This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

Organizational empowerment of volunteer citizen monitors: A field experiment

presented by

Marion Terenzio

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Psychology

Thomas M. Reischl
Major professor

Date 11/15/91

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
FEB 0 2 1998		

ORGANIZATIONAL EMPOWERMENT OF VOLUNTEER CITIZEN MONITORS: A FIELD EXPERIMENT

By

Marion Ann Terenzio

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Psychology

1991

ABSTRACT

ORGANIZATIONAL EMPOWERMENT OF VOLUNTEER CITIZEN MONITORS: A FIELD EXPERIMENT

By

Marion Ann Terenzio

One purpose of the present study was to provide a conceptual framework derived from theories of empowerment and organizational behavior, with particular emphasis on volunteer satisfaction, commitment, self-efficacy and participation within an advocacy agency. Another purpose of the present study was to empirically test an empowerment intervention that was collaboratively implemented by volunteers and the investigator to address low volunteer perceived self-efficacy. The study participants were volunteers who monitored the quality of life of adults with developmental disabilities who were living in group homes. After three years of monitoring, the volunteers felt ineffective in their ability to make changes in the group homes. They, in collaboration with the investigator, developed and empowerment intervention that addressed their concerns. The intervention strategies which represented the independent variable in the present study, involved role clarification and access to appropriate information. A repeated measures experimental control group design was used to test the impact of the empowerment intervention on volunteer self-efficacy, satisfaction, commitment and program participation trends. Volunteers filled out a questionnaire prior to and three months after the intervention implementation. Archival data was used to ascertain the

volunteers' level of participation. Regression analyses were performed to test the mediational model between and the volunteers' level of participation and their levels of perceived self-efficacy, satisfaction and commitment. Results indicated that the volunteers in the experimental group significantly increased in their levels of program self-efficacy, satisfaction and participation, while the volunteers in the control group displayed a significant decrease in these variables. The intervention did not significantly increase the volunteers' sense of program commitment, nor their overall perceptions of general self-efficacy. Results from the regression analyses did not support a mediational model. This study demonstrated the need to further examine the relationship between volunteers and agencies, particularly in terms of meeting volunteer expectations and agency goals. This study also provided an example of how to broaden the application of the construct of empowerment.

I dedicate this dissertation to my first mentor, Dr. Patricia O'Connor, who continously affirmed me as a competent student and valued colleague, and to my parents for their support during those many trying times.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to publicly thank Dr. Thomas Reischl for his patience and guidance in this dissertation process, and to acknowledge Dr. Paul Freddolino and Dr. Daniel Ilgen for their expert advice and words of encouragement. I am most grateful to Mrs. Sandy Orne-Adams and the staff and volunteers at Michigan Association for Retarded Citizens for allowing me the opportunity to be involved in their program and for their integrity in acting upon their convictions. Finally, I would like to particularly thank Dr. William Davidson, II for his confidence in me and his words of wisdom throughout my tenure at MSU.

Thank you, all!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents Page Number

Contents Page Number

Contents Page Number

LIST OF TABLES

Tables | Page Number

LIST OF FIGURES

Figures — Page Number

INTRODUCTION

In times of financial constraints and budgetary cuts, more and more service oriented agencies have to rely on volunteers to perform tasks once done by paid employees. However, individuals who in the past may have been able to devote time to voluntary endeavors now need to seek employment in order to maintain their own financial security. As the potential volunteer pool shrinks, and the demand for volunteers increases, an acute shortage of human resources has resulted, which has forced organizations to pay more attention to the issues of volunteer recruitment, participation and retention (Gamm & Kassab, 1983). The competition for volunteers has been exacerbated by the fact that individuals have become more selective in their choice of agencies to which to volunteer their time (Gidron, 1987). One example of this is that individuals have begun to expect agencies to provide them with opportunities for personal growth and development (Houghland, Turner, & Hendricks, 1988).

As the role of the volunteers become more critical in agencies, researchers of volunteerism have begun to focus on the relationship between volunteers and agencies, particularly in terms of the ability of agencies to fulfill volunteers' personal expectations. This focus directs us to take into account the organizational behavior

of volunteers, such as their perception of self-efficacy, satisfaction and commitment, and level of participation (Gidron, 1987).

Although the notion of organization and volunteer interaction is relatively new to the realm of volunteer research, this concept has received some attention. Several researchers (Dailey, 1986; Gam & Kassab, 1983; & Ilsley and Niemi 1981) have borrowed from models explicated in the organizational and employee behavior research literature. One tenet that these researchers have supported is that organizations that rely on volunteers should closely examine their internal structures, in particular their volunteer management practices. One purpose of the present study was to apply organizational models that depict the interactional relationship between volunteer characteristics and organizational structures in a field setting.

Through his research with volunteers and supervisors of an agency, Dailey (1986) demonstrated that the application of organizational behavior models to explain volunteer behavior within an organizational context is plausible. His process model of volunteer commitment, which was tested in his study, delineated the interactions between the various organizational factors and the individual volunteers, and the possible enhancement of active participation and future retention of volunteers. Borrowing from Porter and Lawler (1968), Dailey emphasized that volunteer perceived satisfaction with outcomes, which is a function of the values that volunteers place on those outcomes, is a key element for successful volunteer recruitment and retention.

Another purpose of the present study was to test the effects of an

empowerment intervention that was developed and implemented by the volunteers in collaboration with the investigator. The theoretical premise which framed the intervention was partly derived from expectancy theories of organizational satisfaction, commitment and participation, and partly from theories of empowerment. The intervention was developed to enhance the volunteers' perceived self-efficacy in terms of their involvement with the program, and their general satisfaction and commitment, (mediating variables of the study), and their level of participation (dependent variable).

The theory of employee commitment, first explicated by Porter and Lawler (1968), and later adapted to the volunteer sector by Dailey (1986), suggested that complex interactions exist among many factors related to employees or volunteers and the organization, and that the outcomes of the interactions can be manipulated and influenced through many diverse mechanisms. One such mechanism that seemed to appropriately address the issue of enhanced perceived self-efficacy and increased satisfaction and commitment among volunteers was the process of empowerment. Empowerment, as explicated in the present study, was defined as the process through which volunteers clarified their roles and gained access to appropriate information. The anticipated end result was the enhancement of perceived self-efficacy, satisfaction and commitment, and an increased level of participation.

Conger and Kanungo (1988) provided an empowerment model that accommodated the factors and issues identified in this study. The model stipulates that change should occur in the organizational setting, and not within the individuals.

The application of this model to the present study seemed appropriate because; (a) it has specific application within an organizational context, (b) it is based on the notion of interactions between the individual and the organization, and (c) it is a process through which individuals manipulate the environment in order to increase self-efficacy.

In summary, the major purpose of this study was to test the effects of an empowerment intervention that was collaboratively implemented by a group of citizen advocate volunteers and the investigator. The purpose of the intervention was to increase the volunteers' sense of self-efficacy in their advocacy tasks and enhance their sense of satisfaction with and commitment to that program. It was also hoped that pertinent information as to the interactive relationship between volunteers and the organization in which they participate would be obtained.

Theoretical Perspective of the Study

The theoretical perspective of this study explicates a reciprocal interaction process between volunteers and the agency, which determines the levels of self-efficacy, satisfaction and commitment on the part of the volunteers, and their level of participation in the agency (Dailey, 1985; Rothman, Erlich & Teresa, 1981; Porter & Lawler, 1968). According to this view, individuals join a particular agency as volunteers with expectations as to valued future outcomes or rewards. The level of

satisfaction and commitment that these volunteers experience is contingent upon the agency's ability to fulfill their expectations. Fulfillment of volunteer expectations will most likely enhance volunteer participation and intent to remain.

The nature of the reciprocal interaction between the volunteers and the agency is dynamic and nonrecursive. The overall description of the process is dependent upon the initial point of examination. For example, if the process is initially viewed from the point of the volunteers' perceptions of self-efficacy and satisfaction toward their roles, tasks and overall involvement with the agency, then these perceptions are seen as influencing their level of participation and performance (Bandura, 1982; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Mento, Steel, & Karren, 1987, Locke, Latham & Erez, 1988; Locke, Lee & Bobko, 1984). As Bandura (1982) has asserted, individuals who do not feel that they can accomplish a task will not attempt that task. Decreased attempts at tasks will impact on the level of participation. The level of participation, which has been partly determined by the volunteers' perceptions, can eventually affect the potential fulfillment of the volunteers' expectations. Thus, a decrease in volunteer participation can result in the obtainment of fewer goals. The realization of fewer goals can adversely impact on the volunteers' levels of satisfaction with and commitment to the program. These lower levels of satisfaction and related experiences can then determine the future levels of volunteer perceived self-efficacy and expectations, which affect future levels of volunteer participation (Porter & Lawler, 1968; Locke, Lee & Bobko, 1984). This process is further refined and explicated in terms of its relationship to the empowerment strategy employed in

the present study.

The following literature review will discuss various theoretical perspectives and research studies which have influenced the development of the above noted theoretical orientation of the present study and the effects of an empowerment intervention on volunteer perceived self-efficacy and participation. The two fundamental constructs which provide the framework for the review and the rationale for the present study are volunteerism and empowerment. The definition of the dynamic interaction between the individual and the organization for the present study will be explicated through a discussion of self-efficacy, organizational satisfaction and commitment, and feedback and goal setting constructs and concepts. The review will begin with a discussion of volunteerism.

Literature Review

Volunteerism

No single definition of volunteerism exists. However, several attributes of volunteerism seem to emerge in the literature (Jenner, 1982; Schorr, 1970). These attributes are: (a) volunteers actively participate; (b) volunteers join a particular organization with expectations as to outcomes of their efforts, and potential satisfaction of their needs; (c) volunteers do not receive financial renumeration for

their involvement; (d) and the function of volunteerism is dependent upon the social, political and moral orientation of an individual volunteer within a particular social structure.

One attribute that has been shown to be of particular import is that the roles of volunteers are influenced by the environmental context. Both Rothman, Erlich and Teresa (1981) and Gidron (1987) found this to be the case in terms of the fulfillment of volunteer expectations for different groups of volunteers. According to these researchers, individuals choose to volunteer based on their expectations that agencies will provide certain benefits. If there is congruence between the volunteers' expectations and the agency's ability to provide the expected benefits, the level of volunteer participation increases. Thus, Rothman, et al. (1981) and Gidron (1987) both concluded that, to foster voluntary participation, an organization must provide appropriate benefits. Such benefits may be either instrumental, or expressive. Instrumental benefits include concrete results such as policy reform or increased allotment of resources; where-as expressive benefits include psychosocial results, such as increased satisfaction, or worthwhile social interactions.

Anderson and Moore (1977) corroborated the findings of Rothman, et al. (1981) and Gidron (1987), and concluded that if voluntary agencies have knowledge as to why people volunteer, these agencies can gain an understanding as to what types of expectations volunteers have. Such knowledge could then be used by the agencies to develop programs that address potential and current volunteer expectations. Anderson and Moore obtained a comprehensive list of voluntary

agencies in Canada, from which they randomly selected 189 service oriented voluntary agencies. The investigators asked the directors of each agency to randomly distribute the questionnaires (with self-addressed stamped envelopes) to their volunteers. The sampling procedure yielded 1062 responses, which represented a 37% response rate. The results supported the conclusion that most individuals volunteer for humanitarian reasons, and that the motivation to continue to volunteer stems from expectations of self-fulfillment and growth.

In their review of the literature, Ilsley and Niemi (1981) found that most researchers assert that volunteer participation issues should be addressed through the assessment of the interactive relationship between the organization and the volunteer. Ilsley and Niemi compiled a list of organizational factors gleaned from their review, that represent potential mechanisms which can influence an organization's ability to fulfill volunteer expectations. The factors included; (a) the mission of the organization, (b) the goals and objectives that have been developed to obtain the mission, and (c) the financial support provided for the volunteer program. Although researchers call for a need to examine the issue of volunteer participation and retention within the context of the organization, very few have proposed a conceptual model that explicates the interaction between the individual characteristics of the volunteer and organizational factors. Dailey (1986) was successful in adapting an organizational commitment model to a volunteer population. The basic tenet of Dailey's model of volunteer commitment, which was borrowed from models of employee organizational commitment (Porter & Lawler, 1968; Porter, Mowday,

Steers, & Boulian, 1974). The basic tenet of the model is that there is an interaction between the individual characteristics of the volunteer, and the organizational factors which influences the volunteer's sense of satisfaction and level of participation with the organization.

Dailey (1986) collected data from a convenience sample of volunteers and their supervisors who were affiliated with a charitable organization. The study examined the hypothesis that volunteers' satisfaction with their role and involvement with an agency are correlated with their commitment to that agency. Dailey's results demonstrated that general volunteer satisfaction was predicted by three task dimensions; task significance, skill variety, and task identity. Task significance was found to be the strongest predictor of satisfaction. Personal characteristics did not significantly predict commitment, but satisfaction did.

