<th>Mean Length of Phone Call (minutes)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 126; Telephone contacts were made with respondents from March 9, 1992 through May 20, 1992. Total number of telephone calls to respondents was 625.
Table F-2

Breakdown of Phone Calls to Respondents by Disposition of Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition of Call</th>
<th>Number of Calls</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Mean (minutes)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Called; no answer or busy signal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Problems with fax transmission</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fax follow-up to obtain questionnaire</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Problems with phone number</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Phone follow-up to obtain questionnaire</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Appointment made for phone interview</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Completed phone interview*</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Faxed questionnaire sent</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>20.80</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Called, respondent not available</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>33.92</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes calls in which an appointment was made for phone interview.
Note. \( N = 126 \). Telephone contacts were made with respondents from March 9, 1992 through May 20, 1992. Total number of telephone calls to the 126 respondents was 625.

* Range of length of time for the telephone interview was 4 to 35 minutes.
Table F-3

Number of Business Days for Faxed Questionnaire Return From Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Days for Return</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Percent Of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0(^a)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mean = 4.53 days; standard deviation = 8.22 days. \( N = 126. \)

Respondents reported a range of 5 to 30 minutes to complete the faxed questionnaire, with a mean of 11.85 minutes and a median of 10 minutes.

Questionnaires were faxed to respondents from March 9, 1992 through May 20, 1992.

\(^a\) Returned the same day.
APPENDIX G
Please get right back to me on this!

I have not received the HRD questionnaire from you. Do you have any questions? Is there a problem? Do I need to fax it to you again? Have you faxed it, but I have not received it? Please call or fax me at the numbers below.

Thank you for your time and help.

Janice Black

TO: Janice Black
FROM: Janice Black
AT: Virginia Tech
PAGES (including cover sheet): 1
FAX NUMBER: 703 - 231 - 7826
Call Script for Telephone Interview

This script was developed based on the guidelines in Lavrakas (1987), Frey (1983), and the pilot study conducted for this research.

Hello, may I speak to ________________
Mr or Ms. ________? My name is ________________ and I am a researcher with Virginia Tech in Blacksburg Va. I am calling to ask for your participation in a national study on the organizational conditions encountered by human resource development managers in business and industry. Your participation requires about 20 minutes of your time. This involves about 10 minutes on the phone to answer a series of questions, then I will fax you some additional questions that will take about 15 minutes of your time to complete and have you fax them back to me. Would you like to answer the questions by phone now or make an appointment for us to call you back at a more convenient time?

(Instructions: If respondent wants to do telephone interview now, proceed with the questionnaire as follows:)

For this first series of questions please respond with either yes or no (ask first six questions and record answers).
For this next series of questions, please respond with either 1. to little or no extent or 2. to a great extent
(ask questions 7-13, record responses).

For this next question, please respond with either 1. influence very little or 2. influence a great deal
(now ask question 14, record answer).

This next series of questions is a little bit different. For these questions you will be ask to rate each item with either 1. used very little or not at all or 2. used to a great extent (read question 15 now and record answers).

Now for the last set of questions. I only have ten very short questions left to ask. For these, we will use a continuous scale from 1 to 7. One is strongly disagree, 7 is strongly agree and 4 is the mid-point or average. You can answer these questions with any number from 1 to 7. For each of these questions, please rate each questions based on your assessment of the situation at your company. (Ask questions 16 - 25 and record answers).

That is all of the questions I need to ask by telephone. Now let me get your fax number so that we may fax the additional questions to you. (GET THE FAX NUMBER AND RECORD ON THE CALL SHEET). The
additional questions will be faxed to you late this afternoon or tonight.

Thank you for your time.

(If the subject has several questions that you cannot answer, please tell them that I will call and answer their questions. Answers to the most often asked questions are listed at the end of this script.)

(If the respondent wants to make an appointment for another time, make the appointment and record the time on the call sheet. When making an appointment be sure to put the time on the call sheet in eastern time).

(If voice mail or answering machine answers the call leave this message:)

Mr or Ms. _________ my name is __________ and I am a researcher with Virginia Tech in Blacksburg Va. Please return my call at 703-552-0054. Thank you.

(If a person is taking messages for the HRD manager, First ask?) When will Mr./Ms _____ be back in the office?

(Second ask?) Do you keep the schedule for Mr/Ms _____?

(If they say "YES", try to schedule a specific time when you can call back and have it scheduled on the calendar of the respondent. If they say "NO", ask if there is some one else who makes appointments for this manager. If so try to schedule an appointment through that person. If appointments cannot be made, then leave this message:)
My name is ______ and I am a researcher with Virginia Tech in Blacksburg Va. Please have ______ return my call at 703-552-0054. Thank you.
Common Questions Respondents May Ask?

