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Abstract

Recent studies on empowerment in public administration have shown many benefits of employee empowerment, including higher job satisfaction, organizational commitment, innovative behavior, and perception of workgroup performance (Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2011, 2013a, 2013b). However, empowerment’s potential contributions to individual and organizational performance remain largely unexplored. The few studies that have examined the connection between employee empowerment and performance outcomes relied on self-reported measures, which are unreliable and inaccurate (Meier & O’Toole, 2013). Moreover, these studies do not provide much insight about the underlying processes through which empowerment from the top of an organization may trickle down to the bottom of the organization.

The present study fills these gaps by examining the direct and indirect effects of empowering managerial practices on attitudes, behaviors, and performance of employees at both the individual and workgroup levels. The main research question of this study is: does empowerment lead to higher employee and organization performance in public agencies? To address this question, the study develops a cascading or “trickle-down” model of empowering leadership, in which senior managers’ empowering managerial practices are expected to influence junior managers’ empowerment practices, which, in turn, are expected to affect frontline employees’ work behaviors. More specifically, this study first examines how senior managers’ empowering leadership practices affects junior managers’ feelings of being empowered and their use of empowering practices
toward their direct reports. Second, this study examines the association of junior managers’ empowering leadership practices with performance outcomes at different levels. These effects are evaluated in relation to employee effectiveness (i.e., task performance, conscientiousness, and voice), workgroup effectiveness (unit-level task performance, conscientiousness, and voice as well as overall work-unit effectiveness), and managerial effectiveness. Finally, assuming a distinction in the leadership influence between upper and lower levels (Yang, Zhang, & Tsui, 2010), this study examines whether the influence of senior managers’ empowering leadership practices can be achieved through full or partial mediation (i.e., the cascading effect) by junior managers’ psychological empowerment and their empowering leadership practices.

These linkages are assessed with data collected from 507 manager-supervisor-subordinate triads in law enforcement agencies in Ohio. The problem of common method bias is addressed by employing three separate surveys and three sources of data: frontline employees, line supervisors (i.e., junior police officers), and senior team leaders (i.e., senior police officers). The analysis shows a positive relationship between senior (upper-level) and junior police officers (lower-level)’ empowering leadership and this relationship is mediated by junior police officers’ perceived psychological empowerment. It also reveals positive associations between junior police officers’ empowering leadership (lower-level) practices and the behaviors and performance of their direct reports and workgroups. Furthermore, the analysis suggests that the influence of senior police officers’ empowering leadership on group-level performance outcomes are mediated first by junior police officers’ perceptions of psychological empowerment and second by their use of empowering leadership. However, there is only marginal support
for such three-path mediation effects on employee in-role and extra-role behaviors at the individual level. Finally, while junior police officers’ empowering leadership is positively related to subordinate ratings of managerial effectiveness, there is no such association with supervisor ratings of managerial effectiveness.

The present study provides a better understanding of the influences of employee empowerment across organizational hierarchy, by demonstrating that the influences of empowering leadership occur not only directly, among immediate followers, but also indirectly, across hierarchical levels, through the cascading of senior leaders' influences on subordinate leader behaviors. Theoretical and practical implications for research on empowering leadership, psychological empowerment, individual and group-level performance outcomes, and managerial effectiveness are discussed.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Over the past several decades, governments around the globe have undertaken various reform initiatives to improve the productivity of public sector employees and the quality of services offered by government organizations. These reform initiatives started with the New Public Management (NPM) movement in the 1990s in the USA, Europe, and parts of Asia (Hood, 1991). The key goals behind these efforts were to make public organizations less bureaucratic and more result-oriented, accountable, and customer-driven (Brudney, Hebert, & Wright, 1999; Brudney & Wright, 2002; Christensen, Laegreid, & Wise, 2002; Frederickson, 1996; Kellough & Selden, 2003; Moynihan, 2006a; Osborne & Gaebler, 1992). One of the key ideas that were put forward in the NPM movement was decentralization and employee empowerment (Lynn, 1998; Peters & Pierre, 2000; Pitts, 2005; Richards, 1989). The expectation was that empowerment would lead to improved decision-making at the service delivery level and a more productive and motivated workforce (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Petter et al., 2002; Seibert, Wang, & Courtright, 2011; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990).

Subsequent studies on employee empowerment in the public sector showed many benefits, including improved employee job satisfaction, organizational commitment, employee in-role and extra-role performance, innovative behavior, and perception of workgroup performance (Cho & Faerman, 2010; Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2011, 2013a, 2013b, 2013c; Lee, Cayer, & Lan, 2006; Moon, 2000; Moynihan & Landuyt, 2008; Peters & Savoie, 1996; Petter et al., 2002). However, a key question remains
largely unexplored: does empowerment lead to higher employee and organization performance? The few studies that have examined the connection between empowerment and employee and workgroup/organization performance (Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2011, 2013a, 2013b) relied on self-reports of employee performance and employee perceptions of workgroup performance, which are often unreliable and inaccurate (Meier & O'Toole, 2013a, 2013b). Moreover, these studies do not provide much insight about the underlying process through which empowerment from the top of the organization may trickle down to the bottom of the organization.

This dissertation thus fills gaps in the public employee empowerment literature by examining the connections between empowering leadership practices and employee and workgroup performance. It tests a cascading or “trickle-down” model of employee empowerment across three levels, from senior managers to mid-level/junior managers to frontline employees, to provide a better understanding of the influence of empowerment across organizational hierarchy. The key questions that the dissertation addresses are:

RQ 1a: Does empowering leadership by senior public managers lead to higher levels of empowerment as perceived by junior public managers?

RQ 1b: Are empowered public managers more likely to use empowering leadership practices with their subordinates?

RQ 2a: Does empowering leadership by junior public managers lead to higher ratings of employee (a) task performance, (b) conscientiousness, and (c) voice behavior?

RQ 2b: Does empowering leadership by junior public managers lead to higher ratings of unit-level (a) task performance, (b) conscientiousness, (c) voice,
and (d) overall unit effectiveness?

RQ 3: Does empowering leadership by senior public managers have an indirect influence on the behaviors and performance of employees and workgroups?

RQ 4: Does empowering leadership by junior public managers lead to higher ratings of managerial effectiveness?

To answer these questions, this dissertation examines the cascading effect model of empowering leadership on the attitudes, behaviors, and performance. Specifically, this model proposes that junior managers who have an empowering boss are more likely to feel psychologically empowered than those who do not have an empowering boss. Then, these empowered managers in turn are expected to be more likely to empower their subordinates. The model also suggests that empowering leadership by senior and junior managers will lead to higher levels of individual and group performance and that the influences of senior managers’ empowering leadership on individual and group level outcomes will be mediated by junior managers’ empowering leadership. Finally, a positive relationship between empowerment leadership and managerial effectiveness is anticipated. These linkages are tested with data collected using four survey instruments from 507 police officers working in various law enforcement agencies in Ohio. Given the nested nature of the data, hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002; Snijders & Bosker, 2012) and structural equation modeling are used to test the hypotheses.

By thoroughly addressing the research questions, this study advances prior research on employee empowerment in public organizations in five ways. First, this study
examines how empowering leadership practices by supervisors affect their supervisees’ engagement in empowering leadership practices. Despite a well-established relationship between structural empowerment practices and psychological empowerment experience, the relationship between senior and junior managers’ empowering leadership has not been studied extensively. This study aims to examine the trickle-down effect of empowering leadership on followers’ experiences of and engagement in empowerment practices. Specifically, this study examines whether a senior manager’s use of empowering leadership practices affects his or her immediate subordinate’s (i.e., junior manager’s) perception of psychological empowerment. Then, this study investigates whether empowered junior managers are likely to engage in empowering managerial practices with their own subordinates.

Second, this study examines the associations between empowering leadership practices and performance outcomes at both individual and workgroup levels. It considers the relationships between empowering leadership and both in-role and extra-role behavior of employees. Three behavioral outcomes that are examined are employee task performance (Williams & Anderson, 1991), conscientiousness (Organ, 1997; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 2000), and improvement-centered voice (Van Dyne & Lepine, 1998). Prior research in public administration (PA) has focused primarily on the effects of empowerment on employee work attitudes. By examining the influence of empowering leadership on employee behaviors, this study makes an important contribution to research on empowerment in public agencies. Moreover, data for the behavioral outcomes of subordinates in this study are gathered from their supervisors, whereas data for empowering leadership practices are obtained from subordinates. The
use of multiple-sources minimizes concerns about common source bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003; Podsakoff & Organ, 1986).

Third, this study extends previous research by examining the relationships between empowering leadership and outcomes at the workgroup level. Prior studies have largely focused on individual-level outcomes. To the best of my knowledge, this is the first study to explore the associations of empowering leadership with workgroup-level outcomes using multisource data in public agencies.

Fourth, this study develops and tests a cascading or “trickle-down” model of employee empowerment. By examining the hierarchical cascading effects, this study provides insight about the indirect effects of senior managers’ leadership practices on both individual and workgroup behavioral outcomes. It also highlights the different roles of leaders at upper and lower levels (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1993; Porter & McLaughlin, 2006; Yang, Zhang, & Tsui, 2010). The simultaneous consideration of both upper-level and lower-level leaders provides a better understanding of the influence of employee empowerment across the organizational hierarchy.

Finally, this study investigates the effects of empowering leadership practices on managerial effectiveness with multi source data. Prior research on this relationship used primarily subordinate ratings of managerial effectiveness. Few studies have used the supervisors’ ratings. By using both supervisor and subordinate ratings of managerial effectiveness, this study provides a more robust test of this relationship.
1.1. Overview of the Law Enforcement Context

As noted earlier, the research model of this study is tested with data from law enforcement agencies in Ohio. Law enforcement organizations provide an interesting research context for empirically testing the influence of employee empowerment for two reasons. First, police organizations are generally considered to be highly bureaucratic with high levels of centralization, specialization, and formalization (Davies & Thomas, 2003; Jermier & Berkes, 1979; Maguire, 1997). In this sense, police organizations are very much like the classic Weberian bureaucracies, marked by hierarchical administrative structures and highly routinized patterns of work activities and processes (Nicholson-Crotty & O'Toole, 2004). However, Davies and Thomas (2003, p. 683) referred police organizations as “mock bureaucracy,” where formal and informal work practices coexist. Also, most, if not all police organizations, especially larger ones, tend to have tall organizational structures, consisting of more than five ranks of hierarchy (Shane, 2011). Police officers also tend to view their organizations as para-militaristic, hierarchical, and bureaucratic structures (King, 2005), in particular, for uniformed patrol officers who deliver police services on a regular basis (Vuorensyrja, 2014). One can argue that any profession where its employees are uniformed, with visible manifestations of rank, and where one might lay down one’s life on the job, is generally hierarchical (police, fire fighters, military). Hierarchical behavior will, though, vary with situation: i.e., less hierarchy under peaceful, quiet circumstances, much hierarchy under volatile circumstances.

Second, police work has been characterized by "a discretionary paradox" (Jermier & Berkes, 1979): i.e., while frontline police officers are given considerable discretion,
police agencies tend to be highly rule-bound and bureaucratic. In this sense, police officers have more opportunity to engage in discretionary behavior (e.g., with a citizen), while at the same time, they are constrained by standardized procedures. Some scholars have also noted that police officers who have leadership responsibilities tend to prefer a control-oriented style in managing subordinates (Steinheider & Wuestewald, 2008; Wuestewald & Steinheider, 2006). Recent police reform efforts, however, have focused on decentralizing decision authority and increasing work autonomy of police officers at the street level (Steinheider & Wuestewald, 2008; Wuestewald & Steinheider, 2006).

There has also been increasing interest in using empowering managerial practices in law enforcement organizations in the United States (Wuestewald & Steinheider, 2006). Several studies, for example, have indicated that law enforcement agencies are increasingly adopting the participative style of leadership and self-managed teams to respond to changing times and new problems (Maguire, 1997; Morreale & Ortmeier, 2004; Steinheider & Wuestewald, 2008; Switzer, 2010; Wuestewald & Steinheider, 2006). However, these changes in management style have not been explicitly examined with empirical studies in police organizations, while it has been extensively studied in private businesses (Maynard, Gilson, & Mathieu, 2012; Seibert, Silver, & Randolph, 2004; Seibert et al., 2011). Furthermore, some scholars have noted that although many police organizations have attempted to decentralize operational decision-making processes, they still are very hierarchical and centralized (Maguire, 1997; Shane, 2011; Steinheider & Wuestewald, 2008). This suggests the need for more empirical research on the effects of employee empowerment in law enforcement organizations.
1.2. Overview of Remaining Chapters

The rest of this dissertation is structured as follows. Chapter 2 provides a thorough review of the relevant literature on employee empowerment. Based on the literature summary, Chapter 3 presents the research model and hypotheses that will be tested in this study. This chapter explicitly draws together previously outlined evidence to support the argument underlying the study’s hypotheses. Chapter 4 provides an explanation of the procedures and methods of data collection and measurement, and discusses the statistical techniques used in the analysis. Chapter 5 presents the test results of the data analyses. Finally, Chapter 6 provides some theoretical and practical implications of the findings, as well as limitations and future research directions.
Chapter 2: A Review of the Literature

The purpose of this chapter is to review the extant literature on employee empowerment. The literature review aims to collect empirical evidence that will contribute to answering the research questions. To address the first set of research questions, it summarizes research studies on the relationship between structural and psychological empowerment, which are distinct but highly correlated constructs. Next, it investigates the antecedents and consequences of the two constructs to identify the gaps in our knowledge of employee empowerment practices. Finally, it presents an analytical review of the literature on employee empowerment, particularly in the field of public administration (PA), thus defining opportunities for future research. More specifically, this review focuses on the ways in which the concept of empowerment has been defined and conceptualized in PA, and identifies the need for more rigor in conceptualizing the construct. Additionally, this chapter reviews empirical studies relating to the antecedents and outcomes of employee empowerment, to help address the second set of research questions about the potential benefits of empowering managerial practices for individual and organizational performance.

In order to conduct a comprehensive literature review, I identified empowerment studies in three ways: (1) a manual scan of journals in related fields, including management, psychology, organizational behavior, and public administration; (2) a web-based search of the terms psychological empowerment, structural empowerment, empowering managerial practices, and empowering leadership in key research databases;
and (3) a scan of reference lists from the articles identified through the prior methods. The next section explains how employee empowerment is conceptualized in various disciplines and how it is distinct from other related constructs.

2.1. Defining Empowerment

The term empowerment, at least initially, appeared in the late 1960s within the discipline of religious studies, to refer to some way of sharing power with, or providing power to, those who are powerless (Lincoln et al., 2002). Since then, it has been used in multiple disciplines, including psychology, sociology, education, social work, and management (Bartunek & Spreitzer, 2006). Empowerment, in its most general sense, is defined as a process by which individuals or groups gain mastery over their lives (Rappaport, 1985, 1987). While there are a variety of different definitions, a historical review of empowerment research in organizational settings shows that the literature has evolved to incorporate three different aspects of empowerment: sharing real power, fostering employee welfare, and fostering productivity or motivation (Bartunek & Spreitzer, 2006). In their review of the construct and its evolution, Bartunek and Spreitzer (2006) noted that the meaning of empowerment has evolved to incorporate methods or techniques that may foster worker motivation and productivity in the workplace.

In organizational settings, empowerment is viewed both as a process and as an outcome. Many organizational scholars view empowerment as a process of sharing power and authority throughout the ranks of an organization. Leach, Wall, and Jackson (2003, p. 37), for example, defined empowerment as “a systematic change involving not only the provision of authority to take a greater range of decisions and actions, but also alignments within the wider system to enable operators to deploy that enhanced authority.” A more
A comprehensive definition provided by Conger and Kanungo (1988, p. 474) characterizes 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 techniques.” In contrast, empowerment as an outcome is seen as increased task or work motivation, which is then manifested in a set of cognitions reflecting that a worker’s orientation to his or her work role is being shaped by the immediate work environment (Spreitzer, 1995; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990).

Employee empowerment has its theoretical roots in the human relations movement in the late 1920s and early 1930s (Boje & Rosile, 2001; Eylon, 1998). Contrary to the ideas of scientific management (Taylor, 1911), Mayo and others who started the Human Relations movement suggested that workers could be self-motivated to carry out good work without close supervision. This was also emphasized earlier by Mary Parker Follett (1924), who extensively discussed the appropriate way of exercising managerial power/authority (Boje & Rosile, 2001; Eylon, 1998). Building on the legacy of the human relations movement, many businesses started experimenting with empowerment initiatives in the second half of the twentieth century. These initiatives include the 1960s job enrichment movement in the U.S., the 1970s industrial democracy movement in Europe, and the quality circles and quality of working life (QWL) movements in the late 1970s and 1980s, both in the U.S. (Bartunek & Spreitzer, 2006; Lincoln et al., 2002).

Over the past few decades, organizations have become more decentralized as well as less hierarchically governed, so there is a growing interest amongst practitioners and
academics in employee empowerment. The recent attention to employee empowerment in
the organizational research, however, is different than earlier studies in several ways
(Boje & Rosile, 2001; Eylon, 1998; Jung & Lee, 2015). Earlier studies and initiatives
focused more on protecting or ensuring employee rights in the workplace and increasing
employee power or influence over decision-making procedures. Employee empowerment
initiatives in many countries in Western Europe, for example, were concerned about the
representation of employees in management decision-making through unionization and
collective bargaining (Eylon, 1998). These efforts were primarily designed to increase the
power of employees over decision-making processes in their organizations. Further,
although some initial empowerment initiatives (i.e., quality circles and quality of working
life programs) were introduced in the U.S. to improve organizational productivity, the
major goals were reducing employee absenteeism and turnover (Lincoln et al., 2002).

In contrast, more recent empowerment initiatives have emphasized improving
employee motivation and proactivity (Bartunek & Spreitzer, 2006; Osborne & Gaebler,
1992; Spreitzer, 1995; Spreitzer, Kizilos, & Nason, 1997). Organizations in the public
and private sectors are undertaking various empowerment initiatives to motivate workers
to go beyond their formal job requirements, to engage in extra-role or citizenship
behaviors that can improve the organization’s performance or effectiveness. The next
section reviews the current literature to examine how the concept of employee
empowerment has developed. The purpose of this review is to identify and evaluate the
published definition of the term “empowerment” and explore possible linkages between
different aspects of empowerment.
2.2. Different Approaches to Research on Employee Empowerment

The discussion and research on employee empowerment can be grouped into socio-structural perspectives and psychological perspectives (see c.f., Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2013b; Spreitzer, 1995; Wallace et al., 2011). The socio-structural perspective is largely concerned with the process of empowering employees by altering organizational or decision-making structures or through the use of certain organizational or managerial practices. The psychological perspective, in contrast, focuses on identifying the psychological states or feelings of empowered employees at the individual level. While most studies rely on one or the other approach, there have been some efforts to combine or integrate the two perspectives (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2011, 2013c; Menon, 2001). In these integrated studies, empowering organizational or managerial practices are generally proposed as predictors of employees’ psychological empowerment. Section 2.2.1 briefly reviews each of these approaches.

2.2.1. The Socio-structural Perspective

In the socio-structural perspective, empowerment has largely been described as a relational and power-sharing phenomenon (Srivastava, Bartol, & Locke, 2006). It has roots in the civil rights movement and the women’s rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s, when employee input and influence/control over organizational decision-making were viewed as a right of workers (Harrison & Freeman, 2004; Wilkinson & Dundon, 2010). The academic as well as popular writings on issues like worker rights, industrial democracy, and participative management focused on providing workers greater opportunity to become involved in their organizations’ decision-making structure/process. Over time, this discussion moved towards changing the design of jobs.
to provide employees with higher levels of decision-making authority (Prasad, 2001; Spreitzer, 2008; Spreitzer & Doneson, 2005).

More recent socio-structural research has focused on identifying a set of practices and techniques that can empower workers (Eylon & Bamberger, 2000). These studies suggest that empowerment occurs through organizational and structural changes and by delegating decision-making authority or power to lower levels of the organizational hierarchy. Additionally, empowerment is described as empowering acts/practices (organizational or managerial) that purposefully change structural and contextual factors of the work environment (Eylon & Bamberger, 2000). Some recent research has also proposed the idea of an empowering organizational climate (Seibert et al., 2004), defined as shared perceptions of employees about organizational structures, policies, and practices that promote empowerment. This research has also noted that structural empowerment is not an individual-level construct, but rather an organization/unit level construct.

A great deal of the discussion in the literature on structural empowerment describes ways that organizations or managers may successfully empower employees (i.e., the organizational perspective) (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Kark, Shamir, & Chen, 2003; Konczak, Stelly, & Trusty, 2000; Spreitzer, De Janasz, & Quinn, 1999) and how these practices, in turn, may affect organization and employee performance (Ahearne, Mathieu, & Rapp, 2005; Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2011, 2013b; Kirkman & Rosen, 1999; Kirkman et al., 2004). The next section discusses these organizational and managerial practices in more detail.
2.2.1.1. Organizational Perspective of Structural Empowerment

As previously noted, from an organizational perspective structural empowerment has been described as changes in the structural conditions that cause a shift from a sense of powerlessness to a sense of empowerment. The focus is on changing existing organizational structures, policies, and practices, with an aim to share power/authority and responsibility with employees at all levels (Foster-Fishman & Keys, 1995; Quinn & Spreitzer, 1997). One of the earliest proponents of this perspective was Rosabeth Moss Kanter (1977). In her seminal work *Men and Women of the Corporation*, she identified three central elements of structural empowerment: (1) the opportunity structure, (2) the power structure, and (3) the proportional distribution of power of different kinds within the organization. The opportunity structure refers to job conditions that provide individuals with opportunity for growth and mobility. The power structure refers to a person’s ability to access three sources of organizational power: (1) lines of information, (2) lines of support, and (3) lines of resources. Access to lines of information means having formal and informal knowledge that is necessary to carry out job activities. Access to lines of support involves receiving feedback, guidance, and support for exercising discretion in one’s job from supervisors, peers, and subordinates in an organization. Access to lines of resources refers to having the ability to obtain the materials, money, time, rewards, and supplies required to accomplish job demands. Finally, the distribution of power refers to the extent to which individuals have autonomy to carry out their work activities satisfactorily. Later, Kanter (1977, 1993) refined her model and argued that empowerment occurs when employees have access to opportunity structure, power structure, and have the ability to carry out their work successfully. She
also discussed the values or benefits of creating structurally empowering work conditions.

Drawing on Kanter’s work, Laschinger et al. (2004) further operationalized empowerment structures as a function of employees’ access to sources of structural power (i.e., information, resources, support, and opportunity structures), as well as to the sources of formal and informal lines of power. Many studies have found that employees’ perceptions of formal power, informal power, and access to empowerment structures increase their work satisfaction, work engagement, and work effectiveness, and decrease turnover intention (Laschinger et al., 2004). In addition, employees’ perceptions of access to workplace empowerment are linked in some studies to their health and well-being (Laschinger et al., 2010).

While Kanter’s concept of structural empowerment has been extensively used in certain disciplines (e.g., nursing studies), management researchers have not studied in detail the wider implications of structural power within organizations. Some researchers and practitioners have attempted to explore the ways organizational structures and processes change to empower employees at the workplace. A central tenet here is the fostering of formalized decentralization in decision-making (Mintzberg, 1979). For instance, Hempel, Zhang, and Han (2012), in a study of employees in a high-technology industry, found that decentralized organizational structures helped to improve employees’ perceptions of empowerment by allowing delegation and downward decision-making. They also suggested that the formalization of organization processes led to an increase in empowerment by reducing uncertainty related to job accomplishment and work roles.
2.2.1.2. Managerial Perspectives of Structural Empowerment

In contrast to the organizational perspective, the managerial perspective (both at
the macro and micro levels) explicates the role of management or leadership in
empowering employees (Menon, 2001). This research has focused on empowerment
initiatives in workgroups and expanded the scope of empowerment beyond the status or
distribution of power, to include a specific set of managerial actions aimed at promoting
employee involvement and participation. It has also focused more on the behavioral
aspects of employee involvement and participation, and identified specific practices or
techniques that can render an empowering climate in which employees feel inspired,
motivated, and confident (Ahearne et al., 2005; Avelino, 2009; Zhang & Bartol, 2010).
Research on the managerial practices perspective on employee empowerment can be
grouped into four broad streams/categories: (a) high-involvement management practices,
(b) participative decision-making (PDM), (c) self-managing teams, and (d) empowering
leadership (Arnold et al., 2000; Boudrias et al., 2009; Cotton et al., 1988; Druskat &
Wheeler, 2003; Guthrie, 2001; Kirkman & Rosen, 1999; Lawler, 1994; Ledford &
Mohrman, 1993; Ugboro & Obeng, 2000). The techniques in all four streams seek to
enhance employee work motivation, organizational commitment, and job performance to
increase organizational performance (Lawler, 1992; Levine, 1995; Pfeffer, 1998). The
rest of this section discusses each of these four streams of research in more detail.
**High-involvement Management Practices**

While discussing the role of management in employee empowerment, Bowen and Lawler (1995) noted that empowerment is a cognitive state among employees created by high-involvement management practices. In an earlier study, Bowen and Lawler (1992) identified four high-involvement management practices: (1) distributing decision-making authority to lower levels of the organization, (2) providing employees access to performance-related information, (3) improving employee skills and knowledge through appropriate training, and (4) recognizing employee performance through appropriate rewards and incentives in the organization. These four practices also mirror the structural changes that Kanter (1977) noted as necessary for empowering employees. Bowen and Lawler (1992, 1995) argued that a system of high-involvement management practices can create feelings of empowerment by enhancing employee perceptions of control, by creating awareness about the business and the strategic context of the organization, and by providing appropriate incentives and an accountability system for high performance.

Numerous studies have found support for the positive relation between high-involvement management practices and employee involvement and productivity. Guthrie (2001), for example, demonstrated a positive association between employee retention and firm productivity. A meta-analysis by Brown (1996) concluded that the use of high-involvement work practices is positively correlated with employee job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational effectiveness, and negatively correlated with employee job stress, turnover intention, actual turnover, and absenteeism.
Participatory Decision-Making

Considerable research during the 1970s and 1980s focused on the effects of participatory decision-making on employee motivation and organizational performance. The most noteworthy result of this research was the Vroom-Yetton-Jago decision-making model (Vroom & Jago, 1988; Vroom & Yetton, 1973). Vroom and Yetton (1973), and subsequently Vroom and Jago (1988), articulated a normative model of decision-making that prescribed when and how leaders should involve their subordinates in the decision-making process. They identified a set of alternative decision-making processes, ranging from highly autocratic to consultative to highly participative/inclusive. This represents a spectrum of participative behavior choices in the leadership process, such as the manager asking the opinions of a few employees to involving all employees in a group decision. The normative decision-making model suggests that managers should adapt their decision-making styles according to situational factors, such as the nature of the problem to be solved and the context in which the decision is made.