Dailey's study provides support to further examine volunteer behavior in terms of employee organizational paradigms. Although Dailey's results are not unique to the volunteer sector, several implications can be drawn, the first is that satisfaction with volunteer tasks plays an important role in volunteer commitment. The second implication is that the volunteers' personal characteristics alone are not strong predictors of volunteer commitment. Dailey's results support the need for researchers to examine organizational characteristics such as task identity, variety and significance, and uses of feedback, along with volunteer perceptions of organizational structures to better understand volunteer participation.

In summary, the trend in volunteerism research is to examine the issue of

increased volunteer participation and eventual increased volunteer retention rates, as the public and private service sectors become more reliant on volunteer resources. In order to assess the critical factors involved with increased participation, researchers need to search for appropriate conceptual models that capture the pertinent dynamic relationship between volunteers and their agencies. It has been asserted by Ilsley and Niemi (1981) and Dailey (1986) that conceptual models should include an interaction between the expectations of volunteers and the agency's ability to meet such expectations.

Organizational Commitment

As noted earlier, volunteers have expectations as to their future satisfaction as well as to their sense of self-efficacy with their participation within an agency's program. In turn, enhanced satisfaction and fulfilled expectations of positive outcomes associated with their participation can enhance individuals' levels of commitment to the agency or program. Research on organizational commitment can provide some important theoretical links and guidelines for the understanding of the relationship between volunteers and agencies and potential strategies to strengthen that relationship.

The literature on organizational commitment is varied, however Naylor, Pritchard and Ilgen (1980) have provided an initial broad conceptual explication of

organizational commitment in relation to organizational motivation. These authors defined organizational motivation as a process which involves allocating personal resources to certain activities. The process of allocation, which they labelled as commitment, can be described in terms of time and energy expended to cause the maximum gain in an individual's anticipated affective level or level of satisfaction. The strength behind the resource allocation process is dependent upon the individual's affective level, his or her cognitive appraisal of past experiences and related prediction of future outcomes.

This definition seems to indicate that an individual's perception of future outcomes can be a determinant of commitment. However, it is not that simple. Many factors, including but not limited to outcomes that are valued by the person, can play a role in the individual's expectation of future outcomes and rewards, as well as choice of behavior used to obtain personal and organizational goals. This assertion was first put forth by Porter and Lawler (1968) who identified some of the factors that could influence outcomes. Such factors included self-esteem, affective and cognitive appraisals of the individuals as to their expectations, and the work environment itself.

Commitment reflects variations in the level of motivation through the arousal of factors outside and within an individual's control. Thus, the assessment of only effort expended by an individual and the end products obtained through a particular act of resource allocation precludes the identification of other factors that play a significant role in the determination of the relationship between the motivation and

commitment process and outcomes.

The discussion of commitment as provided by Naylor, et al. (1980) focuses on a general resource allocation process. Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian (1974) and Porter (1979) provided a definition of commitment in relation to a specific context, namely the organization. They conceptualized organizational commitment as an individual's desire to remain with an organization and his ore her ability to identify with the organizational goals. According to the Porter et al. (1974) definition, three characteristics comprise organizational commitment. They are: (a) a strong belief in the acceptance of the organization's goals and values, (b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization and, (c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization. Mowday, Porter and Steers (1982) further recognized the existence of exchange mechanisms that operate in the establishment of organizational commitment. These mechanisms are represented by (a) the extent to which expectations of the individual are being met by the organization, (b) the extent to which the individual feels important, and (c) the individual's social involvement with the organization.

Steers (1977) and Morris and Sherman (1981) provided empirical evidence that supports the above definitions of organizational commitment. Steers' model of commitment, although it merely defines clusters of variables associated with commitment, represents a two fold process; the first identifies antecedents of organizational commitment, and the second identifies commitment outcomes. The three major antecedents of commitment are: personal characteristics, job

characteristics, and work experiences. The personal characteristics include age, education and central life interest; where as the job characteristics include, job challenge, opportunities for social interaction, and feedback related to performance. Work experiences include, organizational dependability and trust, group attitudes toward the organization, and perceptions of personal investment and importance to the organization. The outcome components of commitment include the intent and desire to remain, attendance, retention and job performance.

Steers collected data from a randomly selected sample of employees in two separate organizations, a hospital and an independent research laboratory. Measures of self-reports were administered to the employees and their respective supervisors, and behavioral measures recorded the outcome variables. Steers' findings demonstrated that personal characteristics, job characteristics and work experiences are important antecedents of commitment.

Morris and Sherman (1981) performed a study which tested the generalizability of the existence of the antecedent variables of organizational commitment as identified in the Steer's model, with one alteration. They added another characteristic in the personal characteristics category, the sense of competence. The results that Morris and Sherman obtained through a regression analysis using data from three different agencies that service developmentally disabled individuals were similar to the findings of Steers. In addition, a sense of competence was also found to be a highly significant predictor of organizational commitment. Morris and Sherman concluded that Steer's model provides a grounded

theoretical framework of organizational commitment which can be utilized across a heterogenous group of organizations.

Further empirical evidence which supports the outcome component of the Steers model comes from a study designed by Koch and Steers (1978) that examined the predictive roles of job commitment and satisfaction. The results indicated that organizational commitment played a significant predictive role in employee turnover. Data for the study was collected from a random sample of entry-level employees in three public sector agencies. Zero order correlations between satisfaction and turnover were not significant. In addition, when satisfaction was partialled out, the relationship between commitment and turnover did not significantly change. When commitment was partialled out, the relationship between satisfaction and turnover significantly increased. Thus, commitment was demonstrated to be a stronger predictor of outcome, in this case turnover, than satisfaction.

It has been empirically demonstrated that the Steer's model of organizational commitment can be applied to a diverse group of individuals in organizations. Thus, it can be assumed that the model can be applied to volunteers and their organizations in determining the antecedent factors and outcomes of volunteer organizational commitment, and its relationship to self-efficacy.

To summarize, four points of interest concerning commitment have emerged from the research that may have implications for volunteer participation and retention. The points are: (a) both a sense of competence and role conflict were found to be significant predictors of commitment, (b) commitment is significantly

related to the desire to remain, (c) commitment represents a dynamic interaction between the individual and the organization, and (d) satisfaction is a strong predictor of commitment.

As stated earlier, satisfaction maybe a strong predictor of organizational commitment, which may have important implications for the understanding of volunteer behavior and ways to enhance the volunteer experience. The following discussion will provide some insight as to the role of satisfaction in an organizational context.

Organizational Satisfaction

A review of the literature on organizational satisfaction reveals that its role in determining employee expected outcomes and future performance levels and its relationship with organizational factors are not directly linked. There is evidence that mediating factors, such as supervisors, co-workers, pay, career progress and work related tasks can influence the various types of satisfaction relationships and interactions with other variables (Shore & Martin 1989, Van De Ven & Ferry, 1980). The implications from such literature for the present study is that manipulation of the mediating variables may enhance volunteer satisfaction, and perhaps increased length of affiliation with an agency.

Although various theories of satisfaction exist, Hackman and Lawler's (1971)

model and measurement of the construct seemed to address the most salient factors related to the volunteer experience in terms of organizational satisfaction. The Hackman and Lawler model of satisfaction, which was based on the tenets of expectancy theory as delineated by both Vroom (1964) and Porter and Lawler (1968), represents an attempt to identify the complex relationships and pertinent factors involved. The major tenets of the model that have received empirical support were; (a) an individual believes that a valued outcome can be reached through the engagement of a particular behavior and (b) the value of the outcomes is partly determined by an individual's ability to satisfy his or her needs directly and indirectly.

According to Hackman and Lawler, the work environment should provide the necessary conditions that will allow for valued outcomes to be reached. In addition to environmental work factors, individual characteristics such a sense of personal responsibility and higher ordered need strengths could also affect an individual's level of satisfaction with his or her job. The organizational characteristics that could impact on satisfaction included the specific task that the individual performed in terms of its identity and the opportunity for variety. Task identity refers to the opportunity afforded to the employee to gain a sense of the entirety of the task. Task variety refers to the degree to which an employee is allowed to utilize a variety of skills and talents within a particular task, as well as perform a variety of tasks.

Although Hackman and Lawler (1971) delineated two separate task dimensions (entirety and variety), they maintained that it is not the mere existence of the environmental aspects that determine the level of satisfaction, but how these

aspects are experienced and perceived by the individual. Hackman and Oldham (1975) further articulated the sense of satisfaction as an intrinsic motivation that is derived from the tasks themselves. The basic tenets of their theory is that high levels of satisfaction can be obtained when three psychological states, which include: a sense of meaningfulness with the job, a sense of responsibility of the outcomes produced and an awareness of the work outcomes are present for the employee. These psychological states are primarily caused by the actual parameters of the tasks of the job. For example, a sense of job meaningfulness seems to be enhanced by the significance of the task, the variety of skill that the task demands and the capability the task affords the individual to perform it in its entirety. Other task parameters include feedback from the performance of the task itself, feedback from other individuals, autonomy and the amount of interaction employees have with each other in order to perform the tasks.

Although, Hackman and Oldham have claimed that the task itself provides the sense of satisfaction felt by an individual, personal and environmental factors may act as mediators between satisfaction and outcomes (Naylor, Pritchard & Ilgen, 1980; Morris & Sherman, 1981; Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982). Well articulated examples of the role of mediating factors on outcomes have been supplied by research in the areas of feedback processes and goal setting behavior. Below is a brief overview of the research findings and explication of feedback and goal setting and their applicability to the volunteer sector.

Contingencies and Feedback

Ilgen, Fisher and Taylor (1979) provided a comprehensive definition of feedback and identified three essential components: a message, someone to send that message (the source), and someone to receive it (the recipient). The actual feedback component of this process is the message or information which specifically pertains to the recipient. Although the source is not considered part of the feedback content, assessment of the impact of the feedback message can only be ascertained through the identification of the source.

According to Ilgen, et. al (1979) three distinct types of sources of feedback have emerged from the research findings. They are: (a) other individuals who are both internal and external to the particular organizational setting, (b) the task associated with the overall performance orientation, and (c) the individual. The influence that each source has on the feedback process is dependent upon factors such as, the credibility of the source, the power the source has over the rewards, and the trustworthiness of the source.

Although the feedback message, or information may be generated from external sources, it is the individual receiver who interprets the information, through his or her own psychological and cognitive perspectives. The individual then interacts with the feedback stimulus, which eventually determines the utilization of the feedback information in future behavior.

Model of the Feedback Process

Ilgen, et al. (1979) presented a conceptual model of the feedback process, and discussed specific interactions that may occur between the three feedback components mentioned above. The model outlined four stages that an individual may engage in when he or she receives feedback information. The execution of the stages, and consequent decisions and behaviors are contingent upon the nature of the source, the feedback stimulus interaction, the recipient's personal cognitive and affective styles, and environmental factors. The four stages are: (a) perceived feedback, (b) acceptance of feedback, (c) desire to respond to the feedback, and (d) the intended response or goals. The final segment of the model is the response that follows from the employment of this four stage process.

As noted earlier, the source of the feedback can play an influential role in the outcome of the feedback process. Some evidence points to the fact that the most relied upon sources of feedback are those that are perceived to be close to the recipient, with the individual recipient being the closest. Greller and Herold (1975) provide empirical evidence that individuals do rely on their own perception of performance efficacy more often than the other sources of feedback.

The purpose of the Greller and Herold study was to assess the importance of different feedback sources on job information. A convenience sample of 64 evening division students at an urban community college participated in the study.
The questionnaires, which tapped two types of information, sources of information and issues, were administered to the students. Issues were broken down into two

categories: the role of the source in providing information concerning job requirements (referent), and the extent to which the source provided information about how well a person is doing on the job (feedback). Five separate sources were identified: self, task, supervisor, co-workers and organization.

Results from a factorial repeated measures ANOVA design, with issue by source, indicated that job attributes, such as friendly atmosphere, types of rewards, and type of tasks performed, had an impact on the relative importance of sources. Individuals relied more on sources that were closer to them for feedback issues rather than referent issues, regardless of the job attributes. Internal sources (self and task) became more relevant as sources of referent information when certain job characteristics, such as autonomy, task identity, enjoyable atmosphere, were present.

It has been demonstrated that the source of feedback can affect the validity of the message given. In addition to the type of source that gives feedback, the frequency of information or the message given in the feedback process can partly affect the outcome response of the recipient. In general, the more frequently positive feedback is given, the more accurate the recipient will be in his or her interpretation of the message, the more competent he or she will feel, and the more likely the appropriate subsequent behavior change will occur. This relationship, however, is not always simple. It seems that the type of feedback, positive or negative, interacts with its frequency and the recipient's cognitive appraisal and can produce situations in which the feedback can be detrimental, and may even inhibit future performance (Ivancevich & McMahon, 1982).

Although it is evident that the source of information and the frequency of giving such information, along with other related factors, can influence the recipient's acceptance of the message, the individual characteristics of the recipient can also impact on the outcome of the feedback process. For example, the intentions of the recipient in terms of his or her response to the feedback can dictate the consequences of the entire feedback process. If recipients perceive that they have control over setting the goals which will determine the type and level of their participation, then their expectations of their future performance and rewards will be enhanced. Goal setting theories, as first postulated by Locke (1968), and later elaborated on by Steers & Porter (1974), and Ivancevich and McMahon (1982) address the salient issues involved in recipients' intentions and the feedback process.