1. How did you get my name?
Response: Your name was selected at random from all the HRD managers in the 1991 ASTD Directory. This is a national study involving approximately 150 HRD and Training managers from a variety of industries from across the country.

2. Can I have a copy of the results of the study?
Response: Yes, The results will be available in early 1993. If you would like a copy of the results, I will note that beside your name and you will be contacted by letter or phone in early 1993 to make sure we have your correct address.

3. Are you interviewing HRD managers from just one industry?
Response: No, This is a national study involving approximately 150 HRD and Training managers from a variety of industries from across the country.

4. What is the purpose of this study?
Response: The purpose of this study is to analyze the organizational conditions encountered by HRD/Training managers in a variety of organizational settings.
5. How will the results of this study be used?

**Response:** The results will be used for research purposes only to publish articles in journals like the Training and Development Magazine or HRD Quarterly. Also the results may also be used to make a presentation at the national ASTD conference.
APPENDIX I
Telephone/Fax Call-Sheet

HRD/HRM/Training Manager Empowerment Study;

Respondent’s Name, Company Name

Telephone number

Time zone of respondent

Appointment Date and Time

Fax number

Fax Sent: __________ Fax Follow-up: __________

Fax returned: __________

Questionnaire number _______ Gender of respondent: M or F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Attempt</th>
<th>Date Mo/Day</th>
<th>Time Start</th>
<th>Time Finish</th>
<th>Disposition Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposition codes</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>No answer after ten rings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Busy after one immediate redial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Answering machine or voice mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Answered by clerical or other staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Number no longer in service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Wrong number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Non business number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>No longer employed by this organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Respondent temporarily unavailable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Respondent unavailable during field period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Refusal by selected respondent; no reason given</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Refusal by selected respondent; reason given</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Partial interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Complete interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Appointment scheduled for interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Other; explain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Fax sent successfully</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Problems with fax transmission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table J-1

**Distribution of Number of Employees per Company**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1000</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001-2000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-3000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001-4000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4001-5000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001-6000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6001-7000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7001-8000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8001-9000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9001-10000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10001-11000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11001-12000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12001-13000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13001-14000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14001-15000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15001-62000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62001-109000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109001-156000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156001-203000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203001-250000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Range = 7 to 250,000 employees; mean = 13,580 employees; median = 2,900 employees.
Table J-2

Central Product of Respondents’ Employer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial Classification</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manufacturing</strong> (sub-total)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Categories:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals/Rubber/Plastics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Machinery</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic/Electrical</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruments and Related</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary/Fabricated Metals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Equipment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile Mill Products</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper and Allied Products</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services</strong> (sub-total)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Categories:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/Business Services</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational/Public Admin.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels/Other Lodging</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance, Insurance and Real Estate</strong> (sub-total)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Categories:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depository Institutions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Carriers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Brokers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*table continues*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial Classification</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Public Utilities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and Retail Trade</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Mining</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  N = 126; 7 respondents did not provide information as to the central product of their employer. Central products were coded by the principal researcher based on the 1987, Standard Industrial Classification Manual.
Table J-3

Distribution of Respondents’ Years of Work Experience With the Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Company Work Experience</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower 1 to Upper 3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower 3 to Upper 5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower 5 to Upper 7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower 7 to Upper 9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower 9 to Upper 11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower 11 to Upper 13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower 13 to Upper 15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower 15 to Upper 17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower 17 to Upper 19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower 19 to Upper 21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower 21 to Upper 23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower 23 to Upper 25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower 25 to Upper 27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower 27 to Upper 29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower 29 to Upper 34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>125</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 126; Range = 1 to 34 years; mean = 9.36 years; median = 7 years.*
Table J-4

Distribution of Respondents’ Total Years of Work Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range Lower</th>
<th>Range Upper</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 126; Range = 2 to 41 years; mean = 20.43 years; median = 20 years.
Table J-5

Distribution of Respondents' Years of Work Experience in HRD/HRM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 126; Range = 0 to 35 years; mean = 11.19 years; median = 10 years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 2 Year College degree or less</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Some College but no degree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. B.S. or B.A. degree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Some education beyond undergraduate, but not a Masters’ Degree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Masters Degree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Course work beyond Masters</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Doctorate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 123 100.0

*Note. N = 126; Mean and median educational level among respondents was: some education beyond undergraduate level but not a Masters Degree.*
Table J-7

Distribution of Number of Employees Supervised by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 126; Range = 0 to 200 employees supervised; mean number of employees supervised = 8.6; and median = 3 employees.
Additional Comments Made by the Respondents on the Returned Faxed Questionnaire

Comments

Comments are divided into four groups as follows: (a) comments about the company in general, (b) comments that are department specific, (c) comments that are job specific, and (d) comments about the faxed questionnaire. Written comments were received from 35 different respondents; 27.78% of the 126 responses used in the data analysis.