Vroom and Yetton (1973) noted that employee participation can improve employee job involvement and organizational commitment. Moreover, they suggested that participatory decision-making is most effective under certain conditions: (1) when there is a need for higher decision quality, (2) when subordinates have adequate knowledge and understanding of the issue at hand, and (3) when subordinates may not implement the decision effectively unless there is a consensus about the issue/problem. Additionally, Vroom and Yetton (1973) also noted that managers are more likely to move from an authoritarian to a more inclusive/participative style when the organization has a decentralized or less authoritarian structure. Some subsequent studies have suggested that
managers are more likely to employ participatory decision-making when they believe PDM enhances organizational effectiveness and does not endanger their organizational power (Field, 1982; Heilman et al., 1984; Parnell & Bell, 1994; Vroom & Jago, 1978). Moreover, Heilman et al. (1984) found that participative leaders were rated by their subordinates to be more effective than autocratic leaders.

It is important to note that the focus in the Vroom-Yetton-Jago model is on managers rather than employees. Recent research has given more attention to the perspectives of employees in decision making. Cotton et al. (1988), for instance, classified different forms of employee participation based on four factors: formal vs. informal, direct vs. indirect, content of decisions involved, and short term vs. long term. Based on these factors, they identified six distinct forms of formal employee participation in decision-making: participation in work decisions, consultative participation, short-term participation, informal participation, employee ownership, and representative bureaucracy. The first two forms (i.e., participation in work decision and consultative participation) are classified as formal, direct, and showing high to medium employee influence on decisions that are focused on employee work job issues. Short-term participation is similar to participation in work decisions and consultative participation, but with a different duration. Conversely, employee ownership and representative bureaucracy are both formal and indirect, but employee ownership (high influence) has greater employee influence than representative bureaucracy (medium to low influence).

The essence of participatory decision-making is that greater employee involvement improves employee motivation and hence performance, by promoting shared responsibility and accountability (Arnold et al., 2000; Chen & Tesluk, 2012;
Seibert et al., 2004). Reviews and meta-analysis on PDM research (Cotton et al., 1988; Locke & Schweiger, 1979; Wagner, 1994) have suggested that the effects of PDM on attitudinal and behavioral outcomes are generally positive. Studies have also shown positive effects of employee participation on work satisfaction and performance (Black & Gregersen, 1997; Jackson, 1983; Lam, Chen, & Schaubroeck, 2002). Employee participation has also been linked to autonomy and perceived control by employees. A meta-analytic study by Spector (1986) found that employees who perceived high levels of job control were more likely to be satisfied, committed, involved, and motivated, and to perform better and hold greater expectancies. Perceived job control is also found to relate negatively to employee absenteeism, turnover intention, actual turnover, and role ambiguity (Spector, 1986).

**Self-managing Teams**

To improve work quality and to respond to higher competition from companies abroad, many manufacturing firms in the U.S. started relying on self-managing teams in the 1970s and 1980s. Self-managing teams are basically “groups of interdependent individuals that can self-regulate on relatively whole tasks” (Cohen & Ledford, 1994, p. 13). Members of self-managing work teams typically have the authority to make decisions necessary to complete the team’s job function, and take collective responsibility for their decisions and actions. An ideal self-managing team includes cross-trained workers who have a variety of job skills related to their tasks, and the team members receive feedback from one another on their performance (Wall et al., 1986). The best example of self-managing teams is the NUMMI car assembly plant, a joint venture between General Motors and Toyota. Following Japanese management practice, it used a
bundle of coordinated measures, including participation at work, quality circles, and work-redesign, which gradually evolved into self-managing teams. Since its popularity in academic and business circles began to boom in the 80s, self-managing work teams have been employed in various industry sectors with an explicit aim to improve product or service quality, employee productivity, organizational learning, and employee commitment (Cohen & Ledford, 1994).

Introduced under the rubric of employee participation and empowerment, the central principle behind self-managing teams is that team members should have discretion over their work methods and decisions (Cohen, Ledford, & Spreitzer, 1996; Follett, 1924; Langfred, 2004; Wellins et al., 1990). Indeed, conceptually, members of self-managing teams are encouraged to be involved and to participate “in making decisions that were formerly the province of supervisors and managers” (Cohen & Bailey, 1997, p. 242). In this sense, the use of self-managing teams represents a more decentralized and less visible approach to control, by shifting monitoring, evaluation, and disciplinary responsibilities to the hands of team members. Studies have demonstrated that employees in self-managing teams feel more empowered and motivated to complete their work (e.g., Druskat & Wheeler, 2003; Kirkman & Rosen, 1999).

To gain a better understanding of how the structural features of self-managing teams affect employee empowerment, Barker (1993) conducted an ethnographic study in a small manufacturing company. Barker (1993) noted that organizations can employ four distinct worker control strategies on a continuum of low to high levels of work autonomy: simple control, technical control, bureaucratic control, and concertive control. Furthermore, he asserted that the locus of control shifts from management to the workers
as organizational structures change from a bureaucratic/hierarchical to a decentralized, flat, or participatory structure. In his qualitative investigation, Barker found that self-managing teams represent collaborative worker management, which is governed by the system of concertive control. Furthermore, he suggested that employee empowerment is more likely to occur when organizations rely more on concertive control and rely less on formal/bureaucratic control.

Empirical research has also shown many potential benefits of self-managing teams. Several quasi-experiments, for example, have found positive effects on cost-savings, employee job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and productivity (Cohen & Bailey, 1997; Cohen et al., 1996; Wall et al., 1986). Other types of research also have indicated that the employee empowerment promoted in self-managing teams is positively associated with team productivity, customer and job satisfaction, and worker organizational commitment (Burpitt & Bigoness, 1997; Kirkman & Rosen, 1999; Kirkman et al., 2004). However, there are a few studies that found no or negative effects of self-managing teams on employee work attitude and performance. These studies showed that employees reported greater turnover intention and actual turnover in self-managing teams, compared to traditionally managed work groups (Cohen & Bailey, 1997; Cohen & Bailey, 1997; Cohen et al., 1996; Wall et al., 1986).
Empowering Leadership

Empowering leadership is a style of leadership that facilitates performance by creating an empowered work environment and encouraging workers in their work roles (Arnold et al., 2000). Empowering leadership fits in the research stream of socio-structural empowerment because it focuses on the managerial perspective of empowerment (Mathieu, Gilson, & Ruddy, 2006; Wallace et al., 2011). Increasing attention has been given to describing managerial practices that can be directed toward increasing employee empowerment, and to understanding their impact on employee responses in organizations (Chen, Lam, & Zhong, 2007; Seibert et al., 2004; Wallace et al., 2011). Conger and Kanungo (1988), for instance, suggested two main roles for managers with respect to empowering workers: (1) diagnosis of the situation to discover causes of powerlessness, and (2) the implementation of strategies to remove the conditions of powerlessness and to build a sense of self-efficacy and empowerment.

Over the last few decades, organizational scholars have devoted considerable effort to identifying various types of managerial actions or practices that can increase employee perceptions of empowerment (Maynard et al., 2012; Seibert et al., 2011). These management actions include, but are not limited to, delegating decision-making authority to subordinates, soliciting input or suggestions from subordinates when making decisions, enhancing subordinates’ senses of personal control (i.e., both work autonomy and impact) and accountability, providing subordinates access to important resources and information, helping subordinates to develop skills and self-confidence, rewarding subordinates for higher efforts and performance, and removing bureaucratic constraints (Ahearne et al., 2005; Arnold et al., 2000; Bowen & Lawler, 1992, 1995; Conger & Kanungo, 1988;
Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2011, 2013b; Randolph, 1995; Srivastava et al., 2006; Wilkinson, 1998). Many of these empowering leadership practices were also identified and discussed in research on high-involvement management practices, participatory decision-making, and self-managing teams.

Recently, several attempts have been made to consolidate the list of empowering leadership practices. One notable empowering leadership model was developed by Arnold et al. (2000), who proposed and validated a five-factor construct that consisted of (1) coaching, (2) informing, (3) leading by example, (4) showing concern, and (5) participative decision-making. A separate four-factor construct proposed and validated by Ahearne et al. (2005) included: (1) enhancing the meaningfulness of work, (2) fostering participation in decision-making, (3) expressing confidence in high performance, and (4) providing autonomy and removing bureaucratic constraints. More recently, Boudrias et al. (2009) put forward a five-factor measure of empowering leadership that included (1) delegation of authority, (2) fostering development of subordinate skills, (3) communicating relevant job information, (4) recognizing and rewarding subordinate performance, and (5) maintaining positive relations with the group.

The variety in these models indicates that there still is a lack of agreement on what actually constitutes empowering leadership. Despite the differences, there are some similar themes and overlapping managerial practices, particularly supporting/coaching, recognizing, delegating, and consulting (Boudrias et al., 2009; Srivastava et al., 2006). Studies on empowering leadership have provided support for many positive influences of these practices, at both the individual and the organizational level (Chen et al., 2011; Lorinkova, Pearsall, & Sims, 2013; Raub & Robert, 2010, 2013; Zhang & Bartol, 2010).
Specifically, studies have found positive connections between empowering leadership and employee in-role and extra-role performance (Raub & Robert, 2010), voice (Raub & Robert, 2013), intention to engage in innovation (Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2013c), innovative thinking and behavior (Chen et al., 2011), creativity (Zhang & Bartol, 2010), knowledge sharing (Srivastava et al., 2006) and proactivity (Martin, Liao, & Campbell, 2013). At the workgroup and the organizational level, research has shown that empowering leadership can improve employee productivity and organizational performance (e.g., Srivastava et al., 2006; Vecchio, Justin, & Pearce, 2010).

**Summary and Limitations of the Social-Structural Perspective**

In summary, the socio-structural perspectives on empowerment have emphasized sharing power/authority and responsibility with employees (Spreitzer & Doneson, 2005). A range of managerial actions and practices can create an empowering organizational/work-unit environment and improve employees’ sense of empowerment. Advocates of this perspective have also developed various measures to assess structural forms of empowerment, including participatory decision-making, high-involvement work systems, self-managing teams, and empowering leadership. However, organizational scholars have also noted that the socio-structural perspective provides only a limited perspective because it does not capture empowerment as experienced by employees (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Spreitzer & Doneson, 2005). It only recognizes the structural features considered necessary for employee empowerment, which may not always lead to perceptions of empowerment. In a case study of a university health center, for instance, Labianca, Gray, and Brass (2000) illustrated how some empowerment tactics, such as soliciting employee input, are not sufficient to empower employees. They found a
disagreement between employees and managers on expectations of what empowerment would look like and how it would be enacted in organizations. Despite management’s efforts to empower them, employees felt certain that their inputs on the change initiatives would not be taken into account.

Furthermore, some employees may feel and act in empowered ways regardless of the extent to which employees are given a voice and are involved in decision-making. The implication of this is that empowerment includes more than just employee involvement and participation, and researchers should pay particular attention to the emotional responses of employees (Spreitzer, 1995; Spreitzer & Doneson, 2005). In response to this limitation, several researchers have utilized the psychological perspective on empowerment, which will be described next.

2.2.2. The Psychological Perspective

Unlike the socio-structural perspective, the psychological perspective on empowerment has primarily been concerned with an “empowered state of mind” (Spreitzer, 1995, 1996). Proponents of this perspective describe empowerment as “increased intrinsic task motivation” (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990, p. 666) that results from “an enabling, rather than a delegating, process” (Conger & Kanungo, 1988, p. 474). This perspective focuses on individuals’ beliefs, cognitive states, intrinsic motivations, and emotional responses to empowerment practices (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Menon, 2001; Spreitzer, 1995; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). The psychological perspective has its roots in Bandura (1977a, 1982)’s work on self-efficacy, and focuses on the psychological conditions necessary for individuals to feel a sense of control in relation to their work and an active orientation to their work role (Spreitzer, 1995; Spreitzer & Doneson, 2005).
Conger and Kanungo (1988) were the first to discuss empowerment from a psychological perspective, defining it as “a process whereby an individual’s belief in his or her self-efficacy is enhanced” (p. 474). In attempts to advance Conger and Kanungo’s initial perspective, Thomas and Velthouse (1990), and subsequently Spreitzer (1995), identified four key indicators of psychological empowerment: meaning, competence, self-determination, and choice (or impact). Meaning relates to the alignment between the demands of one’s work role and one’s own beliefs, values, and behaviors (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). It is more about the value of a work goal or purpose and concerns a sense of feeling that one’s work is personally important. Self-determination refers to employee perceptions of autonomy or freedom in choosing how to initiate and carry out tasks (Deci, Connell, & Ryan, 1989). Competence refers to a sense of self-efficacy or belief in one’s ability to perform a set of tasks successfully (Bandura, 1989; Lawler, 1973). Finally, impact represents the degree to which one views one’s behaviors as making a difference in the strategic, administrative, or operational activities and outcomes at work (Ashforth, 1989). For employees to feel empowered all four components need to be present at the same time, and the absence of any one would decrease the level of empowerment.

To measure psychological empowerment, Spreitzer (1995) developed and validated a multidimensional instrument. The psychometric properties of this instrument have been tested in many studies (Chen, Kirkman, et al., 2007; Liden, Wayne, & Sparrowe, 2000; Spreitzer et al., 1999; Spreitzer et al., 1997; Zhang & Bartol, 2010). Further, field studies have been carried out in a variety of organizational settings, ranging from managers and employees in business firms (e.g., Koberg et al., 1999; Liden et al.,
2000; Raub & Robert, 2013; Spreitzer, 1995; Spreitzer et al., 1997) to public employees in government agencies (Cho & Faerman, 2010; Feldman & Khademian, 2000). Some recent studies have also extended the concept from an individual level of analysis to a workgroup level of analysis (Kirkman & Rosen, 1999; Seibert et al., 2011) and examined it in the context of virtual teams (Kirkman et al., 2004).

It is important to note that the four cognitive states of psychological empowerment are very similar to the core elements of the job characteristics model developed earlier by Hackman and Oldham (1976, 1980). According to their theory, the extent to which an employee feels satisfied with his or her work depends on whether certain elements or features are present in his or her job. Hackman and Oldham (1976, 1980) identified five key characteristics - skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback - and noted that these characteristics affect work outcomes such as job satisfaction and involvement by establishing or improving three specific psychological states: experienced meaningfulness, experienced responsibility, and feedback/knowledge of results. These three psychological states are the exact same as the three cognitive states (meaning, competence, and self-determination) in the three-factor psychological empowerment construct. Therefore, one could argue that the multidimensional psychological empowerment construct proposed by Thomas and Velthouse (1990) and Spreitzer (1995) is just an extension of Oldham and Hackman’s (1976, 1980) job characteristics model.

In summary, the psychological perspective on empowerment focuses on the psychological state of individual employees, as a constellation of experienced cognition. This perspective sees that empowerment is not just management rhetoric and must enable
employees to feel actually empowered at work. Additionally, given the widespread acceptance of the concept, psychological empowerment provides a more efficient empirical approach with which to evaluate the effectiveness of employee empowerment (Menon, 2001). However, psychological empowerment is often criticized for being individual-centric and ignoring the underlying substantive changes within the work environment. In addition, it is difficult to judge whether employees’ beliefs that they are empowered result from leadership or organizational influence. This concern culminated in the development of the integrative perspective of empowerment, as discussed below.

2.2.3. The Integrative Perspective

Several recent studies proposed an integrative approach to employee empowerment that includes both the socio-structural and psychological perspectives (e.g., Mathieu et al., 2006; Menon, 2001). The integrative perspective is based on social cognitive theory (SCT), which suggests that personal dispositions (including psychological empowerment) are reciprocally determined by the interactions of personal, behavioral, and environmental influences (Bandura, 1986). SCT emphasizes the importance of the presence of empowering role models (e.g., empowering leaders) in stimulating individual feelings of empowerment. According to this theory, empowerment is understood as a dynamic process, in which employees’ perceptions of empowerment are shaped by interactions with particular management practices or organizational structures directed at the employees. This perspective suggests that empowerment is best conceived as an interactive process rather than a set of either organizational/managerial actions or psychological outcomes.

Proponents of the integrative approach note that despite their conceptual
differences, the structural and psychological perspectives complement one another (Eylon & Bamberger, 2000). In addition, relying on any single perspective provides only a partial and incomplete picture of a concept. Proponents of the integrative perspective argue that the structural conditions and managerial activities that are considered empowering should influence and reinforce the cognitive states of employee empowerment, and eventually promote positive outcomes (Mathieu et al., 2006; Menon, 2001; Robbins, Crino, & Fredendall, 2002). The resulting outcomes may provide further justification for the new managerial and organizational practices, which, in turn, should trigger experiences of empowerment (Mathieu et al., 2006). This suggests that in order to have a thorough understanding of the processes and manifestations of employee empowerment in organizations, one must simultaneously consider the structural and psychological perspectives.

The emergence of the integrative lens is associated with attempts to differentiate empowerment from similar concepts. Researchers often have used the term empowerment interchangeably with employee involvement, engagement, and participation in the literature (Bowen & Lawler, 1992; Honold, 1997; Olshfski & Cunningham, 1998; Wilkinson, 1998). Integrating the structural and psychological perspectives into one model would help to distinguish among related constructs, and avoid confusion (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Lee & Koh, 2001; Spreitzer, 1995). Some researchers have also noted that recent studies placed insufficient emphasis on organizational structures and management practices that actually promote empowerment; instead, the focus has been primarily on feelings of empowerment (for example Hempel et al., 2012). The sole focus on the psychological perspective also makes it difficult to
distinguish empowerment from other related psychological constructs such as self-efficacy, motivation, and positive orientation.

Several recent studies have used the integrative perspective to examine the direct and indirect effects of empowerment on various dimensions of performance effectiveness (Ahearne et al., 2005; Boudrias et al., 2009; Raub & Robert, 2010; Srivastava et al., 2006; Zhang & Bartol, 2010). Empowering management practices in these studies are hypothesized to be antecedents of psychological empowerment, and this view has generally been supported with empirical evidence (Lorinkova et al., 2013; Raub & Robert, 2010; Wallace et al., 2011; Zhang & Bartol, 2010). A few studies also assessed the connection between structural empowerment and psychological empowerment at the workgroup or the organizational level (Kirkman & Rosen, 1999; Seibert et al., 2004; Spreitzer, 1996). Research also indicates that the effects of structural empowerment on measures of performance and employee affective reactions are mediated through the employees’ perceptions of psychological empowerment (Laschinger et al., 2004). These findings provide further support for the argument that empowerment is a process that includes both actions and outcomes. They also show the benefits of integrating the two perspectives into one synthesis.
2.3. Antecedents and Consequences on Empowerment

To supplement the historical review of empowerment, this section provides a comprehensive summary of empirical findings regarding antecedents and outcomes associated with structural and psychological empowerment. As this review will show, considerable organizational research has focused on identifying the antecedents and consequences of employee empowerment. While the correlates of psychological empowerment are now well-established in the literature, there has been limited research on the correlates of structural empowerment (Ahearne et al., 2005; Seibert et al., 2004; Seibert et al., 2011). Moreover, few studies have tried to integrate the structural (macro) and psychological (micro) approaches to employee empowerment (Ahearne et al., 2005; Kirkman & Rosen, 1999; Kirkman et al., 2004; Seibert et al., 2004; Seibert et al., 2011; Wallace et al., 2011). It is important to note that the antecedents and consequences of structural and psychological empowerment are somewhat different. Sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 provide a detailed review of the findings of research conducted from socio-structural, psychological, and integrative perspectives on empowerment.

2.3.1. Research on Structural Empowerment

Much of the empirical research on structural empowerment has focused on organizational policies and practices aimed at delegating power to lower levels of the organizational hierarchy, and the impact of these changes on organizational and employee work-related outcomes. While the prevalence and consequences of structural empowerment have received considerable attention in the organization studies literature, relatively few studies have explored why organizations use these practices. The next section thus reviews the antecedents and consequences of structural empowerment.
2.3.1.1. Antecedents of Structural Empowerment

While few studies have examined the antecedents of structural empowerment in organizations, extensive research on the adoption and diffusion of administrative innovations offers some insight about the factors that influence organizations to use structural empowerment. Previous research identifies three main determinants of adopting innovative management practices: (1) economic and organizational factors, (2) macro-social factors, and (3) political and environmental factors (Fiss, Kennedy, & Davis, 2012; Fiss & Zajac, 2004; Gondo & Amis, 2013; Goodstein, 1994; Sanders & Tuschke, 2007; Shipan & Volden, 2008, 2012; Westphal, Gulati, & Shortell, 1997).

Early studies in the area explored the role of economic and organizational factors in facilitating the spread of management innovations. These factors include competitive drivers, performance, organizational size, slack resources, structural characteristics, and managerial characteristics (Damanpour, 1991; Damanpour & Schneider, 2006, 2009; Kimberly & Evanisko, 1981; Sharma, 2000; Walker, 2007). Tolbert and Zucker (1983), for example, argued that early adopters of civil service reforms and innovations in municipal governments were motivated by technical and economic gains. Damanpour (1991), in a meta-analytic study, suggested that lower bureaucratic control (i.e., formalization and centralization) and higher complexity (i.e., specialization, functional differentiation, and professionalism) were positively related to the initiation of innovation. Moon and De Leon (2001) found that municipal governments with stronger reinvention-oriented leadership were likely to adopt and implement reinvention programs. Furthermore, Damanpour and Schneider (2009) also showed that public managers’
positive attitudes toward innovation and political ideology increased the likelihood of their agency adopting administrative innovations.

More recent studies have examined the relationship between adoption and such variables as institutional pressures and network effects (Dimaggio & Powell, 1983; Fiss & Zajac, 2004; Frumkin & Galaskiewicz, 2004; Goodstein, 1994; Sanders & Tuschke, 2007; Shipan & Volden, 2008; Westphal et al., 1997; Young, Charns, & Shortell, 2001).

Dimaggio and Powell (1983) presented three institutional mechanisms – coercive, mimetic, and normative isomorphism – that influence managerial decisions to produce similar practice and structure across organizations. Frumkin and Galaskiewicz (2004) showed that organizations in all sectors were influenced by these three institutional pressures to adopt innovative human-resource management practices. The authors also found that after being exposed to coercive pressures, government agencies became less bureaucratized (e.g., more decentralized, less formalized, and less departmentalized), whereas mimetic pressures prompted public agencies to establish more bureaucratic controls. Under normative institutional influences, government organizations were likely to implement less decentralized and formalized but more departmentalized management practices. The influence of normative pressure was argued to be an important element of later adoptions of civil service reforms between 1880-1935 (Tolbert & Zucker, 1983).

Consistently, Westphal et al. (1997) showed in a study of U.S. hospitals that organizations experiencing normative pressures were more likely to adopt and implement management innovations by mimicking other organizations. In the same study, they also argued that the number of social network ties increased mimetic isomorphism influences.
Political or environmental pressure is another potential explanation behind the spread of management innovations such as structural empowerment in the public sector. Several researchers have noted the role of governance structures and stakeholder relationships in facilitating the adoption and diffusion of innovative management practices. For instance, Baldridge and Burnham (1975) argued that environment inputs, i.e., environmental heterogeneity and environmental change, could be a major determinant of an organization’s adoption of innovations. Fiss and Zajac (2004) found, in a study of German firms, that the firm’s ownership structure affected the spread of shareholding firms, as an innovative management practice. Furthermore, Moon and Deleon (2001) compared council-manager run U.S. cities to council-mayor run U.S. cities, and found that the council-manager cities were more likely to adopt government reinvention programs/practices.

Studies on the spread of total quality management (TQM) provide a clue to how these economic-organizational, macro-social, and political-environmental factors can affect structural empowerment practices. For example, Westphal et al. (1997), in a study of hospitals, found that early adopters of TQM were motivated to achieve efficiency gains, while later adopters were acting in response to the established legitimacy. Young et al. (2001) found that the adoption of TQM in veteran affairs hospital was influenced by organizational size, the top manager’s prior exposure to TQM and age, and cumulative adoptions of TQM by competitors within the network. In another study of hospitals, Kennedy and Fiss (2009) also showed that managers’ motivation to achieve economic and social gains were positively associated with the implementation of TQM. While the results of these studies are suggestive, they should not be interpreted as documentation
that structural empowerment practices are similarly related to these factors. In other words, we still have limited knowledge and understanding about the causes of structural empowerment practices.

2.3.1.2. Consequences of Structural Empowerment

In contrast to the limited research on the determinants of structural empowerment, numerous studies have assessed its impact on employee work attitudes and behavior, at both the individual and the organizational level. Table 1 below reports several potential consequences of structural empowerment. To better understand the consequences, the various structural empowerment initiatives/techniques are organized into three broad categories: (1) high-involvement work practices, (2) participative management, and (3) empowering leadership. The consequences of these practices are also classified into three categories: (1) attitudinal, (2) behavioral, and (3) performance outcomes. **Attitudinal outcomes** refer to employee affective reactions such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Next, **behavioral outcomes** refer to potential positive or negative employee behaviors related to structural empowerment. Finally, **performance outcomes** refer to individual employee or workgroup performance (i.e., the attainment of formal task or group goals).

**Attitudinal Outcomes**

As seen in Table 1, research has found positive correlations between structural empowerment practices and critical employee work attitudes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, self-efficacy, and intention to remain in the organization. Vandenberg, Richardson, and Eastman (1999), for example, found that high-involvement work processes had a positive influence on employees’ job satisfaction and
organizational commitment, and a negative influence on their turnover intention. Other studies have also found that empowering leadership enhances employees’ self-efficacy (Lorinkova et al., 2013; Raub & Robert, 2010; Srivastava et al., 2006; Zhang & Bartol, 2010).

The effects of structural empowerment have also been studied at the team or organizational level (Riordan, Vandenbeng, & Richardson, 2005; Seibert et al., 2004; Wallace et al., 2011). For example, Riordan et al. (2005) conceptualized employee involvement climate as a work-unit level construct consisting of four structural features (participative decision making, information sharing, training, and performance-based rewarding), and found that the work-unit involvement climate was positively associated with employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Likewise, Laschinger et al. (2004) found a link between a structural empowerment climate and employee job satisfaction, using a scale that measures Kanter (1979, 1993)’s six structural empowerment practices. Another study by Seibert et al. (2004) found a positive relationship between a structural empowerment climate and employee job satisfaction.

**Behavioral Outcomes**

Structural empowerment has also been related to a variety of important job-related employee behaviors. For example, high-involvement work practices were found to encourage employees to engage in organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) (Kizilos, Cummings, & Cummings, 2013). Empowering leadership by managers has further been linked to higher levels of work innovation (Chen et al., 2011; Zhang & Bartol, 2010), employee learning (Lorinkova et al., 2013), knowledge sharing (Srivastava et al., 2006), challenge-oriented OCBs (Raub & Robert, 2010), and proactive behaviors...
(Martin et al., 2013). In addition to promoting positive employee behaviors, empowering leadership practices have also been found to reduce negative employee behaviors, such as employee turnover and withdrawal behaviors (Arthur, 1994; Cohen & Ledford, 1994).

