

**Ghada El-Kot**

Arab Academy for Science, Technology  
and Maritime Transport  
Alexandria, Egypt  
gelkot@aagsb.aast.edu

**Ronald J. Burke**

Schulich School of Business  
York University  
Toronto, Canada

**Jacob Wolpin**

Schulich School of Business  
York University  
Toronto, Canada

Supervisory Empowerment  
Behaviors, Psychological  
Empowerment and Work  
Outcomes among Egyptian  
Managers and Professionals:  
A Preliminary Study

## ABSTRACT

**Objective:** This research examined the relationship of perceived supervisor empowerment behaviors with important work and well-being outcomes in a sample of Egyptian managers and professionals. Relatively little research has been undertaken on human resource management in Egyptian organizations and even less during and following the Arab spring.

**Methodology:** Data were collected from 121 managerial and professional employees using anonymously completed questionnaires. Respondents were relatively young, had university educations, had short job and organizational tenures, and held lower level -management jobs. All measures used here had been used and validated previously by other researchers.

**Findings:** Work outcomes included job satisfaction, organizational commitment, work engagement, exhibiting voice behaviors, workplace learning opportunities, psychological well-being and intent to quit. Employee perceptions of supervisory empowering behaviors predicted their levels of psychological empowerment. And both perceived levels of supervisory/leader empowerment behaviors and self-reported feelings of empowerment had significant relationships with the majority of work and well-being outcomes

**Value Added:** Relatively little research has been undertaken on human resource management in Egyptian organizations and even less during and following the Arab spring. This will add to the body of knowledge about Egyptian managers and other Arab regions.

**Recommendations:** Practical implications of these findings along with future research directions are offered. Practical applications include training supervisors on empowerment behaviors, and training all employees on the benefits of personal empowerment and efficacy and ways to increase them.

**Key words:** Empowerment, work and wellbeing outcomes, Egyptian managers and professionals

**JEL codes:** F23,M5

## Introduction

This study examined the relationship of perceived supervisor/leader empowerment practices, employee feelings of psychological empowerment and important work outcomes among a sample of Egyptian managers and professionals. To the best of our knowledge, empowerment research has not been carried out in Egypt. In addition, empowerment research has typically

focused on front-line employees in the service sector. The empowerment concept has obvious relevance to the industrial sectors as well.

## Empowering supervisors, psychological empowerment and performance benefits

Herrenkohl, Judson and Heffner (1999; p. 375) defined empowerment as "a set of dimensions that characterize an environments interaction with persons in it so as to encourage their taking initiative to improve processes and to take action." Empowerment exists at two levels (Spreitzer, 1997) the macro-organizational environment that enhances levels of employee empowerment involving its structure, policies, approaches to decision making, where the locus Of control reside,) and the micro presence of empowerment feelings among employees, feeling encouraged to take risks, supported in exhibiting initiative, and accessing information about organizational priorities. Individuals also differ in that some employees are more likely to embrace empowerment than others being more highly educated, more committed to their profession, being at higher organizational levels, and having more self-efficacy). Individuals then have some choice in the levels of psychological empowerment.

Not surprisingly then, measures of empowerment have addressed both organizational and individual levels. Mathews, Diaz and Cole (2003) created and validated a measure of organizational empowerment that included three dimensions. Control of workplace decisions-level of employee input and involvement in decisions and policy making; Dynamic structural\_framework-organizational guidelines indicating potential levels of employee input to decision making and control of their workplace; and Fluidity in information sharing – employees are provided with all information on company objectives, rewards, and clients/customers. Arnold, Arad, Rhoades and Drasgow (2000) created a measure of leader empowerment behaviors that included five dimensions: Leading by example, Informing employees, Coaching employees, Showing concern for the welfare of employees and interacting

with them, and using Participative decision making. Spreitzer (1996, 1995) created and validated a measure of personal or psychological empowerment that had four dimensions: Meaning, Competence Self-determination and Impact. There are predictable links between macro and micro-level indicators with organizational level factors increasing individual level responses. In addition, employee feelings of empowerment would be reflected in more favorable work and well-being outcomes.