Comments Concerning Their Company

1. "We are very lucky - we make orthopedic implants and we are an aging society that need our implants."

2. "We are 5 years into a 'Quality' program and it has really made a difference. Training is supported and we are now beginning to measure the effectiveness of training."

3. "Implemented Total Quality and World Class Manufacturing concepts in January 1990."

4. "Company is struggling with financial pressures and attempting to change the company culture to a quality oriented, customer focused, team empowerment."

5. "We are a federally funded R&D center. Most of our HRD work is with an external client base, working on Total Quality Management issues. We are just beginning to do internal work."

(table continues)
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6. "Our company is a gas utility company. Management does an excellent job caring about the personnel with health programs, defensive driving etc. There is some problems with lower supervision which must be smoothed over."

7. "The company is in the process of implementing Total Quality. However upper management is not practicing Total Quality Management. I am concerned for the company."

8. "A good company going through difficult times creating an unfavorable atmosphere for the moment."

9. "Being the least visible of three regional locations, we are not in the mainstream of long term planning. The streamlining (cutting staff) the past couple of years only leaves time to react to ‘have to’ items instead of organizing, planning, etc."

10. Newspapers were late getting into the HR business. I was the first training manager ever here.

11. "I’d characterize it (attention to training) as ‘benign neglect’.

12. "Training is given a high priority at our company."

13. "We are currently undergoing a lot of change."

Comments Concerning Their Department

1. "Internal industry specific employee relations survey results showed that our site was ranked #1 for exempt and non-exempt employee training among 6 sites across the country."

2. "I am a one person training department with 1 teacher for ESL."

3. "The HRD role is changing to more ‘consultive’ in nature. We have had to get involved in the business more but do not feel we are true partners in any strategic planning process."

(table continues)
4. "Restructured 3 times in 18 months (layoff each time); hit by recession; low morale and general distrust of management."

5. "Have support from line management, labor trainers, and administrative support/service from HR office staff (secretaries, etc.)

6. "I am developing a company-wide training function (a first for this company in 38 years) and am receiving very positive results."

7. "Interestingly, in poor economic times, the training budget has not been affected. I attribute this to the fact that this division is doing training in the strictest sense of the word--helping people do their present jobs better (see Nadler -Human Resource Development, I think). Our efforts are highly valued; the quality of our product is consistently high. We work well together." (Note: this comment was from a training manager at a major university).

Comments Concerning Their Job

1. "I have received numerous position upgrades in the 6 1/2 years of my employ at this company."

2. "I have overall enjoyed my work experience."

3. "I'm in a unique situation here. I am currently working on a Ph.D. in Organizational Psychology and started here as an intern for general HR functions. Our training manager left so I began filling his responsibilities. The position stuck and since then have created a HRD/Organizational Development Department which consists of myself, 2 outside consultants, and one of the partners of the company. We are currently in the planning phase."

4. "Working for individual which was appointed director HR which has no experience in HRD/HRM. He came out of marketing - 28 years with the company."

5. "News flash! My boss (AVP of Quality/OD) just resigned his position with our company. Internal personnel changes and possible restructuring to take place as a result."

(table continues)
6. "We are an unusual place and I am glad to be here."

7. "We are a retail organization and business is not good. Training is always on the edge (budget cutting). Have been informed that I will probably not make the 'second cut'. Did have a staff of 1 1/2 persons."

8. "Can't believe they pay me to do this. Absolutely love my job."

9. "I have the best job in the corporation."

Comments About the Faxed Questionnaire

1. "We are in a transitional time so some of the questions were hard to answer."

2. "A great many 3s are because I simply don't know. I have been in this job a very short time and have no experience with many of these issues."

3. "Much reaction to the "company" is based on the luck of the draw - with other supervisors I've had, my feelings would be different."

4. "The questionnaire seems to have negative problem frame."

5. "I prefer to mail".