Goal Setting and Feedback

In their review of the relevant research on the role of task-goal attributes, Steers & Porter (1974) and Latham (1983) could not provide a universal conclusion regarding the effects of employee participation in goal setting and their performance. Both sets of researchers concluded that contextual and personal factors should be taken into account in determining performance implications of participation in goal setting procedures. The main point here is that the relationship between participation in goal setting and increased performance is more a function of mediating factors that impact on both rather than a direct linkage between the two activities.

Feedback is one such mediating factor that seems to play an influential role in goal setting and its impact on performance is the feedback that is given about performance. Feedback seems to be most effective when coupled with goal setting, but the type of feedback is dependent upon many factors. Specific feedback given to specific goals was found to be the most effective enhancement of motivation and performance (Locke, 1968; Latham, Mitchell, & Dossett, 1978; Ivancevich & McMahon, 1982). However, few studies have been done that specifically look at the role of feedback in goal setting behavior.

Ivancevich and McMahon (1982) examined the motivational impact of goal setting and performance feedback on performance, intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction and organizational commitment. They hypothesized that goal setting combined with feedback would enhance performance, satisfaction and commitment more than feedback alone. The study participants were randomly selected from six separate engineering organizations, and randomly assigned to six different conditions. In the first three conditions, the groups were involved in goal setting. They varied on the following dimensions: (a) received extrinsic supervisory feedback only, (b) received extrinsic supervisory feedback and positive evaluative praise, and (c) received self-generated feedback only. The three groups in the second condition were not involved in goal setting, and varied on the following dimensions: (d) received general feedback from their supervisors on their performance, (e) received feedback from their co-workers, and (f) received only annual evaluations on performance. Data was collected over three quarterly periods.

A repeated measures ANOVA was used to test the relationship between the conditions and the performance outcomes. Both a significant main effect of time period and an interaction effect by time and control costs were obtained. A follow-up repeated measures ANOVA was then used to determine the location of the significant differences, followed by a post hoc contrast coding comparison that further examined the main and unique effects of each condition.

The general results of the contrast coding were that goal setting was found to have a stronger effect on performance than non-goal setting, and that self-generated feedback had a more profound effect on performance than external feedback. In terms of specific outcomes, goal setting conditions coupled with self-generated feedback had a higher impact on intrinsic satisfaction than the non-goal setting, and external feedback goal setting conditions. In terms of commitment, both goal setting conditions had the same impact. However, the conditions with feedback had a greater impact on commitment than the non-feedback conditions, and the self generated feedback was more significant than the externally generated feedback. These results support the results found by Greller and Herold (1982) cited above. Internal feedback mechanisms of information seem to be the most effective source.

Further support for the above findings of Ivancevich and McMahon (1982) comes from the meta-analytic study of goal setting behavior and performance conducted by Mento, Steel and Karren (1987). Although, they found that feedback as a moderator variable between goal difficulty and performance could not be substantiated, a significant zero order correlation was found between feedback and

goal specificity/difficulty-performance in the multiple regression analysis.

Mento, et al. were able to provide substantial support for the two major premises that Locke postulated in 1968. They demonstrated that hard goals lead to a higher level of performance, and that specific hard goals lead to higher performance than do general goals. Seventy studies that examined goal difficulty, and forty nine studies that examined specificity/difficulty in relation to performance were assessed across five moderator variables. These variables were: the experiment setting (laboratory versus field), study type (experiment versus correlation), feedback, level of education, and incentives. The overall conclusion of the meta-analysis is that none of the five variables were able to moderate the relationship between goal difficulty and performance, and that only the setting of the study (laboratory versus field) was found to significantly moderate the relationship between goal difficulty/specificity and performance.

Based on these findings and other empirical results, Mento, et al. (1987) contended that feedback is desirable for the setting of specific goals that are perceived as difficult to obtain in order to enhance effective performance. In general, they supported the goal setting paradigm.

The provision of a self-generated feedback mechanism for the present study was included in the intervention or independent variable. Goal setting strategies were the first intervention tasks performed by the volunteers. The specific targets for intended change were not identified until the goals for both the volunteer program and the intervention were in place. It was assumed by the researcher in this

study that the effectiveness of the intervention strategies were going to be partly influenced by the level of commitment that volunteers felt toward the goals that they set.

Locke, Latham and Erez (1988) provided empirical support for the notion that a relationship exists between performance and goal commitment. Through their review of the research they concluded that it is important to examine the major determinants of goal commitment in order to better identify the relationship between goal commitment and performance. Locke, et. al also identified three major categories of goal commitment determinants which include, external factors, interactional factors and internal factors.

These researchers found that the reason why the studies that they reviewed did not produce similar results between the salient factors involved in goal commitment and performance was methodological. Most studies used different design and measurement techniques that made it virtually impossible to compare or contrast results in a meaningful fashion. Future studies that use a within rather than a between subjects design to better ascertain the existence and influence of commitment differences are needed.

Although, Locke, et al. (1988) provided a brief, but comprehensive discussion about each category of determinant factors of goal commitment, they contended that the one internal determinant that shows strong promise as to its influential role in goal commitment and consequent performance is self-efficacy. It has already been noted that Sherman and Morris (1981) found self-competence to be an important

mediator between commitment and outcome behaviors. As suggested by Bandura (1986) low self-efficacy can override the beneficial impacts of incentives, because the initial motivation for people to perform is not present. Thus Locke, et al. (1988) suggested that rewards may play a more minor role in performance expectation than originally thought when self-efficacy is taken into account.

Self-Efficacy

Bandura (1977) defined self-efficacy as individuals' expectations of their ability at mastering behaviors, skills or tasks. Without this belief or expectation, individuals will not attempt to perform particular behaviors or tasks. Wood and Bandura (1989) further articulated the nature of the construct in that obtainment of a personal goal can enhance an individuals' expectations for future rewards, and provide the standards against which individuals measure their capabilities. Self-efficacy enables an individual to pursue performance goals, as set by external sources, while utilizing self-directed behavior and developing personal incentives. In light of this definition, the examination of the construct of self-efficacy within a volunteer population seem appropriate, because volunteers are identified as group that strives to obtain personal goals. Although the notion of the fulfillment of personal incentives is inherent in a volunteer population, the findings of Morris and Sherman (1981), Locke, Latham and Erez (1988), and Locke, Frederick, Lee and Bobko (1984) for employee populations empirically support the notion that an individual's sense of competence can be a significant predictor or determinant of organizational and goal commitment and can

play an influential role in enhanced performance.

Researchers have suggested that other internal factors may also play mediating roles between goal commitment and performance, which may have specific relevance for volunteers. Pierce, Gardner, Cummings and Dunham (1989) contended that there exists a strong relationship between self-esteem, defined as a belief in the ability to fulfill needs through a particular role within an organization, and self-efficacy in terms of an individual's ability to fulfill a role within an organization. The implications for the present study is that volunteer perceived efficacy and self-esteem, as they relate to role identity within a particular agency, may be good predictors of commitment and thus produce higher levels of participation and eventual increases in volunteer retention. This implication can be well served in the model presented by Steers (1977) and Morris and Sherman (1981).

Organization-Based Self-Esteem

Pierce, Gardner, Cummings and Dunham (1989) proposed that self-esteem is a function of the interaction of the individual and the organization to which he or she is affiliated. The rationale behind this tenet is that most of the psychological constructs that are studied in organizational perspectives are functionally related to the role of the employee within an organization. Factors that impact on a person's motivation, performance and desire to remain with an organization are deeply embedded in the organizational context, be it the characteristics of the organization itself, or the interaction between personal and external characteristics.

Pierce et al. (1989) defined organization-based self-esteem (OBSE) as "the degree to which organizational members believe that they can satisfy their needs by participating in roles within the context of an organization" (p. 625). Those individuals who possess a high organization-based self-esteem (OBSE) perceive themselves as competent members who have been able to satisfy their needs through their member roles. Thus, it can be inferred from the above definition that OBSE is an index of a sense of value and worthwhileness that individuals have of themselves in terms of their roles and organizational affiliation.

Pierce et al. (1989) contended that individuals who possess high OBSE also possess self-efficacy, and feel confident in their ability to perform a task. Such expectations, as noted earlier by Bandura (1977, 1982), Steers (1977), Morris and Sherman (1981), and Dailey (1985) can lead to enhanced organizational commitment and participation.

Although Pierce et al. (1989) labeled an individual's sense of organizational worthwhileness as self-esteem, it should be noted that it is the explication of a global construct within a specific context that is being proposed. Justification for this hypothesis comes from other researchers who have demonstrated the application of global psychological constructs to the organizational context. Just as other researchers have claimed, the contention of Pierce et al. was that global self-esteem measures do not adequately capture the essence of the construct within organizational settings.

The Pierce et al. (1989) model of organization-based self-esteem identifies

antecedents and consequences of the self-esteem construct. The antecedents are primarily organizational characteristics that impact upon the individuals' sense of worthwhileness and value. The sense of value that individuals develop in terms of their affiliation with the organization will result in consequences such as their sense of intrinsic motivation, organizational satisfaction and commitment, participation and performance.

Now that the important constructs and variables of the study have been identified and discussed, an overall framework in which to explain the relationship among these variables needs to be articulated. This framework should take into account the dynamic interaction between individuals and their environment, the impact of personal and contextual characteristics on outcome behaviors, and the feedback processes and roles necessary for access to appropriate information. The concept of empowerment as defined by Rappaport (1984) can provide such a framework.

Empowerment

Rappaport (1984) provided a definition of empowerment that conceptually links this construct with the identified tasks noted above, and volunteer commitment, perceived self-efficacy and participation. It states that:

Empowerment is viewed as a process: the mechanism by which people,

> organizations, and communities gain mastery over their lives. However, the content of the process is of infinite variety and as the process plays itself out among different people and settings the end products will be variable and even inconsistent with one another. The inconsistency is in the ends rather than in the process; yet the form of the process will also vary (p. 3)

This definition depicts the construct as a dynamic process that can only be activated by those individuals who design, develop and implement the components of that process, and who have identified not only the goals of the process, but what aspects of their lives should be and have become to be under their specific control. Mastery over one's life, as stated above, can only be identified and gained by those people who are experiencing the empowerment process.

Kieffer's (1984) definition of empowerment provides further conceptual support for the use of empowerment as a mechanism to enhance volunteer perceived self-efficacy, which can influence satisfaction and commitment. Kieffer identifies the construct of empowerment as a transition through which individuals develop and enhance personal skills and resources needed to influence social policy. Although, Rappaport (1984) did not mention social policy in his definition of empowerment, Kieffer demonstrated what Rappaport meant when he said that the process of empowerment can be utilized in very diverse settings. Kieffer applied Rappaport's general definition of empowerment to grass roots movements as they attempted to gain mastery over instituting social policy change.

Conger and Kanungo (1988) proposed a four stage process model of

empowerment that captured the above stated definitions within an organizational context. The model suggests that a state of psychological powerlessness can exist within the employees of an organization, which can be altered by managerial strategies and techniques. Such strategies target contextual factors or organizational structures that have a detrimental impact on employees' sense of self-efficacy, and thus increase their sense of powerlessness. Contextual factors may include, poor communication networks, low incentives, arbitrary reward allocations, lack of role clarity, unrealistic goals, low task variety, limited participation in programs or meetings, and lack of training and technical support.

Once the empowerment strategies which have been developed to alter the organizational structures that have been deemed detrimental to employees are in place, employees should be able to receive information concerning their perception of self-efficacy. After such information is received, employees can then adopt behavior that not only makes them feel efficacious, but leads to the fulfillment of the organization's goals as well.

Conger and Kanungo (1988) not only provided a conceptual link between empowerment and perceived individual mastery, but also explicated empowerment as a process through which individuals accomplish personal and organizational goals. Conger and Kanungo (1988) stated that, "Empowerment is a process of enhancing feelings of self-efficacy among organizational members through the identification of conditions that foster powerlessness and through their removal by both formal and organizational practices and informal techniques of providing efficacy information"

(p. 474).

This definition provides the conceptual link between the tenets of volunteer participation and retention as stated by Ilsley and Niemi (1981), Anderson and Moore (1977), Dailey (1986), and Rothman, Erlich and Teresa (1981), and organizational constructs that pertain to commitment and satisfaction (Porter & Lawler, 1968, Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Hackman & Oldham, 1975; Naylor, Pritchard & Ilgen, 1980). Voluntary organizations must be cognizant of and address the contextual factors that impact on volunteers and their participatory role within that agency.

Two factors have been identified by both Rappaport and Conger and Kanungo which are central to the empowerment process. The factors are the roles that each key player has access to and the information necessary to carry out those roles. In terms of the present study, this implies that through the empowerment intervention the volunteers secure opportunities for access to roles that they have identified as necessary for enhancing their self-efficacy and increased satisfaction, and information and support that will enhance those roles.

