

Understanding empowerment and resolving its paradox

Lessons from Mary Parker Follett

Dafna Eylon

*E. Claiborne Robins School of Business, University of Richmond,
Richmond, Virginia, USA*

We have to learn to use the paradoxes – to balance contradictions and inconsistencies – as an invitation to find a better way (Charles Handy, 1994, p. 13).

Mary Parker Follett, one of management theory's finest pioneers, identified at the turn of this century key principles that are heralded today as a new style of management "workplace empowerment." She implicitly recognized the paradox of empowerment, which will be discussed along with its implications for organizational processes. Her work will also be used here to guide and recommend future areas of theory development and empirical investigation in the broader area of empowerment. Despite her innovative ideas, Follett has been a relatively unrecognized contributor in the social sciences (Fry and Thomas, 1996), not even in relevant areas such as organizational behavior (Parker, 1984). It is hoped that this paper will encourage further acknowledgment of her vision and contribution to empowerment research. Therefore, the focus of the paper is to learn from and pay tribute to Mary Parker Follett's work. To do so, a brief introduction of the empowerment concept is first presented, followed by a brief summary of Follett's life[1] and her insights regarding the empowerment concept and its paradox. The paper ends with suggestions for further theory development and research.

Empowerment

Today's business environment is characterized by rapid change, knowledge explosion, technological advancement, and intense competition (Cummings, 1990; Kizilos, 1990; Manz, 1992; Srivasta *et al.*, 1990; Stewart, 1989). Some theorists are calling for major changes in the way organizations function (e.g. Handy, 1990, 1994; Snow *et al.*, 1992), and executives are demanding more active organizational involvement from their employees than they did in the past (Kanter, 1989). Organizations are embracing horizontal cooperation as a means of increasing flexibility, and expecting that their employees demonstrate "excellence," "passion," and "involvement" (Peters and Waterman, 1982). At the same time, researchers observe declining commitment among organizational members

(Mowday *et al.*, 1982) suggesting that organizations need to pay more attention to their employees' emotional and spiritual needs (Mitroff, 1993). Given such organizational demands, it should come as no surprise that interest in empowerment is on the rise (Rappaport, 1987; Vogt and Murrell, 1990). With its focus on developing individual potential, while at the same time promoting larger organizational ideals, empowerment offers practical, emotional, and ideological appeal.

Nevertheless, despite its popularity, empowerment is still "a term that confuses even as it inspires" (Simon, 1990, p. 27). A review of the literature reveals little shared understanding of the term, and there is no doubt that "further study is needed if advances are to be made in the understanding and implementation of empowerment" (Florin and Wandersman, 1990, p. 44). Its importance has been stated in psychological terms, with an emphasis on its intra-psychic benefits to the individual (e.g. Conger and Kanungo, 1988; Ozer and Bandura, 1990). Similarly, its sociological significance has been noted, with a focus on the contextual factors which foster helplessness (e.g. Hoffman, 1978; Whitmore, 1990).

Despite widespread agreement that empowerment is a worthwhile objective, there is little understanding of what it is, how it manifests itself, and how the empowerment process can be developed. The following definition is based on underlying themes identified in the different perspectives found within the diverse empowerment literature. Work empowerment is viewed as an enhancing and energizing context-specific process that expands feelings of trust and control in oneself as well as in one's organization (Eylon, 1994). This process (as opposed to merely a state of being) is mediated by intra-psychic constructs, such as self-esteem and self-efficacy, and may eventually lead to outcomes such as performance and satisfaction. In other words, during the empowerment process a change, usually facilitated by others in the workplace, occurs. It is more than a personal feeling (i.e. "I feel empowered today"). The process results from changes in organizational contextual and individual inter-relational variables such as the amounts and quality of information and the degree of expressed trust and confidence the person receives from the work environment as well as the degree of real responsibility s/he feels for work outcomes. These three relational factors—information, responsibility, and active belief—have been underlying themes in much of the work conducted on empowerment to date (e.g. Conger and Kanungo, 1988; Kieffer, 1984; Spritzer, 1995; Vogt and Murrell, 1990).