These measures have been employed in studies carried out in the hospitality sector. Kazlauskaite, Buciuniene and Turauskas (2012), using the Matthews, Diaz and Cole (2003) measure of organizational level empowerment and the Spreitzer (1995) measure of psychological empowerment, examined the role of both levels of empowerment in the HRM-performance linkage. They collected data from 211 front-line service employees at 30 upscale hotels in Lithuania. They reported that organizational empowerment was positively related to psychological empowerment, job satisfaction and affective commitment. In addition, psychological empowerment and affective commitment mediated the relationship of organizational empowerment on self-reported quality of service. Dewettinck and van Amajjde (2010) used the Arnold *et al.* (2000) measure in a study of 381 front-line employees working in four service organizations and found that leadership empowerment behaviors increased levels of both job satisfaction and affective commitment, with psychological empowerment partially mediating these relationships.

## Elements of an empowering workplace

Several writers have proposed workplace factors associated with higher levels of employee empowerment in addition to those discussed above (Mathews, Diaz & Cole, 2003; Arnold, Arad, Rhoades & Drasgow, 2000; Dewettinck & van Amajjde, 2010). Thus, Bowen and Lawler (1992) proposed four factors: sharing of information with employees about the organization's performance, rewarding employees based on their performance and

their performance improvements, giving employees the power to make or challenge decisions, and providing them the knowledge and skills so employees can contribute to organizational performance. Seibert, Wang and Courtright (2011) developed a model based on meta-analysis that included antecedents and consequences of psychological and team empowerment. Four contextual factors were associated with higher levels of psychological empowerment: high performance management characteristics, social-political support, leadership behaviors and job/work characteristics. Individual characteristics (e.g., self-confidence, self-efficacy) also were related to levels of psychological empowerment. Psychological empowerment, in turn, was positively associated with job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job and contextual performance. These findings existed at both individual and team-levels of analysis.

## Organizational and psychological empowerment

Lawler, Mohrman and Benson (2001) suggest that over seventy percent of workplaces have initiated some type of empowerment effort in at least part of their workforce. Since the empowerment concept seems to be a good fit for organizations, studies on the potential benefits of empowerment have been reported, and it was positively related to higher levels of customer-oriented behaviors.

## Human resource management in the Egyptian context

The Egyptian economy has been perming at a low level for several decades. Unemployment rates, particularly among women and recent university graduates, are high (Burke & El-Kot, 2011). Egypt has high rates of poverty, a low standard of living, and relatively high rates of illiteracy. Economic and political uncertainty is high as Egypt has had six different governments since

the Arab Spring revolution in 2011. Tourism, manufacturing and construction were particularly damaged. Corruption and nepotism were major problems in the public sector, the largest employer in Egypt.

Thus the need to improve productivity and organizational performance is high. Unfortunately many managers are not knowledgeable about effective human resource management practices and policies. These factors may, in the short run, increase interest in human resource management practices, in making greater use of their employee talents with empowerment being an element in these efforts.

## Human resource management and performance in Egyptian organizations

There are examples of the benefits to Egyptian organizations from the application of human resource management practices. Atteya (2012) collected data from 549 supervisors working in the petroleum industry. Human resource practices included training, use of rewards and incentives, performance evaluation, recruitment, selection and career development efforts. 'she reported that greater use of these human resource management practices influenced job performance indirectly through job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviors, lower intentions to quit and less criticism of their organizations. Burke and El-Kot (2014), using data from 88 Egyptian small- and medium sized enterprises, reported that greater use of various human resource management practices was associated with greater perceived effectiveness of their small and medium-sized enterprises and generally higher effectiveness this year than last.

## The present study

In this study we consider the relationship of employee perceptions of supervisor/leader empowerment behaviors, levels of felt psychological empow-

erment, and important work and well-being outcomes (e.g. job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment, work engagement, engaging in voice behavior, potential learning opportunities, intent to quit and psychological well-being) among Egyptian managers and professionals.