**Performance Outcomes**

Considerable research has focused on the link between structural empowerment and performance outcomes, such as individual employee productivity and organizational performance. The high-involvement work practices literature (e.g., Bowen & Lawler, 1992; Lawler, 1986) suggests that employee work performance can be enhanced to the degree that employees are given greater autonomy in respect to executing their primary work tasks. Support for the influence of high-involvement work practices on performance was found in a research project carried out through the Center for Effective Organizations at the University of Southern California (Lawler, Mohrman, & Ledford, 1992). Subsequent studies have found high-involvement work practices to be associated positively with measures of organizational effectiveness, including return on investment, financial performance, productivity, work quality, and employee retention rates (Arthur, 1994; Huselid, 1995; Kizilos et al., 2013; Koch & Mcgrath, 1996; Riordan et al., 2005; Vandenbergh et al., 1999). Similar results have also been found in research on self-managing teams (Cohen & Ledford, 1994), participative management (Cotton et al., 1988; Deci et al., 1989), and empowerment leadership (Ahearne et al., 2005; Lorinkova et al., 2013; Srivastava et al., 2006) Ahearne et al. (2005), for example, found that salespersons’ perceptions of empowering managerial practices were positively associated with organizational performance, in terms of improving overall sales performance and customer satisfaction.
**Unintended Consequences of Structural Empowerment**

While many positive results, such as increased work performance and enhanced job satisfaction and organizational commitment, have been documented in previous studies, there also are some inconsistent and conflicting results (Ahearne et al., 2005; Eylon & Bamberger, 2000; Langfred, 2004). It appears that employee perceptions of structural empowerment may not necessarily be always positive, and these practices cannot be discussed in isolation from the organizational context or environment. For example, a study by Cordery et al. (2010) found that task uncertainty altered (i.e., moderated) the impact of empowerment practices on team performance. There is also evidence that employees may not always welcome empowerment initiatives and may even resist such initiatives (Labianca et al., 2000), and that structural empowerment can lead to a decrease in job satisfaction (Maynard et al., 2007). Furthermore, Ahearne et al. (2005) found that empowering leadership had a negative impact on the performance of inexperienced salespersons, whereas they benefited highly experienced salespersons.

Several researchers also have pointed to possible moral hazard dilemmas for managers and high operating costs as potential downsides of structural empowerment (Mills & Ungson, 2003; Spreitzer & Doneson, 2005). Martin et al. (2013) persuasively argued that empowering leadership is likely to invite a loss of control and to increase role ambiguity, which reducing employee task proficiency and proactivity. In addition, some researchers have discussed the unintended negative effects of empowering leadership: it can be interpreted by followers as “the absence of leadership” (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008, p. 1234) or as a laissez-faire style of leadership (Vecchio et al., 2010). A recent study by Humborstad and Giessner (2015), for example, found that employees tended to
interpret their leaders’ delegation of autonomy and responsibility as laissez-faire when their leaders’ empowering behaviors over- or under-fulfilled their expectations. Tekleab et al. (2008) also found that leader-rated empowering leadership was negatively associated with followers’ satisfaction with supervisors and their self-leadership
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Structural Empowerment</th>
<th>Exemplar Studies</th>
<th>Level of Analysis used in Study</th>
<th>Consequences of Structural Empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawler, 1992</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cordery, Morrison, Wright, and Wall, 2010</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kizilos, Cummings, and Cummings, 2013</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riordan, Vandenberg, and Richardson, 2005</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vandenberg, Richardson, and Eastman, 1999</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cotton, Vollrath, Foggatt, Lengnick-Hall, and Jennings, 1988</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kim, 2002</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wagner, 1994</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chen, Sharma, Edinger, Shapiro, and Farh, 2011</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raub and Robert, 2010</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Srivastava, Bartol, and Locke, 2006</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vecchio, Justin, and Pearce, 2010</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zhang and Bartol, 2010</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hmieleski and Ensley, 2007</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laschinger, Finegan, Shamian, and Wilk, 2004</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lorinkova, Pearsall, and Sims, 2013</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humborstad and Giessner, 2015</td>
<td>Multilevel</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maynard, Mathieu, Marsh, and Ruddy, 2007</td>
<td>Multilevel</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seibert, Silver, and Randolph, 2004</td>
<td>Multilevel</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Attitudinal outcomes include greater job satisfaction, greater organizational commitment, and reduced turnover intention; Behavioral outcomes include creativity, innovation at work, knowledge sharing, proactive behavior, challenge-oriented OCBs, and voice behavior; Performance outcomes include employee productivity and organizational performance.

a. Psychological empowerment is included as a consequence of structural empowerment in these studies.
2.3.2. Research on Psychological Empowerment

As noted above, the bulk of the research on employee empowerment has focused on psychological empowerment. Since the introduction of the psychological empowerment scale (Spreitzer, 1995), the literature on psychological empowerment has greatly increased in volume. This section thus examines a number of antecedents and consequences that have been found to be associated with psychological empowerment. While the majority of the studies are on individuals’ perceptions or experiences of psychological empowerment, some recent research has expanded the scope by investigating psychological empowerment at the workgroup or organizational level. Table 2 provides a list of potential antecedents and consequences of psychological empowerment.

2.3.2.1. Antecedents of Psychological Empowerment

In many previous studies, psychological empowerment was treated as an outcome variable for which researchers have proposed a variety of antecedents. Following the precedent set by prior empirical and literature reviews (e.g., Maynard et al., 2012; Seibert et al., 2011; Spreitzer, 2008), this review organizes the antecedents into four categories: leadership, high-performance managerial practices, job and workplace characteristics, and individual characteristics. Leadership considers the role of leaders or management, while high-performance managerial practices examines specific practices or bundles of empowerment initiatives intended to delegate authority and responsibility. Next, job and workplace characteristics include work design characteristics such as task significance, autonomy, and interdependence, as well as the contexts or climates within which employees perform their work. Finally, employees’ individual characteristics may
influence their perceptions of psychological empowerment.

**Leadership and Psychological Empowerment**

As previously discussed, plentiful research suggests that leadership can play a significant role in enabling psychological empowerment in employees. Many studies have found that empowering leadership positively relates to all four indicators of psychological empowerment. An empowering leader, for example, may foster a sense of meaning by demonstrating faith or acknowledging the importance of the employee’s contributions towards achieving the organization’s goals. By recognizing and expressing confidence in employees’ ability and by providing feedback, a manager may also improve their self-efficacy (Ahearne et al., 2005). In addition, including employees in decision-making can improve the sense of self-determination among subordinates. Higher participation in decision-making may also provide employees with an enhanced sense of impact in their workgroup or organization (Raub & Robert, 2010; Zhang & Bartol, 2010).

Various other forms/styles of leadership, including participative leadership (Huang et al., 2010) and transformational leadership (Avey et al., 2008; Kark et al., 2003), have likewise been suggested as antecedents of psychological empowerment (Seibert et al., 2011). Huang et al. (2010) found a positive link between participative leadership and psychological empowerment among Chinese employees. In a study of bank employees, Kark et al. (2003) found transformational leadership to improve followers’ perceptions of psychological empowerment. Seibert et al. (2011), in a meta-analysis of 142 studies, found that such positive styles of leadership were positively related to psychological empowerment, both at the individual (corrected $r = .53$) and team level (corrected $r = .61$).
High-Performance Managerial Practices and Psychological Empowerment

Several researchers have also explored the role of management and human resource practices in facilitating high levels of psychological empowerment (Combs et al., 2006; Liao et al., 2009; Patterson, West, & Wall, 2004; Seibert et al., 2004; Seibert et al., 2011; Zacharatos, Barling, & Iverson, 2005). Seibert et al. (2011), in a meta-analysis study, used the term high-performance managerial practices to characterize these practices, and linked them to psychological empowerment. Their study conceptualized high-performance managerial practices as a group of separated but interconnected practices that concentrate on empowering employees through open information sharing, performance-contingent rewards, training and development, and decentralization/devolution of decision-making power. Seibert and colleagues suggested that high-performance managerial practices may improve performance by ensuring that employees possess a broad range of work-related knowledge, skills, and abilities, as well as information and control over their work. Maynard et al. (2012) also integrated high-involvement work practices and characterized them in terms of structural empowerment.

Like empowering leadership, high-performance managerial practices are also thought to relate positively to all four psychological empowerment cognitions. For example, information sharing may help employees understand how their work role fits the overall operation of the organization, thus increasing feelings of meaning (Seibert et al., 2011; Spreitzer, 1995). Performance-contingent rewards may also enhance employees’ perceived meaning and impact (Liden et al., 2000; Spreitzer, 1995). Extensive employee training and development may enhance the knowledge, skills, and abilities possessed by employees, bolstering their confidence in performing their work roles (Liao et al., 2009).
Increased information and discretion resulting from high-performance managerial practices may likewise increase employees’ perceived self-determination and impact (Randolph, 1995; Spreitzer, 1995).

A few studies have found a positive relationship between high-performance managerial practices and psychological empowerment. Hon and Rensvold (2006) found that the receipt of task feedback, contingent-based reward systems, and participation in goal-setting were positively related to psychological empowerment. Liao et al. (2009) showed that psychological empowerment was positively related to employees’ perceptions of several high-performance managerial practices, including information sharing, extensive employee training and development, and self-managing teams and participation. This relationship was also supported in a meta-analysis of the psychological empowerment literature by Seibert et al. (2011), both at the individual (corrected $r = .48$) and team level (corrected $r = .52$).

**Job and Work Design Characteristics and Psychological Empowerment**

Psychological empowerment has also been shown to relate with certain employee job characteristics (Gagne, Senecal, & Koestner, 1997; Seibert et al., 2011; Spreitzer, 1996). As discussed earlier, the concept of psychological empowerment was developed based on the job characteristics model/theory (Lawler, 1992; Seibert et al., 2011). Hackman and Oldham (1976) asserted that skill variety, task identity, and task significance can increase employees’ feelings of meaningfulness, job autonomy can increase employees’ feelings of responsibility, and job feedback can enhance employees’ knowledge of the results/influence of their work. Thomas and Velthouse (1990) associated several dimensions of psychological empowerment with these psychological
states. Consistent with this view, research by Gagne et al. (1997) and Liden et al. (2000) found positive relationships between employee job characteristics and multiple dimensions of psychological empowerment. Several meta-analyses (i.e., Fried & Ferris, 1987; Humphrey, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007) also indicate similar results: core job characteristics are related positively with all but three cognitions of psychological empowerment, excluding only competence (corrected $r_s > .15$). A more recent meta-analysis by Seibert et al. (2011) that reviewed studies on psychological empowerment confirmed the positive influence of all five core job characteristics on psychological empowerment, which was measured utilizing four dimensions (corrected $r = .58$). They also found a moderately positive relationship between team empowerment and job design characteristics (corrected $r = .49$).

In addition to job design characteristics, researchers have explored a broad range of work design and workplace characteristics that are related to psychological empowerment. Role ambiguity, role conflicts, role overload, and task routineness have been found to relate negatively to psychological empowerment (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Seibert et al., 2011; Spreitzer, 1995, 1996). Psychological empowerment has also been linked with a variety of organizational factors including size, span of control, formalization, and decentralization, as well as with employee perceptions of organizational and supervisor support (Hempel et al., 2012; Logan & Ganster, 2007; Spreitzer, 1995, 1996).
Individual Characteristics

Previous research has shown that perceptions of psychological empowerment are similarly related to certain personal characteristics of individual employees. For instance, studies found that psychological empowerment is positively related to employee self-esteem (Spreitzer, 1995) and needs for achievement and power (Hon & Rensvold, 2006). Seibert et al. (2011) found socio-demographic factors to be salient factors in predicting perceptions of psychological empowerment. Specifically, the study found that individuals with positive self-evaluation traits and higher levels of human capital (i.e., higher education, longer tenure, and higher job levels) were more likely to perceive psychological empowerment (corrected $r_s > .11$). However, gender and age were found not to have any significant relationship with perceptions of psychological empowerment.

2.3.2.2. Consequences of Psychological Empowerment

A large body of evidence supports the idea that psychological empowerment is a significant predictor of employee attitudinal reactions. Research suggests that when employees experience more empowerment, they have more positive attitudes in terms of intrinsic motivation (Zhang & Bartol, 2010), self-efficacy (Leach et al., 2003), job satisfaction (Kirkman & Rosen, 1999; Liden et al., 2000; Maynard et al., 2012; Seibert et al., 2011; Wang & Lee, 2009), and organizational commitment (Kirkman et al., 2004; Liden et al., 2000; Maynard et al., 2012; Spreitzer, 1995; Tymon, 1988). Using team-level analysis, Kukenberger, Mathieu, and Ruddy (2015) similarly linked team empowerment to team commitment. Empowered employees were also found to report lower levels of turnover intention (Seibert et al., 2011), higher levels of job satisfaction (Koberg et al., 1999), and lower levels of job strain (Spreitzer et al., 1997). A recent
meta-analysis (Seibert et al., 2011) reported moderate correlations between psychological empowerment and job satisfaction (corrected $r = .64$), organizational commitment (corrected $r = .63$), turnover intention (corrected $r = -.37$), and job strain (corrected $r = -.36$).

In addition to improving work attitudes, higher psychological empowerment can increase positive work behaviors. Chen et al. (2011), for example, found that psychologically empowered employees were more likely to engage in innovativeness and teamwork. Spreitzer et al. (1999) found that empowered supervisors were seen by their subordinates as more innovative, upward influencing, and inspirational. Researchers also linked psychological empowerment to employee extra-role or citizenship behaviors, suggesting that employees who reported higher levels of empowerment were more likely to show change-oriented extra-role behaviors (Choi, 2007; Raub & Robert, 2010). One public sector study by Cho and Faerman (2010) found that when public employees felt empowered, they were more likely to engage in citizenship behavior. Similar results were found in a meta-analysis that reported moderate positive correlations with organizational citizenship behaviors (corrected $r = .38$) and innovation at work (corrected $r = .33$) (Seibert et al., 2011). Research has also shown that empowered employees are more likely to voice concerns and report organizational problems (Frazier & Fainshmidt, 2012; Raub & Robert, 2013).

Likewise, there is support for a positive connection between psychological empowerment and employee and workgroup performance. For instance, Thomas and Tymon (1994) found that choice or self-determination, a key element of psychological empowerment, is positively related to employee work performance. In a similar vein,
Seibert et al. (2004) found that the overall measure of psychological empowerment is related to work effectiveness, defined in terms of employees’ technical skills, productivity, quality of work, updating of skills, and personal drive. Researchers have also found a positive connection between ratings of managerial effectiveness and employee perceptions of psychological empowerment (Quinn & Spreitzer, 1997; Spreitzer, 1995).

Recent research has expanded psychological empowerment outcomes beyond individual performance to include team or organizational performance. Wallace et al. (2011), for instance, found that restaurants operated by more psychologically empowered managers were more likely to improve sales performance and customer satisfaction. The effects of psychological empowerment on organizational performance have also been documented (Kirkman et al., 2004). Further, the meta-analysis by Seibert et al. (2011) reported significant positive correlations with task performance, both at the individual and organizational levels (corrected $r = .36, .51$, respectively).
Table 2. Antecedents and Consequences of Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedents of Psychological Empowerment</th>
<th>Exemplar Studies</th>
<th>Level of Analysis used in Study</th>
<th>Consequences of Psychological Empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership (r_c = .53 at the individual-level, .47 at the organizational level)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Empowering Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahearne, Mathieu, and Rapp, 2005</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boudrias, Gaudreau, Savoie, and Morin, 2009</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cho and Fareman, 2010</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang and Bartol, 2010</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathieu, Gilson, and Ruddy, 2006</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace, Johnson, Mathe, and Paul, 2011</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen, Sharma, Edinger, Shapiro, and Farh, 2011</td>
<td>Multilevel</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li, Chiaburu, and Kirkman, 2014</td>
<td>Multilevel</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Liao, and Campbell, 2013</td>
<td>Multilevel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raub and Robert, 2010</td>
<td>Multilevel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seibert, Silver, and Randolph, 2004</td>
<td>Multilevel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participative Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transformational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang, Iun, Liu, and Gong, 2010</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High-Performance Work Systems / Management Practices (r_c = .48 at the individual-level, .52 at the organizational level)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High-Performance Work Systems / Management Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spreitzer, 1995</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkman and Rosen, 1999</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liao, Toya, Lepak, and Hong, 2009</td>
<td>Multilevel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liden, Wayne, and Sparrowe, 2000</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph, 1995</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cont’d)
Table 2. (Cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedents of Psychological Empowerment</th>
<th>Exemplar Studies</th>
<th>Level of Analysis used in Study</th>
<th>Consequences of Psychological Empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• High-Involvement Work Practice</td>
<td>Spreitzer, 1995</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Attitudinal X, Behavioral X, Performance X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Structural Empowerment</td>
<td>Koberg, Bost et al. 1999</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Attitudinal X, Behavioral X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laschinger, Finegan, Shamian, and Wilk, 2004</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Performance X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job and Work Characteristics (\( r_c = .58 \) at the individual-level, .49 at the organizational level)*

| • Job Design Characteristics              | Gagne, Senecal, and Koestner, 1997 | Individual                      | Attitudinal X                           |
|                                          | Liden, Wayne, and Sparrowe, 2000   | Individual                      | Behavioral N/A                          |
| • Role Clarity                           | Spreitzer, 1996                    | Individual                      | N/A                                      |
| • Span of Control                        | Spreitzer, 1996                    | Individual                      | N/A                                      |

*Workplace Characteristics (\( r_c = .48 \) at the individual-level, .56 at the organizational level)*

| • Socio-political Support                | Spreitzer, 1996                    | Individual                      | N/A                                      |
| • Trust in Supervisor                   | Gómez and Rosen, 2001              | Individual                      | N/A                                      |
| • Quality of Relationship               | Gómez and Rosen, 2001              | Individual                      | N/A                                      |
| • Team Empowerment                      | D’Innocenzo, Luciano, Mathieu, Maynard, and Chen, 2015 | Multilevel                      | X                                        |
| • Innovative Climate                    | Choi, 2007                         | Multilevel                      | X                                        |
| • Voice Climate                         | Frazier and Faisnshmidt, 2012       | Individual                      | Attitudinal X, Behavioral X              |

(Cont’d)
Table 2. (Cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedents of Psychological Empowerment</th>
<th>Exemplar Studies</th>
<th>Level of Analysis used in Study</th>
<th>Consequences of Psychological Empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Decentralization, Formalization</td>
<td>Hempel, Zhang, and Han, 2012</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Characteristics</strong> ($r_c = .48$ at the individual-level for positive self-evaluation traits)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positive Self-Evaluation Traits</td>
<td>Spreitzer, 1995</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hon and Rensvold, 2006</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kukenberger, Mathieu, Ruddy, 2015</td>
<td>Multilevel</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Human Capital Variables</td>
<td>Seibert, Wang, and Courtright, 2011</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consequences Only</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td>Spreitzer, Kizilos, and Nason, 1997</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td>Thomas and Tymon 1994</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td>Wang and Lee, 2009</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td>Kirkman, Rosen, Tesluk, and Gibson, 2004</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** $r_c$ is corrected correlation produced by Seibert et. al. (2011). Attitudinal outcomes include greater intrinsic motivation, greater self-efficacy greater job satisfaction, greater organizational commitment, and reduced turnover intention; Behavioral outcomes include creativity, innovation at work, team learning, knowledge sharing, taking charge, proactive behavior, challenge-oriented OCBs, voice behavior; Performance outcomes include employee effectiveness, managerial effectiveness, and work-unit effectiveness.
2.3.3. **Research on Employee Empowerment in Government**

Empowerment of public employees emerged as an important topic through the new public administration (NPA) and new public management (NPM) (or “reinventing government”) movements (Brudney et al., 1999; Brudney & Wright, 2002; Frederickson, 1996; Moynihan, 2006b; Osborne & Gaebler, 1992). Historically, the topic was discussed from a normative perspective as it endorses the value of democratic administration (Frederickson, 1996). During and after the “reinventing government” movement, the discussion on employee empowerment shifted to emphasize its function as a managerial strategy, in order to make public organizations more creative and responsive to the needs and demands of citizens (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992). Scholars and practitioners in the public sector turned to business management scholarship for guidance to identify ways to make public organizations more efficient and effective. This also prompted some public agencies and public managers to initiate structural changes and use managerial practices in an effort to empower public sector employees.

The popularity of employee empowerment in public administration has grown over the past few decades, along with an increasing interest in its potential to improve employee motivation, commitment, and job performance. However, in public management research most of the work has been conceptual or descriptive in nature, and there has been little empirical research into the nature and impact of employee empowerment. Indeed, early research on empowerment examined the patterns of employee empowerment initiatives used in state and local government agencies. For instance, Berman (1995) found that most of the state agencies in corrections, transportation, health, education, and welfare had implemented some types of
empowerment programs and practices. In the same study, employee empowerment practices were proposed to improve organizational processes (e.g., group decision-making ability and communication throughout work-units) as well as performance outcomes (e.g., service quality and employee productivity). Petter et al. (2002) proposed in a preliminary study that employee empowerment could serve as a mediating step toward better job-related outcomes such as innovation and performance.

The dearth of empirical studies on empowerment in PA may be because employee empowerment is quite different than traditional management techniques that are usually used in public sector organizations. In contrast to the traditional management characterized by direct control, upward accountability, and standardized procedures, empowerment appears to be a relatively new concept that provides employees with more autonomy and freedom in their jobs (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Seibert et al., 2004). Also, public sector organizations tend to be more bureaucratic and hierarchical with more formal rules, programs, and procedures (e.g., Perry & Rainey, 1988). This indicates that forms of empowerment that manifest in public organizations, and the subsequent impacts of empowerment, may be different in public sector organizations.

Some recent studies, however, have investigated the effects of employee empowerment in government organizations. Several found a negative connection between empowerment and public employees’ intention to leave their organization (Moynihan & Landuyt, 2008; Pitts, Marvel, & Fernandez, 2011), and a positive connection with employees’ organizational commitment (Moon, 2000) and organizational learning (Moynihan & Landuyt, 2009). Further, Lee et al. (2006) provided empirical support for the influence of employee empowerment on public organization
performance. While most studies focused on the direct effects of empowerment on job-related outcomes, some also assessed possible indirect effects (Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2013b; Wright & Kim, 2004). Additionally, several recent articles by Fernandez and Moldogaziev (2011, 2013a, 2013b, 2013c) have reported that empowerment practices in federal agencies are positively related to federal employees’ job satisfaction, innovativeness, and perception about their work-units’ performance. There has not been much research on the influence of empowerment on public employees’ job performance. Furthermore, the mechanisms through which empowerment practices may affect public employee performance have also not been examined in prior studies.

2.3.4. Limitations of the Prior Research and Ways to Move Forward

In order to identify the key limitations of the extant research on empowerment in PA, Table 3 summarizes the literature. The analysis in this section focuses on 1) how empowerment has been conceptualized and studied in PA, 2) the relationship between empowerment and other factors or variables, and 3) the sources and quality of the data used in the studies.

First, there are some conceptual issues in how empowerment has been defined in PA studies. Many studies have used a single item to measure the construct, and referred to it as decision flexibility, participative management, or autonomy (e.g., Kim, 2002; Kim & Wright, 2007; Moynihan & Landuyt, 2008). Moreover, most studies focused on structural empowerment and few assessed employee perceptions of psychological empowerment. Some recent studies (Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2011, 2013b, 2013c) that have attempted to examine the influence of empowerment in public agencies even
completely overlook the distinction between structural and psychological empowerment. Using the Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey, Fernandez and Moldogaziev operationalized employee empowerment with a measure that included items for both empowering practices and psychological empowerment. This approach is not consistent with broader organizational research.

Secondly, empowerment has primarily been considered an independent predictor of various attitudinal reactions, whereas little attention has been devoted to the antecedents of empowerment. One recent study by Hassan, Wright, and Park (2016) showed that supervisor perceptions of employee task performance and learning efforts were positively related to empowerment practices (i.e., delegation and consultation). Few studies examined whether empowerment improves the actual performance of public employees, and only one study examined the effects of empowerment on the behavior of public employees (Cho & Faerman, 2010). With an integrated model that incorporated both structural and psychological empowerment, Cho and Faerman (2010) assessed the direct and indirect effects of empowerment on employee in-role and extra-role performance in South Korea. While they found a positive connection between empowerment and public employee extra-role behavior, the relationship between empowerment and in-role job performance was not found to be statistically significant. Clearly, more research is needed to evaluate the usefulness of empowerment in improving individual and organizational performance in public agencies.

Thirdly, most prior studies have relied only on cross-sectional survey data to assess the influence of employee empowerment in public agencies. When data for both the dependent and independent variables are collected from the same source and at the
same time, the results are likely to be biased (Podsakoff et al., 2003). This issue, often referred to as the common method variance bias, is increasingly recognized as a major problem in survey research in social sciences (Meier & O'Toole, 2013b; Podsakoff et al., 2003). The key concern is that common method variance could inflate the magnitude of the relationships among variables examined using cross-sectional survey data. Research focusing on empowerment in public administration has relied mainly on self-reports of employee attitudes and behaviors, and most researchers did not even apply any methodological and statistical remedies to reduce the problem of common method variance bias (see Cho and Faerman (2010) and Hassan et al. (2016) for exceptions).

The use of self-rated performance measures also presents significant limitations. Therefore, despite empirical evidence supporting positive outcomes of empowerment on organizational performance (see e.g., Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2011, 2013b), this evidence is considered to be less reliable. Although common method variance is not simply and easily resolved with the implementation of data collection from different sources (Meier & O'Toole, 2013b), it is generally recommended that survey-based studies obtain multiple measures from different sources (e.g., supervisor-rated employee performance and subordinate-rated managerial practice).

Finally, the level of analysis in PA empowerment research is limited to individual-level variables: empowerment has rarely been examined using a multilevel framework. Organizational researchers have often argued that organizational data are inherently nested because lower-level individual data are influenced by higher-level factors (Bliese, 2004; Klein & Kozlowski, 2000b; Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002). For instance, lower-level employees are typically nested within work units, and thus
individual employee survey data can have a hierarchically-nested structure with units at many hierarchical levels. This highlights that the evaluation of management practice needs to be carried out within a multilevel framework, in order to account for the nested nature of organizational data and the potential non-independence of observations. The consideration of multilevel variables would provide a dynamic and rich perspective on the influence of empowerment in public organizations. However, public management researchers focusing on leadership and management practices (including empowerment practice) have rarely utilized multilevel frameworks in examining the effects of senior managers on individual frontline employees.

To summarize, although prior studies demonstrated the importance of empowerment, it is not yet clear whether and how empowerment affects individual and organizational performance in public agencies. Three particular issues appear to be significant gaps in the literature. First, empowerment in previous studies has been measured inappropriately and inadequately. This is because most studies relied on secondary survey data to assess the effects on employees, while these surveys were not designed to assess the concept and consequences of empowerment. Second, the existing research primarily focused on employee affective reactions and few examined behavioral outcomes (e.g., Cho & Faerman, 2010). In addition, certain important behavioral outcomes have also not been considered, including employee voice, task performance, and conscientiousness. Moreover, almost all the studies examining the impact of empowerment have relied on self-reported outcome measures, which tend to be inaccurate and unrealistic (Meier & O'Toole, 2013a, 2013b). Finally, none of the studies examined how empowerment from the top of the organization affects workers on the
front line. Accordingly, we still have a limited understanding of the processes through which empowerment affects various outcomes at different organizational levels.

