

INTRODUCING NEW EMPLOYEE EMPOWERMENT APPROACH: A SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW

Gibriel Badjie¹, Armanu Thoyib², Djumilah Hadiwidjojo³, Ainur Rofiq⁴

¹Doctoral student, ^{2,3,4}Promoter & Lecturer, Department of Management, Faculty of Economics & Business University of Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia.

Email: ¹gbadjie@utg.edu.gm, ²armanuthoyib@gmail.com, ³dhafa_shadaaqila@yahoo.com, ⁴rofiq@ub.ac.id

Article History: Received on 30th August 2019, Revised on 28th September 2019, Published on 22nd October 2019

Abstract

Purpose of the study: The aim of the paper is to introduce newly developed constructs of employee empowerment as alternatives to the existing measures serving both the organization and employees. Centered on employees as the focus of the argument regarding how genuinely employee empowerment is realistically practiced in organizations today.

Methodology: The study applied systematic literature review (SLR) or systematic research synthesis (SRS) as the method to gather, analyze and respond to the research query. The study method embraces the definition of SLR by [Rousseau et al. \(2008\)](#). The conditions for the literature search electronically were done through multiple journal sites. The gathered academic published materials were dated between 1954-2017.

Main Findings: The findings revealed that there is a misconception surrounding the true picture of employee empowerment in organizations. Different organizations have different interpretations of employee empowerment as deemed fitting to serve their needs. Most findings propagate employee empowerment on the conditions of internal factors of the organization.

Applications of this study: This new approach to employee empowerment will give employees a new lease of life that extends beyond the immediate influence of the organization. It incorporates external factors as both define and shape the attitude and behaviors of employees. Both micro and macro factors relating to work roles and non-work roles of employees matter in empowerment.

Novelty/Originality of this study: This study takes a holistic approach to employee empowerment by taking both inside-out and outside-in approach to factors that have strong influence on the attitude and behavior of employees thus relates to performance. It introduces new measures for employee empowerment.

Keywords: *Employee Empowerment, Empowerment, Empowering, Empowering Employees, Organizational performance.*

INTRODUCTION

The many literatures and descriptions of employee empowerment are often narrowly focused on internal influence of the organization's environment. They often fail to take note of the fact that, when employees join an organization, their lives have changed for good or for worst. That factor of positivity or negatively is not only limited to the internal structures of the organization but also extends beyond, to the family and the greater community.

Employees who join the organization are not entirely empty vessels and are without purpose. All employees have expectations regarding their involvement and agreement with the organization. Employees are human beings with highly integrated social networks, a collective orientation for support and help for the maintenance and upkeep of society. Employee empowerment for [Kanter \(1979\)](#) means giving some form of concessions and authority to employees to make decisions on their accord. Quite several authors who contributed extensively to this concept relate empower to the art and science of 'delegating', where the leadership surrenders some form of authority to the subordinates because many agreed that the ideals of empowerment cannot be analyzed without a direct reference to power ([Conger & Kanungo, 1988](#)). According to [Conger & Kanungo \(1988\)](#) the notion of empowerment in management practice is rooted in power and control, therefore viewed empowerment as a relational construct and empowerment as a motivational construct.

According to [Honold \(1997\)](#), employee empowerment is a multidimensional construct that is difficult to define. There is no unified definition of employee empowerment acceptable to all. What complicates giving a single definition is since its nature and character are determined based on individual organizational needs and as such each organization defines how it suits their context and content of their work relationship. Some people are also with the opinion that organizations must respond to define employee empowerment to fit the needs and aligned with the culture of the organization. Employee empowerment according to [Honold \(1997\)](#) needs an identity and belonging without which it will not succeed in the organization because no one will claim ownership and who it is meant to serve and how will show level of commitment.

According to [Foster-Fishman \(1995\)](#), without an ideal organizational climate, employee empowerment will unbelievably be failed and stressed that the leadership must be ready to allow to give more work-related autonomy to employees and embolden the employees to have more unlimited choices in making decision that determines how they do work. Every decision maker is a risk taker, so risk taking should only be limited to the leadership, but subordinates should be encouraged within a conducive environment to take risk on ways that will positively inform them to do their work. The leadership should create a climate of trust and inclusion to engage and involve with high level of tolerance from both ends

to accept responsibility with regards to possible outcomes. Because of the way some organizations implement employee empowerment obligations and due to the hypocrisy in the implementation effort that is not fair, concluded that not all organizations are cut-out for employee empowerment, [Forster-Fishman \(1995\)](#). Employee empowerment should only be institutionalized only if the conditions are right that fits and matches with both the internal and external needs of the organization and employees, provided the management is ready to change the system to accommodate the new realities. For the organization's readiness to embrace employee empowerment will be determined based on how much control and autonomy, inclusion and risk-taking propensity it is willing to accept under the new trust reality.

The ambiguity surrounding employee empowerment as a name on paper did not give employee the legitimate power to make changes, to call for things to happen due to the failure or the lack of will from the management to clearly establish the limitations and boundaries. Too much was hoped for from both sides but with little knowledge what empowerment entails ([Rothstein 1995](#)). The genesis of the paper is laid based on the above argument meant to introduce an argument for employee empowerment characterized by the will to support both human and social needs of the employees. The goal is to know to what extent employee empowerment is advocated for and what power is available to the employee in the organization?

LITERATURE REVIEW

To [Honold \(1997\)](#), various researchers looked at the dimensions of empowerment through different lenses, many agree on the following as related to empowerment; *one's ownership of the job through optimum control; power over one's job; diverse teamwork and contingent pay system that relates to one's performance; focus on teams and synergistic effort; job enrichment; advocate for employee stock ownership*. According to [Honold \(1997\)](#), the approach of a leader that emboldens and supports those working under them is a core leadership and organizational factor that translate into performance and effective; this simply means empowering employees, ([Block, 1987](#); [McClelland, 1975](#)). For [Kanter \(1979\)](#), to define the construct of employee empowerment, the analysis should start with an organization's internal factors that determine the distribution of power and control to different groups as this creates recognition and therefore enhance the effectiveness of the organization.