## Research model

Our research framework proposes a link between supervisory empowerment behaviors, levels of psychological or personal empowerment, and various work and well-being outcomes.

We examine the following general hypotheses.

- 1) Supervisor empowerment behaviors will be positively associated with psychological empowerment levels of managers and professionals.
- 2) Both supervisory empowering behaviors and managerial feelings of psychological empowerment will be related to more positive work and well-being outcomes controlling for the effects of personal demographic and work situation characteristics.

## Method

### Procedure

All data were collected using anonymously completed questionnaires in English. A team of MBA students approached employees in a range of organizations in Alexandria and Cairo soliciting their participation. One hundred and twenty one surveys were returned, either immediately or within a short period of time. The response rate was estimated to be approximately seventy-five percent. The sample is best described as a convenience sample.

## Respondents

Table 1 presents the personal demographic and work characteristics of our sample (n=121). Most were male (64%), worked full time (95%), were 30 years of age or younger (68%), were married (53%), without children (55%), had high school educations (50%), worked in their present organizations and positions for five years or less (59% and 84%, respectively), held lower level management positions (30%), had supervisory responsibilities (76%), worked between 41 and 50 hours per week (45%), a majority earned more than 80,000 Egyptian pound salaries (32%), slightly more worked in the service sector than in manufacturing (51%), worked in organizations of varying sizes up to several thousand with a slight majority working in firms of 50 or fewer employees (30%), and worked in a variety of departments (e.g. accounting, marketing, production human resources).

**Table 1. Demographic characteristics of sample**

Gender	N	%	Age	N	%
Male	77	63.6	30 or younger	57	49.1
Female	44	36.4	31-40	45	38.8
			41-50	9	7.8
			51 or older	5	4.3
Work status			Marital status		
Full time	114	95.0	Single	64	52.9
Part-time	6	45.0	Married	57	47.1
Parental status			Education		
Children	54	44.6	Bachelors	95	78.5
Childless	67	55.4	Masters	21	17.4
			Doctorate	5	4.1
Income			Organizational level		
25,000 or less	27	23.1	Non-management	30	24.8
25,001-50,000	32	27.3	Lower management	36	29.8

50,001-75,000	20	17.1	Middle management	30	24.8
75,001 or more	38	32.5	Senior management	25	20.7
Sector			Supervisory duties		
Manufacturing	59	49.2	Yes	90	75.6
Service	61	50.8	No	29	24.4
Work hours			Job tenure		
40 or less	51	42.1	5 years or less	102	84.3
41-50	54	44.7	6 years of more	19	15.7
51 or more	16	13.2			
Organizational tenure			Organization size		
5 years or less	71	58.9	50 or less	36	29.8
6-10 years	29	23.9	51-500	33	22.2
11 years or more	21	17.4	501-4000	31	25.6
			4001 and above	21	17.4

Source: own work.

## Measures: Personal and work situation demographics

Personal and work setting characteristics were assessed by a number of single items. The former included: gender, age, current work status, current marital and parental status, income, and level of education. The latter included hours worked per week, organizational level, job tenure, organizational tenure, Organizational size, employment sector, and whether respondent had supervisory duties. These items served as control variables in some of our analyses.

## Supervisory empowerment behaviors

Arnold, Arad, Rhoades and Drasgow (2000) created a measure of empowering leader behaviors that included five dimensions: Coaching, Informing, Leading by example, Participative Decision Making, and Showing concern/

Interacting with their team. Each was measured by five items. Respondents indicated how frequently their supervisor exhibited each behavior on a five point Likert Scale (1=Never, 3=Sometimes, 5=Always).

Leading by example ( $\alpha = .90$ ) – an item was “Leads by example.”

Participative decision making ( $\alpha = .93$ ) – one item was “Encourages work group members to express their ideas/suggestions”.