Although, Rappaport did not specifically identify particular settings that seem to be the most conducive for the emergence of empowerment, other researchers have. Zimmerman and Rappaport (1988) proposed that settings which involve citizen participation are appropriate contexts in which to examine the process of empowerment, because individuals have the opportunity to experience self-efficacy within a social context. Zimmerman and Rappaport defined citizen participation as,

"an organized activity in which an individual participates without pay in order to achieve some stated goal" (p. 726).

Present Study

Model of an Empowerment Intervention

As noted earlier, Conger and Kanungo's (1988) model of empowerment identifies strategies which can be utilized in organizational settings. However, they did not adequately identify who would determine the strategies to be used or how to set such strategies into motion. O'Connor (1989) proposed an intervention model of competence that provides guidelines as to who should implement empowerment strategies, and under what circumstances change is warranted. Even though the model addresses the issue of competence, its application to an empowerment intervention can be justified.

The O'Connor model is based on two assumptions; the first being that competence does not hold to one specific definition. The second assumption asserts that the values upon which competence criteria are based are subject to change. The implication here is that competence is perceiver bound, which is similar to the explication of empowerment (Rappaport, 1984). Figure 1 depicts the model.

The O'Connor model (1989) is two dimensional, with each dimension

containing two levels, internal and external. The first dimension is the source from which standards are developed and competency is determined for a particular group or organization. The standards can be derived from an internal or external source as it relates to that particular group or organization. The second dimension is the assessment, be it internal or external to the particular group or organization, of the level of competence obtained or acquired by that group or organization. Thus, cell one in Figure 1 represents standards of competence which are developed by a particular group for itself (internal), and the assessments that are performed by that same group in regards to the achievement of the competencies set forth by that group (internal).

O'Connor proposed that when standards and assessments are congruent within or across the cells, there is no need for intervention. It is when discrepancies exist either between sources of standards, or between assessors of achievement, or between the sources and assessors that intervention is warranted. Such incongruities can be played out in a myriad of ways within and across the cells. This takes into account the relationships between individuals and their environments, and among individuals themselves. Thus, according to O'Connor, the change agent has to be aware of the origin of both dimensions (standards and achievement), the incongruities that have prevailed, and the know how to infuse him or herself into the dynamics of the situation.

O'Connor's (1989) model represents the conceptual framework upon which the present empowerment strategy was designed. After listening to all the

Sources of Competence

Assessment	Standards: Internal	Standards: External
Internal	internal only	internal judges external
CHANGE AGENT		
External	external judges internal	external only

Figure 1

O'Connor's sources of competence model

Note. From paper presented at the Second Biennial Division 27 Conference, Community Action and Research, East Lansing, Michigan. "A competency model for community interventions: A theoretical proposal for change agents" P. O'Connor, 1989, p. 14.

stakeholders involved in the monitor program, and carefully reviewing the issues presented, this researcher, as the potential change agent, decided to frame the situation as defined by the volunteers as sources of standards and achievement (cell one of the model). Viewing the situation in this manner directed this researcher to collaboratively develop an intervention strategy with the volunteers that addressed their concerns. If this researcher chose to assess the situation in terms of other sources of standards and achievements in the monitor program, a different intervention strategy would have emerged. The volunteers detected an incongruence between their standards, their ability as citizen monitors to initiate positive quality of life changes for individuals with developmental disabilities who reside in group homes, and the actual situation in which the volunteers felt that they have not made a difference (internal sources and internal assessors). This situation represents cell one of O'Connor's model. The intervention strategy in this study addressed the perceived incongruities of the volunteers.

Setting for the Intervention

In 1983, the Michigan Association for Retarded Citizens (ARC/M) received a grant from the Department of Mental Health to implement a citizen, advocacy monitor program. The program's mission was to monitor the level of quality of life in the group homes and provide direct feedback to the group home providers, and

to the Department of Mental Health as to the extent that individuals who resided in the homes were experiencing a quality of life. The primary advocacy activity that the volunteers performed were group home visits, which entailed filling out assessment forms as to the presence of normalization principles, and providing suggestions to the group home staff to enhance the quality of life.

The Michigan Association for Retarded Citizens (ARC/M) is a collective advocacy organization primarily comprised of local chapters which are located throughout the state, with its headquarters in Lansing. Although there is a state level ARC/M office, it is within the individual local ARC chapters that the advocacy efforts take place, and to which monitors are specifically affiliated. The overseeing supervisors of the monitor program are state level staff who work closely with the volunteer liaisons, known as local coordinators, within the local chapters. The local coordinators are the immediate volunteer monitor supervisors for the specific local chapters.

Three years after the implementation of the program, the volunteer monitors had not been consistently monitoring the group homes, because they felt frustrated about their roles as monitors. Thus, their level of participation dropped, as seen through the infrequent visits to the group homes, and attendance at monitor meetings. Their primary complaint was that they felt ineffective in their role as monitors. In collaboration with the investigator, the volunteers, with support from their state level ARC supervisors, decided to revamp the monitor program in an effort to enhance their perceived self-efficacy as advocates. The following

intervention has been developed in response to this need.

Intervention Goal

The premise behind this intervention was that changes in the monitor program procedures and increased access to other sources of information and agencies involved with group home operations could enhance the roles of the monitors as effective advocates. It was also assumed that increased feelings of self-efficacy would increase levels of monitor satisfaction and level of participation. The goal of this intervention was for the monitors to utilize an empowerment process through which they would gain a sense of self-efficacy in their activities and increase their level of satisfaction with and commitment to the monitor program. For the purpose of the present study, an empowerment process indicates that the volunteers identified the problems or incongruities between their perceived standards of advocacy participation and their level of achievement, and developed the strategies to address the incongruities.

The practical application of the empowerment process was operationalized through two different global strategies. The goal of the first strategy was to increase and enhance the opportunity for influence on the part of the monitors in terms of access to other types of channels of communication and feedback within the group home network, including local and state level regulatory agencies. The second

strategy involved the development and mobilization of support systems within ARC/Michigan and within the local community for each local chapter. Both strategies targeted the contextual factors and not the volunteers. The empowerment process, as defined by the two primary strategies, served as the independent variable in the present study, and was under the control of the monitors and the investigator.

Intervention Rationale

Research has demonstrated that the mission of the organization, the goals and objectives that are utilized to realize that mission, the amount of financial support and the ability of the organization to fulfill volunteer expectations are important influential factors that impact upon a volunteer's decision to remain (Ilsley & Niemi, 1981; Gidron, 1987; Ivancevich & McMahon, 1982). In the case of the ARC/M monitor program, some of these factors were lacking. For example, the volunteers were aware of the program mission: to improve the quality of life of the adults who live in group homes. But, the volunteers perceived the procedures to be inappropriate to realize the mission and the program objectives to be vague. The volunteers' primary role was to visit the group homes and provide various types of feedback to different agencies which were directly or indirectly involved with the operation of group homes. During the visits the volunteers performed two tasks; one was filling out the assessment form which addressed the homes' responsiveness to

quality of life related behaviors, atmosphere and issues. The second task involved the volunteers providing suggestions to the group home staff as to how they could enhance the quality of life in the homes.

The volunteers felt frustrated with both tasks for various reasons. The volunteers found the forms to be too rigid and the information contained on the forms to be incomplete and inappropriate for dissemination to agencies involved with group home operations. Although the group home staff had direct contact with the adults in the homes, the volunteers felt that the staff were in no position to implement the suggested changes in the homes due to their status in the group home organization.

The articulation of these frustrations led the volunteers, in collaboration with the investigator, to target those organizational and program factors that the volunteers perceived to be barriers to their monitor role and tasks. The targeted factors were primarily identified as channels of communication and feedback processes. After identification of the perceived barriers, the group developed the empowerment intervention strategies which particularly focused on the communication and feedback channels between the volunteer monitors and the ARC/M, group home providers, state level regulatory agencies and local community agencies involved with group home operation, as well as general local community systems. An example of a feedback barrier as perceived by the monitors was that they needed to be publicly endorsed by ARC/M as credible sources of feedback for the Department of Mental Health and those agencies who owned and operated

group homes. ARC/M was responsive to this concern, and implemented the proposed changes that the monitors made. Three of the proposed changes included: the formation of a task force to revise the assessment forms and review the training program, the formation of a task force which dealt with sexuality issues and their relationship to quality of life, and a ARC/M sponsored working conference in which the monitors took an active role in presenting, discussing issues and problems, and formulating recommendations.

Although, the main focus of the intervention was for monitors to enhance their effectiveness through their own initiatives to make changes in the monitor program, the investigator had hypothesized a mediational effect would result as well. Through direct volunteer manipulation of targeted program and organizational factors, the volunteers' level of satisfaction with and commitment to the program would increase, which might eventually impact on the volunteers' future expectation of obtained future valued outcomes and performance (Naylor, et al., 1980; Porter & Lawler, 1968; Hackman & Lawler, 1971).

The second global empowerment strategy involved accessing support from various ARC and local community groups, which would lead to enhanced and broadened feedback systems for the monitors to utilize. One particular support strategy involved the formation of the local coordinator dyads. Two local coordinators were paired with the purpose of providing them a forum in which they could more effectively problem-solve among and with each other, rather than always having to turn to the state office for help. External, local community sources of

support were mobilized with the purpose of seeking more communal understanding and involvement in the monitor program. Such involvement might lead to new potential resources for future use.

The basic underlying framework of the study which links the empowerment intervention with organizational commitment, satisfaction, self-efficacy, goal setting and feedback processes is that the empowerment intervention was treated as a two fold process through which volunteers identified goals, roles, tasks and rewards, and set up the mechanisms which dictated the integration and interaction of these identified factors. The empowerment intervention process was a representation of two feedback loop systems; the first one treating the volunteers as recipients of information that they deemed necessary to possess in order to be more effective and credible sources of information in the second feedback loop system. This initial feedback loop process included activities that provided the monitors with information as to their effectiveness. Such activities included receiving input from the ARC/M staff, the group home providers and revamping the training program and assessment forms used on visits. The second feedback loop in the empowerment intervention included activities such as the development of other types of monitor strategies than just group home visits and meeting attendance through which the volunteers were able to provide more accurate information to a broader base of people and agencies. Such activities in this second loop included writing articles in the newsletter and holding meetings with group home providers, local community mental health boards and the Department of Mental Health.

This researcher assumed that if the monitors felt that they were receiving as well as providing accurate and appropriate information then they would feel more efficacious and satisfied with their roles as monitors. As stated earlier by Bandura (1977) individuals will feel more efficacious if they have positive expectations as to their ability to perform the necessary tasks. Since the volunteers identified and modified the barriers to their monitoring performance, then they should begin to feel effective.

The second basic assumption made by the researcher was that the volunteers would have an enhanced sense of satisfaction because they valued the outcome of their efforts; namely to increase their effectiveness to improve the quality of life in the homes. The volunteers' satisfaction was a function of their ability to obtain their desired mission, goals and outcomes. This satisfaction was partially realized by the type of tasks the volunteers added to their monitoring efforts. The intervention provided the context in terms of more tasks and better follow through of tasks as well as improved channels of communication through which the volunteers set their valued goals and developed a mechanism to realize those goals.

If the volunteers felt efficacious and satisfied with the outcomes of their performance, they would probably intend to remain with the program. Thus, the intervention was also seen as a vehicle to increase the volunteers' desire to stay. This, in turn, would increase ARC/M's volunteer retention rate.

Intervention Procedures

Intervention Overview

As stated earlier, this intervention was a collaborative empowerment project designed by volunteers to increase their effectiveness as citizen advocates. One interesting aspect of this intervention was that, although the goals were general, the operationalization of them took place in each local chapter. The initial starting point entailed all monitors to review the overall mission of the program as a collective, and then to move the application of the mission to the local level.

Prior to the implementation of the intervention strategies, the investigator met with the local coordinators and monitors to discuss the purpose of the intervention, and to develop the strategies that specifically addressed the needs of each local chapter. It was made clear to the monitors that they would identify the problems and develop the intervention strategies. For the sake of cohesion and continuity for the collective nature of the monitor program, the intervention was implemented through the same five step process for all local chapters. The specific local chapter issues, concerns and strategies were addressed in each of the general five steps.

Step one. The first step in the intervention process was the identification and setting of the goals for the monitor program by monitors in each local chapter. This procedure was the crucial link between the stated mission of the monitor program and successful accomplishment of the mission as defined by each local chapter.

The investigator compiled a list of goals for the monitor program from various sources of the ARC organization. The monitors in each local chapter reviewed the list of goals and identified those that represented the collective monitoring efforts of all local chapters of ARC/M, and goals that particularly pertained to their specific local chapter program. The monitors included other goals not listed that they felt were important to the mission of the program, both on an overall and local level. Once the program goals were established for each local chapter the monitors prioritized them and developed strategies accordingly.

Step two. The second step, which was guided by the identified goals, entailed the implementation of the opportunities for influence strategy, which expanded certain identified processes and targets of feedback, and curtailed others. The expansion and curtailment strategies were different for each local chapter, depending on the list of goals that they identified and prioritized.