According to [Honold \(1997\)](#), research report identified five groups of employee empowerment, i.e. *Leadership, the individual empowered state, collaborative work, structural or procedural change*, and stressed that employee empowerment is a multi-dimensional construct. [Kanter \(1979\)](#) empowerment is just like handing people the power, people at the lower positions in the organization to lift them up and further argued that empowerment as derived from power, is like removing people from the state of powerlessness to being powerful. Most of the time organization's leadership intervene to make sure genuine empowerment takes place must struggle with the entire system, structural issues as well as problematic issues relating to individuals and management responsibilities, ([Honold, 1997](#)).

According to [Vogt & Murrell \(1990\)](#), defines *'empowerment is an act of building, developing and increasing power by working with others, the term called "interactive empowerment", and of having the ability to influence one's own behavior, the term called "self-empowerment"'*. [Vogt & Murrell \(1990\)](#) argued that employee empowerment is contained in six constructs and includes; *'educating, leading, mentoring/supporting, providing, structuring, and the one that relates to all others'*.

[Thomas & Velthouse \(1990\)](#) believes the concept of empowerment is core to human survival. Empowerment is referred to as *'cognitive variables change'*. The factors that influence variables are *'surrounding, work content tasks, leadership behaviors, personalities of people as it relates how it affects them and in giving meaning to the task at hand'*. [Menon \(2001\)](#) *'the greater job autonomy and meaningfulness of the job lead to greater perceived control and greater empowerment'*. People in control of the means that determine outcomes translate into self-empowerment and give them sense of self-worth.

A report by [Brymer \(1991\)](#), in an empowered organization, employees are viewed as partners, given the autonomy to take initiative and be innovative, champion teamwork, embrace collective effort as well as individual effort as both are needed at different moments in the organization especially when employees are given the recognition to participate and contribute to strategic decision making that will define the prospect of the organization. For this to be a reality, the leadership must create of climate of participation guided by well-established policies that aligned with the mission, values, and structure of the organization. In such organization flexibility is at the heart of norms, people given autonomy to express meaningfully with merits, where individuals are rewarded for participation. It is a place where punishment does not exist for risk-taking on matters that will positively serve the organization, involvement, and engagement of employees is challenged, open support employee's contribution and make sure work-life balance policy is tightly integrated, ([Brymer, 1991](#)). Many research reports relate empowerment as factor of motivation, factor of relations and as a factor of power as the dominant points of arguments, [Bacharach & Lawler \(1980\)](#); [Pfeffer \(1981\)](#).

Empowerment as a factor of Relations

Empowerment as a concept that derives its rights from power and power as a relational factor is described how power and control are perceived as it relates to individual actors within the organization. McClelland's notion of needs for affiliation embodies the concept of empowerment as a relational factor, [Bacharach & Lawler \(1980\)](#); [Pfeffer \(1981\)](#). This idea takes

its root from the social exchange theory [Blau \(1964\)](#); [Emerson \(1976\)](#); [Zafirovski \(2005\)](#); [Cropanzano & Mitchell \(2005\)](#) that interpret power as a function of dependence and interdependence. At organizational level, employee's power in the organization is the belief that employees have ability to contribute to performance and resources that add value to the organization. It also stressed that employees must have abilities adopt and cope with organizational uncertainties, ([Pfeffer, 1981](#)).

Empowerment as a factor of Motivation

This is a concept for psychology, and motivation is a factor that resides in the individual and the ability to get things done through others is empowering and satisfying. Power as a tool or a means to enable control, it motivates the individual with that ability to leverage that goal and helps to fulfill our expectations and beliefs. [McClelland \(1975\)](#) needs for power weld the individual with the ability to achieve through others what he or she could not achieve on his/her own. Power flexibly is a tool to influence others and control their will to do but power forcibly is tool of coercion mandating compliance to attain a given goal ([Fagenson 1988](#)). Power as a factor of motivation challenges the individual to take ownership of his/her destiny (internal locus of control), gives the individual self-responsibility, self-determination, [Deci \(1971\)](#) and self-efficacy or self-worth and self-esteem, ([Bandura, 1986](#)).

To empower is "to enable", enhancing implies motivating through enhancing self-efficacy ([Conger & Kanungo, 1995](#)). [McClelland \(1975\)](#) empowerment is viewed as an enabling rather than a delegating process. Both the relational and motivational construct of employee empowerment concluded that 'power' is the basic ingredient that empowers employees by 'enabling' them to become independent thus creates 'dependence and interdependence. The new employee empowerment concepts thus created on the concern to serve the human and social needs of the employees through the organization as the 'enabler' or source of power and support. The development of the concept is done by integrating many theories and using the typology [Hendar, Ferdinand & Murhayati \(2017\)](#) for developing new construct.

CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT

Employee Empowerment (EE)

Most literature on empowerment and employee empowerment is argued based on seeing the individual employee from the perspective of individualistic society rather than taking an open approach to address employee empowerment from the lens of collectivists societies where communal values posed as a check and recognition thus have a strong influence on the behavior of people in any engagement for profit and growth.

The many researches so far consulted addresses employee empowerment from the conditions of organization and confined to the organizational internal environment as the main dominant factor affecting the behavior of the employee in relation to job/work. The factors that characterize the behavior of employees are reminiscent of both internal and external consequences, thus are strong predictors and therefore shapes, define the work-related attitudes and behaviors of employees in the organization. To isolate external factors in addressing employee empowerment will result in minimizing the role played by the employee in serving the organization and the greater society. Employee empowerment is argued to take a multidimensional approach [Honold \(1997\)](#) and equally the factors that provoked employees to be empowered also existed in unlimited circumstances.

Employee empowerment (EE) in simple terms means "recognition" as it resonates with people's attitude and behavior. Recognition of employee in adding value to the organization. Individual employees who are recognized in an organization reflect rare assets or resources valuable to the functioning of the organization. Many other researches equate empowerment to having power or authority but without being recognized as someone who can be trusted with such powers or authority, empowerment will not take place.