Coaching ( $\alpha = .93$ ) – an item was “Suggests ways to improve my work group’s performance.”

Informing ( $\alpha = .92$ ) – one item was “Explains how my work group fits into the company.”

Showing concern/Interacting with the team ( $\alpha = .91$ ) – an item was “Shows concern for work group members’ well-being.”

Scores on these five dimensions of leader empowerment were significantly and positively correlated (mean inter-correlation being .77 ( $p < .001$ )). Thus the five dimensions were combined into a total leader empowerment measure ( $\alpha = .97$ ).

## Work outcomes: Seven work outcomes were included

### Psychological empowerment

Psychological or personal feelings empowerment was measured by a twelve item scale developed and validated by Spreitzer (1996, 1995). This measure included four dimensions, each addressed by three items. Respondents indicated their agreement with each item on a seven-point Likert scale (1=Very strongly disagree; 4=Neutral, 7=Very strongly agree).

Meaning ( $\alpha = .92$ ) – “The work I do is meaningful to me.”

Competence ( $\alpha = .78$ ) – “I am confident about my ability to do my job.”

Self-determination ( $\alpha = .76$ ) – “I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job.”

Impact ( $\alpha=.85$ ) – “My impact on what happens in my department is large”.

Scores on these four dimensions were significantly and positively correlated (mean inter-correlation being .40 ,  $p<.001$ ). Thus scores on the four dimensions were combined into an overall psychological empowerment measure ( $\alpha=.87$ ).

Job satisfaction was assessed by a seven item scale ( $\alpha=.84$ ) developed by Taylor and Bowers (1972). Respondents indicated their agreement with each item on a five-point Likert scale (1=Very dissatisfied, 3= Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; 5=Very satisfied. One item was “all in all, how satisfied are you with the persons in your work group?”

## Work engagement

Three aspects of work engagement were assessed using measures created by Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma and Bakker (2002). Respondents indicated their agreement with each item on a five point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 5=strongly agree).

Dedication was measured by five items ( $\alpha=.89$ ) – one item was “I am proud of the work I do.”

Vigor was assessed by six items ( $\alpha=.67$ ) – an item was “At my work I feel bursting with energy.”

Absorption was measured by six items ( $\alpha=.76$ ) – one item was “I am immersed in my work.”

Scores on these three measures were positively and significantly inter-correlated (mean inter-correlation being .64,  $P<.001$ ) thus they were combined to form a composite work engagement measure ( $\alpha=.88$ ).

## Learning opportunities

Workplace learning potential was assessed using a twelve item scale developed by Nikolova, Van Ruysseveldt, DeWitte and Syroit (2014). Four learning

potential opportunities were considered, each measured by three items. Respondents rated the applicability of each item to their current work situation on a five point Likert scale (1=Not applicable at all, 5=completely applicable). These four dimensions and a sample item follow.

Reflection ( $\alpha=.68$ ) – “In my work I am given the opportunity to contemplate about different work methods”.

Experimentation ( $\alpha=.52$ ) – “In my job I can try different work methods even if that does not deliver any useful result.”

Supervisor ( $\alpha=.78$ ) – “My supervisor helps me see my mistakes as a learning experience.”

Coworkers ( $\alpha=.76$ ) – “My colleagues tell me if I make mistakes in my work.”

All of the inter-correlations among the four dimensions were positive, with four of the six being statistically significant. The four dimensions were then combined into a composite measure ( $\alpha=.76$ ), the average inter-correlation being .28 ( $p<.01$ ).

Organizational affective commitment was measured by a six item scale ( $\alpha=.92$ ) created by Meyer and Allen (1997). Respondents indicated their agreement with each item on a five-point Likert Scale (1= Strongly disagree, 3=Neither agree nor disagree; 5= Strongly agree). One item was “I am proud to tell others I work at my organization”.