6. Three comments specifically asked for their information be kept confidential.
Table K-1

Number and Percent of Missing Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pieces of Missing Data</th>
<th>Number of Pieces of Data Collected</th>
<th>Percent Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4,032</td>
<td>.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6,678</td>
<td>.36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 126 respondents.
### Table L-1

#### Full Correlation Matrix for All Items and Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>BUS</th>
<th>LEA</th>
<th>IMP</th>
<th>POL</th>
<th>EST</th>
<th>OGS</th>
<th>TRU</th>
<th>COM</th>
<th>COL</th>
<th>FEM</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGS</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRU</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
| ACC | BUS | LEA | IMP | POL | EST | OGS | TRU | COM | COL | FEM | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q5 | Q6 | Q7 | Q8 | Q9 | Q10 | Q11 | Q12 | Q13 | Q14 | Q15 | Q16 | Q17 | Q18 | Q19 | Q20 | Q21 | Q22 | Q23 | Q24 | Q25 | Q26 | Q27 |

(table continues)
| Q28 | Q29 | Q30 | Q31 | Q32 | Q33 | Q34 | Q35 | Q36 | Q37 | Q38 | Q39 | Q40 | Q41 | Q42 | Q43 | Q44 | Q45 | Q46 | Q47 | Q48 | Q49 | Q50 | Q51 | Q52 | Q53 |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
|     |     |     |     | 1.06| .42** | 1.00 |
|     | .30** | .49** | .53** | 1.06 |
|     | .49** | .48** | .43** | 1.00 |
|     | .55** | .42** | .46** | .54** | 1.00 |
|     | .41** | .32** | .29** | .41** | .35** | 1.00 |
|     | .39** | .52** | .51** | .46** | .46** | .28** | 1.00 |
|     | .42** | .66** | .57** | .64** | .60** | .52** | .65** | 1.00 |
|     | .40** | .56** | .49** | .71** | .59** | .41** | .48** | .65** | 1.00 |
|     | .42** | .55** | .52** | .67** | .53** | .45** | .60** | .71** | .72** | 1.00 |
|     | .28** | .30** | .59** | .48** | .36** | .30** | .46** | .55** | .42** | .42** | .42** | .100 |
|     | .12 | .22** | .17 | .20 | .04 | .16 | .22** | .19 | .15 | .28** | .09 | 1.00 |
|     | .20 | .23** | .28** | .26** | .25** | .25** | .27** | .29** | .18 | .37** | .31** | .13 | .41** | .100 |
|     | .99 | .29** | .27** | .26** | .25** | .21** | .32** | .26** | .40** | .35** | .14 | .40** | .76** | 1.00 |
|     | .21 | .24** | .25** | .30** | .21** | .25** | .23** | .30** | .40** | .33** | .23** | .33** | .57** | .49** | 1.00 |
|     | .11 | .15 | .17 | .18 | .04 | .03 | .17 | .15 | .23** | .16 | .44 | .28** | .24** | .32** | .23** | 1.00 |
|     | .17 | .33** | .21** | .24** | .09 | .06 | .24** | .26** | .39** | .28** | .12 | .10 | .25** | .38** | .33** | .64** | 1.00 |
|     | .12 | .10 | .22** | .20 | .03 | .08 | .08 | .15 | .22** | .18 | .10 | .21 | .28** | .36** | .28** | .61** | .60** | 1.00 |
|     | .06 | .16 | .22** | .15 | .07 | .10 | .19 | .22** | .32** | .21** | .09 | .23** | .33** | .48** | .30** | .62** | .61** | .81** | 1.00 |
|     | .11 | .05 | .19 | .09 | .12 | .04 | .10 | .10 | .27** | .17 | .05 | .18 | .40** | .36** | .32** | .49** | .54** | .77** | .78** | 1.00 |
|     | .14 | .28** | .28** | .17 | .12 | .10 | .33** | .28** | .28** | .20 | .16 | .13 | .27** | .39** | .26 | .55** | .63** | .63** | .65** | .56** | 1.00 |
|     | .02 | .14 | .18 | .13 | .07 | .08 | .18 | .16 | .22** | .22** | .09 | .00 | .25** | .42** | .24** | .41** | .52** | .56** | .59** | .52** | .48** | 1.00 |

Note: N=126 for all variables and items. *p<.01; **p<.001. Full questions found in Appendix D and Appendix E.

Codes for Table L-1
ACC = Summed scores for access and control over resources scale.
BUS = Summed scores for understanding of the business operations scale.
LEA = Summed scores for leadership of the HRD department scale.
IMP = Summed scores for involvement and impact in decision making scale.
FOL = Summed scores for understanding the company's political system scale.
EST = Summed scores for organizational-based self-esteem scale.
OBS = Summed scores for organizational support scale.
TRU = Summed scores for trust scale.