Employee empowerment (EE) is a concept that has its roots from structural empowerment theory of [Kanter \(1979\)](#). According to [Kanter \(1979\)](#) in her theory of structural power in organization proposes that workplace empowerment provides employees with access to information, support, resources and opportunity for growth and development to enable them to do their job to the best of their abilities ([Gilbert, Larshinger & Letter, 2010](#)). [Kanter \(1979\)](#), access to information equates 'being in the loop' in terms of "formal and informal" happening relating to the organization. Information access is a sign of recognition and power to enable employee to better and truly make decisions, thus acting quickly, as well as having the mandate and will power to share with others to achieve goals together ([Kanter, 1979](#)).

The employee empowerment (EE) as concept drew inspirations from motivation theories, particularly [McClelland's \(1975\)](#) needs theory which posits that work behavior of most individuals is motivated by three needs i.e. needs for affiliation, needs for power and needs for achievement. Although the research conclusion by McClelland is narrower in scope to organizational internal structures in determining factors that affect employee's behavior in relation to performance. David McClelland's research can be expanded in scope to see how it reflects the outside environment of the organization as relating to external influence on employees.

An employee inside the organization is basically the same person outside the influence of the organization. Employees today must balance their attitude and behaviors between the internal and external factors to help avoid any conflict that may compromise their ability to stay true to themselves. According to [McClelland \(1975\)](#), the needs theory corresponds to

needs desired and acquired over time because of people's life experiences that at most define people's exposure as it relates to attitude, behavior and personality.

The employee empowerment (EE) borrows thoughts from social identity theory and social exchange theory. The true value of social identity is to recognize and to have a sense of belonging which is empowering to people in a given relationship. The facets of social identity are to support and enhance group membership to achieve individual as well as collective goals. The key tenet of employee empowerment is to affect and define individual and collective behaviours. Similarly, social identity also affects both individual and collective behaviour as a token to positively support individual and group performance.

The social exchange theory celebrates group identification or affiliations as a way of exchanges of goods or rewards. Where there is an exchange of rewards, there exists some sort of recognition of the existence of a relationship that warrants that exchange to take place. The basic argument of social exchange theory according to [Emerson \(1976:351\)](#), relationship evolves over time and translates over time resulting to trust, satisfaction, commitment for long term profit for both parties. Parties involved in the relationship must observe some form of rules or norms that define the nature of the give and take relationship. Every relationship is established based on some form of recognition for the agreed principles that enable the parties in a commitment to willing surrender to the obligations so that relations can last with inclusive benefits to all, ([Emerson, 1976:35](#)).

Based on the above theoretical foundations and argument, new employee empowerment (EE) concepts were conceived. It includes issues outside the organization as a burden for employees today and in empowerment such issues should be considered to help create better employees as deeply rooted in the philosophical arguments of human relations and social psychologists. This new concept aligns with the pronouncement made by work-life balance champions for organization to help employees strike a balance between work roles and non-work roles.

This study therefore defines employee empowerment (EE) as the recognition that employees have abilities, wisdom, and hopes that provoked a willing attitude from the authority within the organization to enhance the value of employees by supporting them to serve both work and non-work roles in an atmosphere of trust, consideration, tolerance, risk-taking for greater good.

METHODOLOGY

This study applied the systematic literature review (SLR) or systematic research synthesis (SRS) as the approach to gathering data to make sense of the paper. The study embraced the definition of [Rousseau et al., \(2008\)](#) "a research synthesis is the systematic accumulation, analysis and reflective interpretation of the full body of relevant empirical evidence related to a question". According to [Rousseau et al., \(2008\)](#) "the motives for undertaking a research synthesis include scientific discovery and explanation, improved management practice guidelines and for making public policy".

The objective of the research investigation is to gather data and examine in order to help develop new concepts in employee empowerment that embodies the identity of the employee as someone who saddles between the organization and the outside community. The goal of the paper is to provoke a rethink in the way employee empowerment is approached from the lens of the internal organizational setting yet ignoring the factors that lie outside the organization that also define the attitude and behavior of the employees. Additionally, the new approach is to engaged employee empowerment from the perspectives of the collective societies, where individual achievement is celebrated across the entire community who claimed ownership. The approach of the synthesis entailed extensive, general and open-ended searches of relevant databases appropriate to focus on the research question (i.e. how to create new measures that promote a new approach to employee empowerment). the conditions for data collection searches were limited to the following:

1. Keywords, I searched based on defined keyword which includes 'employee empowerment'; 'empowerment; 'empowering'; 'empowering employees', 'organizational performance'.
2. The search includes data published either as journal article, book (e-book or hard copy) or chapter/s.
3. The published data sets were identified through electronic databases accessible through many search sites (e.g. University library system). Also, hard copies of books were accessible through the University library.
4. General electronic searches were also conducted using google scholar, Researchgate, Emerald, ScienceDirect, Sage Publications, Wiley Online Library, Proquest, Web of Science e.t.c.
5. There is no limitation to date of publication materials, a total of 51 published materials were gathered dated between 1954-2017 including journal articles, books, and chapters.

DISCUSSION / ANALYSIS

The new concept of employee empowerment (EE) is measured with four dimensions namely; organization-obligated empowerment, self-obligated empowerment, family-obligated empowerment, and community-obligated empowerment to test the acceptability of the new concept.

Organization-Obligation Empowerment

This portrays the structural power of the organization as willing to recognize and leverage the benevolence of the employees by allowing them some form of control. The willingness and the pace of employee empowerment have to do with the philosophy of the organization, the level of stress with regards to the competitive challenges it faces ([Conger & Kanungo 1988](#)). Lack of employee empowerment constrains the structure of the organization, limit and minimize stakes in communication, create a divide between the power and the followers, therefore put a dent the possibility of the collective approach to the achievement of the organizational goals, strategies, and tactics, ([Conger & Kanungo, 1988](#)).