## Employee Voice

Employee voice behaviors were assessed by a six item scale ( $\alpha=.92$ ) developed by Van Dyne and LePine (1998). Respondents reported how often they engaged in voice behaviors in their workplaces by indicating the frequency of each item on a five point Likert scale (1=Never, 3=sometime, and 5=Very frequently). One item was “I speak up in my workplace with ideas for new projects or changes in the way we do things.”

Intent to quit was measured by two items ( $\alpha=.81$ ) used by Burke (1991). Respondents indicated “yes or no” for both items. One item was “Are you currently looking for a different job in a different organization?”

## Psychological well-being

Psychological well-being, the absence of psychosomatic symptoms was measured by 19 items ( $\alpha=.90$ ) developed by Quinn and Shepard (1974). Respondents reported how often they experienced each psychosomatic or physical symptom in the past year (e.g. headaches) on a four point frequency scale (1-never, 4-often).

## Results

### Supervisory/leader empowerment behaviors and psychological empowerment

Table 2 shows the results of a hierarchical regression analysis in which the measure of psychological empowerment was regressed on three blocks of predictors entered in a specified order. The first block of predictors were selected personal demographic characteristics: ( $n=3$ ) and included sex, age and education. The second block of predictors were work situation characteristics ( $n=3$  and included organizational level, job tenure and organizational size.) The third block of predictors was the measure of perceived supervisory/leader empowerment behaviors ( $n=1$ ). When a block of predictors accounted for a significant amount or increment in explained variance ( $p<.05$ ) on a given dependent variable, individual items within such blocks having significant and independent relationships with the dependent variable were identified.

Table 2. Supervisor Empowerment Behaviors and Psychological Empowerment

Psychological Empowerment (n=241)	R	R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup>	P
Personal demographics	.15	.03	.03	.NS
Work situation characteristics	.43	.18	.15	.001
Organizational level (.13)				
Supervisor empowerment (.24)	.48	.23	.05	.01

Source: own study.

The following comments summarize these results. First, respondents at higher organizational levels indicated higher levels of psychological empowerment ( $B=.31$ ). Second, respondents reporting higher levels of supervisory/leader empowerment behaviors also indicated greater psychological empowerment ( $B=.24$ ).

## Supervisor empowerment behaviors, psychological empowerment and well-being outcomes

Table 3 presents the results of hierarchical regression analyses in which the seven work and well-being outcomes were separately regressed on four blocks of predictors. The first block of predictors ( $n=3$ ) included personal demographics (sex, age, level of education). The third block of predictors included the measure of perceived supervisor/leader empowerment behaviors ( $n=1$ ). The fourth and final block of predictors was the measure of psychological empowerment ( $n=1$ ). When a block of predictors accounted for a significant amount or increment in explained variance on a given dependent variable ( $p<.05$ ), individual items or measures within these blocks having significant and independent relationships with this variable ( $p<.05$ ) were identified.

**Table 3. Empowerment and Work and Well-being Outcomes**

	R	R2	ΔR2	P
<b>Work and Well-Being outcomes</b>				
<b>Job satisfaction (n=119)</b>				
Personal demographics	.27	.07	.07	.05
Work situation characteristics	.44	.20	.13	.001
Organization size (-.15)	.61	.36	.16	.001
Supervisor empowerment (.37)	.63	.39	.13	.05
Psychological empowerment (.20)				
<b>Organization commitment (n=119)</b>				
Personal demographics – Sex (-.28)	.33	.11	.11	.01
Work situation characteristics			.07	
Organizational size (-.23)	.42	.18	.09	.05
Supervisor empowerment (.27)	.52	.27	.04	.001
Psychological empowerment (.23)	.56	.31		.05
<b>Work engagement (N=118)</b>				
Personal demographics	.20	.04	.05	NS
Work situation characteristics	.30	.09	.07	NS
Supervisor empowerment (.16)	.41	.16	.19	.01
Psychological empowerment(.51)	.60	.21		.001
<b>Learning opportunities (n=117)</b>				
Personal demographics	.15	.02	.05	NS
Work situation characteristics	.26	-.7	.18	NS
Supervisor empowerment (.40)	.50	.26	.04	.001
Psychological empowerment (.22)	.54	.29		.05
<b>Voice behavior (n=118)</b>				
Personal demographics	.20	.04	.09	NS
Work situation characteristics	.36	.13	.01	.05
Supervisor empowerment	.38	.14	.17	NS
Psychological empowerment(.46)	.55	.31		.001