In addition to developing specific strategies, all local chapters addressed the following strategies; (a) involvement in the publishing of the monitoring newsletter, (b) involvement with the preparation of the quarterly report that is sent to the Department of Mental Health, and (c) the development and implementation of presentations to state level regulatory agencies concerning the goals, objectives and progress of the program.

Step three. This step was a further refinement of the opportunities for influence strategy and represented activities that expanded the primary role; that of group home visits. The monitors hoped that these activities would enhance their assessment efforts and provide them with more monitoring mechanisms. Such activities included: the establishment of a People First Group, which is a self help advocacy group for people with developmental disabilities, the training of individuals who reside in the group homes to become citizen monitors, and the establishment of a sexuality task force which dealt with the relationship between problems and issues of sexuality and quality of life.

Step four. This step entailed the development and mobilization of within agency support for each local chapter. The formation of the local coordinator dyad involved the pairing of two local coordinators into a problem-solving, information-sharing, support unit. The main goal of the dyad process was to provide a peer support system for the local coordinators. The dyad structure would also help link the local chapters with each other and allay the sense of isolation and frustration felt by the monitors. It was hypothesized that this type of structure would allow for better flow of information between the local chapters which were in close proximity to each other and enhance collaborative efforts in targeting potential providers, agencies and future monitors. The inclusion of dyad feedback mechanism would also help create a comprehensive feedback information system for the collective efforts of ARC/M.

Step five. The last step involved the mobilization of external support systems for each local chapter. Particular outside agencies within the local communities were targeted by each local chapter as providers of either potential resource or support for the monitor program. This was accomplished through various channels including; dissemination of monitoring findings and information, invitations of key individuals in the community to monitor meetings, invitations of monitors and coordinators to speak at various community agencies, increased involvement with the local community mental health boards and other policy making agencies.

Summary

In summary, this intervention represented a collaboratively developed empowerment process that targeted organizational and program factors that were perceived to act as barriers to the monitoring efforts of volunteer citizen advocates. The process was a two pronged strategy: enhancement of the opportunities for influence, and the mobilization of support systems. The goal of the intervention was to enhance the perceived self-efficacy of the monitors, as well as increase their level of satisfaction, commitment and participation. The monitors set the standard for efficacy and provided the means to achieve it.

Hypotheses

Two statistical strategies were used to test the hypotheses in the present study. The first contained two types of analyses, the first being correlations which were used to examine the relationships among self-efficacy, satisfaction and commitment (mediating dependent variables) and volunteerism as defined by group home visits and attendance at meetings (primary dependent variables). Only pre-test data were used in the these analyses in order to assess the relationships between and among the mediating and dependent variables without the effects of the intervention. The second set of analyses in the first statistical strategies were regression equations which tested the existence of a mediational model. Post-test data were used, since the effects of the independent variable needed to be included. Hypotheses One and Two address the relationship between and among the mediator and dependent variables.

The second statistical strategy was a repeated measures analysis which was use to assess the impact of the intervention on the trend of the primary and mediating dependent variables within the experimental group. Embedded in the experimental study were manipulations of structural and contextual factors (independent variable; empowerment intervention) identified by the monitors as either barriers to their monitoring tasks or necessary to effectively perform their tasks. Change in the dependent variables over time in the experimental group would demonstrate that empowerment strategies did affect volunteerism. Hypotheses Three through Six

represent the second assessment strategy.

Hypothesis One

Organizational satisfaction, commitment and perceived self-efficacy (general [GSE] and program self-efficacy) should be positively related to the two primary dependent variables; number of monitor visits and attendance at monitor meetings.

Hypothesis Two

There should be positive relationships between perceived self-efficacy, organizational commitment and satisfaction and volunteer retention rates.

Hypothesis Three

Members of the experimental group should feel more self-efficacious in their advocacy efforts than members of the control group. The construct of self-efficacy, was defined by three independent measures. The first was a four item scale which assessed the individual's perception of self-efficacy in terms of their roles and tasks

in the monitor program. The second measure was the general self-efficacy scale (GSE) which assessed the individual's general perception of self-efficacy with no reference to a particular situation, and the third measure was the organization-based self-esteem questionnaire (OBSE) which measured the individual's feelings of worth and accomplishment with the program.

Hypothesis Four

Members of the experimental group should feel more satisfied with the monitoring program than members of the control group. Two measures were used to assess satisfaction with the program: the job diagnostic survey (JDS) sub-scale which assessed the individual's general satisfaction with the program, and a frustration index which assessed the level of frustration individuals had with aspects of the program.

Hypothesis Five

Members of the experimental group should visit the group homes more often and attend more monitor meetings than members of the control group. These two variables represented the original monitoring activities and participation variables

that were subject to change due to the intervention strategy.

Hypothesis Six

Members of the experimental group should have a stronger sense of commitment to the program than members of the control group. Commitment was defined as the desire to remain with an organization. The organizational commitment questionnaire (OCQ) was used to measure the volunteers' level of commitment to the program.

Methods

Sampling

Fifteen local ARC/M chapters (n=125 volunteers) represented the total sample for this study. Although sixteen local chapters were involved in the monitor program, one local chapter declined to participate in the study. This researcher did not view this as a threat to the validity of the study, because that particular local chapter was operating under a different set of goals and procedures than the rest of the local chapters in the monitor program. That local chapter had a monitor

program in place prior to the implementation of the present monitor program. The fifteen local chapters who participated in the study were divided into pairs prior to random assignment and data collection. The pairing was a result of the formation of the local coordinator dyads. After the dyads were formed, local chapter pairs were randomly assigned to one of the two experimental groups. Since there were only three local chapters in the Upper Penninsula, and their geographical location precluded them from being able to interact with other local chapters, this researcher formed those three local chapters into a triad. A separate random assignment process was used for those four Detroit-area local chapters in Wayne County (n = 34 monitors; experimental group n = 18; control group n = 16). One pair of Wayne county local chapters was randomly assigned to the experimental group and the other pair was assigned to the control group. The primary reason for this procedure was that Wayne County was not representative of the rest of the counties in terms of the number of group homes, the types of overseer boards that dictate policies and group home procedures, and the location of the city of Detroit, which is more urbanized than any of the other cities in Michigan. The end result was that there were seven local chapter dyad/triad pairings, with eight local chapters assigned to the control group, and seven assigned to the experimental group.

Random assignment according to local chapters was a preferred sampling procedure, because it best protected against possible contamination of the intervention between the experimental and control groups. Random assignment of individuals would not have adequately ensured that monitors in the control group

would not discuss or engage in the intervention procedures with monitors in the experimental group prior to the post-test. One weakness with the random assignment by local chapter rather than individual volunteers was that range of variability would be limited.

All 125 volunteers in the fifteen local chapters (experimental group = 66, control group = 59) filled out the pre-test questionnaire, which represented 100% of the total volunteer population in the monitor program who were eligible to participate in this study. At post-test, only 109 volunteers (experimental group = 55, control group = 54) filled out the questionnaire, which represented 87% of the pre-test sample and total volunteer population in the monitor program. Of the 16 volunteers who did not fill out a post-test questionnaire, eight volunteers (experimental group = 5, control group = 3) terminated the program. This represented a 6% attrition rate for the total sample, a 9% rate for the experimental group and a 5% rate for the control group. Program termination was defined by the local coordinators and this researcher prior to the intervention implementation. This researcher attempted to collect data on those who terminated the program, but was unsuccessful. Several volunteers had left the area and others did not want to fill out the questionnaire.

The other 8 volunteers (experimental group = 4, control group = 4) who did not fill out the post-test questionnaire were still considered active in the monitor program, but for various reasons, did not respond to this researcher's efforts to collect the post-test data. Two major reasons for why these volunteers did not fill

out the questionnaire were; they were on vacation and they did not want to fill out another questionnaire.

To summarize: at pre-test, 100% of the total volunteer population of the monitor program (15 local chapters, n = 125 volunteers) who agreed to participate in this study filled out a questionannire. At post-test, 109 volunteers filled out the post-test questionnaire, which represented 87% of the total population of volunteers who agreed to participate and who filled out questionnaire at the pre-test. Of the 16 volunteers who did not fill out a questionnaire, 8 terminated the program. This researcher could not obtain post-test data on any of these 16 individuals

As stated earlier, the local coordinators and this researcher defined program termination prior to the intervention implementation. The process used by the local coordinators to determine program termination involved a categorization of monitors into three different groups: those who actively monitored and went to meetings, those who had expressed interest in staying with the monitor program, although they had not monitored within the last month, and those who wanted to keep their names on the list, but could not be actively involved for several months. A monitor's name was dropped from the list if he or she specifically requested to leave, or did not stay in contact with the local coordinator for a period of several months. This definition seemed adequate, since the local coordinators communicate, either by phone or in person, with their monitors at least once a month. Thus, the local coordinators could assess on a month be month basis who terminated and who remained.

Procedures

All study participants in both groups (n = 125) filled out questionnaires prior to the intervention implementation (pre-test) which assessed their perceptions of the program and their level of participation three months prior to the intervention. Three months after the implementation of the intervention with the experimental group (post-test), 109 volunteers filled out another questionnaire which assessed their perceptions, levels of participation and engagement in the intervention strategies during that three month time period.

The questionnaires were disseminated through two forums; at the local monitor meetings and by mail. Since both procedures were used for both groups at both data collection time periods, procedural bias could be ruled out as a potential threat to validity. The investigator collected the pre-test data during her initial visit with all of the local chapters in the study. Time was set aside at the beginning of each meeting to allow the monitors to fill out the questionnaires. After the questionnaires were filled out (which were coded for identification and matching at post-test), the general intervention plans were discussed for the experimental group. Discussion in the meetings for local chapters in the control group focused on general monitor program issues, concerns and progress. The local coordinators disseminated questionnaires to those monitors who were not present at the meetings. A two week grace period for return was given for those monitors who received their questionnaire in the mail. If the investigator did not receive a questionnaire within the first week

of the respondent receiving the form, she called the monitor and mailed another questionnaire in the self-addressed stamped envelope. All 125 questionnaires were received within the two week deadline. A grace period of longer than two weeks would have jeopardized the intervention, and made it harder to control for influences due to the passing of time. As each pre-test questionnaire was returned, the investigator recorded the post-test date and a two week grace period for that particular respondent (three months from the intervention implementation). Although, the same data collection procedure was followed for both groups at both time periods, no intervention plans were discussed with the local coordinators and monitors in the control group at the meetings. They knew that they would be addressing their perceived problems within the near future.

The procedures that the investigator used in an attempt to obtain the data from those 8 individuals who terminated the program involved a) a written request and questionnaire sent to the individual from the local coordinator, b) a verbal request from the local coordinator to the individual via the telephone and c) a written request from the investigator enclosed with a second questionnaire and a self-addressed stamped envelope with a follow-up phone call from the investigator. These procedures are slightly different than the procedures used for active volunteer of the monitor program, because those who terminated the program did not attend the meetings at which the questionnaires were disseminated.

The primary justification for the three month interval between the pre-test and post-test was that the monitors were anxious to see change in their program.

However, their anxiety was directed and tempered by very specific perceptions of the problems they were encountering. Thus, the monitors were not easily swayed by just any change, or the presence of someone who promised to help make change in the program. This was demonstrated by the fact that the volunteers in the experimental group significantly decreased in their level of frustration with only those aspects of the monitor program that were addressed by the intervention. The volunteers in the control group did not significantly increase in their level of frustration. (Refer to Table 5 in the results section of this report.) The empowerment intervention procedure helped guarantee that the appropriate problems and frustrations as perceived by the monitors were addressed.

A less salient, but related reason for the three month measurement interval was that the volunteers were randomly assigned to either an experimental or control group, which meant that the control group did not immediately receive the intervention. As stated above, the volunteers were anxious to implement the changes that would allow them to have access to information and feedback sources that would enhance their ability to make a difference in the group homes. In order for the investigator to best assure that the intervention strategies would not spill over into the control group, perform an adequate assessment of the effectiveness of the intervention, and be sensitive and responsive to the needs of all of the monitors, an evaluation period that was long enough to assess change in the experimental group and yet not cause more frustration for the volunteers in the control group had to be selected. Thus, a three month time interval was decided upon by the investigator and

the ARC state level supervisors of the monitor program, who were extremely reluctant to agree to a longer time period.

Data Sources

Although, the local chapters were the units that were randomly assigned, the volunteers themselves were the unit of analysis for testing the hypotheses. The two primary sources of data used to test the hypotheses were the self-report questionnaires filled out by the participants in both groups, and archival data that were contained in both the local chapter and state office files.