Two additional structural and interpersonal issues are also basic to the process of empowerment in the workplace: without a supportive structure and a sharing of enabling values previous reinforcement pressures will continue to mold people and their feelings (Conger and Kanungo, 1988; Florin and Wandersman, 1990; Rappaport, 1987). Without them, any attempt for change will be quickly blocked, either for structural reasons or for lack of support at both the inter- and intra-personal levels.

With a supportive structure and enabling shared values in place, changes in information, responsibility, and active belief can activate the empowerment

process. While all three components are usually achieved in interactive relationships, a person can also influence them personally. Central to this definition is the understanding that empowerment is a process mediated by intrapsychic elements with outcomes at both the individual and the organizational level.

Even though the confusion within the academic literature is shared by management practitioners, there is much to learn from interacting with managers and consultants who are currently attempting to understand and implement empowerment. For example, Thier (1992) suggested that managers need to refrain from assuming that increasing employee responsibility necessitates increased accountability, so as not to overwhelm subordinates. It is illuminating, therefore, to turn to the writings of Mary Parker Follett, who developed her theories of management by observing and speaking to practitioners.

Mary Parker Follett

Mary Parker Follett (1868-1933) was an American political scientist and philosopher whose primary interest was the psychological underpinnings of individuals and groups (Urwick and Brech, 1963). She was particularly enthralled by the interactions of individuals within groups and in society, as she believed that individuals can both grow personally and develop the group they are in concurrently. Her primary audiences were business related but she believed that her organizational analyses were relevant for all organized human activity. Her approach of exposing the dynamic emotions and forces of the organizational process differed from the more popular Fayol and Taylor who focused on the more static structural aspects.

In addition to her theoretical work she invested great effort in a variety of social pursuits with the goal of overcoming the social evils of growing industrialization. She was an active woman who organized and managed Boston's vocational guidance centers in the early 1900s. These social efforts brought her into contact with industry, despite the fact that she was not a businesswoman (although her advice was frequently sought by business people). As a result of what she observed, in 1924 she started giving a series of talks to executives both in the United States and in England. Her focus was on leadership, control, authority, and conflict between individuals and groups.

Follett clearly saw business as a social setting, not only an economic one. Follett suggested that individuals and groups could contribute to each other only when involved individuals are also the decision makers. She argued in favor of democratic authority where bureaucratic institutions would be replaced by networks of people involved in all stages of the process. These individuals would analyze, produce, and be responsible for results. This idea is becoming more and more popular and as a result Mary Parker Follett is considered to have been ahead of her time, "a prophet of management" (Drucker in Graham, 1995, p. vii). As mentioned, the primary focus of this paper is on a particular aspect of her work: her foresight regarding workplace empowerment and the paradox surrounding empowerment in general.

It is useful to probe the ways in which Follett's ideas anticipated current work on empowerment as well as to investigate if ideas for future work can be recognized. This investigation will allow for a richer appreciation of Follett's contributions as well as an opportunity to extend potential areas of work in the empowerment domain. While Follett's writings were grounded in practical observation and reflection, today's work on empowerment adds to her theories a scientific understanding of the psychological processes through which empowerment is manifested.

Mary Parker Follett and empowerment

Implicit in Follett's writings are themes consistent with much of the current work on empowerment, which describe the removal of organizational barriers to individual development (e.g. Conger and Kanungo, 1988). Follett's management philosophy was grounded in the belief that the wish to govern one's own life is one of the most definitive feelings in every human being. However, she maintained that this desire for self-governance was not incompatible with collective action; in fact, she believed that only through group activity could the full potential of individuals be realized. Organizations, therefore, provided the ideal setting within which to study efforts to develop individuals' potential. Follett went so far as to state that the real service of business was to develop individuals through the effective coordination of relationships within the organization. While Follett included in her speeches and writings numerous examples of effective organization, she maintained that too often individuality was smothered by organizational practices which discouraged collective participation. She argued that the tendency to think in terms of dichotomies, such as leaders and followers or a rigid preoccupation with hierarchy rather than function, resulted in a failure to recognize and develop human potential within the business organization.