To address these gaps, this dissertation develops and examines a trickle-down model of empowerment by investigating the way in which public managers at different levels influence employees. In order to understand better how empowering managerial practices can influence lower-level employees, this study takes a multilevel approach (Chen, Kirkman, et al., 2007; Marquis & Tilsik, 2013; Mawritz et al., 2012; Maynard et al., 2012; Schaubroeck et al., 2012). Specifically, this dissertation examines whether empowering practices of senior managers are linked to employees’ attitudes and behaviors through the behaviors of junior managers/immediate supervisors. Considering the structural limitations of bureaucratic public sector organizations in adopting and utilizing empowerment practices, research indicates that the leaders’ behaviors would be especially important to motivating and possibly empowering public employees (Vaccaro et al., 2012). Thus, this study pays particular attention to the energizing aspect of empowering leadership and its importance in enhancing employee and workgroup performance.

This dissertation can contribute to a growing body of empirical literature by explaining the process by which empowering managerial practices lead to specific employee attitudes, which in turn lead to specific employee behaviors beneficial to the organization. Specifically, this research examines the role of empowerment on various outcomes (i.e., employee in-role and extra-role performance, workgroup performance, and managerial effectiveness). This study also examines the effects of structural empowerment practices on psychological empowerment experience and subsequent
empowering managerial practices toward subordinates, a dynamic which has been overlooked in the public management research, in the relationship between senior managers and frontline supervisors. It tests the effects of empowering managerial practices on employee and workgroup performance as well. As reviewed above, the effects of empowerment on these outcomes have been already identified in empowerment research, focusing on private sector organizations. However, the difference between the public and private sectors requires researchers to replicate and evaluate the existing findings on the effects of empowerment on individual and organizational performance, in the unique context of public sector organizations. Hence, the present study will provide a better understanding of empowerment practices adopted in public sector organizations.
Table 3. Summary of the Previous Studies on Employee Empowerment in the Public Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical Definition</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Operational Definition</th>
<th>Item(s)</th>
<th>Correlated Factors/Variables</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Sample Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural Empowerment (SE) - Only</td>
<td>Moynihan and Landuyt (2009)</td>
<td>Decision Flexibility</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>- Organizational Learning</td>
<td>Survey of state employees in Texas (2004)</td>
<td>- Decision making and control are given to employees doing the actual work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kim (2002)</td>
<td>Participative Management</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>- Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Survey of local employees in Clark County, Nevada</td>
<td>- Manager's use of participative management style (e.g., Manager's attempt to allow an employee to improve the work process).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hassan et al. (2016)</td>
<td>Participative Management (i.e., Consultation &amp; Delegation)</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>- Employee Task Performance - Employee Learning Efforts</td>
<td>Survey of state employees in Ohio (2010)</td>
<td>- Consultation - My supervisor consults with you before making important decisions that will affect you. - Delegation - My supervisor empowers you to solve work-related problems on your own.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cont’d)
### Table 3 (Cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical Definition</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Operational Definition</th>
<th>Item(s)</th>
<th>Correlated Factors/Variables</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Sample Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Psychological Empowerment (PE) - Only | Lee (2006) | Empowerment | Single (varies over different survey years) | • Organizational Effectiveness (OE)  
• Job Satisfaction (JS)  
• Support for Organizational Change | 1997-200 OPM Survey (United States) | • I don’t have enough authority to determine how I get my job done.  
• Employees in my work unit are encouraged to participate in decisions affecting their work.  
• How satisfied are you with your involvement in decisions that affect your work? |
| Pitts, Marvel, and Fernandez (2011) | Empowerment | Single | • Turnover Intention | 2006 FHCS (United States) | • Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes. |
| Moon (2000) | Job Autonomy | Single | • Organizational Commitment | 1992 NASP (United States) | • I do not have enough authority to determine how to get my job done.  
• I am treated with respect at work.  
• I am able to openly express concerns at work. My opinions count at work. |
<p>| Jung (2013) | Respect at work | Multiple | • Job Satisfaction | 2005 MPS (United States) | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical Definition</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Operational Definition</th>
<th>Item(s)</th>
<th>Correlated Factors/Variables</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Sample Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Structural and Psychological Empowerment (SE & PE) – Mixed | Wright and Kim (2004) | Employee Participation | Multiple | Direct Effect: • Job Satisfaction  
Indirect Effect: • Task Significance  
• Career Development Support  
• Feedback | Survey of state employees in New York (2000) | • My supervisor asks for my opinions and thoughts when determining my work objectives.  
• I feel involved in important decisions in my work unit.  
• Employees who will be affected by decisions are asked for their inputs.  
• I feel free to suggest changes in my job. |
| Fernandez and Moldogaziev (2011) | Empowerment Practices | Multiple | • Work-Unit Performance | 2006 FHCS (United States) | • Empowerment Practice 1 – providing information about goals and performance  
• Empowerment Practice 2 – offering rewards based on performance  
• Empowerment Practice 3 – providing access to job related knowledge and skills  
• Empowerment Practice 4 – granting discretion to change work processes |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical Definition</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Operational Definition</th>
<th>Item(s)</th>
<th>Correlated Factors/Variables</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Sample Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural and Psychological Empowerment (SE &amp; PE) – Mixed</td>
<td>Fernandez and Moldogaziev (2013a)</td>
<td>Empowerment Practices</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>• Encouragement to Innovate</td>
<td>2006 FHCS (United States)</td>
<td>• Same Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fernandez and Moldogaziev (2013b)</td>
<td>Empowerment Practices</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Direct Effect • Innovativeness • Job Satisfaction Indirect Effect • Work Unit Performance</td>
<td>2010 FEVS (United States)</td>
<td>• Same Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fernandez and Moldogaziev (2013c)</td>
<td>Empowerment Practices</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>• Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>2010 FEVS (United States)</td>
<td>• Same Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural and Psychological Empowerment (SE &amp; PE) – Integrated</td>
<td>Cho and Faerman (2010)</td>
<td>Structural Empowerment</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Direct Effect • Psychological Empowerment Indirect Effect • In-Role Performance • Extra-Role Performance</td>
<td>Survey of city employees in Seoul, South Korea (2008)</td>
<td>• Participation - My supervisor actively seeks input from employees on most decisions. • Feedback on performance - I receive frequent and fair appraisals of my job performance by my supervisor. • Delegation - My supervisor lets me make decisions by myself, without consulting with him/her.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As reviewed in the previous chapter, employee empowerment has largely been studied using the psychological or socio-structural perspective. A large number of studies have assessed the direct and indirect effects of structural and psychological empowerment of workers. The findings can be summarized as follows: structural empowerment practices work as enablers by facilitating subordinates’ experiences of empowerment, thereby leading to positive employee outcomes (both attitudinal and behavioral) that are relevant to organizations (Spreitzer, 1995; Spreitzer et al., 1999; Spreitzer & Doneson, 2005; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990; Wallace et al., 2011; Zhang & Bartol, 2010). However, as discussed in the previous chapter, neither the relationship between structural and psychological empowerment nor the relationship between empowerment practices and employee and workgroup performance have been studied adequately in the public sector setting. While empowerment researchers have devoted considerable attention to understanding the psychological processes by which workers become empowered, and the role that psychological empowerment plays in influencing employee attitudes and behaviors, few studies have examined whether a perception of psychological empowerment is an antecedent of managers’ use of empowerment practices. The second issue is related to evaluating the efficacy of employee empowerment in the context of public administration. Studies of empowering leadership in public and police administrations are few. In one study, Fernandez and Moldogaziev (2011) investigated the role of employee empowerment in federal government agencies.
without distinguishing between empowering managerial practices and experiences of psychological empowerment. Furthermore, few investigations have sought to disentangle the role that employee empowerment may play in individual and organizational performance with concrete data in public sector settings.

To address these gaps, this chapter develops a multilevel, trickle-down model of employee empowerment to provide insight into how empowering leadership may affect public employees’ work attitudes, behaviors, and performance. This model is specifically developed to examine the cascading effects of empowering leadership across hierarchical levels in public organizations. This approach has recently garnered considerable interest among leadership scholars who seek to explore how leadership practices from the top of an organization may affect the attitudes and behavior of employees across different levels of the organization (Mawritz et al., 2012; Mayer et al., 2009; Schaubroeck et al., 2012). Many recent studies have used the trickle-down approach to examine the effects of transformational leadership (Bass et al., 1987), ethical leadership (Mayer et al., 2009; Schaubroeck et al., 2012), and even abusive supervision (Mawritz et al., 2012). However, to the best of my knowledge, trickle-down influences of empowering leadership have not been examined in any research, either in public or private sector work settings. Thus, this study aims to explain whether and how empowering managerial practices by upper-level, senior managers are transmissible to lower-level, frontline employees via mid-level, junior managers. The following sections briefly describe the rationale behind using the trickle-down approach, and then develop a set of testable hypotheses regarding the effects of employee empowerment in public agencies.
3.1. Theoretical Backgrounds of the Trickle-Down Approach

The premise of trickle-down models of leadership is that the experience of individuals at one level of an organization influences not only their own perceptions about the organization but also their behavior toward other individuals (Ambrose, Schminke, & Mayer, 2013). This approach has been used to capture both the direct and indirect effects of senior managers’ practices on frontline employees through the experiences and behaviors of middle-level managers/supervisors (Bass et al., 1987). Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) and social learning theory (Bandura, 1977b, 1986) provide the theoretical lenses to explain the trickle-down effects or the cross-level influences of management and leadership practices on employees and workgroups in organizations (Mawritz et al., 2012; Mayer et al., 2012; Mayer et al., 2009; Wo, Ambrose, & Schminke, 2015).

Social learning theory suggests that individuals learn organizational norms for acceptable or unacceptable and appropriate or inappropriate behavior by witnessing and then emulating the behaviors of others, especially their role models (Bandura, 1977b, 1986). Based on this perspective, several studies have suggested that managers often model the behavior of their superiors, and engage in similar leadership practices or behaviors with their own subordinates. For example, Mayer et al. (2009) suggested that “employees in a work group are affected similarly as they witness sanctions for inappropriate behavior and rewards for positive behaviors” (p. 2). The study found that supervisors’ ethical leadership behaviors encouraged subordinates’ organizational citizenship behaviors and withheld their subordinates’ deviant interpersonal behaviors. Further, the effect of senior managers’ ethical leadership on employee deviance in the
study was found to be mediated by middle managers’ ethical leadership. Similarly, Mawritz et al. (2012) indicated that lower-level employees would “watch and learn” (Robinson & O’leary-Kelly, 1998, p. 659) workplace patterns of abusive behaviors from their supervisors and emulate them by engaging in deviant behaviors. This study found that senior managers’ abusive supervision was related to abusive supervision by line managers, which in turn was positively related to employees’ deviant behavior. Both of these studies argued that trickle-down effects of leadership occurred because supervisors identify their managers as role models and engage in similar behavior with their own employees.

Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) also provides insight about how the effects of leadership practices may trickle down to different levels in an organization. According to Blau (1964), there are two major types of social exchange: transactional and socio-emotional. While transactional social exchange focuses on economic exchanges of money and/or resources, socio-emotional exchange focuses on the development of mutual trust, loyalty, and respect through a series of positive social exchanges between two parties. A key idea in social exchange theory is the norm of reciprocity, which can be either positive or negative. Social exchange theory posits that a series of mutual exchanges between two parties leads to a sense of obligation for both to reciprocate the good (or bad) faith/behavior (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Accordingly, individuals who interpret their work experiences as a reflection of trust and support from the organization feel obligated to increase their contributions to the organization, and in turn are motivated to treat others in the organization in similar ways (Wo et al., 2015). Several studies have used social exchange theory to explain the trickle-down effects of employee
perceptions and behaviors from supervisor to subordinates. For example, Masterson (2001) found that employees’ perceptions of distributive and procedural justice were positively related to customers’ favorable perceptions of employees. Similarly, Tepper and Taylor (2003) showed that supervisors’ perception of procedural justice trickled down to subordinates’ perceptions of procedural justice. Bordia et al. (2010) also indicated that psychological contract breach may trickle down from supervisors to subordinates.

The current study examines whether and how empowering leadership by senior managers trickles down to junior managers and consequently to frontline employees in public agencies. Drawing on social exchange and social learning theories, it argues that when public managers themselves feel empowered, they are more likely to engage in empowering leadership practices with their immediate subordinates. Such practices in turn would lead to positive behaviors among subordinates, including higher levels of in-role and extra-role behaviors. In other words, through processes of social learning and social exchange, an empowering senior manager may initiate a cycle of empowerment by inspiring his or her subordinates (i.e., junior managers) to experience psychological empowerment and then to empower their own subordinates (i.e., frontline employees). The cycle of empowerment may perpetuate through the social influence processes to inspire frontline employees to reciprocate by engaging in positive behaviors that influence organization performance. Based mainly on these two theoretical perspectives, the next section develops a set of testable hypotheses about the effects of employee empowerment in public agencies.


3.2. Research Model/Framework

Figure 1 shows the conceptual model and Table 4 provides a summary of the research hypotheses that will be tested in this study. The research model can be divided into five components: (1) the connection between senior and junior managers’ empowering leadership practices, (2) the connection between junior managers’ empowering leadership and employee effectiveness (both in-role and extra-role performance), (3) the connection between junior managers’ empowering leadership and workgroup effectiveness (unit-level in-role and extra-role performance and overall unit effectiveness), (4) the indirect effects of empowering leadership by senior managers on the behavior and performance of employees and workgroups, and (5) the connection between empowering leadership and perceptions of managerial effectiveness.

Figure 1. A Multilevel Conceptual Model

Note. U indicates that the variable was reported by senior leaders (i.e., senior police officers); M indicates that the variable was reported by junior managers (i.e., junior police officers); S indicates that the variable was reported by subordinates (i.e., frontline employees).
Drawing on both social learning theory and social exchange theory, the first part of the model focuses on how empowering leadership practices by senior managers may induce empowering leadership practices by junior managers through their effects on psychological empowerment. The second and third parts of the model focus on how empowering leadership practices by junior managers may influence the behavior and performance of employees and workgroups. Drawing on self-determination theory and social exchange theory, this study hypothesizes that junior managers’ empowering leadership will positively affect frontline employees’ in-role (i.e., task performance and conscientiousness) and extra-role (i.e., voice) performance. There is no expectation that the individual-level and aggregated variables at a higher level reflect the same construct (Chan, 1998; Klein & Kozlowski, 2000a; Klein & Kozlowski, 2000b). Thus, the present study also explores the relationships of empowering leadership to unit-level in-role and extra-role performance and overall work unit effectiveness. The fourth part of the model focuses on the cascading effects of empowering leadership, i.e. that senior managers’ empowering leadership indirectly influences the performance of employees and workgroups by promoting junior managers’ empowering leadership. The last part of the model concerns how empowering leadership affects supervisor and subordinate perceptions of managerial effectiveness. Table 4 shows the hypotheses, and their relations to the research questions.
Table 4. Summary of Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Paths</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Level of Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1a &amp; 1b: Senior and Junior Managers’ Empowering Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1a</td>
<td>Empowering Leadership by Senior Managers (Upper-level)→ Empowering Leadership by Junior Managers (Lower-level)</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Single (Positive) (Individual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b</td>
<td>Empowering Leadership by Senior Managers (Upper-level)→ Psychological Empowerment by Junior Managers (Lower-level)→ Empowering Leadership by Junior Managers (Lower-level)</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Single (Positive) (Individual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2a: Empowering Leadership and Employee Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Empowering Leadership by Junior Managers (Lower-level)→ Employee (a) Task Performance, (b) Conscientiousness, and (c) Voice</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Multi (Positive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2b: Empowering Leadership and Workgroup Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Empowering Leadership by Junior Managers (Lower-level)→ Unit-level (a) Task Performance, (b) Conscientiousness, (c) Voice, and (d) Unit Effectiveness</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Single (Positive) (Group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ3: Cascading Effects of Senior Managers’ Empowering Leadership on Employee and Workgroup Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Empowering Leadership by Senior Managers (Upper-level)→ Psychological Empowerment by Junior Managers (Lower-level)→ Empowering Leadership by Junior Managers (Lower-level)→ Unit-level (a) Task Performance, (b) Conscientiousness, (c) Voice and (d) Overall Unit Effectiveness</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Single (Positive) (Group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Empowering Leadership by Senior Managers (Upper-level)→ Psychological Empowerment by Junior Managers (Lower-level)→ Empowering Leadership by Junior Managers (Lower-level)→ Employee (a) Task Performance, (b) Conscientiousness, and (c) Voice</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Multi (Positive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ4: Empowering Leadership and Managerial Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Empowering Leadership by Junior Managers (Lower-level)→ Supervisor and Subordinate Rating of Managerial Effectiveness</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Single (Positive) (Group)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. a) indicates that the variable was reported by senior leaders (i.e., senior police officers); b) indicates that the variable was reported by junior managers (i.e., junior police officers); c) indicates that the variable was reported by subordinates (i.e., frontline employees).
3.3. Research Hypotheses

3.3.1. The Link between Senior and Middle/Junior Managers’ Empowering Leadership Practices

Empowering leadership practices reflect the degree to which managers increase their employees’ actual or perceived ability to take actions or to make decisions independently (Burke, 1986). Organizational research has made great strides in documenting various attitudinal outcomes of structural and/or psychological empowerment (e.g., greater job satisfaction and organization commitment, and lower turnover intention). However, there has been limited progress in determining how perceptions of empowerment translate into behavioral manifestations in empowered employees. Boudrias et al. (2009), for example, pointed out that research has not adequately investigated the chain of relationships between structural and psychological empowerment with respect to the behavioral consequences of empowerment. Similarly, Spreitzer (2008) argued that it is unclear whether employees who experience psychological empowerment may actually attempt to empower others in the workplace, such as coworkers and subordinates.

The lack of progress in understanding this issue is partly because previous studies mostly centered on the attitudinal/behavioral outcomes of frontline employees. Moreover, most prior studies focused on the relationship between mid-level/junior managers and frontline workers, while the relationship between senior managers’ and junior managers’ empowering practices has received less attention. One notable exception is a study by Olshfski and Cunningham (1998), who found that middle/junior managers’ willingness to engage in active behaviors, i.e., going beyond their job requirements, was dependent on
whether the attitudes of their supervisors (i.e., senior managers) toward them were empowering and accepting or discouraging. Though the authors do not explicitly say so, the findings of this research suggest that middle managers’ experiences of empowering leadership (from their superiors) might influence them to engage in empowering leadership with their followers. This is because when middle/junior managers experience empowering leadership from their superiors (e.g., senior managers) and observe such behavior being rewarded in the organization, they themselves are likely to engage in the same behaviors with their own subordinates. This interpretation is in line with the assertions of social learning theory (Bandura, 1977a, 1986) and social exchange theory (Blau, 1964). In a similar vein, Sharma and Kirkman (2015) proposed that senior leaders who empower their subordinates would serve as role models for junior managers to engage in the same behaviors in organizational settings.

Following previous research and theories, this study argues that when senior police officers practice empowering leadership, junior police officers are also likely to engage in empowering leadership with their subordinates. The rationale is that police organizations tend to have a strong occupational culture, where police officers are likely to perceive their superiors as role models and emulate their practices and behavior (Jermier & Berkes, 1979; Van Maanen, 1975). Many researchers have reflected on a socialization process within police culture whereby police officers adopt similar attitudes and behaviors to their senior personnel and peer group members (i.e., other officers) (Van Maanen, 1973, 1975). For instance, Van Maanen (1975) found that the job-related attitudes of veteran patrol officers were modeled by the newcomers in a patrol division. Oberfield (2010) also found that police cadets’ rule-following identities were strongly
influenced by other cadets’ behavior. Other research discovered that police officers at different organizational ranks socialize differentially. While “street cops” or patrol officers have strong bonds with their peers, officers at higher ranks tend to identify more closely with their supervisors (Paoline, 2003; Reuss-Ianni & Ianni, 1983; Sun, 2002). For example, Densten (2003), in a study of Australian police officers, found that senior sergeants were likely to exert extra work efforts when their direct supervisors utilized transformational leadership and served as strong role models. Accordingly, police officers who have empowering supervisors are also likely to use empowering practices with their own subordinates, by following their supervisors’ behavior (see Figure 2). In that light, the study tests the following hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 1a:** There will be a direct positive correlation between senior and junior police officers’ empowering leadership practices.

In addition to having a direct positive influence, empowering senior police officers may indirectly influence junior police officers to use empowering practices with their subordinates by increasing the junior officers’ sense of psychological empowerment. Within the research on empowerment, a strong case has been made for a positive relationship between empowerment leadership and perceptions of psychological empowerment among employees (Boudrias et al., 2009; Konczak et al., 2000; Wallace et al., 2011; Zhang & Bartol, 2010). There are different ways that empowering leadership may influence a subordinate’s perceptions of psychological empowerment. First, an empowering leader may enhance a subordinate’s sense of meaningfulness by providing recognition for his or her work achievements and contributions to the organization (Zhang & Bartol, 2010). Second, an empowering leader may lead an employee to feel
more competent by expressing confidence in his or her prospects for high performance and providing helpful feedback and coaching. In a study of salespeople, Ahearne et al. (2005) found that when employees had empowering supervisors they were more likely to perceive high levels of self-efficacy. Third, an empowering leader may help an employee experience a sense of self-determination by providing him or her more work autonomy and discretion (Pearce & Sims, 2002). Lastly, an empowering leader is likely to involve his or her subordinates in the decision-making process (Manz & Sims, 1987), which in turn is likely to result in an enhanced sense of impact or influence in the work group (Zhang & Bartol, 2010). Several studies also found a positive relationship between empowering leadership and psychological empowerment among subordinates (Boudrias et al., 2009; Raub & Robert, 2010).

While there has been limited research on the connection between managers’ perceptions of psychological empowerment and their use of empowering leadership practices (with their subordinates), one might reasonably expect such a relationship. Some research does suggest that empowered managers are more likely to use empowering leadership. Chan and Drasgow (2001) argued that past leadership experience and self-efficacy are important determinants of positive leadership behaviors. Their study found that individuals with greater self-efficacy were likely to report greater affective and social normative motivation to lead others. Moreover, Kanter (1977) noted that powerful managers are more likely to share power with their staffs. Studies have also shown that individuals higher in the organizational hierarchy are more likely to perceive themselves to be more empowered (Haugh & Laschinger, 1996). One study of public and private managers by Mishra and Morrissey (1990) found that managers with greater
control/authority over resources were less reluctant to share decision-making responsibility with their subordinates. Another study by Ireland, Hitt, and Williams (1992) also found that managers who had a great deal of self-confidence were less threatened by high-performing subordinates and were more willing to provide subordinates with greater work autonomy. In addition, Parker and Price (1994) suggested that managers who have higher levels of control over decision making processes are more likely to believe that they are in a good position to share resources and control with their subordinates. Haugh and Laschinger (1996), in a study of staff nurses and public health managers, found that empowered managers were more likely to empower their subordinates. Based on these studies, the study proposes and tests the following hypothesis.

*Hypothesis 1b: Perceptions of psychological empowerment will mediate the relationship between senior and junior police officers’ empowering leadership practices.*

**Figure 2. The Link between Senior and Junior Managers’ Empowering Leadership Practices**
3.3.2. Empowering Leadership and Employee Effectiveness

Research suggests that formal rules and procedures cannot solely determine the work behavior of employees, and that managers in public organizations can play an important role in inspiring and motivating employees to leverage their knowledge, skills, and abilities for organizational benefits (Combs et al., 2006). In this respect, empowering leadership practices can be particularly influential for improving the motivation and performance of police officers. Assessing the use and influence of empowering managerial practices in law enforcement organizations is particularly interesting for several reasons. Organizational researchers have often characterized police work as paradox of discretion in that police officers have to exercise considerable discretion while at the same time being tightly controlled by formal rules, procedures, and a strict hierarchy (Jermier & Berkes, 1979; Lefkowitz, 1977; Paoline, 2003; Van Maanen, 1973). Moreover, law enforcement organizations such as the State Highway Patrol tend to have a paramilitary type work culture, and some researchers have noted that police officers have a preference for a directive or authoritarian style of leadership (Lefkowitz, 1977). Van Maanen (1975), for instance, found that highly motivated police officers were evaluated less favorably by their immediate supervisors, especially by those who had an authoritarian leadership style. More recent research, however, suggests that law enforcement organizations today are less hierarchical and bureaucratic and that police officers no longer prefer to be always directed by a centralized authority (Sun, 2002). Furthermore, law enforcement organizations are encouraged to adopt a more inclusive or team-oriented management approach and empowering managerial practices to improve police officers’ performance (Dick, 2011; Hough et al., 2010; Steinheider & Wuestewald,
2008; Wuestewald & Steinheider, 2006). However, we know little about the extent to which law enforcement officers actually use empowering leadership and its effectiveness in improving police officers’ job performance.

As noted in the previous chapter, research on public organizations has shown that empowering managerial practices lead to important positive attitudinal outcomes such as higher employee job satisfaction (Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2013a, 2013b), stronger organizational commitment (Hassan et al., 2013), and lower turnover intention (Kim & Fernandez, 2015). However, there has been limited research on whether and how empowering practices influence public employee work behaviors, especially their job performance (Cho & Faerman, 2010). The current study examines the influence of empowering leadership on three important measures of employee job performance: (1) task performance (i.e., the extent to which employees fulfill their formally prescribed job responsibilities), (2) conscientiousness (i.e., the extent to which employees adhere to the organization’s rules, regulations, and procedures) and (3) improvement-centered voice (i.e., the extent to which employees voluntarily raise work issues or problems and provide suggestions about how to resolve them). While the first two measures are generally referred to as employee in-role performance, the last qualifies as employee extra-role performance. Current research in organizational behavior suggests that improving both in-role and extra-role employee performance is important for increasing the effectiveness of organizations (Liden et al., 2008; Raub & Robert, 2010; Vigoda-Gadot, 2007). The next section discusses the detailed mechanisms through which empowering leadership may increase in-role and extra-role performance among police officers.

Prior research describes how empowering leadership practices can be key
enablers of employee performance. Empowering leadership practices are specifically identified as a way of reflecting the importance of sharing information regarding job skills and organizational goals, rewarding employees based on job performance, and allowing employee participation in decision-making processes (see e.g., Ahearne et al., 2005; Arnold et al., 2000; Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Seibert et al., 2004; Thomas & Tymon, 1994). For instance, by communicating better and more accurate information with organizational members an organization can expect better decision-making, which ultimately improves organizational performance (Srivastava et al., 2006). A good recognition and reward system can help to attract, retain, and motivate employees (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990; Zhang & Bartol, 2010) by creating a work environment where employees feel appreciated for their efforts and contribution (Seibert et al., 2004; Seibert et al., 2011). Finally, employee participation in decision-making and implementation processes can improve employees’ information processing and understanding of organizational processes, which in turn can enhance problem-solving skills (Wright & Kim, 2004).