According to [Kanter \(1979\)](#), the organizational structure is laid down power structure and charged to enable employees with limited or unlimited authority to act on their own accord rather than employee's ability to mobilize resources to do the work. Power to [Kanter \(1979\)](#) there is informal power derived from informal organizational power politics for advantages and formal power derived from the structures contained the work relations. Formal power is bold and visible, inherent in the individual positional responsibility to make and support decisions that enhance the highest possibility of attaining organizational goals. Informal power is hidden, secretive and often explicit in networks and informal alliances. Informal power has both internal and external projections and most often to help individuals to access undue advantages in a situation of scarce resources or limited privileges. Informal power relations can be influential and has the potentials to translate into formal power. It can support group members to emerge visibly and can support the attainment of organizational goals, ([Kanter, 1979](#)).

In their research, [Cropanzano & Mitchell \(2005\)](#) argued that people in authority simply have the mandate and obligation to empower subordinates by willingly surrendering some form of authority to subordinates to enable to boldly make decisions to get the work done. [Cropanzano & Mitchell \(2005\)](#), many empowerment failed because they focus on 'power' without redistribution of information, knowledge, and rewards. [Lawler, Mohrman & Ledford \(1992\)](#) in their longitudinal studies, showed that employee empowerment and high-involvement management practices are effective at improving job satisfaction.

According to [Brymer \(1991\)](#), granting full empowerment to employees means leadership ability to wilfully give authority to subordinates to help them gain the mandate to make decisions. The situation of fully empowering employees is meant to guide them to make decisions to serve the customers in ways fitting to serve both interests. [Sparks, Bradley & Callan, \(1997\)](#), The essence of employee empowerment is to increase customer satisfaction, hence satisfied employees served customers satisfactorily. Employee recognition is in line with the doctrine of organizational justice, particularly, procedural justice, which sees empowerment as a psychological factor that shapes the mindset, perceptions, attitude, and behaviors of employees to reciprocate the same recognition to customers who will feel worthy.

[Brymer \(1999\)](#) argued that checked empowerment or "limited empowerment" like [Kelley \(1993\)](#) "routine discretion". enables the employees to make decisions within the boundaries of limitations. It allows employees to consult under strict procedural guidance in addressing issues of concern through predetermined list of alternatives identified by the organizations to address problems.

In non-empowerment situation, employee refers the matter of concern or problem to a superior for advice or instructions before dealing with the customer's complaints. Employee empowerment can relate to the organizational structural orientation of both centralized and decentralized behaviors, that exists in the organization under the context and content of recognition, formalized and informalized relationship to support organizational goals and long-term vision.

Proposition 1: *The more autonomy or authority the organization devotes to the employees, the more the employees feel recognized, the greater their commitment and loyalty to enhance organizational performance.* [Cropanzano & Mitchell \(2005\)](#) employee empowerment creates employees with agility to adapt to the environment or uncertainties to help improve level of interaction to serve customers and to improve the value of time which will in turn significantly influence organizational performance. Many studies on empowerment have established a significant relationship between empowerment and organizational commitment, performance of workgroup and innovative behaviour ([Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2013](#)). For example, an instituted decentralized structure that exists in teams, units, divisions, and departments is symbolic of a structured organization with flexible approach to organized work structure.

Self-Obligation Empowerment

This aspect of employee empowerment addresses empowerment from the individual level and relates more to psychological empowerment. Psychological empowerment identical to the individual's beliefs and perception being empowered ([Lee & Koh, 2010](#)). This demonstrates that employees who are empowered feel motivated to engage and adhere to their obligations to positively affect the organization ([Conger & Kanungo, 1988](#)).

The motivational concept of employee empowerment connects more to Bandura's self-efficacy notion ([Bandura, 1986](#)). It projects empowerment to be a process of self- belief that translates into self-efficacy and self-worth. Therefore, to empower employees is to strengthen their bargaining power to believe in their ability to be accomplished rather be minimized to the position or situation of weakness. self-efficacy is a personal responsibility that empowered by the power of self-belief that translates into self-determination for the employees to challenged to add value, [Deci \(1971\)](#). The 'competence motive' [White \(1959\)](#), the 'need for achievement' of [McClelland \(1975\)](#), [Hertzberg \(1968\)](#), 'crave for responsibility and growth' and the 'self-actualization' of [Maslow \(1954\)](#), all characterizes personal responsibility and self-

belief for self-fulfillment and each increases the feeling of individual's self-worth in the organization. Expectancy theory postulates that '*an individual's motivation to increase his/her effort in a given task will depend on two types of expectations; a) that their efforts will result in a desired level of performance and b) that their performance will produce desired outcomes*' ([Conger & Kanungo, 1988](#)).

The self-obligation empowerment is based on organizational recognition and consideration to enhance the employee's self-esteem, the degree of self-worth, develop a mentality of internal locus of control, taking ownership of responsibility and always ready to receive and share information for common good. [Kanter \(1979\)](#) to empower, the organization must make sure information more available to more people at all levels. [Abd-El-Salam et al. \(2013\)](#), lack information results to information black-out and without information people would not be willing to take responsibility for the fear of the unknown. [Cropanzano & Mitchell \(2005\)](#) suggest for employees to be empowered, information is critical to the achievement of that goal and the most important is information organization mission, vision, and strategies and job-related performance, ([Conger & Kanungo 1988](#)).

Self-obligation empowerment at the individual level demonstrates a choice factor at the disposal of the employees-based ability and self-determination to take charge of control of work and performance. The power within the self to adapt to contingency situation can be applied in the choice factor to take initiatives in a way that serves the needs and aspirations of both the employee and the organization.

Proposition 2: A supportive work environment psychologically powers the employees to take ownership, therefore have more positive energy with enthusiasm, the greater their motivation to perform. According to [Bandura \(1986\)](#), '*when individuals are empowered, their self-efficacy expectations are strengthened*'. Employees have sense of self-belief guided with a sense of internal locus of control, an attitude favorable to enhance organizational performance. Organizational jobs that provide variety of tasks, duties, and responsibilities, with a measured level of authority and control, with flexible rules, are likely to empower employees, [Kanter \(1979\)](#). For example, systems and policies based on merits, create opportunities for training and development.