Archival data was collected from the files of the state and local chapter offices to obtain an objective assessment of the volunteers' attendance at meetings and rates of monitoring visits, intervention activities performed and termination from the program. Since it was hypothesized that the intervention would help increase the two major monitoring activities of each local, namely the monitor visits and attendance at local monitor meetings, it was important to have a data source that was reliable and not based on the participants' recollection and perceptions. The archival data information came from local chapter meeting minutes, office records on current and terminated volunteers, date books of general monitoring and intervention activities, training sessions, and the number of monitor assessment forms on file at the ARC/M state office. This data provided information on the following variables; the number of group home visits that each monitor made, the number of local monitor meetings

that monitors attended, the number of monitors recruited, as well as the number who remained with or terminated the program, the number of group homes that were monitored, and the total number of visits each local chapter made within a three month time interval prior to and a three month interval after the intervention implementation. The archival data also provided the number of volunteers who participated in the intervention activities prior to and after the manipulation of the independent variable (the intervention). The use of archival data allowed for confirmation, since the data was not supplied by monitor self-reports.

Manipulation Check

To assess the success of the random assignment process, a series of between-group comparisons were used to detect differences between the two groups on 15 pre-test variables. Only one significant difference was found; volunteers in the experimental group had more education than the volunteers in the control group. Appendix A, Tables 1 and 2 contain the results of the between group comparisons on the 15 variables.

In addition, no significant differences were found between the four chapters located in Wayne County and the other chapters on the dependent variables of the study. Refer to Appendix A, Table 3 for the results. Since no differences were found between Wayne County local chapters and other ARC local chapters, or

among the four local chapters themselves, geographical location was not used as a covariate in subsequent analyses.

A manipulation check was performed to: a) assess the existence of contamination of the independent variable in both experimental groups at pre-test, b) to assess the existence of contamination of the independent variable in the control group at post-test, and c) to determine that the manipulation of the independent variable took place in the experimental group. At pre-test, all monitors were asked if they had engaged in any activity associated with the proposed intervention strategies. The results of the manipulation check at pre-test showed no significant differences between the two groups in terms of their engagement in activities related to the intervention. A total of three monitors, two from the control and one from the experimental group, engaged in two intervention-related activities: recruitment of new monitors and starting a People First group. Thus, out of a total of 125 participants, only three individuals reported engaging in one intervention related activity. This did not seem to pose a contamination threat for further assessment of the effectiveness of the intervention.

In order to detect a spill-over effect of the intervention strategy activities into the control group, during the post-test monitors were asked if they specifically engaged in any of the intervention strategies. The inclusion of these responses served two purposes; the first was to assess if the control group engaged in any of the empowerment strategies (spill-over or contamination check). The second purpose was to ascertain if the manipulation of the independent variable occurred in the

experimental group. Since the major goal of this study was to test the effectiveness of an empowerment strategy, it was essential to ascertain if the manipulation of the independent variable took place.

Results of the chi-square analysis at post-test, contained in Appendix A, Table 4, revealed that there was a significant difference in the level of engagement on seven of the 10 intervention activities between the two groups. The two groups did not differ significantly in their engagement of three of the intervention strategies. Only one individual from the experimental group, and no one from the control group reported that they attended other local chapter meetings. No one from either group reported being involved in writing an addendum to the quarterly report, and the same number of participants in each group reported being involved with writing an article for the newsletter. The number of control participants (18) who reported engaging in an intervention strategy represents 2% of the potential number of control group participants who had the opportunity to engage in at least one intervention strategy. This minimal percent does not indicate that there was a significant spill-over of the independent variable into the control group.

Participants

Participants in the study included 125 monitors (experimental group = 66, control group = 59) at pre-test, which represented 100% of the total volunteer

monitor population across all 15 local chapters. At post-test 109 monitors responded to the questionnaire (experimental group = 55, control group = 54), which represented 87% of the 125 monitors who responded at the pre-test.

Since the random assignment process was somewhat successful in producing two homogeneous groups prior to the intervention, the following description pertains to the entire sample population. The mean age of the volunteer monitors was 52 years old, 81% were women and the mean length of volunteer service to the program was 20 months. The majority of the volunteers were parents (65%) of individuals with developmental disabilities. A total of 49% of the volunteers had adult children with developmental disabilities living in a group home.

The reasons for volunteering related to parental concerns about the future welfare of their children (46%). This is also borne out in the expectations that the monitors had of the program. The majority of the volunteers (58%) expected that the program would allow them to improve the quality of life in the group homes. The major frustration, as indicated by 54% of the monitors was the assessment form that they used on visits. Little access to the group homes was found to be frustrating by 42% of the volunteers, and 30% found the group home staff frustrating in that they would not cooperate to improve the conditions of the group homes.

Data gleaned from the office files revealed that the average number of visits for all monitors within the three month time period prior to the intervention implementation was 8.1. The average number of local meetings that all monitors attended within that three month time period was 1.5.

Measures

Self-Efficacy Measures

The Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE). The Generalized Self-Efficacy (GSE) Scale (Tipton & Worthington, 1984), measures general self-efficacy, which is defined as an individual's relatively enduring set of perceptions in regards to his or her ability to generally cope with broad range of situations. Although the reliability and validity data on this measure are limited, there is some evidence that the measure significantly correlates with the Goal Attainment Scale which measures the extent to which and individual successfully achieves a personal goal ($r = .33$, $p < .05$). There is some speculation that the test should be administered in conjunction with measures that assess the specific nature of the task at hand (Tipton & Worthington, 1984). This occurred in the present study.

The index of internal consistency for the GSE was low for this sample (alpha = .60). Appendix B, Table 1 contains the 7 items of the GSE.

Program Self-Efficacy Scale. Since it has been suggested in the literature that self-efficacy should be assessed in relation to a particular task, four items were developed for this study to tap the monitors' perception of their self-efficacy in relation the monitor program. Two items addressed the monitors' perception of their individual efforts as effective monitors, and two items addressed their

perception of the efficacy of the program as a whole to make a difference in the group homes. The index of internal consistency for the four items of the "Program Self-Efficacy Scale" was moderate (alpha= .71). The items are found in Appendix B, Table 2.

The Organization-Based Self-Esteem Scale (OBSE). The measure of Organization-Based Self-Esteem (OBSE) has demonstrated excellent psychometric properties as indicated by reported alphas of .86 to .91 in seven studies performed by Pierce, Gardner, Cummings and Dunham (1989). These researchers also reported a test-retest reliability coefficient of .75 before they controlled for perceived organizational change. The correlation increased to .87 when perceived change was taken into account. Two versions of the OBSE, which differed on a semantic differential dimension, were given to the same group of subjects to assess convergent validity. The obtained correlation was .69 (Pierce, Gardner, Cummings and Dunham, 1989). Discriminant validity was assessed by a factor analysis which was performed on the OBSE and the Rosenberg and Beehr global measures of self-esteem with measures of organizational commitment, intrinsic motivation, and job and organizational satisfaction to assess discriminant validity. A two factor solution emerged with the three self-esteem measures loading on one factor and the organizational and job measures loading on the second factor. The strength of the predictive validity of the OBSE for level of organizational satisfaction was found to be significant with a correlation of .59.

The index for internal consistency for the 9 item, 5 point Organizational-Based Self-Esteem Scale (OBSE) was excellent for the present sample (alpha= .97). Appendix B, Table 3 contains the items of the OBSE scale.

Satisfaction Measures

The Job Diagnostic Survey General Satisfaction Sub-scale (JDS). The Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS), (Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Hackman and Oldham, 1975) was utilized in this study to measure the general satisfaction level of individuals with their voluntary activities with one modification. The word "job" in the original survey was substituted with the phrase "monitoring experience" for the present sample.

This widely used measure has demonstrated good psychometric properties, with reported internal consistency of the scale items ranging from .82 (Dailey, 1986) to .56, and the discriminant validity obtained between the JDS general satisfaction sub-scale and the other sub-scales of the JDS ranged from .12 to .28 (Hackman & Oldham, 1975; Oldham & Hackman, 1980). The substantive validity of the JDS indicates that the variables measured do relate to one another, and to external criterion variables, as postulated by Hackman's and Oldham's (1975) theory (Hackman & Lawler, 1971).

The index of internal consistency for the JDS general satisfaction sub-scale items (14 items) for this sample, was good (alpha=.84). After reviewing the content

of the items in this sub-scale for this sample, it was decided to label the general factor as "general satisfaction with the program". The items of the JDS general satisfaction sub-scale are contained in Appendix B, Table 4.

Although the JDS general satisfaction sub-scale was used in the present study it should be noted that the survey has received some criticism. Roberts and Glick (1981) caution the use of the JDS for the following methodological reasons: the survey does not adequately specify the measurement and analysis of the job characteristics, the issue of common method variance never gets addressed by researchers who have utilized the survey, and the uni-dimensional index is not valid. Roberts and Glick (1981) also discussed the inability of the job characteristics model to address individuals who are low on higher-order growth need strength. These issues were addressed in the present study through the following actions: a) other measures, including archival data, of volunteer experience with the monitor program were used, b) the JDS index was not computed, and c) another scale which assessed the volunteers' level of frustration was developed as another indicator of satisfaction with the program. Research has demonstrated that volunteers, in general, display high levels of higher-order growth need strength (Anderson & Moore, 1977; Gidron, 1987; Houghland, Turner, & Hendricks, 1988). Thus, this variable was treated as a constant in the present study.

The Frustration Index. The investigator developed a nine item frustration index, which contains the major frustrations with the program that the monitors identified prior to implementation of the study. The index of internal consistency for this nine item index was moderate (alpha=.67). The frustration items are found in Appendix B, Table 5.

The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ)

The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) which was developed by Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979 was used to measure organizational commitment in the present study. The psychometric properties of the OCQ were examined by Mowday, et. al., who administered the questionnaire to 2563 employees in nine different organizations, ranging from auto companies to hospitals, banks and universities. Internal consistency coefficients ranged from .82 to .93, with the median alpha correlation being .90. Test-retest stability coefficients (with 3 to 4 month intervals) ranged from .56 to .75. A factor analysis performed on six of the nine employee samples resulted in a one factor solution: that of commitment. Martin and Shore (1989) obtained an alpha coefficient of .91 on a sample of professional staff at a large hospital, and an alpha coefficient of .89 on a sample of clerical staff at the a large bank.

Discriminant validity coefficients obtained between the OCQ and measures of job involvement ranged from .30 to .56 across four different samples. The common variance shared by organizational commitment and the other measures was

primarily around 24%, and did not exceed 50%.

The index of internal consistency for the 12 item OCQ for the present sample was good (alpha=.84). Appendix B, Table 6 contains the items included in the OCQ scale used for this study.

The Intervention/Process Measures

Ten different strategies comprised the empowerment intervention (the independent variable)for this study. The strategies included: a) presentations about the monitor program to local community groups and agencies, b) presentations about the effectiveness of the monitor program to state level agencies, c) articles for the state-wide ARC newsletter pertaining to monitor issues, d) the implementation of People First Groups, e) attendance at other local chapters' monitor meetings, f) workshops on normalization and the monitor process for group home providers, g)attendance at monitor training sessions, h) training adults with developmental disabilities to monitor, i) the compiling of a manual which contained ideas and solutions to problems encountered on monitoring visits, j) and the implementation of the local coordinator dyads. At both pre-test and post-test, all monitors were asked to indicate whether or not they engaged in any of the 10 strategies. As noted earlier, the manipulation check revealed that contamination at pre-test for both groups and the spill-over effect in the control group were minimal, and did not pose a threat to the study. In addition, it was evident that the manipulation of the independent variable did occur in the experimental group.

Results

A significant difference was found between the experimental and control groups at pre-test on the level of education, as reported above. As shown in the correlation matrix contained in Table 1, only one variable, general satisfaction, was significantly correlated with education. It seems safe to assume that single significant result was due to chance. Random assignment should have ensured that the groups are not significantly different, and that no further analyses which control for the between-group difference in the level of education are needed. However, since a significant correlation was found between general satisfaction, identified as an important mediational variable in the present study, and level of education, the relationship between the level of education and the dependent variables in this study was further assessed, using MANCOVAs and ANCOVAs with education as a covariate. The lack of significant results from the MANCOVA and ANCOVA analyses demonstrated that level of education did not significantly impact on either of the dependent variables. Therefore, the covariance analyses are not reported here; only the results from repeated measures MANOVAs and ANOVAs are reported below.

Table 1

Correlation matrix of the variables in the present study at pre-test

n = 125

Pre-test data

		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
(1) PROGRAM SELF-EFFICACY	1.00	.01	.55**	-.12	.41**	.21	.32**	.19	.08
(2) GENERAL SELF-EFFICACY		1.00	.01	.10	.01	.14	.03	.08	.06
(3) GENERAL SATISFACTION			1.00	-.27*	.64**	.29*	.27*	.32**	-.27*
(4) FRUSTRATION LEVEL				1.00	-.05	-.14	-.01	-.05	.17
(5) COMMITMENT					1.00	.27*	.22*	.33**	.06
(6) SELF-ESTEEM						1.00	.15	.21	.06
(7) GROUP HOME VISITS							1.00	.44**	.15
(8) MEETING ATTENDANCE								1.00	.05
(9) LEVEL OF EDUCATION									1.00

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .001$

The Relationships Among the Dependent Variables

The first two hypotheses addressed the existence of potential relationships between self-efficacy, satisfaction and commitment (the mediating variables) and participation, as defined by group home visits and attendance at meetings (the dependent variables). Pre-test data were used to obtain the correlations reported in Table 1, because these data do not reflect the intervention impact. Post-test data were used to test the mediational model, because these data reflected the impact of the independent variable.