More directly, empirical research on empowering leadership shows that empowering leaders enhance followers’ self-efficacy (Ahearne et al., 2005) and encourage them to engage in in-role and extra-role performance behavior (Boudrias et al., 2009; Li, Chiaburu, & Kirkman, 2014; Lorinkova et al., 2013; Raub & Robert, 2010; Srivastava et al., 2006; Vecchio et al., 2010; Zhang & Bartol, 2010). For instance, Boudrias et al. (2009) argued that supervisors’ empowering practices lead to employees’ self-determined and positive work behaviors, aimed at securing work effectiveness or at improving work efficiency within the organization. Raub and Robert (2010) also found
that when employees perceived their supervisors as empowering, they were more likely to engage in in-role behavior and helping behavior, or affiliative extra-role behavior. However, the relationship between empowering leadership and other forms of extra-role behavior (e.g., voice) was found to be mediated through psychological empowerment.

Self-determination theory provides a general approach for understanding how employees are likely to respond in a way that engages in in-role and extra-role work behaviors when they perceive their leaders as empowering. Self-determination theory is premised on the assumption that all individuals have three basic psychological needs (i.e., autonomy, relatedness, and competence), whose fulfillment leads to higher levels of autonomous motivation than controlled motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000). The satisfaction of basic psychological needs is thus predicted to improve employee performance by encouraging employees’ self-determined decisions (Gagné & Deci, 2005). Specifically, self-determination theory explains the role of empowering leadership on employee effectiveness as the fulfillment of individual needs for competence and autonomy (Parker, Bindl, & Strauss, 2010). Empowering leaders may help their followers to satisfy their psychological needs, in particular competence and self-determination, by encouraging them to take responsibility and expressing confidence in their abilities (Ahearne et al., 2005; Arnold et al., 2000; Ugboro & Obeng, 2000). Employees’ sense of autonomy also can be heightened when managers utilize empowering managerial practices such as showing confidence in their abilities and initiative in resolving work-related issues. Indeed, Raub and Robert (2010) used self-determination theory to explain why employees are likely to alter their in-role performance based on the extent of empowering leadership behaviors.
In addition to self-determination theory, social learning and social exchange theories provide additional insight about the role of empowering leadership in improving employee effectiveness in their jobs. According to social learning theory, individuals learn by modeling the attitudes, values, and behaviors of role models. Empowering leaders serve as role models in organizations by setting a good example by the ways they behave (Arnold et al., 2000; Raub & Robert, 2010). They can also provide coaching and information to followers and establish harmonious leader-follower relationships, thus inspiring followers to emulate their empowering behaviors toward others, including colleagues or supervisors. In line with the social exchange perspective, subordinates who receive supervisory benefits from empowering leadership reciprocate by performing in accordance with supervisors’ preferences (Keller & Dansereaul, 1995). The norm of reciprocity also suggests that empowered employees will have a proactive orientation and perform well when they believe that they are being treated well (Van Dyne, Kamdar, & Joireman, 2008). Consistent with these perspectives and results of prior research, the study tests the following hypothesis.

_Hypothesis 2a: Junior police officers’ empowering leadership will be related positively with subordinate police officers’ task performance._

While task performance represents those behaviors that directly contribute to completing employees’ job duties, conscientiousness involves active positive contributions (e.g., following organizational rules and regulations) as well as avoidance of certain harmful or negative work behaviors (e.g., being late, taking unnecessary or long breaks, or being absent at work) (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997). Conscientiousness is particularly important for police officers as it is predictive of
their job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991). In general, police officers are expected to perform their work duties according to the law and their agency’s work protocols. Law enforcement agencies tend to encourage and reward conscientious behavior among police officers. Many police agencies, for example, focus on adherence to internal organizational procedures, such as following protocols and the code of conduct, in the formal evaluation of their employees (Lilley & Hinduja, 2006). As conscientiousness is stably related to job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991), highly conscientious employees are preferred by many organizations, particularly by law enforcement agencies. Studies of law enforcement have consistently shown that effective police officers are conscientious, dependable, and emotionally stable (Cortina et al., 1992; Lord & Schoeps, 2000). For instance, Black (2000) found that police recruits with high conscientiousness tend to be higher performers during training.

Social exchange theory provides insight on how empowering leadership may improve conscientiousness among police officers. From a social exchange perspective, when employees feel that their supervisors are supportive, recognize their contributions, and provide opportunities for growth and development, they are more likely to have a positive attitude toward the organization, follow the organization’s rules and procedures, and avoid engaging in behaviors that are harmful to the organization. Research also has shown that employees tend to make extra efforts to reciprocate satisfying work experiences and conditions provided by the organization (Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-Lamastro, 1990) or the supervisor (Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997). Laad and Henry (2000), for example, found that when employees perceived high levels of organizational support, they were more likely to reciprocate by conscientiously performing their job
responsibilities. Furthermore, other research has shown that supportive leadership practices promote conscientiousness among subordinates. In their meta-analytic study, Podsakoff et al. (2009) discovered that supervisors’ managerial practices, measured in terms of transformational leadership (corrected $r = .24$), transactional leadership (e.g., contingent reward behavior corrected $r = .26$), and supportive leader behavior (corrected $r = .24$), were positively related to employee conscientiousness. However, there has been limited research on the relationship between empowering leadership and employee conscientiousness. Empowering leadership is likely to have a positive relationship with employee conscientiousness as being supportive and this is an important indicator of psychological empowerment (Boudrias et al., 2009; Watt & Shaffer, 2005). In addition, Podsakoff et al. (2009) argued that employees are likely to exhibit greater conscientiousness when they require less close managerial supervision. In other words, by providing subordinates with more autonomy and delegating decision-making authority to them, empowering leaders may increase subordinates’ conscientiousness. Accordingly, the following hypothesis is tested in the current study.

_Hypothesis 2b: Junior police officers’ empowering leadership will be associated positively with subordinate police officers’ conscientiousness behavior._

In addition to improving police officers’ in-role performance, empowering leadership is likely to have a positive influence on their extra-role performance. This study focuses on a particular type of extra-role behavior, i.e., voice. Voice refers to employees’ behavioral expressions of constructive ideas, information, and opinions about changes in organizations (Lepine & Van Dyne, 1998; Van Dyne & Lepine, 1998). More specifically, voice behavior is a discretionary and challenging form of extra-role behavior.
(Detert & Burris, 2007; Lepine & Van Dyne, 1998; Morrison, 2011; Van Dyne & Lepine, 1998). Research suggests that employee voice can be either active or passive, constructive or destructive (Gorden, 1988), prosocial or defensive (Van Dyne, Ang, & Botero, 2003), and promotive or prohibitive (Liang, Farh, & Farh, 2012). Among these different forms of voice, this study pays particular attention to promotive and improvement-oriented voice, which is exhibited by an employee, organizationally relevant, and focused on influencing the work environment (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, & Podsakoff, 2016). Improvement-oriented voice behavior is often described as a type of empowered behavior as it reflects “one’s willingness to take responsibility for effective decision-making across those decisions that must be made and those that are discretionary and require some degree of personal initiative” (Robbins et al., 2002, p. 435). Similarly, improvement-oriented voice is considered the immediate and direct result of employee empowerment, as it relates to a follower-central, bottom-up decision making process which is initiated by employees rather than managers (Ng & Feldman, 2012).

Implicit in the notion of employee empowerment is the premise that more voice would be observed as employees become more empowered. Since the publication of Hirschman (1970) seminal exit-voice-loyalty framework, employee voice has received extensive attention from researchers as a behavioral response to work-related problems. The literature suggests that employees often choose to speak up by cognitively calculating the potential benefits and costs associated with voicing ideas (Liang et al., 2012). While employees can achieve positive benefits such as favorable visibility, favorable performance evaluation, and promotion opportunities (Liang et al., 2012;
Morrison, 2011), they might need to accept the risk of material or social losses when initiating voice (Detert & Burris, 2007; Liu, Tangirala, & Ramanujam, 2013; Liu, Zhu, & Yang, 2010). Accordingly, there are two important considerations that have been emphasized in the literature: perceived voice efficacy, and safety in the voice process (Morrison, 2011). For instance, Morrison, Wheeler-Smith, and Kamdar (2011) found that when employees perceived their voices to be effective, they were more likely to share suggestions and concerns, especially when they were strongly identified with their work groups. Detert and Burris (2007) found that employees were more likely to engage in voice behavior when they felt psychologically safe to make suggestions. Liang et al. (2012) further detailed the psychological antecedents to employee voice and found that a felt obligation for constructive change was strongly related to improvement-oriented, or suggestion-focused, voice behavior. Conversely, psychological safety was found to be strongly related to problem-focused employee voice. Thus, it is expected that the more competence and control over their work (e.g., voice efficacy) they have, the more likely empowered employees will be to speak up.

Since supervisors are likely to be the primary targets of employee voice, research has considered supervisor (re)actions as the main factors of affecting voice behavior, alongside employee motives. Several studies have explored the role of various supportive leadership styles and behaviors in creating opportunities for voice and shaping the cognitions that drive the decision of whether or not to voice a concern (Lepine & Van Dyne, 1998; Ng & Feldman, 2012; Raub & Robert, 2013; Wood & Wall, 2007). For instance, Lepine and Van Dyne (1998) found that employees of self-managed work groups were likely to exercise their voices and express ideas, information, and opinions.
Voice behavior is also linked to transformational leadership and managerial openness (Detert & Burris, 2007), and to ethical leadership (Walumbwa & Schaubroeck, 2009). However, there has been little research aimed at understanding the role of empowering leadership in the voice process (Raub & Robert, 2010, 2013). Only a few studies have examined the relationship between psychological empowerment and voice behavior (Frazier & Fainshmidt, 2012) and the indirect effect of empowering leadership via psychological empowerment (Raub & Robert, 2010, 2013), or the role of empowering leadership in moderating the relationship between trust in leaders and voice behavior (Gao, Janssen, & Shi, 2011). In other words, little is known about the extent to which managers’ use of empowering leadership contributes to employee voice behavior.

There are several reasons to expect that empowering leadership will have a direct influence on employee voice behavior. A central idea within the empowering leadership literature is that empowering leaders allow their followers input into decisions that affect them by soliciting their ideas and opinions and making them participate in decision-making (Ahearne et al., 2005; Arnold et al., 2000; Srivastava et al., 2006). As with the relationship between empowering leadership and employee in-role performance, self-determination theory and social exchange theory are also helpful in explaining how employee voice may be influenced by empowering leadership. Self-determination theory suggests that perceptions of competence and autonomy are critical for employee proactivity, including their voice behavior (Choi, 2007; Deci et al., 1989; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Martin et al., 2013). Cirka (2005), for instance, found that employees were more motivated to engage in voice behavior when they perceived their managers were supportive and encouraged autonomy. Further, social exchange theory suggests that by
respecting others’ ideas, opinions, and concerns, empowering leaders can improve subordinates’ perceptions that their ideas and opinions count, which in turn may motivate them to speak up with suggestions and concerns (Detert & Burris, 2007; Detert et al., 2013). Empowering leadership may also foster voice behavior by enhancing employees’ sense of shared accountability through social exchange processes (Wallace et al., 2011).

Consistent with these theoretical perspectives and the results of prior research, it is expected in the current study that employees will be more likely to speak up with suggestions for change (i.e., improvement-oriented voice) when they perceive leaders as empowering.

_Hypothesis 2c: Junior police officers’ empowering leadership will be associated positively with subordinate police officers’ improvement-oriented voice behavior._

### 3.3.3. Empowering Leadership and Workgroup Effectiveness

In addition to improving the performance and behavior of individual employees, empowering leadership practices may positively improve the performance of work groups within public organizations. However, there has been limited research in public administration about the connection between empowering leadership practices and workgroup-level outcomes in government organizations. Examining this relationship could help extend our understanding of the overall impact of empowering leadership in public agencies. Therefore, this study investigates whether empowering leadership facilitates positive group-level behaviors and higher work-group performance, in addition to affecting individual-level behavior and performance in law enforcement agencies.

To do so, the study examines the influences of empowering leadership practices on four workgroup-level variables: (1) task performance, (2) conscientiousness, (3) voice,
and (4) overall work unit effectiveness. Organizational researchers have argued that the same construct at different levels has different theoretical meanings and may exercise its impact on employee performance through different paths (e.g., Chan, 1998; Ehrhart, 2004; Klein & Kozlowski, 2000a). This implies that group performance is not merely the aggregate of individual-level employee performance. Similarly, Ehrhart (2004) pointed out that comparison of results from different levels of analysis can help reveal whether the influences that a manager or leader has on his/her subordinates are uniform or different. In other words, investigating whether empowering leadership is predictive of behavior and performance at the group-level is important.

Prior work has established a link between empowering leadership and individual work behaviors and outcomes (Ahearne et al., 2005; Boudrias et al., 2009; Raub & Robert, 2010; Zhang & Bartol, 2010) as well as group behavior and performance (Chen et al., 2011; Lorinkova et al., 2013; Martin et al., 2013; Srivastava et al., 2006). However, research on the effects of empowering leadership on group level in-role and extra-role performance in the public sector is limited. Previous studies have investigated the link between empowerment and performance outcomes primarily at the individual level of analysis. To the best of my knowledge, no prior public sector study assessed the effects of empowerment at the workgroup level in public sector organizations. Two notable public sector studies that examined the link between empowerment and workgroup performance used individual-level data but generalized findings to the group level (Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2011, 2013b). Organizational scholars, however, have argued that group-level constructs differ from the same construct at the individual level, and emphasized the importance of capturing shared perceptions within groups regarding
the construct in order to generalize findings to the group level (Klein & Kozlowski, 2000a; Seibert et al., 2004; Wallace et al., 2011). Building on findings from studies at the individual level, the present study predicts that a similar pattern of relationship will also exist at the workgroup level, whereby empowering leadership will foster group in-role (i.e., task performance and conscientiousness) and extra-role behaviors (i.e., voice), and improve overall workgroup effectiveness.

Both self-determination theory and social exchange theory provide insight about how empowering leadership may increase the effectiveness of workgroups. Self-determination theory suggests that empowering leaders promote a sense of competence, autonomy, and relatedness among team members, and inspire them to exert extra efforts in their tasks and roles (Ahearne et al., 2005). For instance, Wallace et al. (2011), in a study of restaurant managers, found that empowering leadership was a distal antecedent to group performance through its influence on team members’ shared perceptions of autonomy and competence. Social exchange theory predicts that if team members perceive their team leaders as empowering, they will reciprocate by contributing to group or organizational performance. Prior work has established a relationship between empowering leadership and in-role and extra-role behavior at the individual level (Cho & Faerman, 2010; Raub & Robert, 2010), but has been less explored at the group level. Therefore, building on these perspectives and results of prior research, this study will test the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3: Junior police officers’ empowering leadership will be related positively with unit-level (a) task performance, (b) conscientiousness, (3) voice, and (4) overall unit-effectiveness.
3.3.4. The Cascading Effects of Senior Managers’ Empowering Leadership

Frontline employees are influenced not only by the leadership practices of their immediate supervisor but also by those of senior managers in the organization (Detert & Trevino, 2010; Masterson, 2001; Mawritz et al., 2012; Mayer et al., 2009; Schaubroeck et al., 2012). The majority of leadership research has focused on the influence that a leader has on his/her immediate subordinates, usually lower-level or frontline workers, primarily due to the structural and psychological proximity of a supervisor-subordinate relationship. Other research, however, has indicated that leadership practices of senior managers can indirectly influence attitudes and behaviors of frontline workers through their influence on the organization’s climate and structure (Yammarino, 1994). In addition to exerting broader influences on organizational structures, systems, and practices (Detert & Trevino, 2010), senior managers may also affect frontline workers’ work attitudes and behavior by directly influencing mid-level and junior managers’ behaviors and practices (Mayer et al., 2009; Schaubroeck et al., 2012). Hambrick and Mason (1984), for example, found that senior leaders had a strong influence on the behavior of both mid-level managers and lower-level employees. Studies employing a trickle-down approach also found that the leadership practices of senior managers had an indirect effect on lower level employees by influencing the leadership practices of middle and junior-level managers (Ambrose et al., 2013; Masterson, 2001; Mawritz et al., 2012; Mayer et al., 2009; Wo et al., 2015). Such indirect influence is more likely to occur “when subordinate leaders mirror senior leaders’ styles and those subordinate leaders’ styles in turn influence how their followers think and behave” (Schaubroeck et al., 2012, p. 1655). Following these studies, the current study expects that empowering leadership
by senior police officers will have indirect positive influences on both employee and workgroup-level outcomes through promoting empowering leadership among middle and junior level police officers with supervisory responsibilities (see Figure 3).

Social learning and social exchange theories provide insight about the mechanisms through which senior police officers’ empowering leadership may indirectly affect individual and workgroup-level outcomes in law enforcement agencies. According to social learning theory, a mechanism might exist such that junior managers learn and imitate from senior managers in police organizations, and then show empowering leadership practices toward frontline police officers, which in turn improves the behavior and performance of workgroups. In line with social exchange theory, empowered managers and employees may use their power and position to benefit the organization as a way of reciprocating the support from their immediate bosses. Thus, when police officers with supervisory responsibilities observe their immediate bosses exhibiting empowering leadership practices, they themselves are likely to empower their subordinates. These empowered employees, in turn, are likely to be highly motivated and engage in behaviors that will enhance their own and the workgroup’s performance.

Following these arguments, this study tests the following two hypotheses.

Hypothesis 4: Empowering leadership by senior police officers will have an indirect positive influence on workgroup-level (a) task performance, (b) conscientiousness, (c) voice behavior, and (d) overall workgroup performance.

Hypothesis 5: Empowering leadership by senior police officers will have an indirect positive influence on individual-level (a) task performance, (b) conscientiousness, and (c) the voice behavior of frontline police officers.
3.3.5. Empowering Leadership and Ratings of Managerial Effectiveness

Another question that this study aims to address is whether empowering managers are perceived to be more effective than managers who are not empowering. To this end, it examines the relationship between empowering leadership practices and subordinate and supervisor ratings of managerial effectiveness. Subordinates are expected to rate their managers as more effective when they practice empowering leadership. This is because by empowering subordinates, managers provide a positive signal to subordinates about their confidence and competence in managing their staffs (Arnold et al., 2000; Konczak et al., 2000; Srivastava et al., 2006). Subordinates are also more likely to view empowering managers in a positive light (Arnold et al., 2000; Konczak et al., 2000; Srivastava et al., 2006) and consider empowerment as an important criterion of managerial effectiveness (Hakimi, Van Knippenberg, & Giessner, 2010). Subordinates are likely to feel respected and valued when their managers recognize their contribution, consult with them on important decisions, and support them during challenging periods.
Research has shown that the extent to which subordinates have autonomy for job-related decisions is positively related to their perceptions of the leader’s effectiveness (Kanter, 1979). One study by Pfeffer et al. (1998) found that subordinates evaluated work quality and managerial activities better when they were involved by the managers in the work processes. Supervisors of empowering managers are also likely to view them as more effective, although there may be some differences in supervisor and subordinate perceptions. Since empowerment has been considered a “must do” for effectively managing organizations (Maynard et al., 2012), senior managers are likely to have favorable attitudes toward their subordinate managers when they use empowering practices. Studies in law enforcement organizations suggest that senior police officers increasingly characterize empowering leadership as more effective than autocratic leadership. Although several previous studies found that senior police officers avoid risky leadership practices such as delegation due to lack of confidence and trust in the abilities of their followers (Girodo, 1998; Kuykendall & Unsinger, 1982), recent evidence suggests that many police officers express a decided preference towards participatory and empowering leadership styles (Bruns & Shuman, 1988; Vito, Suresh, & Richards, 2011). Given this increasing preference for empowering leadership, senior police officers are likely to perceive junior officers with managerial responsibilities as more effective when they use empowering practices. In other words, both supervisors and subordinates of junior police managers are likely to rate them as more effective when they engage in empowering leadership practices. Most prior research on the connection between empowering leadership and
managerial effectiveness has relied on subordinate rather than supervisor ratings of managerial effectiveness. A few studies also found that the connection between empowering leadership and managerial effectiveness is stronger with subordinate ratings of managerial effectiveness. For example, Kim and Yukl (1995) found that managerial effectiveness was correlated more strongly with follower ratings than with leaders’ self-ratings. Tekleab et al. (2008) also documented a stronger correlation with subordinate perceptions than with leaders’ self-ratings. These studies, however, did not use supervisor ratings of managerial effectiveness. While there may be some differences in subordinate and supervisor perceptions, the present study expects a positive correlation between empowering leadership and ratings of managerial effectiveness.

_Hypothesis 6: Junior police officers’ empowering leadership will be positively associated with supervisor and subordinate ratings of managerial effectiveness._

**Figure 4. Empowering Leadership and Managerial Effectiveness**
Chapter 4: Data and Methods

This chapter describes the sample, data collection procedures, and measurement of the variables used in the present study.

4.1. Sample and Procedures

Data for this study were collected via questionnaire from 101 law enforcement officers in Ohio, as well as their direct reports and bosses. The officers took part in an 11-week long leadership training program organized by a large public university and funded by the Ohio Law Enforcement Training Fund. It was designed to develop and improve police officers’ leadership and managerial skills. The data collection effort was part of the leadership training program; the data collected were used to provide officers with individualized feedback and coaching. Police officers with at least one year of supervisory experience were eligible to take part in the training program, and participants were nominated by their supervisors. The ranks of these police officers ranged from sergeant to police chief, and all had supervisory responsibilities.

Table 5 provides an overview of the demographic data for the officers and their subordinates. Among the officers, the participants were mostly of Caucasian (87%) ethnicity, followed by African American (7%), Hispanic (3%), Asian (2%), and other (4%). All except eight junior police managers were men (92%), and the average age of the participants was between 36 and 45 years. The tenure of the respondents in their law enforcement career ranged widely from 7 to 32 years, with a mean of 19.7 years. The most frequently reported education level was some college training (30%), followed by a
bachelor’s degree (26%), high school (16%), and a graduate degree (14%).

Table 5. Sample Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Supervisors (%)</th>
<th>Subordinates (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Junior Managers, n = 100)</td>
<td>(Frontline Employees, n = 446)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/white</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School/GED</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;20 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29 years (26-35 years for junior manager)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years (36-45 years for junior manager)</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 years (46-55 years for junior manager)</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;60 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the subordinates, 93.0% of the sample identified themselves as Caucasian. Approximately, 3.4% of the sample identified themselves as African American, 1.6% Hispanic, and 0.9% Native American. A vast majority of the sample was male (85.4%), and the average age of the sample was between 40 and 49 years. The respondents’ average tenure in law enforcement ranged widely from 0 to 40 years, with a mean of 16.2 years. The most frequently reported education level was some college training (37.3%),
followed by a bachelor’s degree (27.3%), an associate degree (19.5%), high school (12.1%), and a graduate degree (3.8%).

At the beginning of the training program, the police officers were informed about the purpose of the research project. Because a key goal of the project was to assess and compare the effectiveness of various leadership practices in law enforcement agencies from different perspectives, members of the research team asked the officers to provide the contact information (i.e., email address) of their boss and up to 6 subordinates. After the selection of the triads, four separate surveys were distributed and collected, either electronically or on paper. The first survey was administered to all 102 law enforcement officers in the training program regarding their supervisors’ and their own leadership practices, as well as their perceptions of psychological empowerment. One police officer dropped out the training program. The resulting response rate for the first survey, therefore, was 99%.

Concurrent with the completion of the first survey, the second survey, i.e., the subordinate survey, was administered to 507 subordinate law enforcement officers working in various agencies in Ohio. The purpose of this survey was to gather information about subordinates’ perceptions of their managers’ use of various managerial practices and effectiveness as managers. The direct subordinates of the participating officers were invited via email to take part in the online survey. In the recruitment email, the research team introduced the study’s purpose, informed participants about the confidentiality of responses, and emphasized that their participation in the study was voluntary. The survey remained open for 3 weeks, during which up to three individualized email reminders were sent to maximize the response rate. Altogether, 446
usable subordinate surveys were returned, for an overall response rate of 88%.

After gathering data from subordinates, the research team distributed another survey to the supervisors of the police officers enrolled in the training program. The purpose of this survey was to gather information about supervisors’ perceptions of the subordinate managers’ use of managerial practices, as well as their assessment of the officers’ managerial effectiveness and performance of the work units they were leading. This survey was administered to all 101 bosses of the participating officers who completed the first survey. The bosses were given 3 weeks to complete the surveys. Similar to the second survey, the respondents were invited via email and up to three individualized email reminders were sent to them to maximize the response rate. Altogether 98 surveys were completed and returned, for an overall response rate of 97%.

After gathering data from the supervisors, the research team distributed a fourth survey to the police officers enrolled in the training program. The purpose of this survey was to collect data regarding the performance of the 446 employees (i.e., subordinates) who completed the second survey. The survey was distributed one month after the completion of the supervisor and subordinate surveys. Altogether, 100 surveys were completed by the 101 police officers for a response rate of 99%. Overall, the complete sample without missing data consisted of a total of 413 out of possible 507 triads (81.5%).
4.2. Study Measures

4.2.1. Outcome Variables

The primary purpose of this study was to assess the effect of empowering leadership on employee and workgroup performance outcomes. Data for the individual-level outcomes, i.e., employee task performance, conscientiousness, and voice, were collected through the fourth survey. To alleviate problems associated with common method variance, the research team collected data for employee performance from a separate source (Podsakoff et al., 2003; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, & Podsakoff, 2012). Police officers were asked to provide ratings of each of their respective subordinates’ task performance, conscientiousness, and voice. All of the variables were measured using a six-point Likert type scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree). Task performance was measured using four items from the six-item scale developed by Williams and Anderson (1991). Only four items were selected to reduce survey length and competition time. Sample items included: “[This employee:] Adequately completes assigned duties and responsibilities,” and “Meets performance requirements of the job.” The internal reliability coefficient (Cronbach’s $\alpha$) for the measure was 0.91.

Conscientiousness was measured with four items adapted from a scale developed by Podsakoff, Mackenzie, and Moorman (1990) to measure the conscientiousness dimension of organizational citizenship behavior (Organ, 1988, 1997). Sample items included: “[This employee:] Follows unit rules, regulations and formal procedures even when no one is watching,” and “Does not take unnecessary or long breaks.” The Cronbach’s alpha for this measure was 0.77. Voice was measured using six items from a scale developed and validated by Van Dyne and Lepine (1998) to measure improvement-
or change-oriented voice. The items focused on employees’ voluntary communication efforts directed at challenging the status quo of a work unit through the suggestion. Sample items included: “[This employee:] Develops and makes recommendations concerning issues that affect this work group,” “Speaks up and encourages others to get involved in issues that affect this work unit,” and “Communicated his or her opinions about work issues and problems.” The Cronbach’s alpha for this measure was 0.90.

Work unit effectiveness was measured in the supervisor survey using four items taken from a scale developed by Hackman and Oldham (1976). In order to get an accurate assessment, the research team asked supervisors of the enrolled police officers to rate the performance of the workgroups they were leading. Sample items included: (1) “How would you rate the quality of work performed by the unit” and (2) “How would you rate the overall performance of the unit.” The items were measured using a five-point response scale (1 = far short of expectations to 5 = far exceeds expectations). The Cronbach’s alpha for the measure was 0.92.