Before we turn to ways in which Follett's writing can inform future work in the area of empowerment, we need to recognize some of the common themes identified between Follett's past work and current work on empowerment. These themes include issues such as equality of organizational members, organizational synergy, and the focus on process rather than on structure. The Civil Rights, Welfare Rights, and Women's Movements prompted the development of sociological empowerment approaches concentrating on social equality (Torre, 1986). Much of this empowerment literature, similar to writings from a more psychological perspective, focuses on sharing and developing individual's unique skills through cooperation with other people and redistribution of resources. Overall, there seems to be a genuine concern with the good of people and in fostering development, without reliance on the helper (Kieffer, 1984). Follett also believed in the ability of individuals to contribute to the group and to the organization as a whole. She explained that this ability could be recognized and encouraged when the "law of the situation" was followed.

Follett maintained that the organization must be constantly aware of both its external and internal environments. As a result, she argued that coherence is created when collective action responds to, and anticipates, both internal and

external situational imperatives. The organization as a whole benefits from an understanding of the view from each department and the perspective of each employee involved in the situation. The law of the situation, then, dictates that all organizational members should be united in discovering and obeying specific situational "laws." The effective organization seeks to achieve what Follett termed a functional unity, in which the contributions of each individual member are coordinated based on their function. However, for this functional unity to occur each person must have the authority and responsibility that go with their specific function.

Follett believed that an organization could function efficiently only when all of its members were full and willing participants. This will occur when empowerment is context-specific as it will be only then that the law of a particular situation will dictate what are the specific requirements for empowerment to ensue.

This theme is well-represented in the current literature. Kanter (1979) has written of the importance of context when empowering different organization position-holders, such as first-line supervisors, staff professionals, etc. Zimmerman (1990) goes beyond the job level and suggests that to achieve empowerment a variety of contextual elements, such as environmental influences, organizational factors, and social, cultural, and political contexts, need to be considered.

As part of this recognition, both Follett and current writers assert that a prerequisite for achieving functional empowerment in any situation is the free exchange of information (e.g. Vogt and Murrell, 1990). Follett argued that genuine coordination is impossible so long as information is withheld by organizational members who view their specialized knowledge as a means of gaining power. Limiting information can only stifle collective organization. These thoughts are reflected in current empowerment research, which focuses on the importance of communication as a conduit to the development of mutual trust (Culbert and McDonough, 1985; Eylon, 1994). Follett was also one of the first organizational analysts who recognized the notion of synergy within the organizational context. She claimed that an organization was more than simply the sum of its parts as individuals interact and react within a constellation of relationships. However, not only do they react to others but they also respond to the relationship itself. In other words, the relationship, created by the interactions themselves, is an entity in and of its self which then, in turn, triggers additional reactions. Thus, interacting individuals are creating a mutual dialectic interaction where they create more than what they could have separately. This process is repeated throughout all organizational relationships. This recognition of what we term today "group synergies" is evident in the work of current empowerment researchers. Different theorists describe these synergies in different ways. Some point to the ability of organization members to maximize each other's potential (Katz, 1984), while others focus on the learning which occurs as part of the empowerment process (Vogt and Murrell, 1990). In addition, several researchers stress that the development of new abilities and insights will create boundless

resources for the organization (Florin and Wandersman, 1990; Katz, 1984; Rappaport, 1987; Stewart, 1989; Zimmerman, 1990). Torre (1986) also suggested that the “collective” within which empowerment most usually occurs enables dialogue, which leads not only to individual development, but also to “liberation” (the achievement of social change). In other words, Torre (1986) not only implied synergistic outcomes at the individual and organizational levels, she also believed that such outcomes would lead to new enhanced outcomes for society as a whole.

Follett maintained that this synergy is at the very core of all organizational functioning since it occurs at the most fundamental level – the interactions of individuals, which is an ongoing organizational process. The fact that the perspectives and contributions of each individual shape, and are shaped by, the experiences of other organizational members, creates at the same time the interactive nature of the relationship between the organizational member and the situation which prompts a change in both the situation and the member. Given this circular response, the achievement of functional unity is “always a process, not a product” (Metcalf and Urwick, 1941, p. 195)[2]. Here, too, we find that several of the empowerment theories echo Follett’s opinion, and suggest that empowerment is an ongoing and continual cyclical process (Britt, 1992; Eylon, 1994; Spreitzer, 1992; Thomas and Velthouse, 1990).