Family-Obligation Empowerment

This level of employee empowerment pitched the employee as someone with many needs to address as part of his/her obligations related to non-work roles outside the influence of the organization. The organization-employee relationship has evolved in a way that, we not only talk of a contractual or exchange arrangement but a relational arrangement. Today organizations are forced to institutionalized work-life balance policies that are meant to give support to employees to help them fulfill their non-work obligations.

More recently, there has been a growing increase and understanding about the important role care and support to employees play in enhancing organizational performance through employees as employees would always recognize support and to reciprocate good gesture, ([Cowell et al., 2010](#); [Formánková & Křížková, 2015](#)). Organizational support and care are core values and principles geared towards helping employees fulfill their non-work obligations. This demonstrates the value organization place in the role-played employees in enhancing organizational performance ([Derry 1991](#); [Liedtka 1996](#)). [Koblenz \(2003\)](#) numerated the importance of organizational care to the employee as; create organization environment founded on mutual respect and recognition of individual dignity in a fair and just work setting. It makes employees feel valued, encouraged and embolden to fully participate as partners knowing fully well that the organization have policies that dignified them, e.g. work-life balance, and other support and benefits as members of the organization meant to empower them internally and beyond (free housing, holiday pay, childcare support, mortgage package); appreciating and recognizing the contribution of people who work for the organization.

The social exchange theory has been used to understand workplace behaviour and establish the nature of relationships. In social exchange theory, the nature and characteristics of relationships are bound by the concept of reciprocal exchanges of the means of (production or services) that avails opportunities for individuals to be empowered. The reciprocal exchanges create a situation of dependency contingent upon the hopes of fulfilling promises made and trust is a key ingredient in reciprocal exchanges ([Blau 1964](#); [Homans 1958](#)). Many researches indicated, employees with positive organizational see "*perceived organizational support*" vital for them and are highly likely to show commitment to their organization with a sense of obligations to serve the organization, thus they engage in organizational citizenship behaviors engaged ([Cho et al. 2006](#); [Sahoo et al. 2015](#)). Within the concept of social exchange theory, employees who believed their organization supported them are more likely to engage in discretionary, extra-roles and unrewarded organizational citizenship behavior ([Cho et al. 2006](#); [Sahoo et al. 2015](#)).

Perceived organizational support from the organization received the same amount of reciprocity from the employees as they have obligations to the two organizations with an expectation to increase their performance index to add value to the organization as compensation, ([Settoon et al. 1996](#)).

Empowerment in the context of the organization should not be limited to serving only the organization but rather should extend to accommodate and help employees to perform their non-organization related work responsibilities. Family-obligation empowerment stressed that "behind any successful employee, lies the family support".

Proposition 3: *The more support extended to the employee and family, the greater the loyalty, perceived organizational support and the more will to reciprocate the social exchange to enhance organizational performance.* Perceived organizational support theory is rooted in social exchange relationship as way_of giving and take situation wherein employees loyalty and contribution is compensated with rewards of tangible and social benefits from the organization, ([Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005](#)). It is natural that employees with positive attitude of organizational support engaged in increased efforts that result to increase job performance because they go beyond their mandate to serve the organization, ([Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005](#)). For example, comprehensive health insurance that includes family, childcare support and policy on work-life balance. Most of the time, employees' goodwill gesture towards the organization is always positively responded in kind. Many individual's life cycle patterns have changed positively through their relationship with their organization due to support given to enable them self-actualized.

Community-Obligation Empowerment

This concept of employee empowerment challenges the organization to have an inclusive approach not only to itself but the outside environment as contained in the systems theory view of organization being a system among other systems. The community in this approach is referring both to the microenvironment, where inclusion is guaranteed to every employee to become part of a team or group and give them a voice of recognition to contribute to the functioning of the organization. The other community here refers to the macro environment, where the organization is challenged to become an active citizen of the greater society. To participate in programs or policies to include working with people and collaborate to support the maintenance and upkeep of society to lift the face of the community in mutual interest as they are key stakeholders worth recognizing.

Today's organizations are heavily involved in corporate social responsibility (CSR) programs as obligations to serve both inside and outside of the organizations. The concept of inclusion is mostly related to the issues of diversity, termed "social inclusion" ([Fujimoto et al. 2014](#); [Roberson, 2006](#); [Le et al. 2014](#)). [Fujimoto et al. \(2014\)](#) reported that inclusion is 'the new workplace diversity management approach that aims at helping an organization's address diverse employees' needs to achieve competitive advantage'. [Roberson \(2006\)](#), organization's adopts inclusion as a new work perspective strategy, it is a form of recognition of employee through acceptance and treatment as insiders within the organization's work system. Workplace inclusion relates to the organization's fairness principles of procedural and interactional justice, ([Le et al. 2014](#)).

'Inclusion means acceptance of diverse employees, making them feel accepted and included in work environments', ([Fujimoto et al. 2014](#); [Le et al. 2014](#)). Employees who are included are empowered because they express a sense of belonging and acceptance. The sense of acceptance gave them a sense of self-determination and identity to work hard with confidence. The ability for such employees to climb the ladder to become employees with recognized status enhanced their social standing in their respective communities. Such employees are empowered to become and serve as good-will ambassadors for the organization to the outside world. Inclusion is reflective of the organizational justice paradigm of workplace fairness.

The organization is part of a larger system, so it would be wise to have organizational to have an all-inclusive policy towards recognizing individual as well as collective approach to organizational work, with benefits for individuals involved in the community of the organization or the organization's engagement with the wider community, ([Mor Barak, 2000](#)). According to [Mor Barak \(2000\)](#) "inclusive workplace" is the art of embracing diversity in the organization for the good of all. The organization is community of communities based on the integration of people from different diverse backgrounds, accepting each other as a workforce defined by a common identity. Such organizations with that recognition, establish social and cultural policies distinct from others and participate in programs to support its immediate community in a mutual interest venture ([Mor Barak, 2000](#)). In their book, [Wren & Bedeian \(2009\)](#) cited Parker-Follet in her Gestalt concept of wholeness emphasizing the importance of team and group within the organization.