The first hypothesis, that organizational satisfaction, commitment and perceived self-efficacy (mediating variables) should be significantly related to the two primary dependent variables: number of monitor visits and attendance at monitor meetings was not supported by these post-test data. A set of three regression equations (a total of 18 regression equations) was performed on each mediator variable (program self-efficacy, commitment and satisfaction) and dependent variable (group home visits and attendance at monitor meetings) to test for mediational effects (Baron & Kenny, 1986). In order to establish the existence of a mediational model, all three equations for each mediator variable and each dependent variable set had to show that the specified independent variable had an effect on the specified dependent variable in the equation. In none of the sets of analyses did all three conditions hold. Thus, the researcher was not able to statistically establish a mediational model for program self-efficacy, satisfaction or commitment on either

group home visits or attendance at meetings. Table 2 contains the zero order correlations between the two sets of mediating and dependent variables. The correlation between general satisfaction and group home visits was .27 ($p < .01$) and between general satisfaction and attendance was .32 ($p < .001$). Only two other significant correlations were found between the mediating variables and the primary dependent variables. Program self-efficacy significantly correlated with group home visits ($r = .32$; $p < .001$) and commitment significantly correlated with attendance at meetings ($r = .34$; $p < .001$).

The second hypothesis, that there should be positive relationships between perceived self-efficacy, organizational commitment and satisfaction and volunteer retention rates was difficult to test because of the limit of range on the retention variables: only 9 volunteers terminated their involvement, which represents a 7% reduction of the 125 study respondents. The retention rate for the experimental group was 91% (n=60) and for the control group was 95% (n=56).

A between group analysis on the retention variables revealed no statistically significant difference between group assignment and those who terminated or remained with the program. A chi-square analysis revealed no significant difference between those volunteers who terminated and those who remained in terms of their level of education or if they knew someone with a developmental disability. Post-test data were used for both types of analyses, since the pre-test represented 100% of the volunteer population.

Table 2

Correlation coefficients between the mediating and dependent variables

Mediating variables	Visits	Attendance	n
OBSE	.15	.21	53
Program self-efficacy	.32**	.19	54
Self-esteem	.03	.08	54
General satisfaction	.27*	.32**	54
Commitment	.22*	.33**	54
Level of frustration	-.01	-.05	54

* $p < .01$; ** $p < .001$

The Intervention Impact

The analyses performed to test Hypotheses Three through Six were repeated measures MANOVAs and ANOVAs. When statistical significance was found in the group by time effect in a MANOVA analysis, a repeated measures ANOVA was performed for each dependent variable to assess the significance of the trend between time pre-test and post-test. When a significant group by time effect was found by the repeated measures ANOVA, a Scheffé post hoc test was performed to learn if the differences in the means over time were statistically significant. The Scheffé post hoc test represents a conservative approach to examining the difference in the means between pre-test and post-test within each group (Scheffé, 1959; Shavelson, 1988).

The means in the tables which present the results of the repeated measures analyses show an interesting trend in which the experimental group increases and the control group decreases. The Scheffé post hoc confirmed these trends to be statistically significant.

Self-Efficacy

The third hypothesis, that members of the experimental group should feel more self-efficacious in their advocacy efforts than members of the control group, was supported by the present study. A repeated measures MANOVA was performed on general self-efficacy (GSE), program self-efficacy and organization-based self-

esteem(OBSE) to assess the extent to which the experimental and control groups change over time. Follow-up repeated measures ANOVA's were performed to examine the trends.

The results of the repeated measures MANOVA showed that there was a significant group by time effect (Hotellings $T = .95$, est. $F [3,104] = 33.0$, $p < .001$). The results of the follow-up repeated measures ANOVAs, reported in Table 3, indicated significant group by time effects for all self-efficacy measures, with one exception, general self-efficacy (GSE).

In addition, Scheffé post hoc comparison tests were performed on the program self-efficacy and OBSE measures for each group. In each case, members of the experimental group significantly increased in their perception of program self-efficacy ($t [52] = 6.66$, $p < .01$); and their mean score on the OBSE, ($t [52] = 6.66$, $p < .01$) while the members of the control group significantly decreased in program self-efficacy, ($t [52] = 4.66$, $p < .01$); and their mean score on the OBSE ($t [52] = 3.33$, $p < .01$).

Although there was a theoretical premise that OBSE would be highly related to feelings of self-efficacy, this sample did not support this position (Wood & Bandura, 1989; Pierce, J., Gardner, D., Cummings, L., & Dunham, R., 1989)). The correlation between OBSE and the two self-efficacy measures were: GSE, $r = .14$; and program self-efficacy, $r = .21$.

Table 3

Means (and SDs) of self-efficacy measures and F coefficients for Group X Time design

Self-efficacy Measure		Assessment Time				
		Pre-test	Post-test	Group Effect	Time Effect	Group X Time Effect
group	n	M (SD)	M (SD)	F (df)	F (df)	F (df)
Program efficacy				.52(1,107)	7.55(1,107)*	91.82(1,107)*
experimental	54	3.30(.44)	3.60(.32)			
control	54	3.50(.43)	3.20(.54)			
General efficacy				.00(1,107)	.06(1,107)	.55(1,107)
experimental	55	3.12(.73)	3.10(.69)			
control	54	3.11(.84)	3.12(.86)			
OBSE				1.68(1,106)	2.74(1,106)	27.23(1,106)*
experimental	54	1.91(.78)	2.05(.75)			
control	54	1.96(.77)	1.74(.60)			

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

General Satisfaction

The fourth hypothesis, that members of the experimental group should feel more satisfied with the monitor program than members of the control group, was supported. A repeated measures MANOVA was performed to assess the extent to which the groups' levels of satisfaction changed over time. The results indicated that a significant group by time effect was found for the two satisfaction variables (Hotellings T = .645, F [2,102] = 32.92, p < .001). The results of the repeated measures ANOVAs, which are found in Table 4, indicated that there was a significant group by time effect for both general satisfaction and levels of frustration between pre-test and post-test.

The Scheffe post hoc comparison test for general satisfaction revealed that there was a significant increase in the experimental group's level of general satisfaction with the program between pre-test and post-test (t [50] = 6.66, p < .01), while there was a significant decrease in the control group's level of general satisfaction (t [51] = 3.33, p < .01). The Scheffe post hoc comparison for the level of frustration revealed that the experimental group significantly decreased in the level of frustration that they felt between pre-test and post-test (t [53] = 7.33, p < .01). However, no significant change in the level of frustration was found for the control group between pre-test and post-test.

To further assess the impact of the intervention on the experimental group in terms of the frustrations felt, four of the nine frustration items, two of which were addressed by the intervention, and two of which were not, were examined by

Table 4

Means (and SDs) of satisfaction measures and F coefficients for Group X Time design

Satisfaction Measure		Assessment Time: Pre-test	Assessment Time: Post-test	Group Effect	Time Effect	Group X Time Effect
group	n	M (SD)	M (SD)	F (df)	F (df)	F (df)
General satisfaction				.63(1,103)	.08(1,103)	25.41(1,103)*
experimental	52	5.44(.83)	5.56(.89)			
control	53	5.68(.68)	5.55(.79)			
Frustrations				1.86(1,107)	17.26(1,107)*	44.33(1,107)*
experimental	55	2.23(1.9)	1.07(.21)			
control	54	1.90(1.6)	2.18(1.3)			

* $p < .001$

chi-square analyses. The two frustrations which were addressed by the intervention were, the assessment forms used during the visits and access to the group homes. The two frustration items which were not addressed by the intervention were, the interactions between the monitors and the group home staff and the monthly group home visits. The results of the chi-square analyses, which are reported in Table 5, revealed significant differences between the two groups on their level of frustration with the assessment forms that they use during group home visits, and their limited access to the group homes at post-test. More members in the experimental group showed less frustrations on both variables than the members of the control group. Thus, the intervention had an impact on reducing the frustration levels for the forms and group home access.

Participation (Dependent) Variables

The fifth hypothesis, that the members in the experimental group should visit the group homes more often and should attend more monitor meetings than the members in the control group, was supported.

A repeated measures MANOVA yielded a significant group by time effect for group home visits and attendance at local meetings (Hotellings $T = 1.49$, F [2,105] $= 78.04$, $p < .001$). Since a significant difference was found, separate repeated measures ANOVA's were performed for each dependent variable, the results of which are reported in Table 6. In both cases, a significant group by time effect was found.

Table 5

χ^2 coefficients of four items from the Frustration Index

(N = 109; experimental = 55, control = 54)

Frustration Variable	group	Assessment Time: Pre-test n (%)	Assessment Time: Post-test n (%)
Forms			
	experimental	35 (63)	4 (6)
	control	23 (42)	31 (58)
χ^2		NS	29.16*
Staff interactions			
	experimental	16 (30)	16 (31)
	control	17 (29)	18 (33)
χ^2		NS	NS
Group home access			
	experimental	20 (38)	9 (15)
	control	26 (47)	27 (51)
χ^2		NS	12.16*
Monthly visits			
	experimental	6 (11)	4 (7)
	control	5 (8)	7 (13)
χ^2		NS	NS

* $p < .001$

Table 6

Means (and SDs) of the dependent variables and F coefficients for Group X Time design

Visits & Attendance		Assessment Time		Group Effect	Time Effect	Group X Time Effect
		Pre-test	Post-test			
group	n	M (SD)	M (SD)	F (df)	F (df)	F (df)
Visits				2.99(1,107)	14.76(1,107)*	12.58(1,107)*
experimental	55	2.82(2.14)	3.75(1.85)			
control	54	2.54(1.51)	2.57(1.33)			
Attendance				8.26(1,107)	26.69(1,107)*	11.27(1,107)*
experimental	55	1.58(.12)	2.53(.63)			
control	54	1.44(1.7)	1.69(1)			

* $p < .001$

The Scheffé post hoc test indicated that there was a significant increase in the number of group home visits and meetings attended by members of the experimental group between pre-test and post-test (t [53] = 5.29, $p < .01$; t [53] = 5.79, $p < .01$, respectively). While there was a significant decrease in the control group's home visits, (t [52] = 2.77, $p < 01$.), there was no significant change in their attendance behavior.

Program Commitment

The sixth hypothesis, that the members of the experimental group should have a stronger sense of commitment to the program than the members of the control group was not supported by the present sample. The repeated measures ANOVA yielded no significant trends between per-test and post-test on organizational commitment. Since no significant trends were found, no further analyses were performed.

Summary

As predicted, the volunteers in the experimental group did increase in their level of perceived program self-efficacy and general satisfaction with the program as well as in their level of program participation. This observation was consistent with the study's primary theoretical perspective on empowerment. The ability of the

volunteers to directly manipulate those factors that they deemed to be barriers to effective monitoring can increase volunteers' perceptions of program self-efficacy and general satisfaction and levels of participation.

In addition to verifying the gains in the treatment group,this study noted a downward trend in the control group. Volunteers displayed decreases in feelings of program self-efficacy, general satisfaction with the program and level of participation between pre-test and post-test assessments. Although this trend was not specifically addressed in the hypotheses, the theoretical perspectives underlying this study would indicate that it should have been anticipated. Research studies have demonstrated the upward spiral and have suggested that the inverse would be likely to occur (Wood & Bandura, 1989, Morris & Sherman, 1981). The development of the hypotheses in this study was in the context of examining the positive effect of an empowerment strategy, and the potential negative changes in the control group were not adequately addressed. This observation provides some evidence for speculating that the intervention had an even stronger impact on the volunteers in the experimental group, since the groups were not significantly different in their levels of program self-efficacy, general satisfaction or program participation prior to the intervention implementation. It might be assumed that not only did the intervention increase perceptions and participation, but it also countered a downward trend.

Two results were not consistent with the hypotheses of this study. The levels of general self-efficacy and commitment remained stable for the volunteers in the experimental group. These findings are further explored in the following section.

Discussion

The data provide empirical support for some of the hypotheses of this study. Also observed have been trends consistent with the theoretical perspectives explicated above. However, other interesting results emerged which did not confirm others of the hypotheses presented. The discussion will first focus on those hypothesized relationships confirmed by the data. These include program self-efficacy, general satisfaction and the two outcome participation variables: group home visits and meeting attendance. The discussion will then switch to those hypotheses not confirmed by the data, which include organization-based self-esteem, general self-efficacy and commitment.

Program Self-Efficacy

As demonstrated by the results, the volunteers in the experimental group significantly increased their perception of program self-efficacy, while the control group volunteers significantly decreased. As predicted, the observed trend in the experimental group may have been due to the volunteers' ability to exercise control over the factors that they perceived to be influencing the effectiveness of the monitor program. The volunteers identified and manipulated factors which they perceived to be barriers to their efforts to improve the quality of life in the group homes. Such

factors included the lack of clear program goals, the lack of a comprehensive monitor program plan and tasks, and the unresponsiveness of the agencies within the group home system to the volunteers' efforts and suggestions. It seems this involvement may have enhanced their expectations that they could improve the quality of life in the group homes. Support for this explanation is found in several research endeavors, including goal setting (Mento, Steel & Karren, 1987; Locke, Latham & Erez, 1988), self-efficacy (Wood & Bandura,1989), organizational satisfaction (Shore & Martin, 1989), and organizational commitment (Steers, 1977; Morris & Sherman, 1981). The common theme among these studies, which was also observed here, is that positive perceptions of situations may be enhanced through direct involvement in organizational activities, especially if such involvement leads to the fulfillment of expectations, which in turn may enhance positive outcomes, such as increased participation.