Managerial effectiveness was measured with two items that were developed by Kim and Yukl (1995): (1) “Please indicate the overall effectiveness of the subordinate (or supervisor) in carrying out managerial roles,” and (2) “Please rate the subordinate (or supervisor)’s effectiveness as a manager.” Both items had a nine-point response choice (1 = least effective to 9 = most effective). Data for managerial effectiveness were collected from both supervisors and subordinates of the police officers enrolled in the training program. Two separate measures, therefore, were created to capture unique perceptions of managerial effectiveness. Ratings from the subordinates were aggregated to develop an overall measure of managerial effectiveness. The Cronbach’s alphas for the two measures
were 0.93 and 0.84 for subordinate-rated managerial effectiveness and supervisor-rated managerial effectiveness, respectively.

4.2.2. Predictor Variables

To measure *empowering leadership*, various scales have been proposed over the years. For example, a multi-dimensional scale developed by Arnold et al. (2000) has five components: leading by example, coaching, participative decision making, informing, and showing concern/interacting with the team. Ahearne et al. (2005) proposed a four-dimensional scale to measure “Leader Empowering Behavior (LEB).” The four dimensions of this scale are: enhancing the meaningfulness of work, fostering participation in decision making, expressing confidence in high performance, and providing autonomy from bureaucratic constraints. Recently, Boudrias et al. (2009) proposed another scale that consists of five dimensions: delegating or sharing power, fostering development of skills, communicating relevant job information, recognizing and rewarding performance, and maintaining positive relations with the group. In addition, focusing on organizational aspects of empowerment, Seibert et al. (2004) proposed an organization-level measure, *empowerment climate*, that consists of three components: information sharing, autonomy through boundaries, and team responsibility and accountability. A careful review of all of these measures indicated considerable overlap.

In the current study, I rely on four behavior scales of the Managerial Practice Survey instrument (MPS) developed by Yukl and associates (Kim & Yukl, 1995; Yukl, Gordon, & Taber, 2002; Yukl, Wall, & Lepsinger, 1990) to measure *empowering leadership*. The four practices are participating, supporting, coaching, and recognizing,
and all are key components of the relations-oriented behavior meta-category identified by Yukl et al. (2002). A close inspection of the definitions of various leadership practices offered by Yukl and associates (1995; 2002; 1990) shows that these four practices are also key elements of various existing empowering leadership scales (Ahearne et al., 2005; Arnold et al., 2000; Boudrias et al., 2009). Furthermore, these four practices correspond closely with items used by Fernandez and Moldogaziev (2011; 2013a; 2013b) to measure employee empowerment in public sector organizations. The measure used by Fernandez and Moldogaziev (2011) has four dimensions: (1) providing employees information about organizational goals and performance, (2) offering rewards based on performance, (3) providing access to job-related knowledge and skills, and (4) granting discretion to change work processes.

I operationalized empowering leadership at two levels: upper-level (i.e., senior managers’ empowering leadership) and lower-level (i.e., junior managers’ empowering leadership). Empowering leadership was measured in both the supervisor and subordinate surveys of the police officers (i.e., trainees). In the supervisor survey, police officers were asked to report about their boss’ empowering behavior and, in the subordinate survey, the direct reports were asked to report about their immediate supervisors’ empowering behavior. In both surveys, respondents were shown three items for each of the four empowering practices, and were asked to provide one overall rating for the component behavior scale. The items had five response choices (1 = not at all to 5 = a very great extent). Respondents also had the option to choose “Don’t know or not applicable.” The Cronbach’s alphas for this measure were 0.80 for senior managers’ empowering leadership and 0.83 for junior managers’ empowering leadership.
Psychological empowerment was measured in the supervisor survey using a 12-item scale developed by Spreitzer (1995). This scale consists of four subscales (i.e., meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact) and each dimension was measured with three items. Sample items included: (1) “The work I do is very important to me” (meaning), (2) “I am confident about my ability to do my job” (competence), (3) “I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my work” (self-determination), and (4) “I have a great deal of control over what happens in my department” (impact). The construct validity and internal consistency of the scale have been examined and supported in numerous previous studies (Seibert et al., 2011; Spreitzer et al., 1999). The items were measured using a 7-point response scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). The Cronbach’s alphas were 0.84 for the overall measure, 0.85 for meaning, 0.67 for competence, 0.92 for self-determination, and 0.81 for impact.

4.2.3. Control Variables

Measures of task-oriented leadership, red tape, workgroup size, and quality of supervisor-subordinate relationships were included as controls in the analyses. The measure for task-oriented leadership consisted of four practices: clarifying, planning, problem-solving, and internal monitoring (Kim & Yukl, 1995; Yukl et al., 2002). In both the supervisor and subordinate surveys, respondents were shown three items for each of the four task-oriented practices and were asked to provide one overall rating for the component behavior scale. The items had 5-point response format (1 = not at all to 5 = to a very great extent) and a “Don’t know or not applicable” option. The Cronbach’s alphas for this measure were 0.79 for senior managers’ task-oriented leadership and 0.84 for junior managers’ task-oriented leadership. Red tape was measured using a single-item
global measure as used by Bozeman (2000). The item had a 10-point response choice (1 = \textit{no red tape} to 10 = \textit{the highest level}). \textit{Workgroup size} was measured with a single item from the supervisor survey: “How many people currently work in your unit?” Quality of supervisor-subordinate relationship was measured with a single item in both the supervisor and subordinate survey: “How would you describe the relationship between you and your supervisor?” (1 = \textit{very poor} to 5 = \textit{very good}).

Additionally, the analysis controlled for personal characteristics (age, gender, minority status, unit tenure, and education level) of supervisors and subordinates in the analysis. Gender and minority status (i.e., nonwhite) of supervisors and subordinates were each measured with a dummy variable (1 = \textit{female}, 0 = \textit{male} for gender and 1 = \textit{yes}, 0 = \textit{no} for minority status). Supervisor age was measured with a single survey item from the supervisor survey: “What is your current age?” The item had three response choices (1 = 26-35 years, 2 = 36 to 45 years, 3 = over 45 years). Separate dummy variables (1 = \textit{yes}, 0 = \textit{no}) were created to assess the unique effect of each age group. The base/reference category in the regression analyses was 36 to 45 years. Subordinate age was also measured with a single item from the subordinate survey. The item had six response choices (1 = \textit{under 20 years} to 6 = \textit{more than 60 years}). Separate dummy variables (1 = \textit{yes}, 0 = \textit{no}) were created to assess the unique effect of each age group. The base/reference category in the regression analyses was 40-49 years. Supervisor and subordinate unit tenure were each measured with a single item from the two surveys: “How long have you worked in your current unit?” (1 = \textit{less than 6 months} to 6 = \textit{more than five years}). Supervisor and subordinate education level were each measured with a single item from the two surveys. The item in both surveys had six response choices (1 =
high school to 6 = professional degree).

4.2.4. Data Aggregation

Given the hierarchically nested structure of my data, the subordinate responses on empowering leadership were aggregated. Supervisor ratings of subordinate task performance, conscientiousness, and voice were also aggregated to develop workgroup-level measures of these variables. Following the suggestions of Klein and Kozlowski (2000b), within-group agreement was assessed by estimating the $r_{wg}$ statistic (James, Demaree, & Wolf, 1984) for the aggregated study measures. The median $r_{wg(j)}$ value of the aggregated empowering leadership measure was .83. For the three unit-level outcome measures—task performance, conscientiousness, and voice—the median $r_{wg(j)}$ values were .88, .93, and .84, respectively. All of these values exceeded the suggested cutoff value of .70, indicating sufficient within-group variance for the measures (Bliese, 2000; Chen, Mathieu, & Bliese, 2004).

Moreover, I calculated the intra-class correlation (ICC) coefficients to determine the extent of between-group variation in the study measures. The ICC1 and ICC2 values were .29 and .64 for empowering leadership, .30 and .66 for task performance, .42 and .75 conscientiousness, and .42 and .76 for voice. The ICC2 values for all the aggregated

---

1 The ICC, as an index of within-group consistency or interrater reliability (Bliese, 2002), is used to assess restricted within-unit variance index of within-group consistency, which along with $r_{wg(j)}$, allows an index of within-group consensus or agreement (James, Demarre, and Wolfe 1984). The ICCs for the observed variables provide a measure of the amount of variability between workgroups and the degree of nonindependence or clustering of the data within workgroups. Using a random effects model, the ICC for an item represents the variation between workgroups in the intercepts (means) of the item, divided by the total variation (sum of the variation between agencies in the intercepts and the variation within agencies). ICCs can range from 0 to 1.0, with larger values indicating greater clustering effects within workgroups. Although there are no firm guidelines for deciding how large the ICC has to be to warrant multilevel analyses, most of the published multilevel CFAs have reported ICCs greater than .10 (Dyer, Hanges, & Hall, 2005; Hox, 2002).
measures were above .60, indicating sufficient between-group variation in the data for the measures (Klein & Kozlowski, 2000b). In addition, I performed a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for each of the aggregated measures. The ANOVA results also confirmed that there was sufficient between-group variation in the measures. The calculated $F$-ratios were 2.82 for empowering leadership, 3.20 for task performance, 4.56 for conscientiousness, and 4.27 for voice. All of the $F$-ratios were statistically significant at 1 percent. Taken together, these results provide the needed empirical support for aggregating the individual ratings to unit-levels and proceeding to multilevel analysis.
Chapter 5: Analysis and Results

5.1. Psychometric Properties of the Measures

Prior to testing research hypotheses, I conducted a series of confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) using MPlus to assess the psychometric properties of the study measures (Muthén & Muthén, 2012). For the constructs measured at the individual level and operationalized at the workgroup level (i.e., empowering leadership, task performance, conscientiousness, and voice), a multilevel CFA was performed to justify grouping individual-level responses to a single score at each workgroup level. A multilevel CFA was performed to investigate whether the constructs have different structures at the aggregate (i.e., workgroup) level of analysis (Dedrick & Greenbaum, 2011; Dyer et al., 2005). For the constructs operationalized only at one level (i.e., the workgroup level), I performed a single-level CFA. Because the ordinal nature of the data, this analysis used the weighted least squares maximum likelihood estimation method for the CFAs.

Multiple indices were used to evaluate the goodness of fit of the measurement models (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Specifically, I relied on the overall models’ chi-square ($\chi^2_{(df)}$), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR), and the Weighted Root Mean Square Residual (WRMR) to assess the models’ fit to the data. Generally accepted cut-off criteria for the CFI and TLI indices are $\geq .95$ for a good fit and $\geq .90$ for an adequate fit. Similarly, cutoff values for RMSEA and SRMR are $\leq .06$ for a good fit, $\leq .08$ a satisfactory fit, and $\leq .10$ for an acceptable fit. For
WRMR, ≤ .90 indicates a good fit, while ≤ 1.00 indicates a moderate fit.

5.1.1. CFA of Empowering Leadership Practices

A multilevel CFA was conducted to test the factor structure of the constructs, i.e., senior and junior managers’ empowering leadership, at both within-workgroup (micro) and between-workgroup (macro) levels of analysis simultaneously (Dyer et al., 2005; Pornprasertmanit, Lee, & Preacher, 2014). Following procedures described by Dyer et al. (2005) and Dedrick and Greenbaum (2011), I performed CFA of nested observations with two data-analytic methods: single-level and multilevel CFA. Specifically, a single-level CFA was first performed to determine the fit of a prior two-factor measurement model (i.e., senior and junior managers’ empowering leadership), either at the individual or at the workgroup-unit level. Next, a two-level CFA was performed to compare the fit with that of the single level CFA.

I used “TWOLEVEL” and the diagonally weighted least squares estimator (WLSMV: weighted least square mean and variance adjusted) in MPlus to implement the two-level CFA, as it can analyze both the individual-level and group-level variables simultaneously. The estimated factor loadings and model fits were similar for WLSMV and MLR (maximum likelihood with robust standard errors) estimation, and the WLSMV estimator provided a better model fit for the data. As such, the results are reported using the WLSMV estimator.

Table 6 displays the fit indices of the measurement models at the single- and multilevel. Results of the correlated two-factor multilevel model indicate a good fit with
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2 In the context of leadership, the between-workgroup factor structure refers to differences between workgroups, which is the ratings of leadership aggregated across employees within the workgroup. The within-workgroup factor structure refers to differences within workgroups at the micro level, which is the deviation of a workgroup’s mean on each subordinate’s rating of leadership.
the data (CFI = .99; TLI = .99; RMSEA = .02; WRMR = .45). The SRMR values indicated that the fit of the Level 1 (within) part was better than the fit of the Level 2 part of the model (SRMR$_W$ = .02 vs. SRMR$_B$ = .08, where SRMR$_W$ and SRMR$_B$ are the standardized root mean square residuals for the within- and between-group models, respectively). However, the chi-square value for WLSMV was inconsistent with a good model fit ($\chi^2(21) = 26.74, p = .18$). Although the chi-square value indicates a lack of fit to the data, it was not of particular concern because these indices are sensitive to sample size, with larger samples inflating the chi-square and increasing the likelihood of achieving a good model fit (James, Mulaik, & Brett, 1982).

Table 6. Model Fit for a Priori Single- and Multilevel Models of Senior and Junior Managers’ Empowering Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>WRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Level CFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregated CFA (Workgroups)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Factor</td>
<td>129.60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Factors</td>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaggregated CFA (Individuals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Factor</td>
<td>384.04</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Factors</td>
<td>37.94</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilevel CFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Factor</td>
<td>72.33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>W=.02, B=.24</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Factors</td>
<td>26.74</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>W=.02, B=.08</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $n = 446$ employees and 100 workgroups. df = degrees of freedom, CFI = comparative fit index, RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation, SRMR = standardized root mean square residual, W = within-group portion of the model, B = between-group portion of the model, WRMR = weighted root mean square residual.

Further, I examined whether the proposed two-factor model provided a better fit to the data than an alternative one-factor model, which combined senior and junior managers’ empowering leadership into a single factor. The results suggested that the data
fit the single factor model poorly ($\chi^2_{(22)} = 72.33, p < .01; \text{CFI} = .92; \text{TLI} = .88; \text{RMSEA} = .07, \text{WRMR} = .92$). A change in $\chi^2$ test indicated that the two-factor model represents a significantly better fit to the data than the one-factor model ($\Delta \chi^2 = 45.59, \Delta df = 1, p < .01$). In addition, the results of multilevel CFA indicated that the two-level measurement fit the data better the single-level model ($\chi^2_{(27)} = 37.94; \text{CFI} = .99; \text{TLI} = .98; \text{RMSEA} = .04, \text{WRMR} = .69$).

### Table 7. Standardized Factor Loadings ($\lambda$s) from Single-Level CFA and Multilevel CFA Results for Senior and Junior Managers’ Empowering Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Single-Level Analysis</th>
<th>Multilevel Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disaggregated CFA (Individuals)</td>
<td>Aggregated CFA (Workgroups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Managers’ Empowering Leadership (Upper-level)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>.75 (.03)</td>
<td>.77 (.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>.72 (.03)</td>
<td>.73 (.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>.68 (.04)</td>
<td>.66 (.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing</td>
<td>.71 (.03)</td>
<td>.68 (.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Junior Managers’ Empowering Leadership (Lower-level)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>.83 (.03)</td>
<td>.83 (.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>.76 (.03)</td>
<td>.76 (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>.76 (.03)</td>
<td>.76 (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing</td>
<td>.76 (.03)</td>
<td>.80 (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 446 employees and 100 workgroups. The values in parentheses are standard errors (SEs) of standardized factor loadings. All loadings are significant at $p < .01$. 
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5.1.2. CFA of Psychological Empowerment

A single-level, second-order CFA was conducted to assess the construct validity of the measure of psychological empowerment. The items were set to load on their respective components, and each of the four components was then set to load onto the second-order psychological empowerment factor. The fit indices for the four first-order factors and the second-order factor were within an acceptable range ($\chi^2_{(49)} = 88.51, p < .01$, RMSEA = .09, CFI = .99, TLI = .98, WRMR = .69), indicating that the dimensions reflected the overall construct.

Table 8. Standardized Factor Loadings ($\lambda$s), Reliability Coefficients ($\alpha$s), and AVEs from CFA Results for Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>$\lambda$</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First-Order</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work I do is very important to me.</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job activities are personally meaningful to me.</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work I do is meaningful to me.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident about my ability to do my job.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am self-assured about my capabilities to perform my work activities.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have mastered the skills necessary for my job.</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Determination</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job.</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can decide on my own how to go about doing my work.</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do my job.</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My impact on what happens in my department is large.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a great deal of control over what happens in my department.</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have significant influence over what happens in my department.</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second-Order</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Determination</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n =100 junior managers.*
As shown in Table 8, all of the item loadings were significant \((p < .01)\) on their respective latent factors, as well as each component loading on the second–order factor psychological empowerment. The standardized loadings for the items measuring junior managers’ psychological empowerment ranged from 0.57 to 0.92, greater than 0.50. The AVE values for meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact were 0.80, 0.44, 0.86, and 0.70, respectively. These results largely confirmed that the four components indeed represent an underlying construct of psychological empowerment.

5.1.3. CFA of Employee and Unit-level Performance Outcomes

In the dataset, employees were nested within workgroups. Hence, I conducted both single-level and multilevel CFAs to test the factor structure of three performance outcome measures: task performance, conscientiousness, and voice. First, a single-level CFA was used to determine the fit of the prior three-factor measurement model at the individual level. I began by specifying a congeneric measurement model, which specifies that indicators load only onto their corresponding latent variables. The results indicate a reasonable fit of the model to the data \(\chi^2(73) = 271.69, p < .01, \text{RMSEA} = .07, \text{CFI} = .99, \text{TLI} = .98\). In addition, alternative models were tested by specifying the indicators of two or more of the constructs as loading onto the same latent variable. For instance, one model was tested wherein task performance and conscientiousness (the two constructs dealing with in-role performance) were collapsed into one factor, and another model was tested wherein all three constructs were collapsed into one factor. As seen in Table 9, none of the possible alternative models fit the data as well as the three-factor model.

Furthermore, a set of multilevel CFAs were conducted to examine variation in the work behaviors across workgroups, and test whether such variations affected the factorial
structure of the measures within and between workgroups. The results of a multilevel CFA indicated a reasonable fit of the hypothesized three-factor model to the data, providing support for the distinctiveness of three measures at both the individual- and workgroup-levels ($\chi^2_{(148)} = 695.52, p < .01, \text{RMSEA} = .09, \text{CFI} = .96, \text{TLI} = .95$).

Additionally, in the multilevel analysis, none of the possible alternative models fit the data as well as the hypothesized, congeneric model.

### Table 9. CFA Model Comparison for Employee and Unit-level In-Role and Extra-Role Performance Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>WRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-level CFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Factors</td>
<td>271.69</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Factors</td>
<td>340.14</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Factor</td>
<td>1457.89</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilevel CFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Factors</td>
<td>695.52</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Factors</td>
<td>956.00</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Factor</td>
<td>2529.71</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $n = 446$ employees and 100 workgroups. All chi-squares are statistically significant at $p < .01$, df = degrees of freedom, CFI = comparative fit index, RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation, WRMR = weighted root mean square residual.*

Table 10 displays standardized factor loadings for the items measuring in-role and extra-role performance at the individual and workgroup levels. All factor loadings were significantly different from zero ($p < .01$) and ranged from 0.64 to 0.93. The AVE values for task performance, conscientiousness, and voice were 0.80, 0.53, and 0.63, respectively, at the individual level of CFA. In the multilevel CFA, the individual-level AVE values for employee task performance, conscientiousness, and voice were 0.86, 0.67, and 0.68, respectively, and 0.71, 0.52, and 0.64, respectively, at the workgroup level. The AVE for each construct was larger than the squared correlation between the
constructs in the Level 1 and Level 2 models, except the correlation between unit-level task performance and conscientiousness, providing reasonable support for the validity of the individual and workgroup level measures (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Table 10. Standardized Factor Loadings (\(\lambda\)) and AVEs from Single-level and Multilevel CFA Results for Employee and Unit-level Performance Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Single-Level</th>
<th>Multilevel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\lambda)</td>
<td>(\text{AVE})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately completes assigned duties and responsibilities.</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfills responsibilities specified in the job description.</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not neglect any aspect of the job he/she is obligated to perform.</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets performance requirements of the job.</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows unit rules, regulations and formal procedures even when no one is watching.</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance is above the norm.</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not take unnecessary or long breaks.</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is always punctual.</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops and makes recommendations concerning issues that affect the unit.</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks up and encourages others to get involved in issues that affect the unit.</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates his or her opinions about work issues and problems even when others disagree with him or her.</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides constructive ideas and suggestions about how to improve unit performance.</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies rules, policies, or procedures that are unproductive and counterproductive.</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tries to persuade changing unproductive rules, policies, or procedures.</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(n = 446\) employees and 100 workgroups.
5.1.4. CFA of Work Unit and Managerial Effectiveness

Finally, I conducted a single-level (i.e., workgroup level) CFA in which items for overall work-unit effectiveness, supervisor-rated managerial effectiveness, and subordinate-rated managerial effectiveness loaded on three separate factors. Table 11 summarizes the CFA results, reporting standardized factor loadings. As shown in Table 11, all of the scale items were found to have statistically significant factor loadings ranging from 0.87 to 1.00 (ps < .01). These results indicate a good fit for the model (RMSEA = .00, CFI = 1.00, TLI = 1.00, WRMR = .24). The AVE values for work unit effectiveness, supervisor-rated managerial effectiveness, and subordinate-rated managerial effectiveness were 0.80, 0.78, and 0.88, respectively. The value of AVE for each construct was greater than the squared correlations between the measure and the other remaining measures. Overall, these results provided empirical support for the validities of the three latent constructs (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Table 11. Standardized Factor Loadings (λs), Reliability Coefficients, and AVEs from CFA Results for Work-unit and Managerial Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>λ</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work-unit Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the quality of work performed by the unit?</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the quantity of work performed by the unit?</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the overall commitment of the employees of the unit in achieving its goals and objectives?</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the overall performance of the unit?</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Effectiveness (Supervisor-rated)</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate the overall effectiveness of your supervisor in carrying out his/her managerial responsibilities.</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please rate your supervisor's effectiveness as a manager</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Effectiveness (Subordinate-rated)</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate the overall effectiveness of your supervisor in carrying out his/her managerial responsibilities.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please rate your supervisor's effectiveness as a manager.</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 100 workgroups.
5.2. Univariate and Bivariate Analysis

Table 12 presents the means, standard deviations, internal reliability (i.e., Cronbach’s alpha), and cross-level correlation coefficients of the study measures. The mean scores for the two measures of empowering leadership (employee task performance, conscientiousness, and voice and leaders’ managerial effectiveness) were slightly negatively skewed, whereas the mean score for the measure of workgroup effectiveness was slightly positively skewed. The internal reliability coefficients for all but one of the measured variables—employee conscientiousness—were above .80.

An inspection of the correlation coefficients at the workgroup level indicates that senior managers’ empowering leadership was weakly correlated with junior managers’ empowering leadership \((r = .18, p < .1)\), while junior manager’s perceptions of psychological empowerment were weakly related to measures for both senior and junior managers’ empowering leadership \((rs > .20, ps < .05)\). Also, as expected, junior managers’ empowering leadership was positively related to unit-level task performance \((r = .33, p < .05)\), conscientiousness \((r = .28, p < .05)\), voice \((r = .32, p < .05)\), and subordinate-rated managerial effectiveness \((r = .74, p < .05)\). However, senior managers’ empowering leadership was not related to any of the outcome measures \((rs < .13, ps > .10)\). At the individual level of analysis, individual perceptions of junior managers’ empowering leadership were positively related to employee task performance \((r = .25, p < .05)\), conscientiousness \((r = .21, p < .05)\), and voice \((r = .18, p < .05)\). Additionally, the magnitude of inter-correlations between the measures of employee task performance, conscientiousness, and voice (both at the individual and workgroup levels) were moderate to strong \((rs > .45, ps < .05)\).
Table 12. Means, Standard Deviations, and Cross-level Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Obs.</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</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>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2</strong></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>1. Senior Manager’s Empowering Leadership</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>.80</strong></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>2. Junior Manager’s Empowering Leadership</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>.17†</td>
<td>.86</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>3. Junior Manager’s Psychological Empowerment</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Unit-level Task Performance</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Unit-level Conscientiousness</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.31†</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Unit-level Voice</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.20†</td>
<td>.76*</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Work Unit Effectiveness</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.18†</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Managerial Effectiveness (Senior manager-rated)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.30†</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Managerial Effectiveness (Subordinate-rated)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.19†</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1</strong></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>10. Junior Manager’s Empowering Leadership</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.13†</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.19†</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08†</td>
<td>.50†</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Employee Task Performance</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.25†</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Employee Conscientiousness</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.21†</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Employee Voice</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.47†</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Internal consistency coefficients, Cronbach’s alphas, are reported in bold on the diagonal.

† p < .10, * p < .05.
5.3. Tests of Hypotheses

5.3.1. Senior and Junior Managers’ Empowering Leadership

Hypothesis 1a predicted that junior or lower level managers would be more likely to empower their subordinates when their own supervisors empower them. Hypothesis 1b suggested that the positive relationship between senior and junior managers’ empowering leadership practices would be mediated by junior managers’ perceptions of psychological empowerment. To test these hypotheses, I used hierarchical regression analysis and structural equation modeling (SEM). Following the procedures suggested by Preacher and Hayes (2004), I first performed a series of hierarchical regression analyses to estimate the total, direct, and indirect effect of senior managers’ empowering leadership on junior managers’ empowering leadership. Specifically, I regressed junior managers’ empowering leadership on senior managers’ empowering leadership without including junior managers’ psychological empowerment (the total effect of the IV on the DV). I then regressed junior managers’ perceptions of psychological empowerment on senior managers’ empowering leadership (the direct effect of the IV on the mediator, giving an estimate of $a$ path). Next, I regressed junior managers’ empowering leadership on their perceived psychological empowerment (the direct effect of the mediator on the DV, giving an estimate of $b$ path) while controlling for senior managers’ empowering leadership (giving an estimate of $c' \text{ path}$). Finally, the mediation effect via psychological empowerment was quantified as the product of the $a$ and $b$ coefficients. Results are presented in Table 13.3

---

3 Based on the guidelines of Baron and Kenny (1986), mediation is inferred when: (1) the IV is significantly related to the DV, (2) the IV is significantly related to the mediator, (3) the mediator has a
As shown by the results of Model 1 in Table 13, senior managers’ empowering leadership had a significant positive relationship with junior managers’ empowering leadership (for path $c: \beta = 0.16, t = 2.29, p < .01$). The table also shows that senior managers’ empowering leadership was positively related to junior managers’ perceptions of psychological empowerment (for path $a: \beta = 0.23, t = 3.29, p < .01$), which, in turn, was positively related to subordinate ratings of junior managers’ empowering leadership (for path $b: \beta = 0.24, t = 2.18, p < .05$). To test this mediation further, I used the bootstrapping method described by Preacher and Hayes (2008). The standardized coefficient for the indirect relationship via psychological empowerment was 0.06 ($k = 10,000$ resamples), and the 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals (CIs) around the bootstrapped indirect effect did not include zero (0.01, 0.16). These results indicate that senior managers’ empowering leadership had a positive indirect association with junior managers’ empowering leadership through junior managers’ perceptions of psychological empowerment. Therefore, overall, Hypothesis 1a and 1b are supported with evidence.
Table 13. The Direct and Indirect Effect of Senior Managers’ Empowering Leadership on Junior Managers’ Empowering Leadership (Hypotheses 1a & 1b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1: Empowering Leadership (Junior managers)</th>
<th>Model 2: Psychological Empowerment (Junior managers)</th>
<th>Model 3: Empowering Leadership (Junior managers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Leadership (Senior managers)</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment (Junior managers)</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Tape</td>
<td>0.07**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workgroup Size</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Tenure</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (1 = Yes)</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority (1 = Yes)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group 1 (1 = 26-35 years)</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group 2 (1 = over 45 years)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.84**</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>4.69**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 94 mid-level/junior police officers. Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported. 
**p < .01, *p < .05, †p < .01.