Organizational structural flexibility and organizational support to others outside its core mandate of the organization can positively influence performance. These are very powerful influential factors that relate to employee satisfaction and performance, plays a central role in overall organizational existence ([Mor Barak, 2000](#)).

The level of "inclusion and corporate community relations" relates to the organization's sense of being part of its surrounding community. [Mor Barak \(2000\)](#) 'an inclusive workplace keeps dual focus, that is both intrinsic and extrinsic and that comes from acknowledging its responsibility to the wider community'. A workplace that is inclusive encourages, support and finance diverse activities depending on the needs of the community, ranging from education, sport, social and today such good gestures are part of the organization wider policy as corporate social responsibility (CSR) or corporate philanthropic gesture under the purview of HRM.

The notion of CSR is in recognition that economic benefits are not enough to power business entity into sustained growth and sustainability, therefore extending hands of support to society or immediate communities has a positive ripple effect in winning the hearts and minds of the key constituents of their business strategic goals. The concept of CSR has rooted in the foundation that business activities have consequences that extend beyond the organization either positively or negatively, so engaging on ways to establish stability in other community create stability for the business too, [Sethi \(1995\)](#).

There is generalised consensus that firms voluntarily contributing to their social environment is a vital corporate responsibility and will go long way to repair and enhance the reputation of the organization in the long term, ([Quinn, Mintzberg & James, 1987](#)). Many researches have documented the relationship between an organization's social and ethical policies and its performance outcomes in financial terms, ([McGuire, Sundgren & Schneeweis, 1988](#)). Many Studies indicated that organizations with favorable reputation ratings in the market have the potentials to change prices due to their positive standing [Klein & Leffler \(1981\)](#), therefore enhance their ability to access capital markets to their advantage, ([Beaty & Ritter, 1986](#)).

Proposition 4: *The more involved the employee in-group circles, the more self-confidence, identification with the organization, the greater employee self-worth in contribution to organizational performance.* Employees who are included are empowered because they express a sense of belonging and acceptance. The sense of acceptance gave them a sense of self-determination and identity to work hard with confidence ([Roberson 2006](#); [Shore et al., 2011](#)). By extending from a central component of Triandis's theory of collectivism, ([Triandis et al.1988](#)) categorically states that organizations with collective orientation towards teamwork and effort have become more flexible that gives employees a greater sense of emotional attachment to in-group and the entire organization as a committed partner.

Today the debate is on socialist values versus capitalist values due to the huge gap between the poor and the rich. The challenge is towards the big and powerful businesses to give more to employees and society to redress the social ills confronting most countries. The last economic crisis nearly halted many businesses but governments all the world intervened to save them through a 'bail-out' program using tax payer's money. That move by governments was criticized but others applauded the strategic move to save millions of jobs loses and stabilize societies. How many businesses especially wealthy and powerful businesses show the same reciprocal gestures to society at the cost of profit?

CONCLUSION

In addressing the question raised in the paper to develop a new employee empowerment construct that will define a new approach to employee empowerment. The basis of the effort that its roots from merging the theoretical underpinnings of [Kanter's \(1979\)](#) structural empowerment theory, [McClelland's \(1975\)](#) needs theory, social identity theory [Ashforth & Mael. \(1989\)](#) and Social exchange theory ([Blau, 1964](#)).

The new employee empowerment approach differs with earlier conceptualization of employee empowerment because it embraced an inside-out and outside-in factors as the premise of the argument to redefine employee empowerment as practically binding rather addressing it from the perspective of the internal organization or from individualized societal orientation. But rather from the perspective of collectivized societies and focused on the outside factors that also contribute to defining the attitude, personality and behavior of people.

The integrative approach to employee empowerment was developed based on the proposition that integrating the internal and external constituents that collectively define the attitudes and behaviors of employees would translate into genuine, recognizable empowerment. *'The greater the empowerment, the higher the internal work motivation, the higher the job satisfaction, the lower the job stress, the greater the job involvement, the more involvement beyond the defined job of the individual and the greater the organizational commitment'*, ([Menon 1995](#)).

The application of employee empowerment will practically fit into the strategic goals of the organization, starting with the process of recruitment and selection in the challenges faced by organizations to compete for talents and their retention. Recruitment messages mostly carry statements like, "We encourage women, minorities and physically challenged are encouraged to apply", "we are an all-inclusive employer (diversity)". During the socialization and induction programs, the organization can explicitly tell the new employees what is expected of them and what they should expect in terms of benefits and entitlements as members of the organization. This can sell the organization and make it an admirable employer with substance.

Employees who are included are empowered because they express a sense of belonging and acceptance. The sense of acceptance gave them a sense of self-determination and identity to work hard with confidence. The ability for such employees to climb the ladder to become employees with recognized status enhanced their social standing in their respective communities, which also has a trade-off effect as portraying a good image and reputation for the organization. Such employees are empowered to become and serve as good-will ambassadors for the organization to the outside world ([Roberson 2006](#); [Shoe et al., 2011](#)). A true employee empowerment like genuine organizational communication have the potentials to create positive HR outcomes like 'high employee satisfaction'; 'high employee commitment'; 'high organizational citizenship behaviour'; 'high employee involvement'; 'high employee engagement'; 'strong perception of organizational support' and 'strong sense of belonging and loyalty' all of which strongly correlates with organizational performance, ([Luthans et al., 2007](#))

LIMITATION AND STUDY FORWARD

The ideas on this paper are yet to be tested in a real research situation in order to validate the argument. Therefore, it needs real testing to establish the assumptions contained in the paper.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am greatly indebted to the University of The Gambia as the sole sponsors of my Doctoral degree program in Management. My special thanks and appreciation go to Brawijaya University, Department of Management, Faculty of Economics and Business for the psychological support. A humble thanks to my supervisory team for the guidance. I valued their collective wisdom, Prof. Armanu Thoeyib, Prof. Djumilah Hadiwidjojo, Ainur Rofiq.