Intent to quit (n=118)	.21	.04	.04	NS
Personal demographics	.28	.08	.04	NS
Work situation characteristics	.38	.15	.07	.01
Supervisor empowerment (.28)	.38	.15	.00	NS
Psychological empowerment				
Psychological well-being(n=119)	.19	.04	.04	NS
Person demographics	.30	.09	.06	NS
Work situation characteristics	.32	.10	.01	NS
Supervisor empowerment	.33	.11	.00	NS
Psychological empowerment				

Source: own study.

The following comments are offered in summary. First, managers and professionals working in smaller organizations were more job-satisfied ( $B = -.15$ ); managers and professionals reporting higher levels of supervisor empowering behaviors and higher levels of psychological empowerment were also more job-satisfied ( $Bs = .37$  and  $.20$ , respectively.) Second, managers and professionals indicating greater supervisor empowerment behaviors and higher levels of psychological empowerment were also more work engaged ( $Bs = .16$  and  $.51$ , respectively.) Third, males, managers and professionals working in smaller organizations, those reporting higher levels of supervisory empowerment behaviors, and those indicating higher levels of their own psychological empowerment were more organizationally committed ( $Bs = -.28$ ,  $-.17$ ,  $.27$  and  $.23$ , respectively.) Fourth, respondents indicating more supervisory empowerment behaviors and higher levels of psychological empowerment indicated a greater number of potential learning opportunities ( $Bs = .40$  and  $.22$ , respectively.) Fifth, respondents indicating greater psychological empowerment, not surprisingly, engaged in more voice behaviors ( $B = .46$ .) Sixth, managers and professionals indicating higher levels of supervisor empowering behaviors were less likely to intent to quit ( $B = -.28$ .) Finally, no predictor variables had significant and independent relationships with self-reported psychological well-being, the absence of psychological symptoms.

Supervisory empowering behaviors had significant relationships with five of the seven work and well-being outcomes (not engaging in voice behavior or psychological well-being); psychological empowerment also had significant relationships with five of the seven outcomes (not intent to quit or self-reported psychological well-being).

## Additional observations

Some broader observations can also be drawn from these findings. Not surprisingly, individuals at higher organizational levels reported both more supervisory/leader empowerment behaviors and higher levels of their own psychological empowerment. It is possible to instill characteristics of the experiences of these higher level respondents (more influence, more discretion) into employees at lower organizational levels. Managers and professionals working in larger organizations reported fewer supervisor empowerment behaviors and lower levels of their own psychological empowerment suggesting that larger organizations, perhaps being more bureaucratic and less personal, face a greater challenge in increasing empowerment.

## Discussion

We found support for our two hypotheses (see tables 2 and 3). First, levels of supervisory empowerment behaviors were significantly and positively related with employee feelings of psychological empowerment (see table 2). In addition, one work situation characteristics emerged as a significant predictor of psychological empowerment (see table 2). Individuals at higher organizational levels perceived higher levels of supervisor empowerment behaviors. Second, levels of psychological empowerment were generally positively related with work and well-being outcomes, with the exception of employees' quit intentions and levels of employee well-being. The variance on our measure of employee well-being – the absence of symptoms – was

limited as the sample was generally young and in relatively good health. Our results were generally consistent with previous writing and research carried out both in tourism and hospitality and other sectors reviewed above. In addition, these results replicate the findings from our previous work investigating these same concepts in a sample of service employees from five-star hotels in Turkey and managers and professionals in the manufacturing sector in Turkey. Third, levels of employee psychological empowerment were significantly and positively related with five of the seven work and psychological well-being indicators, neither with intent to quit nor psychological wellbeing/absence of psychological symptoms. Variance on these two outcomes was restricted as few respondents intended to quit and the relatively young age of the respondents resulted in relatively low levels of psychological symptoms.