In addition to hierarchical regression analysis, I performed SEM to test the mediation hypothesis (i.e., H1b). The measurement model had an acceptable fit to the data ($\chi^2(51) = 75.51, p < .05, CFI = .93, TLI = .91, RMSEA = .07, SRMR = .07$). In the structural model, supervisor perceptions of red tape, workgroup size, supervisor gender, minority status, age, education, and unit tenure were included as control variables. The fit statistics indicated a good fit to the data ($\chi^2(131) = 142.50, p = .23, CFI = .97, TLI = .96, RMSEA = .03, SRMR = .06$). Figure 5 presents the results of the structural model as

---

I also estimated a multilevel SEM to test the mediation effect. Both measurement and structural model showed good fitness indices as well. Since the results are similar, they are not reported here.
standardized regression coefficients. As illustrated in Figure 5, senior managers’ 
empowering leadership was positively related to junior managers’ perceptions of 
psychological empowerment ($\beta = 0.48$, $t = 4.23$, $p < .01$), which in turn was positively 
related to their use of empowering leadership ($\beta = 0.38$, $t = 2.00$, $p < .05$). Results of 
bootstrapping (10,000 replications) revealed a significant mediation effect of junior 
managers’ perceived psychological empowerment (bootstrapped indirect effect = 0.18 [0.00, 0.41]).

**Figure 5. SEM Results for the Relationship between Senior and Junior Managers’ Empowering Leadership Practices (Hypotheses 1a and 1b)**

![Figure 5: SEM Results](image)

*Note. n = 94 mid-level/junior police officers. Standardized path coefficients are presented.

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, † $p < .01$.

### 5.3.2. Empowering Leadership and Employee Performance

Hypotheses 2a to 2c predicted that junior managers’ empowering leadership would have positive connections with employee task performance, conscientiousness, and voice. Given the nested structure of the data (i.e., employees are nested within managers), I estimated a set of HLMs to test these hypotheses (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002; Snijders & Bosker, 2012). For each outcome variable, I estimated three separate HLM models. The first was a baseline or “null” model, followed a model with measures of the individual subordinate perceptions of empowering leadership and task leadership
(i.e., Level 1 predictors) as well as the socio-demographic variables as covariates. The third model included both individual and group-level predictors (i.e., both Level 1 and Level 2 predictors). In this model, measures of aggregated empowering leadership and task leadership as well as workgroup size, and red tape were included as Level 2 predictors. The Level 1 predictors were individual perceptions of empowering and task leadership, employee tenure, gender, race, age, and education. I also included individual perceptions of empowering leadership and task leadership to control for potential method effects. I centered the Level 1 predictors at workgroup means (i.e., group-mean centering) to isolate Level 1 effects into Within (within-workgroup variance) and Between (between-workgroup variance) components (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002; Shin & Raudenbush, 2010; Snijders & Bosker, 2012). This is done because raw or grand-mean-centered lower level scores can be conflated and contain both individual- and workgroup-level variance (Zhang, Zyphur, & Preacher, 2009). For each construct measured with multiple items, the average item scores were used as a composite to represent the construct. Tables 14, 15, and 16 summarize the analyses testing the hypothesized influence of empowering leadership (Level 2) on employee task performance, conscientiousness, and voice (Level 1), respectively.

*Task performance.* A shown in Table 14, the intercept of the baseline model for task performance was statistically significant. The analysis indicated that 30.7% of the total variance in subordinate task performance was at the workgroup level and 69.3% of the variance was at the individual level. These results suggest that multilevel analysis was indeed the right approach for testing the relationship between subordinate task performance and empowering leadership. Model 2 in Table 14 shows estimates for the
Level 1 predictors of subordinate task performance. As indicated in Model 2 in Table 14, individual perceptions of empowering leadership were related to subordinate task performance ($\gamma = 0.23, SE = .07, p < .01$), while individual perceptions of task leadership had no such association ($\gamma = -0.08, SE = .08, ns$). Model 2 accounted for 3.8% of the total variance in employee task performance. The results of the mixed model are shown in Model 3 in Table 14. As indicated in Table 14, the aggregated empowering leadership measure was positively related to employee task performance ($\gamma = 0.42, SE = 0.13, p < .05$). However, there was no relationship found between task leadership and employee task performance ($\gamma = -0.17, SE = 0.16, ns$). Finally, the Level 2 predictors accounted for an additional 8.2% of the total variance in subordinate task performance. These results provide support for Hypothesis 2a.

Conscientiousness. As illustrated in Table 15, the intercept of the baseline model for conscientiousness was statistically significant. The analysis indicated that 40.8% of the total variance in subordinate conscientiousness was at the workgroup level and 59.2% of the variance was at the individual level, suggesting multilevel analysis was the right approach for testing the relationship between subordinate conscientiousness and empowering leadership. Model 2 in Table 15 shows estimates for the Level 1 predictors of subordinate conscientiousness. As indicated in Model 2 in Table 15, individual perceptions of empowering leadership ($\gamma = 0.08, SE = 0.05, ns$) and task leadership ($\gamma = 0.08, SE = 0.08, ns$) were not related to subordinate conscientiousness. Model 2 accounted for 4.8% of the total variance in employee conscientiousness. The results of the mixed model are shown in Model 3 in Table 15. As indicated in Table 15, the
aggregated empowering leadership measure was positively related to employee conscientiousness ($\gamma = 0.38, SE = 0.14, p < .01$). However, there was no relationship found between task leadership and employee conscientiousness ($\gamma = -0.10, SE = 0.19, ns$). Finally, the Level 2 predictors accounted for an additional 8.6% of the total variance in subordinate conscientiousness. These results provide support for Hypothesis 2b.

**Voice.** Similar to the models for employee task performance and conscientiousness, the intercept of the baseline model for voice was statistically significant (see Model 1 in Table 16. The analysis indicated that 42.2% of the total variance in subordinate voice was at the workgroup level and 57.8% of the variance was at the individual level. Again, a multilevel analysis was the right approach for testing the relationship between subordinate voice and empowering leadership. Model 2 in Table 16 shows estimates for the Level 1 predictors of subordinate voice. As indicated in Model 2 in Table 16, individual perceptions of empowering leadership ($\gamma = 0.02, SE = 0.07, ns$) and task leadership ($\gamma = -0.04, SE = 0.09, ns$) were not related to subordinate voice. Model 2 accounted for 2.5% of the total variance of employee voice. The results of the mixed model are shown in Model 3 in Table 16. As indicated in Table 16, the aggregated empowering leadership measure was positively related to employee voice ($\gamma = 0.51, SE = 0.16, p < .01$). However, there was no relationship found between task leadership and employee voice ($\gamma = -0.05, SE = 0.16, ns$). Finally, the Level 2 predictors accounted for an additional 8.2% of total variance in subordinate voice. These results provide support for Hypothesis 2c.
Table 14. HLM Results Predicting Employee Task Performance (Hypothesis 2a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1: Null Model</th>
<th>Model 2: Individual -Level Predictors</th>
<th>Model 3: Mixed Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Effect</td>
<td>( \gamma )</td>
<td>( SE )</td>
<td>( \gamma ) ( SE )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.98** (0.05)</td>
<td>4.96** (0.21)</td>
<td>5.10** (0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Leadership</td>
<td>0.23** (0.07)</td>
<td>0.23** (0.07)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-Oriented Leadership</td>
<td>-0.08 (0.08)</td>
<td>-0.08 (0.08)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Unit Tenure</td>
<td>-0.04 (0.03)</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Female (1 = Yes)</td>
<td>-0.15 (0.12)</td>
<td>-0.13 (0.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Minority Status (1 = Yes)</td>
<td>-0.23 (0.18)</td>
<td>-0.27 (0.17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Age</td>
<td>0.05 (0.05)</td>
<td>0.03 (0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Education</td>
<td>0.03 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.02 (0.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Leadership (aggregated)</td>
<td>0.42* (0.13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-Oriented Leadership (aggregated)</td>
<td>-0.17 (0.16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workgroup Size</td>
<td>0.00* (0.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Tape</td>
<td>-0.04† (0.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual (( \tau_\beta ))</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept (( \tau_\pi ))</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2_{\text{Level 1}} )</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2_{\text{Level 2}} )</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2_{\text{Total}} )</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Deviance</td>
<td>1003.36</td>
<td>965.97</td>
<td>886.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Groups</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** \( p < .01 \), * \( p < .05 \), † \( p < .1 \).

\( R^2_{\text{Total}} = R^2_{\text{Level 1}} \times (1-\text{ICC}(1)) + R^2_{\text{Level 2}} \times \text{ICC}(1) \) (Snijders & Bosker, 2012)
Table 15. HLM Results Predicting Employee Conscientiousness (Hypothesis 2b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1: Null Model</th>
<th>Model 2: Individual Level Predictors</th>
<th>Model 3: Mixed Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.00** (0.06)</td>
<td>4.75** (0.22)</td>
<td>4.89** (0.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Leadership</td>
<td>0.08 (0.05)</td>
<td>0.08 (0.06)</td>
<td>0.08 (0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-Oriented Leadership</td>
<td>0.08 (0.08)</td>
<td>0.08 (0.08)</td>
<td>0.08 (0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Unit Tenure</td>
<td>-0.06* (0.03)</td>
<td>-0.04 (0.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Female (1 = Yes)</td>
<td>-0.14 (0.12)</td>
<td>-0.08 (0.12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Minority Status (1 = Yes)</td>
<td>-0.25 (0.18)</td>
<td>-0.29 (0.18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Age</td>
<td>0.12** (0.04)</td>
<td>0.11* (0.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Education</td>
<td>0.03 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.02 (0.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Leadership (aggregated)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.38** (0.14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-Oriented Leadership (aggregated)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.10 (0.19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workgroup Size</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00** (0.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Tape</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.04 (0.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual (τ₀)</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept (τ₁)</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2_{Level 1} )</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2_{Level 2} )</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2_{Total} )</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Deviance</td>
<td>942.57</td>
<td>906.82</td>
<td>831.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Groups</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** \( p < .01 \), * \( p < .05 \), † \( p < .1 \).

\( R^2_{Total} = R^2_{Level 1} \times (1 - ICC(1)) + R^2_{Level 2} \times ICC(1) \) (Snijders & Bosker, 2012)
Table 16. HLM Results Predicting Employee Voice (Hypothesis 2c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1: Null Model</th>
<th>Model 2: Individual -Level Predictors</th>
<th>Model 3: Mixed Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.47** (0.06)</td>
<td>4.03** (0.19)</td>
<td>4.26** (0.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1 Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Leadership</td>
<td>0.04 (0.07)</td>
<td>0.02 (0.07)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-Oriented Leadership</td>
<td>-0.05* (0.09)</td>
<td>-0.04 (0.09)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Unit Tenure</td>
<td>0.00 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.02 (0.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Female (1 = Yes)</td>
<td>-0.21* (0.11)</td>
<td>-0.18† (0.11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Minority Status (1 = Yes)</td>
<td>-0.27* (0.15)</td>
<td>-0.32* (0.15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Age</td>
<td>0.13** (0.03)</td>
<td>0.13** (0.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Education</td>
<td>0.01 (0.04)</td>
<td>-0.00 (0.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2 Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Leadership (aggregated)</td>
<td>0.51** (0.16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-Oriented Leadership (aggregated)</td>
<td>-0.05 (0.16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workgroup Size</td>
<td>0.00* (0.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Tape</td>
<td>-0.06* (0.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Random Effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual (τ_β)</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept (τ_π)</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R^2 Level 1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R^2 Level 2</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R^2 Total^a</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Deviance</td>
<td>1019.72</td>
<td>996.04</td>
<td>920.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Groups</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **p < .01, *p < .05, †p < .1.

^a R^2 Total = R^2 Level 1 x (1-ICC(1)) + R^2 Level 2 x ICC(1) (Snijders & Bosker, 2012)
5.3.3. Empowering Leadership and Workgroup Performance

To examine relationships between empowering leadership and the outcome variables at the workgroup level (i.e., to test Hypotheses 3a to 3d), I conducted OLS regression analyses. Measures of task-oriented leader behavior, workgroup size, red tape, and supervisor-supervisor relationship quality were included as controls in the analyses. All of the outcome variables measured at the individual level were aggregated at the workgroup level. As shown in Table 17, junior managers’ empowering leadership was positively related to unit-level task performance ($\beta = 0.29$, $t = 2.24$, $p < .05$), conscientiousness ($\beta = 0.29$, $t = 1.98$, $p < .05$), voice ($\beta = 0.32$, $t = 2.29$, $p < .05$), and unit effectiveness ($\beta = 0.39$, $t = 3.09$, $p < .01$). These results provide empirical support for Hypotheses 3a to 3d.

Table 17. Relationship between Empowering Leadership and Workgroup Performance (Hypotheses 3a to 3d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1: Task Performance</th>
<th>Model 2: Conscientiousness</th>
<th>Model 3: Voice</th>
<th>Model 4: Overall Unit Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Leadership</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-Oriented Leadership</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workgroup Size</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Tape</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor-Supervisor Relationship</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor-Subordinate Relationship</td>
<td>0.23†</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $n = 90$ workgroups.

"** $p < .01$, "* $p < .05$, † $p < .1$."
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5.3.4. The Indirect Effects of Senior Managers’ Empowering Leadership

5.3.4.1. Senior Managers’ Empowering Leadership and Workgroup Performance

Hypotheses 4a to 4d focused on the indirect effect of senior managers’ empowering leadership on unit-level task performance, conscientiousness, and voice, as well as overall work-unit effectiveness. Analysis showed that the positive relationship between senior and junior managers’ empowering leadership was fully mediated through junior managers’ perceived psychological empowerment. To examine the cascading effects of empowering leadership from upper level managers to unit and employee level outcomes, I estimated a three-path mediation model. In this model, the influence of senior managers’ empowering leadership on unit-level performance outcomes is expected to be mediated first by junior managers’ psychological empowerment (first mediator) and then their use of an empowering leadership style with their subordinates (second mediator). As was suggested by MacKinnon and colleagues (Mackinnon et al., 2002; Taylor, Mackinnon, & Tein, 2008), I estimated bootstrapped bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals to assess statistical significance of the indirect effects. I included measures of junior managers’ task-oriented leadership, red tape, and workgroup size as control variables, as well as their gender, minority status, age, education, and unit tenure. For constructs measured with multiple items, I used the composite scale to represent the construct. The results of this analysis are summarized in Figure 6.

As illustrated in Figure 6, senior managers’ empowering leadership was positively related to junior managers’ perceptions of psychological empowerment ($\beta = 0.24, SE = 0.08, p < .01$), which in turn was positively linked to their use of empowering leadership ($\beta = 0.20, SE = 0.09, p < .05$). This leadership was positively related to unit-level task
performance ($\beta = 0.43, SE = 0.13, p < .01$), conscientiousness ($\beta = 0.35, SE = 0.15, p < .05$), voice ($\beta = 0.46, SE = 0.17, p < .01$), and overall unit effectiveness ($\beta = 0.32, SE = 0.18, p < .1$).

**Figure 6. Summary of Regression Results of the Direct and Indirect Effect of Senior Managers’ Empowering Leadership on Workgroup Performance (Hypotheses 4a, 4b, 4c, and 4d)**

![Diagram showing relationships between senior and junior managers and workgroup performance]

Note. $n = 90$ workgroups. The path coefficients and squared multiple correlations are standardized. **$p < .01$, *$p < .05$, †$p < .1$.

Results of bootstrapping analysis (10,000 replications) revealed that the relationship between senior and junior managers’ empowering leadership was transmitted through junior managers’ perceptions of psychological empowerment (0.05, 95% CI [0.01, 0.12]). In addition, junior managers’ psychological empowerment was positively and indirectly related to unit-level task performance (0.08, 95% CI [0.01, 0.21]), conscientiousness (0.07, 95% CI [0.004, 0.19]), and voice (0.09, 95% CI [0.01, 0.24]). However, the results also showed a marginally significant indirect effect of junior managers’ psychological empowerment on overall unit effectiveness (0.06, 90% CI [0.01,
Finally, through junior managers’ psychological empowerment as a first mediator and junior managers’ empowering leadership as a second mediator, senior managers’ empowering leadership had positive associations with unit-level task performance (0.02, 95% CI [0.02, 0.07]), conscientiousness (0.02, 95% CI [0.002, 0.06]), voice (0.02, 95% CI [0.003, 0.07]), and unit-effectiveness (0.02, 95% CI [0.001, 0.07]). Overall, Hypotheses 4a, 4b, 4c, and 4d all received support.

5.3.4.2. Senior Managers’ Empowering Leadership and Employee Performance

Hypotheses 5a to 5c focused on the indirect relationship between senior managers’ empowering leadership on employee task performance, conscientiousness, and voice. To test these hypotheses, I estimated HLM models following recommendations provided by Raudenbush and Sampson (1999) and Zhang et al. (2009). Again, I developed a three-path mediation model in which the influence of senior managers’ empowering leadership on lower-level employees’ behaviors is mediated by junior managers’ psychological empowerment as a first mediation, and by junior managers’ empowering leadership as a second mediator. Measures of junior managers’ task leadership, red tape, and workgroup size were included as the Level 2 controls, and employee gender, minority, age, education, and unit tenure were included as the Level 1 controls. The model also included individual perceptions of empowering leadership and task leadership to control for potential method effects. Furthermore, because ratings of employee performance are nested within groups (i.e., by supervisors), the coefficients of paths from the independent variable to the dependent variable, through the mediator variables, were estimated at the workgroup or between level of analysis (i.e., between direct and indirect effects), and the coefficient from the mediator variable to the dependent variables were estimated at the
individual or within level of analysis (i.e., within effect). Finally, group-mean centering was employed for the Level 1 mediator to estimate the indirect effects (Zhang et al., 2009).

The results of the multilevel mediation analyses are summarized in Figure 7. As shown in Figure 7, senior managers’ empowering leadership was positively related to junior managers’ psychological empowerment ($\gamma = 0.18, SE = 0.08, p < .05$), which was positively linked to junior managers’ empowering leadership ($\gamma = 0.26, SE = 0.10, p < .01$) and thus to employee task performance ($\gamma = 0.39, SE = 0.14, p < .01$), conscientiousness ($\gamma = 0.40, SE = 0.15, p < .01$), and voice ($\gamma = 0.50, SE = 0.17, p < .01$).

Next, I computed Monte Carlo 95% CIs to estimate asymmetric confidence intervals on the indirect effects of senior managers’ empowering leadership on employee performance outcomes. Consistent with previous results, the analysis showed that the connection between senior and junior managers’ empowering leadership was transmitted...
through junior managers’ perceptions of psychological empowerment (0.05, 95% CI [0.01, 0.12]). The analysis also showed that, via junior managers’ empowering leadership, junior managers’ perceived psychological empowerment had positive associations with subordinate job performance (0.10, 95% CI [0.02, 0.22]), conscientiousness (0.04, 95% CI [0.01, 0.23]), and voice (0.13, 95% CI [0.02, 0.28]). Finally, the results indicated that via junior managers’ psychological empowerment as a first mediator and junior managers’ empowering leadership as a second mediator, senior managers’ empowering leadership had marginally significant indirect associations with employee job performance (0.02, 90% CI [0.001, 0.05]), conscientiousness (0.02, 90% CI [0.0004, 0.05]), and voice (0.02, 90% CI [0.001, 0.06]). Overall, Hypotheses 5a, 5b, and 5c were marginally supported.

5.3.5. Empowering Leadership and Managerial Effectiveness

Hypothesis 6 proposed a positive relationship between empowering leadership and managerial effectiveness. To test this claim, I aggregated individual-level variables to the workgroup level using the group means of the variables. I then included measures of junior managers’ task-oriented leadership, workgroup size, subordinate perceptions of red tape, supervisor-supervisor relationship, supervisor-subordinate relationship, supervisor gender, minority status, age, college education, and unit tenure as control variables. As shown by the results of Model 1 in Table 18, junior managers’ empowering leadership had no connection to their bosses’ ratings of their managerial effectiveness ($\beta = -0.12, t = -0.90, ns$). However, a positive link between junior managers’ empowering leadership and subordinate rating of managerial effectiveness was observed ($\beta = 0.21, t = 2.57, p < .05$). These results provide only partial support for Hypothesis 6.
Table 18. Relationship between Empowering Leadership and Managerial Effectiveness (Hypothesis 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1: Supervisor-Rating</th>
<th>Model 2: Subordinate-Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Managers’ Empowering Leadership</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Managers’ Task-Oriented Leadership</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workgroup Size</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Tape</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor-Supervisor Relationship</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Manager Unit Tenure</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Manager Minority (Yes = 1)</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Manager Female (Yes = 1)</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Manager Age (26-35 years)</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Manager Age (over 46 years)</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Manager Education</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>(1.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>32.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, † $p < .1$.

Table 19 summarizes the results of all the hypotheses. The analysis showed that while there was a positive association between senior and junior police officers’ empowering leadership practices, this relationship was fully mediated by junior police officers’ perceptions of psychological empowerment (supporting Hypotheses 1a and 1b). The analysis also provided evidence that junior managers’ empowering leadership was positively associated with the behaviors of subordinate police officers (supporting Hypothesis 2) and unit-level performance (supporting Hypothesis 3). Moreover, as expected, empowering leadership by senior police officers had significant indirect associations with unit-level performance at the workgroup level (supporting Hypothesis 4), and had marginally significant indirect relationships with subordinate behaviors at the individual level (marginally supporting Hypothesis 5). Finally, empowering leadership
was positively associated with subordinate ratings of managerial effectiveness, but not
with supervisor ratings (partially supporting Hypothesis 6).

Table 19. Summary of Hypotheses with Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1a</td>
<td>There will be a direct positive correlation between junior police officers’ perceptions of senior police officers’ empowering leadership and subordinate perceptions of junior police officers’ empowering leadership practices.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b</td>
<td>Junior police officers’ perceptions of psychological empowerment will mediate the relationship between junior managers’ perceptions of senior police managers’ empowering leadership and subordinate perceptions of junior police officers’ empowering leadership practices.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Subordinates’ perceptions of junior police officers’ empowering leadership (lower-level) will be positively associated with junior police officers’ ratings of subordinate police officer’s (a) task performance, (b) conscientiousness, and (c) improvement-oriented voice behavior.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Subordinates’ perceptions of empowering leadership by junior police officers (lower-level) will be positively related to unit-level (a) task performance, (b) conscientiousness, (c) voice, and (d) overall work unit effectiveness.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Junior police officers’ perceptions of empowering leadership by senior police officers (upper-level) will have an indirect positive influence on unit level (a) task performance, (b) conscientiousness, (c) voice, and (d) overall unit performance.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Junior police officers’ perceptions of empowering leadership by senior police officers (upper-level) will have an indirect positive influence on employee (a) task performance, (b) conscientiousness, and (c) voice.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Subordinate perceptions of junior police officers’ empowering leadership (lower-level) will be positively associated with supervisor and subordinate ratings of managerial effectiveness.</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 6: Discussions, Implications, and Conclusions

This chapter focuses on the implications of the results reported in Chapter 5 for public management research and practice. First, I discuss the limitations of this study and some directions for future research. Second, I discuss the results for each hypothesis in detail and their implications for PA research. Finally, the study’s implications for practice is discussed followed by concluding remarks.

6.1. Limitations of the Current Study

Before going into the details of the research findings, it is essential to acknowledge some of the limitations of this study. First, I used perceptual data to measure both empowering leadership and employee behavior; however, the strength and direction of findings are consistent with previous research where empowering leadership and managerial practices are linked to work outcomes (D'innocenzo et al., 2015; Martin et al., 2013; Raub & Robert, 2013). It is also important to note that the data on empowering leadership and employee behavior were collected from multiple sources and in different time periods to address concerns about same-source bias (Meier & O'Toole, 2013b; Podsakoff et al., 2003; Podsakoff et al., 2012). While self-ratings could have been used, research suggests that leaders tend to rate themselves favorably on the socially desirable behaviors (Ashford, 1989; Atwater et al., 1998). Therefore, the use of others’ ratings in the study was appropriate.

The use of subjective measures for individual and workgroup performance, however, is a key limitation of this research. In particular, the mixed results on the
relationship between empowering leadership and managerial effectiveness suggest incongruence in ratings by different raters (i.e., supervisors vs. subordinates). The limitations of potential non-response bias and retrospective bias also need to be carefully considered. In addition, although the use of objective measure of police performance is certainly desirable, perceptual measures are not necessarily inaccurate. Data on employee performance collected from the agency records may not cover various aspects (e.g., extra-role behaviors) of job performance, as well (Shane, 2011). Furthermore, one can expect that the elements of task performance and conscientiousness could be closely related to objective police performance measures such as number of arrests, prosecution, and convictions (Shane, 2011). Future research should consider using objective performance data as well as compare them with perceptual measures.

Second, another limitation of the study was the use of a convenient sample. Convenient samples are prone to selection bias. The participants of this study (i.e., focal junior police officers) were enrolled in a training program and were not selected in a random process. The results, therefore, are not highly generalizable. However, the characteristics of the participants were similar to population characteristics (from the Bureau of Justice Statistics data) in terms of gender, race, and age. Hence, the selection bias problem may not have been very acute. In addition, the program was not designed to train the subjects on specific leadership styles related to employee empowerment but instead was designed to provide basic knowledge and skills related to public administration, not causing considerable bias in the treatment effect. It should be also noted that focal junior officers invited up to six of their direct reports to complete surveys about their leadership practices, managerial effectiveness, and work-unit effectiveness.
Given the subordinates were not selected in a random fashion, their ratings about their manager may have been biased. However, the effects of empowering leadership found in this study are similar to prior studies, including experimental and longitudinal research showing that empowering leadership influence employee work behaviors like task proficiency, citizenship, and voice (D’innocenzo et al., 2015; Li et al., 2014; Martin et al., 2013; Zhang & Bartol, 2010). Additionally, I was not able to collect responses from all members in each workgroup, which may have biased ratings for the outcome variables. However, the relatively high levels of ICC(1) values probably mitigated some of these biases in the results (Nesterkin & Ganster, 2015).