REFERENCES

1. Abd-El-Salam, E. M., Shawky, A. Y., El-Nahas, T.M., & Nawar, Y. S. (2013). The Relationship among Job Satisfaction, Motivation, Leadership, Communication and Psychological Empowerment: An Egyptian Case Study, *S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal*, ABI/INFORM Collection, Vol. 78, No.2, pg. 33, <https://search.proquest.com/openview/cdb03be3b816556b3e9a8ce478e678a2/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=40946>
2. Ashforth, B. E. & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 20-39. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1989.4278999>
3. Bacharach, S. B. & Lawler, E. J. (1980). *Power and Politics in Organizations*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
4. Bandura, A. (1986). The Explanatory and Predictive Scope of Self-Efficacy Theory, *Journal of Social & Clinical Psychology*, Vol.4, Iss. 3, pp. 359-373. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.1986.4.3.359>
5. Beaty, R. P., & Ritter, J. R. (1986). Investment banking, reputation and the underpricing of initial public offerings. *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 15, pp. 213-232. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X\(86\)90055-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(86)90055-3)
6. Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and Power in social life*, New York, Wiley
7. Block, P. (1987). *The empowered manager: Positive political skills at work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
8. Brymer, R. A. (1991). Employee Empowerment: A Guest- Driven Leadership Strategy, *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 32(1), 58-68. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F001088049103200116>
9. Cho, J., Laschinger, H.K. S & Wong, C. (2006). workplace empowerment, work engagement and engagement and organizational commitment of New Graduate Nurses, *Journal of Nursing Leadership*, Vol. 9, No. 3. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Heather_Laschinger/publication/6755559_Workplace_Empowerment_Work_Engagement_and_Organizational_Commitment_of_New_Graduate_Nurses/links/0912f50aae6a2d23c7000000.pdf
10. Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The Empowerment Process: Integrating Theory and Practice, *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol.13, No.3, pp.471-482. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1988.4306983>
11. Cowell, N., M. & Saunders, T., S. (2010). Family Values and Employment Relations: A Jamaican Case Study, *Social and Economic Studies*, ProQuest, Vol.59, No.3 pg. 97-126. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41803639>
12. Cropanzano, R. & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review, *Journal of management*, Vol. 31, No.6, pg. 874-900. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0149206305279602>
13. Deci, E. L. (1971). Effects of externally mediated rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol.18, pp. 105–115. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/h0030644>
14. Derry, R. (1991) 'Institutionalizing ethical motivation in business ethics', in E. Freeman (Ed.), *Business Ethics: The State of Art*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press
15. Emerson R. M. (1976), Social exchange theory, *Annual review of sociology*, Vol.2, pp. 335-362. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.02.080176.002003>
16. Fagenson, E. A. (1988), The Power of a mentor: Protégé's and nonprotégés' Perceptions of their own power in Organizations, *Journal of Group & Organizations Studies*, Vol. 13, Iss. 2, pp.182-194, <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0105960118801300205>
17. Fernandez, S. & Moldogaziev, T. (2013). Employee Empowerment, Employee Attitudes, and Performance: Testing a Causal Model, *Public Administration Review*, the American Society for Public Administration, Vol. 73, Iss. 3, pp. 490–506. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12049>
18. Formánková, L. & Křížková, A. (2015). Flexibility trap—the effects of flexible working on the position of female professionals and managers with in a corporate environment, *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Vol.30, No.3, pp. 225-238. <https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-03-2014-0027>
19. Foster-fishman, P. G. (1995). The Inserted pyramid: how a well-meaning attempt to initiate employee empowerment ran afoul of the culture of a public Bureaucracy *Academy of management Journal Best papers' Proceedings*, pp. 364-372. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.1995.17536650>
20. Fujimoto, Y., Rentschler, R., Le, H., Edwards, D. and Härtel, C.E.J. (2014). "Lessons learned from community organizations: inclusion of people with disabilities and others", *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 518-537. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12034>
21. Gilbert, S., Laschinger, H.K.S & Leiter, M. (2010). The mediating effect of burnout on the relationship between structural empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviours, *Journal of Nursing Management*, vol.18, pp. 339-348. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2834.2010.01074.x>
22. Hendar, H., Ferdinand, A.T. and Nurhayati, T. (2017), "Introducing the religio-centric positional advantage to Indonesian small businesses", *Management & Marketing. Challenges for the Knowledge Society*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 78-102, <https://www.degruyter.com/downloadpdf/j/mmcks.2017.12.issue-1/mmcks-2017-0006/mmcks-2017-0006.pdf>
23. Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, Vol.46, No. 1, pp. 53-62. <https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/33572556/herzbergmotivation.pdf?response->