## Practical implications

This investigation has shown that higher levels of supervisor empowering behaviors was associated with positive outcomes, which is consistent with a large body of emerging research findings in studies carried out in various industrial sectors (Burke et. al., 2015a, 2015b; Zemke & Schaaf, 1989). But the empowerment concept may be more appropriate and easy to implement in some sectors than others good fit for every organization and sector (Greasley et. al, 2005; Bowen & Lawler, 1995, 1992). Quinn and Spreitzer (1997) propose seven questions that executives should consider about the fit of empowerment with their business environment and organizational characteristics.

But the implementation empowerment practices will be a difficult challenge (Ahearne, Mathlieu & Rapp, 2005). There is usually tension between management's desire for control and employee feelings of empowerment. There is also a gap between manager's opinions of levels of employee empowerment and employee feelings of empowerment (Hales, 2000). Implementing an empowerment initiative is a major organizational change, and with all major organizational change efforts, many fail or fall short.

Based on our work and the work of others (see Spreitzer, 2008 for a review) empowerment practices have the potential to yield positive outcomes for both employees and workplaces. A number of ways to increase levels of empowerment of both front line employees and managers have been identified. These include increasing employee participation in decision making, delegating authority and control to these employees, creating more challenging work roles through job redesign, leaders sharing more information, and leaders providing more coaching and mentoring to their staff. At the micro level, increasing levels of employee self-efficacy through training and more effective use of their work experiences will increase personal empowerment and improve work outcomes (Maddux, 2002).

## Limitations of the research

The present research has shortcomings which should be noted to better consider the findings. First, all data were collected using self-report questionnaires with the small risk of response set and common method biases. Second, all data were collected at one point in time making it challenging to address issues of causality. Third, all respondents came from the two largest cities in Egypt thus the extent to which our findings would generalize to managerial and professional women and men is indeterminate. Fourth, it was not possible to determine the representativeness of our sample as well.

## Future research directions

The size and nature of our sample made this an exploratory investigation of empowerment in Egyptian organizations, to our knowledge the first Egyptian study on empowerment. The results, consistent with our hypotheses and previous research findings from other countries and other industries, indicated that supervisory empowering behaviors were associated with valued individual and organizational outcomes. As a consequence, undertaking

future research in Egypt which examines empowerment is warranted and should include larger and more representative samples of managers and professionals. In addition, including outcomes measures of a more objective nature such as absenteeism, managerial ratings of job performance, and actual job performance evidence would strengthen conclusions about the potential benefits of empowerment in organizations. Finally, initiating efforts to increase levels of empowerment, where appropriate, and evaluating these efforts, would provide meaningful information to organizational leaders.

## Footnotes

Preparation of this manuscript was supported in part by Arab Academy for Science, Technology and Maritime Transport and York University. We thank those assisting in the data collection and our respondents.

## References

**Ahearne, M., Mathieu, J., & Rapp, A. (2005).** To Empower or Not to Empower Your Sales Force? An Empirical Examination of the Influence of Leadership Empowerment Behavior on Customer Satisfaction and Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*(5), 945–955.

**Arnold, J. A., Arad, S., Rhoades, J. A., & Drasgow, F. (2000).** The empowering leadership questionnaire: The construction and validation of a new scale for measuring leader behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *21*(3), 249–269.

**Atteya, N. M. (2012).** Testing the impact of human resource management practices on job performance: an empirical study in the Egyptian joint venture petroleum companies. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, *3*(9), 105–119.

**Bowen, D. E., & Lawler, E. E. (1995).** Empowering service employees. *Sloan Management Review*. *36*, 73–84.

**Bowen, D. E., & Lawler, E. E. (1992).** The empowerment of service workers: What, why, how and when. *Sloan Management Review*, *33*(3), 31–40.