The Empowerment paradox

The paradox

While both Follett and current empowerment researchers identify the importance of conceptualizing empowerment as an ongoing process, many of today’s researchers stop short of considering the underlying implications of continuing efforts to facilitate the empowerment of individual employees. Follett and others (e.g. Kanter, 1979; Tannenbaum 1968) regard power as an infinite commodity, rather than a finite resource to be jealously guarded. Follett wrote: “our task is not to learn where to place power; it is how to develop power ... Genuine power can only be grown, it will slip from every arbitrary hand that grasps it” (Metcalf and Urwick, 1941, p. 101). This notion is also consistent with Murrell (1985) and Thomas and Velthouse’s (1990) conceptualization of empowerment as the act of building, developing, and increasing power, rather than simply the action of authorizing.

However, when it comes to initiating the empowerment process, the conditions that allow one individual to empower others may also work to undermine the democratic development of power that is implied by conceptualizations of empowerment (Gruber and Trickett, 1987; Kizilos, 1990; Simon, 1990). While we may speak of developing infinite capacity, the paradox of empowerment is that the very existence of circumstances that place one group in a position to “provide” another group with power implies that power is a finite commodity controlled by a sub-set within the organization. In other words, the very fact that one group is in the position to judge if others are dis-empowered and then to decide what to “give” so that they will become “empowered” indicates that true empowerment is not occurring. As long as organizational members do not have access to

information, are not allowed to be responsible – even to their own fate – and do not receive active indications that they are trusted to plan and carry out improvements, we will see a process that only perpetuates the current situation. The substantial changes necessary for “real empowerment” imply a long-term process (Kizilos, 1990) and redistribution of resources which, at some point, will have structural implications for the organization. However, as a result of such changes it may become apparent that the organization’s commitment to empowerment is, in fact, subordinate to other objectives. This occurs if underlying these changes exists the belief that power is a commodity given by the “haves” to the “have-nots.” Real change requires the belief that all have the right to be active and interactive participants of organizations and power. Consequently, we see organizations that do not subscribe to these beliefs and, as a result, limit the sphere within which empowerment is pursued, thus creating a condition which defeats the process.

Sewell and Wilkinson (1992) examined the implications of “allowing” empowerment only within a sphere of influence defined and closely monitored by management. They argue that when boundaries to involvement are defined by management, empowerment appears as merely “rhetoric and the centralization of power and control as the reality” (Sewell and Wilkinson, 1992, p. 102). This conclusion is consistent with Follett’s assertion that the development of power is dependent on a continuous interactive influence between employees at all levels of the organization. In this case, what Follett would term “the field of desire” was prescribed from above: while workers were afforded some control over their immediate environment, management monitored the process rigidly, and as a result empowerment failed to occur.

While investigating examples of empowerment implementation a similar situation was observed. A small local hotel chain attempted an empowerment program. At the end of the time allocated for “empowerment training,” all hotel employees were asked a series of questions to determine the extent to which they felt empowered. However, employees were asked to respond to these questions during face to face interviews with their direct manager. Management explained that this format was chosen for the employees’ benefit. Nonetheless, the presence of the managers reinforced the perception that management was “empowering” the employees, supposedly giving or providing them with some gift for which they should be grateful, and therefore contributed to the perpetuation of power imbalances. This example highlights the complexity of empowerment: the hotel’s process may have not only defeated the empowerment philosophy, but may have also been detrimental to the process of self-development and to the establishment of mutual trust. Programs which treat empowerment as a static, contained concept that can be established in a short training program cannot and will not achieve a sustainable process of true empowerment. Organizations which stop short of inviting full and equal interaction are not truly empowering.

Follett's contribution to resolving the paradox

At the core of the empowerment paradox is the belief that there is some clear demarcation between management and workers – between those who have and those who do not have power. However, to overcome the empowerment paradox, that is, to achieve genuine empowerment, the organization must constantly seek and be adaptive to the contributions of its members. Mary Parker Follett would argue that it is only when all view each other equally that true empowerment will occur. Only under these circumstances can individuals bring their unique experiences and abilities to the organization. It is management's role to orchestrate such an environment so that the law of the situation will always govern. Thus, to resolve the paradox there needs to be a willingness to undertake a long term commitment which may include significant functional and structural changes.