Third, from a design standpoint, a cross-sectional design does not allow inferring any causal connection between empowerment and any of the outcome variables. Statistical tests of mediation based on observational data also limit any conclusions that can be drawn about causal inferences. Indeed, there could certainly be alternative explanations for the findings of this study. For instance, my model does not incorporate a bottom-up empowerment process from subordinates to supervisors. In words, rather than senior leaders’ empowering leadership evoking junior managers’ empowering leadership, it is possible that senior police officers simply exhibit empowering practices toward junior managers who have higher levels of psychological empowerment. To assess the robustness of the results, I used several statistical methods, including hierarchical multiple regression analysis and path analyses, not reported in the results section. The results of hierarchical multiple regressions provided support for the proposed causal paths, as did structural equation modeling with the same variables. However, a model with paths in the opposite direction did not fit the data equally well. Despite these results, I am
unable to ascertain any causal connection between the predictor and outcome variables. Future research should consider using a longitudinal design to verify these results.

Fourth, despite the fact that the trickle-down effect model of this study is based on social learning theory and social exchange theory, I did not include variables that specifically measured the processes of social learning and social exchanges in my analyses. Research has shown that the quality of leader-membership exchange (LMX) relationship may mediate the effects of employee empowerment on their performance (Chen & Klimosk, 2003). There is also evidence that members with high LMX relationship with their supervisor tend to rate them as more effective managers (Hassan et al., 2013). To provide more precise empirical support the trickle-down effect, future research should consider assessing such mediation mechanisms in the public sector work context. Future inquiries may also assess potential moderating effects of demographic similarity (e.g., gender match) between leader and follower at the individual level as well as at the workgroup level. Additional contextual determinants could be included in future investigations on empowering leadership. For instance, agency size may affect the structure of police agencies and attitudes and behaviors of police officers. Large police departments may be more hierarchical and rely more on directive management styles, whereas small agencies may adopt more participative and empowering management styles (Manning, 1977; Shane, 2011). In the current study, I included the size of the workgroup as a control but it had little explanatory power. Future research may treat agency size as a potential moderating variable in the relationship between empowerment and performance. Another factor that needs to be further explored is the role of organizational culture. Another limitation of the study was the omission of an intervening
variable, psychological empowerment, for lower-level employees. Studies have suggested that employee perceptions of psychological empowerment mediate the relationship between empowering practices and behavioral outcomes.

Fifth, I noted that law enforcement agencies tend to more bureaucratic than other types of public agencies. However, I did not have specific measures for the levels of bureaucratization like centralization of authority, formalization, and span of control. Nonetheless, the agencies included in the study have a relatively tall structure (many hierarchical levels) and the respondents reported a high level of red tape. While such characteristics do indicate a hierarchical nature (King, 2005), future research should consider controlling for the structuring characteristics (e.g., specialization, formalization, and centralization) of organizations (Dalton et al., 1980). Finally, the relatively small number of workgroups (<100) was another limitation of this study. Replicating this research in other types of organizations and with larger samples would be instructive and render stronger tests of the hypotheses.

6.2. Implication for Research on Public Employee Empowerment

Despite the limitations, the study contributes to research on empowerment in public agencies in several important ways. As reviewed in Chapter 2, prior research in public agencies has demonstrated that empowerment improves employee job satisfaction (Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2013a), affective commitment (Hassan et al., 2013), willingness to innovate (Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2013c), and perceptions of workgroup performance (Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2011, 2013b), while reducing employees’ intentions to leave their organizations (Kim & Fernandez, 2015). However, few studies in PA have examined the influence of empowerment on positive behaviors
and performance of employees. The few studies that have assessed the relationship between empowerment and performance relied on self-reported measures of performance (Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2011, 2013b). These studies did not distinguish between structural and psychological aspects of employee empowerment. In addition, no prior study in PA has examined how empowering leadership relates to employee and workgroup performance. To fill these gaps and advance the research forward, the current study assessed a trickle-down model of employee empowerment. Six separate hypotheses were proposed based on the extant theory and research on employee empowerment, and tested with multisource survey data collected from law enforcement agencies in Ohio. Next, I discuss the implications of the findings for each of these six hypotheses, in the context of current theory and practice.

Hypotheses 1a and 1b suggested that junior managers are more likely to use empowering leadership practices with their subordinates when their supervisors practice empowering leadership. The results provided support for these hypotheses, and also showed that this relationship was fully mediated by junior managers’ perceptions of psychological empowerment. These results are consistent with findings of several previous studies (Boudrias et al., 2009; Seibert et al., 2011; Zhang & Bartol, 2010). As noted earlier, most prior studies in PA have focused on either structural empowerment or psychological empowerment, and did not attempt to bridge the two perspectives. Some recent research has also not differentiated between the two types of empowerment, while they have recognized the conceptual distinction between structural and psychological empowerment (Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2011, 2013a, 2013b; Kim & Fernandez, 2015). Therefore, it was unclear how these two constructs together influence work
attitudes and behaviors of public employees. By simultaneously considering the influence of structural and psychological empowerment, this study makes an important contribution to research on empowerment in PA. Furthermore, previous studies have demonstrated that structural empowerment can improve perceptions of psychological empowerment. However, the possible reverse relationship – i.e., greater psychological empowerment leading to more structural empowerment – was not examined in any earlier study. The present study is one of the first attempts to evaluate empirically whether an individual’s experience of psychological empowerment relates to his or her use of empowering leadership practices. This study also extends previous work by including psychological empowerment as a mediator. These results are noteworthy extensions of the existing research on public employee empowerment.

Moreover, these results are consistent with the arguments of social learning theory. Research on the culture of police organizations (Manning, 1977; Reuss-Ianni & Ianni, 1983; Van Maanen, 1975) has shown that police officers tend to have strong social ties with their immediate supervisors as well as their peers. The results of this research also showed that junior managers look to their supervisors for guidance, and that they emulate leadership practices of their superiors with their direct reports. In words, senior police officers serve as role models for junior police officers and influence their behavior.

Hypotheses 2a through 2c proposed that junior managers’ empowering leadership would be positively associated with subordinate task performance, conscientiousness, and voice, respectively. Empirical support was found for all of these hypotheses. The positive links found between empowering leadership and subordinate in-role behaviors (i.e., task-performance and conscientiousness) are congruent with the results of past research.
among private sector employees (Maynard et al., 2012; Sharma & Kirkman, 2015). Yet these findings are still notable, as no prior study in PA found support for the influence of employee empowerment on public employees’ in-role performance. Cho and Faerman (2010) examined the effects of structural empowerment on public employee performance via psychological empowerment; their study, however, did not find adequate support. Thus, the current results provide much-needed evidence related to the relationship between employee empowerment and job performance.

The positive relationship found between empowering leadership and employee voice behavior is important for several reasons. Organizational scholars have noted that voice is a particularly good indicator of whether or not an organization’s empowerment initiative has had the desired effect (e.g., Raub & Robert, 2013). While a few studies in PA suggested a connection between empowerment and voice, they did not examine the relationship (Lee & Whitford, 2008; Whitford & Lee, 2014). One recent study found a positive relationship between employee perceptions of control and their voice behavior (Hassan, 2015), but this study did not examine the influence of empowering leadership practices. The findings of the current study, therefore, are significant.

Hypotheses 3a through 3d suggested that junior managers’ empowering leadership would be positively associated with unit-level task performance, conscientiousness, and voice, as well as overall unit effectiveness. The analyses provided support for these unit-level relationships. These results are consistent with findings of previous studies at the individual level of analysis (Boudrias et al., 2009; Raub & Robert, 2010) and were somewhat expected given the results of multilevel analysis for Hypotheses 2a-c. These results indicate that empowering leadership practices indeed
have positive effects on workgroup performance in public agencies.

The empirical assessment of empowering leadership in improving individual and organizational performance is another important implication of this study. Public management researchers have explored and examined the influences of various leadership styles, including transformational, transactional, charismatic, servant, and ethical leadership, on performance among employees. However, to date, the question of how empowering leadership practices affect employees and organizations has received relatively little attention. Although many authors have advocated the value of empowerment practices (Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2013b; Petter et al., 2002), its relationship with individual and organizational performance has not been fully investigated. Thus, this study represents a useful first step toward a better understanding of the process in which empowerment practices promote higher performance in public agencies. Similarly, this work extends empowerment research into a new organizational setting – a police organization. Furthermore, the majority of work on employee empowerment has been focused on private sector organizations (Seibert et al., 2004; Seibert et al., 2011), so this study offers some support for the generalizability of the effects of empowerment practices in a different work context.

Hypotheses 4a to 4d proposed that senior managers’ empowering leadership would have indirect positive effects on the unit-level outcomes through enabling the junior managers to use empowering leadership with their subordinates. Hypotheses 5a to 5c suggested similar cross-level indirect effects. These hypotheses were derived from the trickle-down framework and tested at both the workgroup and individual levels. The results exhibited strong empirical support for these indirect effects at the workgroup level.
(Hypotheses 4a to 4d) and partial support at the individual level (Hypotheses 5a to 5c). The mediational analyses indicated that the effects of senior managers’ empowering leadership on the performance outcomes were fully mediated by junior managers’ perceived psychological empowerment and their use of empowering leadership. These analyses suggested that while both senior managers and junior managers influence the behaviors and performance of workgroups and employees, they have different levels of influences. Specifically, immediate supervisors have a stronger influence on the behavior of their subordinates than senior managers, whereas senior managers have indirectly influence line employees through their effects on junior managers. These results extend and corroborate findings of other studies that have examined trickle-down models of empowering leadership in private sector organizations (Ambrose et al., 2013; Bordia et al., 2010; Masterson, 2001; Mawritz et al., 2012; Mayer et al., 2009; Schaubroeck et al., 2012; Wo et al., 2015). The use of a trickle-down approach is an important contribution to research in PA, as no prior study has used this approach to study implications of leadership practices in public agencies. While the extant literature has suggested this cascading effect, it has rarely been tested in PA research.

Hypothesis 6 suggested that empowering managers would be rated more effective managers by their bosses and subordinates. The analysis revealed a positive correlation for only subordinate ratings of managerial effectiveness. Empowering supervisors were not rated as more effective by their bosses. One potential explanation of these results is the presence of same-source bias in the subordinate ratings. It is also possible that empowering managerial practices are perceived differently by different organizational members due to their unique positions/roles in the organization (Hassan & Rohrbaugh,
Research indicates that empowering managers often develop high-quality relationships with their subordinates (Hassan et al., 2013), and that lower-level employees are more likely to view these practices as more desirable and important than higher-level employees (Oyinlade, 2008). This suggests that subordinates are more likely to rate their immediate supervisors as more effective when they use an empowering leadership style because it is consistent with their expectations. On the contrary, senior managers may perceive junior managers who utilize empowering leadership practices as ineffective leaders due to the thin line between laissez-faire and empowering leadership (Humborstad & Giessner, 2015).

Finally, the inclusion of both employee and senior manager ratings of managerial effectiveness significantly contributed to the field. Prior research on managerial effectiveness in PA relied on single-source data, either from supervisors themselves or their immediate subordinates. In contrast, this study used both subordinate and boss ratings of managerial effectiveness. Ehrhart (2004) noted that, if ratings by different sources are not strongly related, these ratings should not be considered equivalent and should not necessarily be used interchangeably. Given the insignificant correlations found between employee and senior manager ratings of managerial effectiveness, this study confirms the importance of collecting data from different sources.

Although not a central focus in this study, the analysis revealed that junior managers were rated as more effective by both their supervisors and subordinates when they used more task-oriented leadership practices. There are several possible explanations for this result. First, drawing on Pfeffer et al. (1998) work, an emphasis on participation and expression of confidence in staff may be unfavorably perceived by police officers
who tend to see work done under the control of a supervisor as better. Second, the masculine and feminine stereotypes attached to leader behavior may influence how leaders are perceived and evaluated (Arnold & Loughlin, 2013; Heilman & Eagly, 2008). In past research, task-oriented or directive leadership styles have been regarded as stereotypically masculine ways to lead (Heilman, Block, & Martell, 1995), whereas participative and empowering leadership styles are perceived as congruent with a stereotypically feminine approach (Helgesen, 1995). Considering the masculine culture of the police force (Loftus, 2010), it is possible that both senior and frontline police officers are likely to prefer a highly directive leadership to empowering leadership. Also, one can expect the influence of supervisor-subordinate gender similarity (or dissimilarity) on the effectiveness of managers who either use task-oriented or empowering leadership, a relationship which is not fully examined in the present study. Furthermore, it is important to note that task-oriented leadership has been compared to empowering leadership and found to influence employee functioning and organizational performance differently, but with less attention to managerial effectiveness (Lorinkova et al., 2013; Martin et al., 2013). The present study examined how managerial effectiveness is related to directive and empowering leadership styles simultaneously.
6.2.1. Methodological Contributions

Despite some of the data limitations, the sophisticated design used this study is one of important methodological contribution. Previous studies on public employee empowerment had some seriously methodological deficiencies, most notably their reliance on secondary data and employee self-assessments of job performance. By collecting data from multiple sources (i.e., upper-level managers, immediate supervisors, and frontline employees) and in different time periods, this study provided a more rigorous test of the underlying relationships between empowering managerial practices and employee and organization performance.

Another methodological contribution was to distinguish between the "between" and "within" effects of empowering leadership practices by performing a multilevel analysis. Organizational researchers have often conceptualized constructs of interest at higher levels of analysis, while higher-level data were inferred from individual respondents. Typically, based on the within-group consensus, the total or the mean of the lower unit scores (i.e., workgroup members’ perceptions of empowering leadership) is aggregated and translated into the meaning of the construct at the higher level (i.e., empowering leadership). Then, the relationships among variables are examined at one level of theory or analysis, by using individual-level data at the individual level or aggregated data at the organizational level.

Given the hierarchically structured and nested nature of the data, this study instead conducted a series of two-level analyses and showed how variables were related to each other at multiple levels. More specifically, this study used multilevel CFA to assess the work-unit level factor structures of a four-item empowering leadership
practices scale, and found that the factor loadings of the items were stronger at the between level (i.e., the workgroup level) than at the within (i.e., within-workgroup) level of analysis. By using multilevel analysis techniques, this study was also able to separate the within-group and between-group effects of empowering leadership, to disclose the cross-level and unit-level mediation effects in the trickle-down effect models.

6.3. Implications for Practice

The study’s findings have important implications for practice. First, they suggest specific ways to promote empowerment in public sector organizations. While previous studies have identified how public employees encourage their managers to use empowering practices (Hassan et al., 2016), my findings suggest ways in which senior managers may influence their subordinates to engage in employee empowerment. Specifically, we observe that when police officers with supervisory responsibilities have an empowering boss, they are more likely to feel empowered and to engage in empowerment with their immediate subordinates. Specific practices that managers can use to empower and motivate their subordinates include seeking ideas and input while making decisions, allowing subordinates to handle challenging assignments on their own, acknowledging their efforts and contributions to the team and the community, showing concerns for subordinates’ needs and confidence in their ability to handle challenging tasks, and providing them opportunities to develop new skills. The use of these practices is likely to facilitate an empowering work climate in the workgroup, and motivate junior police officers to exert more efforts in their work duties. Furthermore, the empirical support found for the trickle-down effects indicates that public organizations interested in an employee empowerment initiative might begin by encouraging their senior managers
to use empowering practices with their subordinate managers.

Second, the current study shows the benefits of promoting empowering practices in public sector organizations. The analyses revealed that empowering leaders were influential in improving the positive behaviors of employees at both the individual and the workgroup levels, while task-oriented leaders did not have significant influences. Specifically, the findings suggest that as junior managers utilize more empowering leadership practices, their direct reports become more likely to engage in in-role and extra-role behaviors; both will contribute to improving organizational performance. Because of the positive impact of empowering leadership on the behaviors and performance of employees and workgroups, it appears that empowering leadership is a promising approach to improve employee functioning and organizational performance, even in hierarchical settings such as police organizations.

Third, the findings shed light on the importance of immediate supervisors as a bridge between line employees and upper management. It has been suggested that immediate supervisors serve as transmitters of behavior and buffers between their own subordinates and upper-level managers (Mawritz et al., 2012; Mayer et al., 2009; Wo et al., 2015). Although senior managers are less likely to have direct interactions with line employees, they have significant distal and indirect influences on lower-level employees via junior managers. Specifically, the findings suggest that employee empowerment practices are transmitted from senior police officers to line employees via junior police officers’ experiences of psychological empowerment and their engagement in empowering leadership practices. Thus, public organizations, including police organizations, might benefit from considering whether individuals in supervisory roles
understand and realize the trickle-down effect of employee empowerment.

The analyses suggest that employee empowerment may not be considered an important element of a leader’s repertoire. This study found that empowering leader behaviors have a tendency to be undervalued among senior police officers, although empowering leadership is critical to driving the performance of employees and workgroups. In addition, empowering leadership may be more attractive than task-oriented leadership in organizations characterized by rules and procedures, where tasks can be formalized and standardized (Martin et al., 2013). Given the positive consequences to employees and workgroups, the value of empowering leadership needs to be evaluated and recognized in the performance appraisals of public managers.

Finally, the results have some implications for public policy. The current study suggests that increasing discretion improves performance of police officers and workgroups in law enforcement agencies. However, with numerous media reports of police officers abusing their discretion and authority and using excessive force against minority groups and communities, many policy makers and citizens have expressed concerns and suggested reducing police discretion with more stringent rules and higher monitoring. Many citizens, in particular, minority groups, have called for more direct executive control of police organizations and police officers’ behavior at the street level. These prescriptions actually run counter to results of the current study, which showed positive benefits of increasing discretion among police officers. While the current study did not assess police officers’ behavior at the street level, it is plausible that outcomes related to an officer’s behavior at the street level factors into the supervisor’s evaluation of the subordinate’s job performance (Bakker & Heuven, 2006) and that, by allowing
subordinates the discretion needed to carry out their tasks, senior police officers may positively affect junior officers’ performance at the street level. Furthermore, the results of the present study also showed that directive managerial practices, which includes higher monitoring, did not contribute police officers’ in-role and extra-role performance. It is possible, however, directive practices would reduce incidences of abuse or mistreatment as research has shown higher supervisory control affects the frequency and duration of police officers’ encounters with citizens, their discretionary decision making toward citizens, and their misbehavior (Allen, 1982; Engel, 2002).

6.4. Concluding Remarks

The main goal of this study was to address a key question in research on public employee empowerment; i.e., does empowerment contribute to higher levels individual and organizational performance in public agencies. Drawing upon social learning and social exchange theory, I developed and tested a trickle-down model of empowerment in which senior managers’ empowering practices were expected to have a cascading effect on the behaviors and performance of middle and junior police officers. The findings are largely consistent with the hypothesized model and suggest that senior police officers’ empowering practices positively influence junior police officers experience of psychological empowerment and use empowering practices with their subordinates, which, in turn, positively affect subordinate police officers in-role and extra-role behaviors, both at individual and workgroup level. Finally, the results show empowering managers are rated more effective by their subordinates but not by their supervisors.

While the present study addressed a critical gap in the literature on public employee empowerment, considerable work still remains for PA scholars. One important
question for future research is whether higher levels of empowerment increase deviant employee behavior in law enforcement organizations such as rule-breaking (Morrison, 2006) and mistreatment of people (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). It is possible that empowering leadership may increase opportunities for police officers to deviate from the organizational rules and procedures and engage in behaviors that may negatively influence the legitimacy and effectiveness of their organizations. Furthermore, it is important for researchers to attend to other potential unintended consequences of empowerment practices. For some employees, higher levels of discretion and less guidance from supervisors may increase uncertainty and role and goal ambiguity, which, in turn, may negatively influence their work performance. Delegation of decision authority to a subordinate may be viewed by subordinate that the manager is less interested in performing the task, which in, turn, may reduce the task’s perceived significance and discourage the employee to exert any extra effort (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Future research should also examine potential curvilinear relationship (inverted U-shaped) between empowering leadership and the behaviors of public employees.

The effectiveness of empowering leadership in public agencies may depend on certain boundary conditions. Olshfski and Cunningham (1998) argued that employee empowerment reflects the superior’s willingness to empower their subordinates and the employee’s willingness to exercise autonomy and shoulder responsibility. This indicates that the relationship between empowering leadership practices and employee performance is likely to be moderated by employees’ personality traits such as prosocial motivation and duty orientation. Research on prosocial motivation suggests that prosocially motivated employees are more likely to exert extra efforts to help their
organization (Grant, 2008a, 2008b; Lee, 2012; Rioux & Penner, 2001; Wright, Christensen, & Pandey, 2013; Wright, Hassan, & Park, 2016). Recent research on duty orientation also suggests the employees’ sense of moral and ethical obligation at the workplace influence their work behaviors, including voice behavior, ethical behavior, and deviant behavior (Hannah et al., 2014; Tangirala et al., 2013). Along with these research lines, future research might examine whether the effects of empowerment on employee in-role and extra-role behaviors are moderated by levels of their duty orientation and prosocial motivation. Future research should also explore whether structural constraints (formalization, centralization and power distance between managers and employees) influence the use of empowering leadership by managers in public organizations.
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Appendix A: Study Measures

Senior Managers’ Empowering Leadership (Junior Manager-Report of Senior Manager)

Authors: Yukl et al. (1990) and Yukl et al. (2002)

Response Format:

5 = To a Very great extent
4 = To a Considerable extent
3 = To a Moderate extent
2 = To a Limited Extent
1 = Not at all
0 = Not Relevant/Applicable

Scale Items:

1. Supporting: shows concern for the needs and feelings of individual members; provides support and encouragement when there is a difficult or stressful task; and expresses confidence in members.
2. Coaching/Developing: provides helpful feedback and coaching for members who need it; provides helpful career advice; and encourages members to take advantages of opportunities to develop their skills.
3. Participating (Empowering): involves members in making important work-related decisions; delegates responsibility and authority for important tasks and allows members to resolve work-related problems without your prior approval.
4. Recognizing: praises effective performance; provides recognition for achievements and contributions to the organization; and recommends appropriate rewards for members with high performance.

Junior Managers’ Empowering Leadership (Employee-Report of Junior Manager)

Authors: Yukl et al. (1990) and Yukl et al. (2002)

Response Format:

5 = To a Very great extent
4 = To a Considerable extent
3 = To a Moderate extent
2 = To a Limited Extent
1 = Not at all
0 = Not Relevant/Applicable
Scale Items:
1. Supporting: shows concern for the needs and feelings of individual members; provides support and encouragement when there is a difficult or stressful task; and expresses confidence in members.
2. Coaching/Developing: provides helpful feedback and coaching for members who need it; provides helpful career advice; and encourages members to take advantages of opportunities to develop their skills.
3. Participating (Empowering): involves members in making important work-related decisions; delegates responsibility and authority for important tasks and allows members to resolve work-related problems without your prior approval.
4. Recognizing: praises effective performance; provides recognition for achievements and contributions to the organization; and recommends appropriate rewards for members with high performance.

Junior Managers’ Task-oriented Leadership (Employee-Report of Junior Manager)
Authors: Yukl et al. (1990) and Yukl et al. (2002)
Response Format:
5 = To a Very great extent
4 = To a Considerable extent
3 = To a Moderate extent
2 = To a Limited Extent
1 = Not at all
0 = Not Relevant/Applicable
Scale Items:
1. Clarifying: explains task assignments and member responsibilities; sets specific goals and deadlines for important tasks; explains priorities for different objectives; explain rules, policies, and standard procedures.
2. Planning: develops short-term plans for the work; determines how to schedule and coordinate activities to use people and resources efficiently; determines action steps and resources needed to accomplish a project.
3. Problem Solving: identifies work-related problems that can disrupt operations; makes a systematic but rapid diagnosis; and takes action to resolve the problems in a decisive and confident way.
4. Monitoring Operations: checks on the progress and quality of the work, determines how well important tasks are being performed; and evaluates member performance in a systematic way.
Junior Managers’ Psychological Empowerment (Junior Manager Self-Report)

Authors: Spreitzer (1995)

Response Format:

7 = Strongly Agree
6 = Agree
5 = Somewhat Agree
4 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree
3 = Somewhat Disagree
2 = Disagree
1 = Strongly Disagree

Scale Items:

1. The work I do is very important to me.
2. My job activities are personally meaningful to me.
3. The work I do is meaningful to me.
4. I am confident about my ability to do my job.
5. I am self-assured about my capabilities to perform my work activities.
6. I have mastered the skills necessary for my job.
7. I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job.
8. I can decide on my own how to go about doing my work.
9. I have considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do my job.
10. My impact on what happens in my department is large.
11. I have a great deal of control over what happens in my department.
12. I have significant influence over what happens in my department.

Task Performance (Junior Manager-Report of Employee)

Authors: Williams and Anderson (1991)

Response Format:

4 = Almost Always Or All the Time
3 = Often
2 = Sometimes
1 = Rarely
0 = Almost Never or Never

Scale Items:

1. Adequately completes assigned duties.
2. Fulfills responsibilities specified in the job description.
3. Does not neglect any aspect of the job he/she is obligated to perform.
4. Meets formal performance requirements of the job.
Conscientious Citizenship Behavior (Junior Manager-Report of Employee)

*Authors:* Podsakoff et al. (1990)

*Response Format:*

- 4 = Almost Always Or All the Time
- 3 = Often
- 2 = Sometimes
- 1 = Rarely
- 0 = Almost Never or Never

*Scale Items:*

1. Follows unit rules, regulations, and formal procedures even when
2. Attendance is above the norm.
3. Does not take unnecessary or long breaks.
4. Is always punctual.

Voice Behavior (Junior Manager-Report of Employee)

*Authors:* Van Dyne and Lepine (1998)

*Response Format:*

- 4 = Almost Always Or All the Time
- 3 = Often
- 2 = Sometimes
- 1 = Rarely
- 0 = Almost Never or Never

*Scale Items:*

1. Develops and makes recommendations to my supervisor concerning issues that affect my work.
2. Speak up and encourages others in my work unit to get involved in issues that affect our work.
3. Communicates my opinions about work issues to others in my work unit, even if their opinions are different and they disagree with me.
4. Provides constructive ideas and suggestions about how to improve.
5. Identifies rules, policies, or procedures that are unproductive.
6. Tries to persuade changing unproductive rules, policies, or procedures.

Unit Effectiveness (Senior Manager-Report of Junior Manager)

*Authors:* Hackman and Oldham (1980)

*Response Format:*

- 5 = Far Exceeds Expectations
- 4 = Exceeds Expectations
3 = Equals Expectations
2 = Short of Expectations
1 = Far Short of Expectations

*Scale Items:*
1. How would you rate the quality of work performed by the unit?
2. How would you rate the quantity of work performed by the unit?
3. How would you rate the overall commitment of the employees of the unit in achieving its goals and objectives?
4. How would you rate the overall performance of the unit?

**Managerial Effectiveness (Employee-Report of Junior Manager & Senior Manager-Report of Junior Manager)**

*Authors:* Kim and Yukl (1995)

*Response Format:*

9 = The most effective manager I have known
8 = Well above average, in the top 10%
7 = Moderately above average, in the top 25%
6 = A little above average, in the top 40%
5 = About average in effectiveness
4 = A little below average, in the bottom 40%
3 = Moderately below average, in the bottom 25%
2 = Well below average, in the bottom 10%
1 = The least effective manager I have known

*Scale Items:*
1. Please indicate the overall effectiveness of your supervisor in carrying out his/her job responsibilities.
2. Please rate your supervisor in terms of his or her overall effectiveness as a manager.