**Burke, R. J. (1991).** Early work experiences of female and male managers and professionals: Reasons for optimism? *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, *8*(4), 224–230.

**Burke, R. J. & El-Kot, G. (2014).** Human resource management practices in small- and medium-sized enterprises in Egypt. *Journal of Transnational Management*, *19*(3), 211-226.

**Burke, R. J., Koyuncu, M., Wolpin, J., Yirik, S., & Koyuncu, K. (2015).** Organizational empowerment practices, psychological empowerment and work outcomes among frontline service employees in five-star Turkish Hotels. *Effective Executive*, *18*, 42–65.

**Dewettnick, I. & van Ameijde, M. (2011).** Linking leadership empowerment behavior to employee attitudes and behavioral intentions. *Personnel Review*, *40*(3), 284–305.

**Greasley, K., Bryman, A, Dainty, A, Price, A., Soetanto, R., & King, N. (2005).** Employee perceptions of empowerment. *Employee Relations*, *27*(4), 354–368.

**Hales, C. (2000).** Management and empowerment programs. *Work, Employment and Society*, *14*(3), 501–519.

**Herrenkohl, R. C., Judson, G. T., & Heffner, J. A. (1999).** Defining and measuring employee empowerment. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *35*(3), 373–389.

**Kazlauskaite, R., Buciuniene, I. M., & Turauskas, L. (2012).** *Organizational and psychological empowerment in the HRM-performance linkage*. *Employee Relations*, *34*(2), 138–158.

**Lawler, E. E., Mohrman, S. A., & Benson, G. (2001).** *Organizing for higher performance: Employee involvement, TQM, reengineering, and knowledge management in the fortune 1000*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

**Maddux, J. E. (2002).** Self-efficacy: The power of believing you can. In **C. R. Snyder, & S. J. Lopez** (eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 274–287). New York: Oxford University Press.

**Mathews, R. A., Diaz, W. M., & Cole, S. G. (2003).** The organizational empowerment scale. *Personnel Review*, *32*(3), 297–318.

**Meyer, J. & Allen, N. (1997).** *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

**Nikolova, I., Van Ruysseveldt, J., DeWitte, H., & Syroit, J. (2014).** Work-based learning: Development and validation of a scale measuring the learning potential of the workplace (LPW). *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *84*(1), 1–10.

**Quinn, R. E., & Spreitzer, G.M. (1997).** The road to empowerment: Seven questions every leader should consider. *Organizational Dynamics*, *26*(2), 37–49.

**Quinn, R.P., & Shepard, L. J. (1974).** *The 1972-73 Quality of employment Survey*. Institute for social Research, University of Michigan. Ann Arbor: Michigan.

**Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, AM., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002).** The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analysis approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *3*(1), 71–92.

**Seibert, S. E., Wang, G., & Courtright, S. H. (2011).** Antecedents and consequences of psychological and team empowerment in organizations. *A meta-analytic review*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *96*(5), 981–1003.

**Spreitzer, G. M. (2008).** Taking stock: A review of more than twenty years of research on empowerment. In **J. Barling, C. L. Cooper, & S. R. Clegg** (eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational behavior* (pp. 54–72). London: Sage Publications.

**Spreitzer, G.M. (1997).** *Toward a common ground in defining empowerment*. In **W. A. Pasmore, & R. W. Woodman** (eds.), *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, *10*, 31–62.

**Spreitzer, G. M. (1996).** Social structural characteristics of psychological empowerment. *Academy of Management Journal*, *39*(2), 483–504.

**Spreitzer, G. M. (1995).** Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*(5), 1442-1465.

**Taylor, J. C., & Bowers, D. (1972).** *Survey of organizations: A machine-scored standardized questionnaire instrument*. Ann Arbor, MI.: Institute for social Research.

**Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998).** Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, *41*(1), 108–119.

**Zemke, R., & Schaef, D. (1989).** *The service edge: 101 companies that profit from customer care*. New York: New American Library.