(table continues)
Table L-2

Means and Standard Deviations for the Empowerment Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access/Control Over Resources:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Prepare budget (R)</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Projects terminated</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Adequately staffed (R)</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understand Business Operations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. Involved in decision meetings</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. Involved long range planning</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9. Involved company wide decisions</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership of HRD Department:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10. Meeting department objectives</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Department have objectives (R)</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15. Items used to justify training:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15a. Productivity</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15b. Profit ratios</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15c. Cost savings</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15d. Competitive demands</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15e. Needs assessment</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15f. Work force flexibility</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15g. Organizational goals</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involvement in Decision Making:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. Involved in salary decisions (R)</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11. Consulted about training</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12. Involved in training decisions</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understanding Political System:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. Get what want for department (R)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14. Influence outcomes favorably</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13. Influence political system</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational self-esteem:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16. Matter around company</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17. Taken seriously</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18. Important at company</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19. Trusted at company</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20. Faith in you at company</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21. Make difference at company</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22. Valuable at company</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23. Helpful to company</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24. Efficient at company</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25. Cooperative at company</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** N = 126. **Questions 1-6** measured with either *yes* or *no* response; **Questions 7-13** measured with either *to little or no extent* or with *to a great extent*; **Question 14** measured with either *influence very little* or *influence a great deal*; **Question 15** measured with either *used very little or not at all* or *used to a great extent*; **Questions 16-25** measured with 7-point Likert type scale with 1 = *strongly disagree* and 7 = *strongly agree*; *(R)* denotes responses which were reversed for data analysis.

**Complete questions contained in Appendix D.** Permission to use the **Organizational Based Self-Esteem Scale** also contained in Appendix D.
Table L-3

Means and Standard Deviations of the Individual Items in the Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Company values my contributions (R)</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Would replace me at lower salary</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Fails to appreciate my efforts</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Considers my goals/values (R)</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. Ignores my complaints</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. Disregards my best interests</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. Help available for my problems (R)</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. Cares about my well being (R)</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9. Helps/perform to best of ability</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10. Fails to notice my best work</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11. Helps me with special favors (R)</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12. Cares about general satisfaction (R)</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13. Would take advantage of me</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14. Shows little concern for me</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15. Cares about my opinion (R)</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16. Takes pride in my accomplishments (R)</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17. Tries to make job interesting (R)</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18. Free to discuss work problems (R)</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19. Trust in immediate supervisor (R)</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20. If make mistake, forgiven (R)</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21. Supervisor friendly/approachable (R)</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22. Count on supervisor if difficulties (R)</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23. Trust in workgroup (R)</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24. Workgroup members keep confidences (R)</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25. Trust workgroup will treat fairly (R)</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26. Count on workgroup if difficulties (R)</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27. Management little regard for well being</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28. Management cannot be trusted</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29. Managements’ decisions justified (R)</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30. Management does not do as they say</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31. Supervisors ask for suggestions (R)</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32. Supervisors act on criticism (R)</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33. Supervisors listen to complaints (R)</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34. Ask supervisor’s opinion (R)</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35. Supv. follow up peoples opinions (R)</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36. Supervisors suggest new ideas (R)</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37. Supervisors listen to bad news (R)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38. Listen to ideas of co-workers (R)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39. Supervisors listen to new ideas (R)</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q40. Supervisors follow-up suggestions (R)</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41. Supervisors ask for personal opinions</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42. Listen to supervisors’ suggestions</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaboration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43. Friendly and cooperative relations</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44. Poor communications (R)</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q45. Conflict among departments (R)</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q46. Difficult to coordinate actions (R)</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q47. Cooperation in the workgroup</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48. Communication good in workgroup</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q49. Trust in workgroup</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q50. Friendly atmosphere in workgroup</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q51. Workgroup cooperation</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q52. Help with difficult jobs</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q53. Friction among workgroup members (R)</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Note. \[ N = 126. \] Questions 1 through 43, 47 and 48 measured with 5-point type Likert scale with 1 = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree; Questions 44, 45, 50 and 51 measured with 5-point Likert type scale with 1 = less than 20% of the time and 5 = 80 to 100% of the time; Questions 46, 52 and 53 measured with 5-point Likert type scale with 1 = practically never and 5 = almost always; (R) denotes responses which were reversed for data analysis. Complete questions and permissions to use the scales contained in Appendix E.
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Other:

Paper reviewer for:
- 1993 Association of Management Annual Conference.
- 1993 and 1994 Midwest Academy of Management Annual Conference.

Currently being considered as a reviewer for:
- Academy of Management Journal.
- Academy of Management Review

AWARDS


1991-92; Recipient of the Cunningham Dissertation Year Fellowship at Virginia Tech. Fellowship worth approximately $15,000.

PAPERS


Janice Black


PRESENTATIONS


Janice Black

presented at the annual meeting of the Virginia Community College Association, Richmond, VA.


Janice Adele Black