Follett directly acknowledged and addressed the implications of such an approach. She argued that we must not use words like "share" and "distribute" to describe the development of power. Instead, she suggested, we must recognize that if the organization is to benefit from the experience of each and every organizational member, and to illuminate the whole field of desire as a means of best responding to the law of the situation, it must necessarily remove structural impediments to the full participation of the organization's members in its activities. Follett wrote that "the will to integrate, as it has been called, is not enough ... The success of organization engineering depends on its treatment of the problem of participation, of functional relating. To draw out the capacities of all and then to fit these together is our problem" (Metcalf and Urwick, 1941, p. 229). It is not enough to transfer formalized power. Rather individuals need to be directly involved in analyzing, producing, and implementing problems and solutions.

In addition to moving away from conceptualizing power relationships in terms of superior over subordinate, Follett introduced the concept of "power-with." She distinguished "power-with" from "power-over," with the former being "a jointly developed power, a co-active, not a coercive power" (Metcalf and Urwick, 1941, p. 101) based on the understanding that all are equal under the law of the situation. She also made the distinction between "equal power" and power-with. To her, equal power suggested setting the stage for a fair fight, while power-with was the joint development of power: a unifying force which allows for infinite differing and as a result does away with fighting. Her notion of power-with is closely tied with her beliefs regarding conflict. The best solutions are obtained by satisfying the desires of both sides. "A business should be so organized," she wrote, "... that full opportunity is given in any conflict, in any coming together of different desires, for the whole field of desire to be viewed" (Metcalf and Urwick, 1941, p. 39). This "win-win" view of conflict is at the core of resolving the empowerment paradox. For unless power is viewed in this manner, there must always be someone who loses something. However, power-with people need to put aside the need to see "their" issue prevail. Follett is clear that business must be so organized that: "you can influence a co-manager while he is influencing you, so organized

that a workman has an opportunity of influencing you as you have of influencing him, if there is an interactive influence going on all the time between you, power-with may be built up" (Metcalf and Urwick, 1941, p. 105). To reach this point, individuals need to be willing to embrace solutions based on dialectic synthesis, even though one can never predict what form the new solution will take.

In explaining the distinction between the different approaches to conflict and power, Follett took great pains to show how language symbolizes underlying intent. For example, she identified how words such as "top," "higher," and "superior," were unfortunate in the organizational context as they take away from the contribution of each specific individual and places some in an inferior position where their contributions may be under-recognized. Using examples such as "persuade" versus "convince" she helped identify the difference between leading as power-over and managing using what she considered the only true power – power-with. Ahead of her times, she spoke extensively with workers and identified their attitudes, feelings, and perspectives on the issue and frequently supported her views with poignant quotes.

Despite all this, Mary Parker Follett did not believe that it was possible to completely eradicate power-over. Nevertheless, the goal to try and reduce power-over through the integration of interests, avoiding the withholding of facts, by adhering to the law of the situation, and by making business more of a functional unity, should be maintained. The key is to recognize that authority is where knowledge and experience are located, regardless of rank or hierarchical position. In other words, authority is related to the job itself. The person who holds a particular job is the one with authority in matters particular to the job, regardless of his/her rank.

Follett believed that power could not be delegated as "genuine power is capacity" (Metcalf and Urwick, 1941, p. 109). As a result, "to confer power on the workers may be an empty gesture" (Metcalf and Urwick, 1941, p. 109). Indeed, describing power as a commodity that can be transferred or shared hides the fact that it is a self-developing capacity. The real issue is how much power can the workers themselves grow. The question should not be how much managers are willing to give up, but rather, how much are workers willing to assume. However, in order for this question to be answered managers must give workers the opportunity to grow and contribute to the group production. To do so one must consider the method of organization that will generate power and not the division of power. However, at the same time she warns that "you should never give authority faster than you can develop methods for the worker taking responsibility for that authority...not give workers authority without some corresponding stake in the business...the moral right to an authority which has not been psychologically developed, which is not an expression of capacity, is an empty ethics" (Metcalf and Urwick, 1941, p. 110-1). Many who rush into empowerment programs or who wonder if implementation problems lie within the disinterest of workers, should heed Follett's warning: "To confer authority where capacity has not been developed is fatal to both government and business" (Metcalf and Urwick, 1941, p. 112).