- [content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DHBR_01JAN68.pdf&X-Amz-Algorithm=AWS4-HMAC-SHA256&X-Amz-Credential=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A%2F20190722%2Fus-east-1%2Fs3%2Faws4_request&X-Amz-Date=20190722T115533Z&X-Amz-Expires=3600&X-Amz-SignedHeaders=host&X-Amz-Signature=9364292d829ed37ebfcb410b460cfa3297a422289443994ccdf024af81b2a8de](#)
24. Homans, C. G. (1958). Social Behavioras Exchange, *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol.62, pp.597-606. <https://doi.org/10.1086/222355>
 25. Honold, C. (1997). a Review of the Literature on Employee Empowerment, *Journal of Empowerment in Organizations*, Vol. 5, No.4, pp.2020-212. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14634449710195471>
 26. Kanter, R. M. (1979), Power failure in Management Circuits. *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 54, pp. 65-75, <https://hbr.org/1979/07/power-failure-in-management-circuits>
 27. Kelley, S. W. (1993). Discretion and the Service employees, *Journal of Retailing*, Vol.69, pp. 104-126. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359\(05\)80005-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359(05)80005-3)
 28. Klein, B. & Leffler, K. (1981). The Role of Market Forces in Assuring Contractual Performance, *Journal of Political Economics*, Vol.89, No.4, pp. 615-641. <https://doi.org/10.1086/260996>
 29. Koblenz, M. (2003). Ten Best Practices of Companies That Care, *Employment Relations Today*, pp.1-7. http://companies-that-care.org/files/ctc_news_article.pdf
 30. Lawler, E. E., III, S. A. Mohrman, G. E. Ledford Jr. (1992), *Strategies for High Performance Organizations*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA
 31. Le, H., Polonsky, M. & Arambewela, R. (2014). “Social inclusion through cultural engagement among ethnic communities”, *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, Vol. 24 No. 4, pp. 375-400. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2014.911714>
 32. Lee, M. & Koh, J. (2010). Is empowerment really a new concept, *The International Journal of Human resource management*, Vol. 12, No. 14, pp. 684-695. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713769649>
 33. Liedtka J. M (1996), Feminist Morality and Competitive Reality: A Role for an ethic of Care? *Business Ethics Quarterly*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 197-200. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3857622>
 34. Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M., (2007). Positive Psychological Capital: Measurement and Relationship With performance and satisfaction, Vol.60, No.3. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00083.x>
 35. Maslow A. H. (1954), *Motivation and Personality*, New York: Harper and Bros
 36. McClelland, D. C. (1975). *Power: The inner experience*. New York: Irvington Press
 37. McGuire, J., Sundgren, A. & Schneeweis, T. (1988). Corporate Social Responsibility and Firm Financial Performance, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 31, No. 4, pp. 845-872. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256342>
 38. Menon, S, T. (2001). employee empowerment: An integrative psychological approach, *Journal of Applied Psychology: An International review*, Vol. 50, No.1, pp.153-180. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00052>
 39. Mor Barak, M. E. (2000). The Inclusive workplace: An Ecosystem Approach to diversity Management, *Social work Journal*, Vol. 45, No. 4, pp. 339-353. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/45.4.339>
 40. Pfeffer, J. (1981), *Power in Organizations*, Marshfield, MA: Pitman
 41. Quinn, J., Mintzberg, H. & James, R. (1987). *The Strategy Process*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall
 42. Roberson, Q.M. (2006), “Disentangling the meanings of diversity and inclusion in organizations”, *Group & Organization Management*, Vol. 31 No. 2, pp. 212-236. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1059601104273064>
 43. Rousseau, D. M., Manning, J., & Denyer, D. (2008). Evidence in Management and Organizational Science: Assembling the Field's Full Weight of Scientific Knowledge Through Syntheses. *SSRN eLibrary*.Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1309606
 44. Rothstein, L., R. (1995), The Empowerment effort that came undone, *The Journal of Product Innovation Management*, Vol.12, No. 4, pp.347-348, <https://www.infona.pl/resource/bwmeta1.element.elsevier-01d19131-286e-3c22-ab5d-e39829f5d192>
 45. Sahoo, B C., Sia S K., Sahu, N., & Appu, A V (2015). Psychological capital and Work attitudes: a conceptual analysis, *Journal of Organization & Human Behaviour*, Volume 4 Issue 2 & 3, pp. 11-22. https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/39549686/Psychological_Capital-Conceptual_pa_per.pdf?response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DPSYCHOLOGICAL_CAPITAL_AND_WORK_ATTITUDE.pdf&X-Amz-Algorithm=AWS4-HMAC-SHA256&X-Amz-Credential=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A%2F20190722%2Fus-east-1%2Fs3%2Faws4_request&X-Amz-Date=20190722T130911Z&X-Amz-Expires=3600&X-Amz-SignedHeaders=host&X-Amz-Signature=2cb52e18538522ad6ba2b333470103d0606a80b8e9df2_dd8d676ce0af6aace49
 46. Sethi S. P. (1982), Corporate Political Activism, *management Review*, Vol. 24, No. 3, pp. 32-42. <https://doi.org/10.2307%2F41164966>
 47. Settoon, R P., Bennett, N. & Liden, R C. (1996), Social Exchange in Organizations: Perceived Organizational Support, Leader-Member Exchange, and Employee Reciprocity, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 81, No. 3,219-227. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/4e2f/7400a73bb375bbc2f72702ba181460350aa2.pdf>
 48. Shore, L.M., Randel, A.E., Chung, B.G., Dean, M.A., Ehrhart, K.H. and Singh, G. (2011), “Inclusion and diversity in work groups: a review and model for future research”, *Journal of Management*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 1262-1289. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0149206310385943>



49. Sparks, B A., Bradley, G L., & Callan, V J. (1997). The Impact of Staff Empowerment and Communication Style on Customer Evaluations: The Special Case of Service Failure, *Psychology & Marketing* (1986-1998), ABI/INFORM Collection John Wiley & Sons Inc, Vol. 14, No. 5; 475-493 pg. 475. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1520-6793\(199708\)14:5%3C475::AID-MAR3%3E3.0.CO;2-5](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6793(199708)14:5%3C475::AID-MAR3%3E3.0.CO;2-5)
50. Spreitzer, G.M. (1996). Social Characteristics of Psychological empowerment, the *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 39, No. 2, pp. 483-504. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256789>
51. Thomas, K. W. & Velthoiese B. A. (1990), Cognitive elements of empowerment: An “interpretative” Model of intrinsic task motivation, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 666-681. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1990.4310926>
52. Triandis, et al. (1988). Individualism and Collectivism: Cross-Cultural Perspectives and Self-Ingroup Relationship, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 54, No. 2, pp. 323-338. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-3514.54.2.323>
53. Vogt, F.J., & Murrell, L.K. (1990). Empowerment in organizations: how to spark exceptional performance. USA: University Associates, Inc.
54. White, R. W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered. *Psychological Review*, Vol. 66, pp.297–333, <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/h0040934>
55. Wren, D. A. & Bedeian A G. (2009). *The Evolution of Management Thought*, Sixth edition, John Wiley & Sons Inc.
56. Zafirovski, M. (2005). Social exchange theory under scrutiny: A positive critique of its economic-behaviourist formulations, *electronic journal of sociology*, ISSN: 1198 3655. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.454.7467&rep=rep1&type=pdf>