As previously mentioned, Follett also believed that the free flow of information is critical. However, this notion goes beyond open communication. True empowerment is achieved only when the possibility of a respectful ongoing dialogue between all members of the organization is established. Follett acknowledges that a dynamic approach to collective organization offers no pat solutions to managers (or researchers) seeking to encourage organizational members. However, similar to current work, which recognizes the cyclical process of empowerment (e.g. Britt, 1992; Eylon, 1994; Spreitzer, 1992; Thomas and Velthouse, 1990) she recognized that despite the difficulties involved, this cycle is what allows for the process to be successful:

Until we look on control as a continuing activity, we shall not get out of the fallacy that we can solve problems ... What we need is some process for meeting problems. When we think we have solved a problem, well, by the very process of solving, new elements or forces come into the situation and you have a new problem on your hands to be solved. When this happens, men are often discouraged. I wonder why; it is our strength and our hope. We don't want any system that holds us enmeshed within itself (Metcalf and Urwick, 1941, p. 304).

Until we acknowledge the dynamic and dialectic nature of empowerment, and the potential this offers to organizations, its value is limited. Organizations need to strive to allow their members the authority and control to perform and define the essential functions of their jobs, recognizing that this process will result in the constant readjustment of the individual employee to the organization, and vice versa.

Implications for future work

Conceptualizing empowerment as an ongoing process will have profound implications for organizational structure. Current organizational researchers have recognized that empowerment will be influenced by structure (Conger and Kanungo, 1988; Fawcett, 1984; Vogt and Murrell, 1990; Rappaport, 1987; Spreitzer, 1992; Zimmerman, 1990), and that empowerment will, in turn, influence the form of the organization (Culbert and McDonough, 1985; Eylon, 1994). However, the ways in which empowerment will influence the structure of the organization have not been sufficiently elaborated. This may be due, in part, to the scarcity of work which attempts to investigate the empowerment process at both the micro and macro levels of analysis. Segregation can create blind spots. If we focus on the empowerment process at the individual level, we fail to recognize how difficult it may be to create an "enabling structure." If our focus is on the structural level, however, as previously described by the empowerment paradox, we ignore the extent to which "providing" power to others may defeat the purpose of empowerment.

Follett's perspective, as we have seen, is dynamic and holistic. It is useful to recognize the extent to which her ideas were grounded in practical observation. She describes industry as the place where the practical and ideal join hands, and writes of attending a dinner with twenty business people saying that there she found hope for the future since there people were not theorizing or dogmatizing; they were thinking of what they had actually done and were willing to try new ways the next morning. David Hurst (1992, p. 74) suggests that Follett's writings

remind us that “the formulation of effective strategy may actually follow successful implementation. What we have been calling strategy may often be emergent rather than planned; implementation may precede or at least be concurrent with formulation.” By basing more of our empowerment research on practical observation and interaction at all organizational levels, we may be able to contribute to a broader understanding of the process and its implications for the individual and the organization. In addition, the empowerment paradox reinforces the issue suggested by Cullen and Townley (1994) that to truly understand and implement empowerment we first need to understand the underlying view of power held within the organization and by the investigating researcher. At the same time, one of the challenges identified by looking back at Follett’s contributions is how to develop the norm of respectful reciprocity which will enable overcoming the empowerment paradox.

Follett provides us with some useful starting points from which to address several of the thorny issues raised by empowerment. Her work signifies that if an empowerment program is executed without all those affected being included in its development, there is little chance that it will be successful. It is not the giving of authority that is important for empowerment to succeed, but the development of methods for allowing empowerment components such as responsibility, responsiveness, reciprocity, and synthesis to be present. This suggests that, not only must all affected take part in implementing change, but they should also be involved in the process of planning change. Future work in this area of process integration will enhance our understanding of when and how the empowerment process is effective and should be of primary focus.

The dynamic nature of empowerment poses a significant challenge to researchers. Consequently, we need to find ways to observe and describe ongoing changes within the organization, and to recognize the extent to which the empowerment process may be at odds with preferences for internal stability. We need to understand when and how organizations will overcome not only the general resistance to change, but also the specific resistance to changes in the placement of power. Since as Nord (1978) astutely described, most organizations are composed of competing coalitions engaged in win-lose battles. Once participants perceive that their power is threatened they respond defensively, while those who have acquired the power seek to consolidate it as quickly as possible. Nord also suggests that the more turbulent the environment the stronger the internal strife. As mentioned at the beginning of this paper, current environments are more turbulent than ever. Nevertheless, these last few years have also been a time when increasing numbers are calling for change towards workplace empowerment. Thus, it is now time for organizational theorists and researchers to help organizations rise to the occasion and overcome the underlying forces and values that are stagnating the empowerment processes.

Notes

1. Interested readers may wish to turn to Parker (1984) for a more comprehensive review of her work.

2. Follett's lectures were collected and published through the efforts of Lyndall Urwick and Henry Metcalf. Their edited volume is a collection of unedited lectures that she gave both in England and in the United States. Hence, this edited volume has become a primary source for those interested in her work.

References

- Britt, J.A., "Empowerment in organizations: usage, critical elements, and theory," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation Proposal, The University of California at Los Angeles, 1992.
- Conger, J.A. and Kanungo, R.N., "The Empowerment Process: Integrating Theory and Practice," *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 13(3), 1988, pp. 471-482.
- Culbert, S.A. and McDonough, J.J., *Radical Management: Power Politics and The Pursuit of Trust*, New York, NY: The Free Press, 1985.
- Cullen, D. and Townley, B. (1994), "Autonomy and empowerment: new wine and bottles?", paper presented at the Western Academy of Management, March, Sante Fe, NM.
- Cummings, T.G., "The Role of Executive Appreciation in Creating Transorganizational Alliances," in Srivastva, S., Cooperrider, D.L. and Associates, *Appreciative Management and Leadership: The Power of Positive Thought and Action in Organizations*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1990.
- Eylon, D., "Empowerment: Does it Work or Just Feel Good?," paper presented at the Academy of Management, Dallas, TX, 1994.
- Fawcett, S.B., Seekins, T., Whang, P.L., Muiu, C. and Balcazer, Y.S., *Prevention in Human Services*, Vol. 3, Winter-Spring 1983-84, pp. 145-171.
- Florin, P. and Wandersman, A., "An Introduction to Citizen Participation, Voluntary Organization, and Community Development: Insights for Empowerment Through Research," *American Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol. 18(1), 1990, pp. 41-54.
- Fry, B.R. and Thomas, L.L., "Mark Parker Follett: Assessing the Contribution and Impact of Her Writings," *Journal of Management History*, Vol. 2(2), 1996, pp. 11-19.
- Graham, P.(Ed.), *Mary Parker Follett-Prophet of Management: A Celebration of Writings from the 1920s*, Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press, 1995.
- Gruber, J. and Trickett, E.J., "Can We Empower Others? The Paradox of Empowerment in the Governing of an Alternative Public School," *American Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol. 15(3), 1987, pp. 353-371.
- Handy, C., *The Age of Unreason*, Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press, 1990.
- Handy, C., *The Age of Paradox*, Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press, 1994.
- Hoffman, C., "Empowerment Movements and Mental Health: Locus of Control and Commitment to the United Farm Workers," *Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol. 6, 1978, pp. 216-21.
- Hurst, D.K., "Thoroughly Modern - Mary Parker Follett," *Business Quarterly*, Vol. 56(4), 1992, pp. 55-58.
- Kanter, R.M., "Power Failure in Management Circuits," *Harvard Business Review*, July/August, 1979.
- Kanter, R., *When Giants Learn to Dance: Mastering the Challenge of Strategy, Management, and Careers in the 1990s*, New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 1989.
- Katz, R., "Empowerment and Synergy: Expanding the Community's Healing Resources," *Prevention in Human Services*, Vol. 3, Winter-Spring, 1983-4, pp. 201-225.
- Kieffer, C.H., "Citizen Empowerment: A Developmental Perspective," *Prevention in Human Services*, Vol. 3, Winter-Spring, 1983-4, pp. 9-36.
- Kizilos, P., "Crazy About Empowerment?," *Training*, December, 1990, pp. 47-56.
- Manz, C.C., *Mastering Self-Leadership*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1992.
- Metcalf, H.C. and Urwick, L.(Eds), *Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett*, London, England: Pitman, 1941.

- Mitroff, I., Address to the American Psychological Association Division 14 (SIOP) San- Francisco, April 30, 1993.
- Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W. and Steers, R.M., *Employee-Organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover*, New York, NY: Academic Press, 1982.
- Murrell, K.L., "The Development of a Theory of Empowerment: Rethinking Power for Organization Development," *Organization Development Journal*, Summer, 1985, pp. 34- 38.
- Nord, W.R., "Dreams of Humanization and the Realities of Power," *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 3(3), 1978, pp. 674-679.
- Ozer, E.M. and Bandura, A., "Mechanisms Governing Empowerment Effects: A Self-efficacy Analysis," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 58(3), 1990, pp. 427-486.
- Parker, L.D., "Control in Organizational Life: The Contribution of Mary Parker Follett," *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 9(4), 1984, pp. 736-745.
- Peters, T.J. and Waterman, R.H. Jr (1982), *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best Run Companies*, Harper & Row, New York, NY.
- Rappaport, J., "Terms of Empowerment/exemplars of Prevention: Toward a Theory for Community Psychology," *American Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol. 15, 1987, pp. 121-148.
- Sewell, G. and Wilkinson, B., "Empowerment or Emasculation? Shopfloor Surveillance in a Total Quality Organization," in *Reassessing Human Resource Management*, Blyton, P. and Turnbull, P.(Eds), 1992, pp. 97-115.
- Simon, B.L., "Rethinking Empowerment," *Journal of Progressive Human Services*, Vol. 1(1), 1990, pp. 27-39.
- Snow, C.S., Miles, R.E. and Coleman, Jr.H.J., "Managing 21st Century Network Organizations," *Organizational Dynamics*, Winter, 1992, pp. 5-20.
- Spreitzer, G.M., "When Organizations Dare: The Dynamics of Individual Empowerment in the Workplace," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1992.
- Spreitzer, G.M., "Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace: Dimensions, Measurement, and Validation," *The Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 38(5), 1995, pp. 1442- 1465.
- Srivastva, S., Fry, R.E. and Cooperrider, D.L., "Introduction: The Call for Executive Appreciation," in Srivastva, S., Cooperrider, D.L. and Associates, *Appreciative Management and Leadership: The Power of Positive Thought and Action in Organizations*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1990.
- Stewart, T.A., "New Ways to Exercise Power," *Fortune*, 1989, November 6, pp. 52-64.
- Tannenbaum, A. (1968), *Control in Organizations*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Thier, M.J., Personal Communication, June 19, 1992.
- Thomas, K.W. and Velthouse, B.A., "Cognitive Elements of Empowerment: An "Interpretive" Model of Intrinsic Task Motivation," *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 15(4), 1990, pp. 666-681.
- Torre, D.A., "Empowerment: Structured Conceptualization and Instrument Development," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Cornell University, 1986.
- Urwick, L. and Brech, E.R.L., *The Making of Scientific Management*, Vol. 1, London, England: Pitman and Sons, 1963.
- Vogt, J.F. and Murrell, K.L., *Empowerment in Organizations: How to Spark Exceptional Performance*, San Diego, CA: University Associates, Inc., 1990.
- Whitmore, E., "Empowerment in Program Evaluation: A Case Example," *Canadian Social Work Review*, Vol. 7(2), 1990, Vol. 215-229.
- Zimmerman, M.A., "Taking Aim on Empowerment Research: On the Distinction Between Individual and Psychological Conceptions," *American Journal of Community Psychology*, Vol. 18(1), 1990, pp. 169-177.