An inverse trend could also be explained in the same manner. Negative perceptions could be reinforced through the inability to fulfill expectations which eventually may lead to decreased participation outcomes. Such may have been the case for the volunteers in the control group who significantly decreased in their perception of program self-efficacy.

This general downward trend has also been observed by Bandura (1982), who asserted that individuals who do not feel that they can accomplish a task will not continue to attempt that task. Decreased attempts at tasks will impact on the level of participation, which has been partly determined by individuals' perceptions of

their ability to affect the situation. Lower levels of participation result in the obtainment of fewer goals which can adversely impact on satisfaction, which then determines future levels of perceived self-efficacy and future expectations. The fact that the volunteers in the control group not only decreased in their level of perceived program self-efficacy but also in their level of satisfaction with the program and their level of monitoring activity (participation), is consistent with Bandura's hypothesis.

The trend observed in the experimental group in terms of program self-efficacy corroborates two other theoretical perspectives; the first is that the obtainment of personal goals enhances a sense of self-efficacy (Wood & Bandura, 1989). As noted in the results, 79% of the volunteers became involved with the monitor program to fulfill their personal goal, namely to improve the quality of life in the group homes. Through the intervention strategies, the volunteers in the experimental group directly revised aspects of the monitor program that had precluded them from realizing their personal goal. This empowerment intervention demonstrates Wood and Bandura's assertion that the obtainment of personal goals enhances individuals' expectation of future rewards. Such expectations then lead to the initiation of self-directed behavior to pursue those goals. In the present case, the empowerment intervention represented the volunteers' self-directed behavior, and their personal goal was the improvement of the quality of life in the group homes.

The second theoretical perspective supported by this study places importance on the role of volunteers within an agency and their ability to fulfill their expectations of personal rewards (Houghland, Turner & Hendricks, 1988; Gamm &

Kassab, 1983; Gidron, 1987). Since volunteers choose to affiliate with an agency based on their expectations of future obtainment of personal rewards, their perception of self-efficacy will be determined by the fulfillment of their expectations (Gidron, 1987). At pre-test 50% of the volunteers in the experimental group and 56% of the volunteers in the control group reported that their personal expectations had been met by the monitor program. The correlation between the volunteers' perceived program self-efficacy and their feelings of fulfilled expectations was a significant .37 ($p < .05$), consistent with the findings of Houghland, Turner and Hendricks (1988) and Wood and Bandura (1989). The present empowerment intervention was the vehicle that the volunteers used to fulfill their personal expectations which enhanced their effectiveness as monitors. At post-test, 76% of the volunteers in the experimental group reported and 59% of the volunteers in the control group reported having their expectations met, yielding a significant 26% increase in the experimental group and a slight decrease in the control group.

The above findings have important implications for volunteers and agencies with which they affiliate. The central focus in terms of volunteer self-efficacy seems to be the interaction between fulfillment of volunteer expectations and articulation of agency mission and goals. As hypothesized by Conger and Kanungo (1989), identification of personal needs and expectations could help agency managers clarify and predict the goodness of fit between their goals and agency operation and the level of employee satisfaction, performance and turnover. The empowerment intervention represented the identification process which impacted on the interaction

between volunteer needs and expectations and agency management and mission.

Satisfaction

A significant increase was observed in the level of satisfaction with the monitor program for the volunteers in the experimental group three months after they implemented the intervention. There are two salient issues here. The first one is that the volunteers in the experimental group had the opportunity to take on more tasks, as well as to follow through with the existing monitor tasks to completion. This is consistent with Hackman and Lawler (1971) who postulated that satisfaction increases when individuals have the opportunity to gain a sense of the entirety of a task as well as to be able to perform a variety of tasks.

The second issue is that both task entirety and variety for the volunteers in this study were specifically related to the goals and expectations articulated by the volunteers, and thus the inclusion of those in the empowerment intervention strategies led to the increase in general satisfaction. Ivancevich & McMahon (1982) stressed the importance of recognizing goal and feedback specificity.

The intervention strategies represented the integration of the two issues related to the tasks noted above. Changes in the tasks involved the expansion of existing group home visit tasks (entirety) and inclusion of tasks not directly related to group home visits (variety). Both types of tasks involved feedback processes that

were specifically related to the volunteers' personal goals; to improve the quality of life in the group homes. Since both types of changes occurred, as demonstrated by the post-test manipulation check, it may be assumed that increased satisfaction was a result of increased task entirety and variety, coupled with feedback and goal specificity, an expansion of Hackman and Lawler's (1971) theory.

The Frustration Index provides further evidence of the volunteers' increase in their general satisfaction on a different dimension. The index listed particular mediating factors that the volunteers identified as having a strong negative influence on their ability to be effective monitors. As stated by Shore and Martin (1989) and Van De Ven and Ferry (1980), mediating factors such as co-workers, supervisors, and so forth, can influence an individual's sense of satisfaction with an organization. Since the present intervention was a direct manipulation of mediating factors that the volunteers perceived to be barriers to the monitor program, it could be assumed that the decrease in the Frustration Index would substantiate the increased sense of satisfaction. The correlation between the frustration index and the JDS general satisfaction sub-scale was significant ($r = -.27$, $p < .05$).

The Frustration index also served a second purpose. It provided an opportunity to assess the volunteers' feelings about specific elements of the monitor program that the volunteers identified to be problematic and that they were able to directly change through the intervention. This intervention process refers back to the issue of task specificity discussed above. As noted in the results section of this study, at post-test, the volunteers in the experimental group only felt less frustrated with

those mediating factors (the assessment forms and access to the group homes) that were addressed by the intervention strategies. Their level of frustration did not significantly change for the aspects of the program that they chose not to change.

The results further show that the volunteers in the control group did not significantly change in their level of frustration with specific aspects of the program. Although, their level of satisfaction significantly decreased, as indicated by the JDS general satisfaction sub-scale, their level of frustration did not. One might speculate that once the frustrating factors have been identified, the level of frustration with those factors might not change, but the adverse impact that such factors have on individuals' level of satisfaction continues. Thus, the volunteers' level of frustration would not change, but their general level of satisfaction would. Measurement constraints may partly contribute to this observation, because the Frustration Index comprised dichotomous variables. It might have been more useful for the volunteers to indicate their levels of frustration on a likert scale. This would have made it possible to assess the relationship between the level of frustration with the mediating factor and the type of intervention strategy or task that volunteers used to address that factor without the restriction of range imposed by the current measuring system.

The Dependent (Participation) Variables

The volunteers in the experimental group did significantly increase their group home visits and meeting attendance between pre-test and post-test. Although, the intervention strategies did not directly address aspects of either participation variable, the volunteers' outcome behaviors did increase.

As stated by several researchers (Conger & Kanungo, 1989; Morris & Sherman, 1981, Hackman & Lawler, 1971) mediating factors such as individuals' perceptions, the mission goals of an organization, incentives, co-workers, supervisors, can influence performance outcome. The strategies employed by the volunteers of the present study addressed mediating factors that were identified as barriers which blocked the volunteers from achieving their goals. Through the manipulation of these mediating factors, the participation level of the volunteers in the experimental group increased.

The number of visits to the group homes by the volunteers in the control group significantly decreased, while their level of meeting attendance did not change. Although, the reason for the decrease in monthly visits may be due to a demoralizing factor, which random assignment cannot take into account, the reason for decline is consistent with the theory discussed in the previous sections of this paper. The decline was probably due to a continued feeling of ineffectiveness by the volunteers, who were aware that they had to wait three months before they could implement the intervention. Although they knew that they would be involved in the intervention,

they were still dealing with the present situation, which was adversely impacting on their ability to participate.

Two processes seemed to have occurred simultaneously in this study. If we can assume that the volunteers were displaying a downward trend in terms of their overall participation with the monitor program, then it might be assumed that all volunteers would continue to decrease in their levels of program participation, because of their lack of confidence in their ability to make changes (Wood & Bandura, 1989). Then we might further assume that the present intervention countered the downward trend for the volunteers in the experimental group, while the volunteers in the control group continued to display the original downward trend.

Although there is evidence to support the above assumptions, more data collection time periods would have provided further empirical support. For example, there should have been at least two pre-test time periods which would have detected a overall trend prior to the intervention. In addition, a follow-up assessment should have been done after the volunteers from the control group implemented the intervention. This would have provided further evidence to detect if the intervention countered the downward trend as hypothesized.

As stated earlier, models and theories derived from research on employee behavior have been adequately applied to the volunteers in the present study. However, it seems that the notion of personal expectations and goals play a more prominent role in influencing the volunteers' level of participation in the present study than for employees in general.

Further examination of the interactions between the personal characteristics of the volunteers and the goals and management processes of the organization is needed. Conger and Kanungo (1989) provided a model of empowerment which takes such interactions into account for employees, while Ilsley and Niemi (1981) found this process to be true for volunteers. The enhancement of outcome variables is through the manipulation of organizational and contextual factors which can impact on personal characteristics, perceptions and expectations.

Organization-Based Self-Esteem

Although there was a significant increase in the level of organization-based self-esteem for the volunteers in the experimental group, surprisingly, the results of this study did not provide support for the inclusion of the OBSE as a related measure of self-efficacy. The correlation between OBSE and program self-efficacy was nonsignificant ($r = .21$). Perhaps self-esteem in terms of organizational affiliation was not as relevant for the volunteers in this study in terms of their perceived self-efficacy, since the volunteers had a specific goal in mind; that of improved quality of life in the group homes. Thus, rather than having a need to feel good about their affiliation with ARC, the volunteers may have had a stronger need to feel good about the quality of life in the homes.

This position is somewhat substantiated by the fact that 63% of the volunteers

chose to affiliate with ARC in order to improve the quality of life in the group homes. In addition, 92% of the volunteers did not find their affiliation with ARC to be frustrating which would indicate that their level of organization-based self-esteem would be high. The correlation between the volunteers' level of OBSE and their satisfaction with ARC was a significant .29 ($p < .05$).

Although the level of organization-based self-esteem for the volunteers in the experimental group changed significantly between pre-test and post-test and significant correlations were obtained between OBSE and satisfaction and commitment, this measure did not act as an indicator of self-efficacy in this sample. Further research may be needed to ascertain the meaning of organization-based self-esteem in terms of volunteers.

General Self-Efficacy

The first of the hypotheses not supported by the present study to be discussed here is the hypothesis regarding general self-efficacy. Although, the intervention had a positive impact on the volunteers' perception of program self-efficacy, the intervention did not significantly impact on the volunteers' sense of general self-efficacy. In addition, the results of the study demonstrated that the volunteers' general feelings of self-efficacy was not a significant factor in increasing volunteer participation, or influential in determining the volunteers' sense of accomplishing

their monitoring goals.

Several explanations may account for the present findings. One reason may be that a measure of general self-efficacy was too broad, and thus was not robust enough to have an impact on a person's sense of accomplishment with a specific task. As stated earlier, task specificity may be an important factor in enhancing positive perceptions and outcomes. In addition, there may be mediating factors such as commitment to a goal, or satisfaction of personal expectations that are more influential in determining an individual's overall feeling of self-efficacy. It might be more plausible to suggest that the volunteers, the majority of whom were parents (65%), were determined to make the monitor program work, because they were committed to a specific goal; the welfare of their children. This explanation seems valid in light of the previous findings and assertions noted above, which speak to the specificity of the problems and tasks.

It seems that a consistent pattern has emerged in the results, which is that specific attitudes and beliefs can alter and be altered by actions that impact on specific problems either directly or through mediating structures. It would be logical to suspect that measures of global constructs would not provide insight into the relationships between individuals and their organizational contexts. The fact that the general commitment levels of the volunteers were not altered by the intervention provides further evidence of this position.

Perhaps it may have been inappropriate to measure the volunteers' general feeling of self-efficacy, because the intervention strategy targeted structures that had

specific impacts on the program and not individuals. Thus, the measurement of internal global psychological constructs may be inconsistent with the theoretical guidelines of this intervention and study, in which the independent variable was manipulated by the study participants who identified the relevant targets for change in the monitor program. Thus, the results of the present study seem to demonstrate that those constructs which are more global and internally based did not change between pre-and post-test, where as those constructs that were program specific did significantly change between pre-test post-test.

Two other possible explanations for the present results involve methodological considerations. The first explanation may be that three months may not have been enough time to detect a change in the global constructs. The second explanation for the lack of change in general self-efficacy may be measurement error. As indicated in the correlation matrix in Table 1, the measure of general self-efficacy did not correlate well with any of the other measures in the study, and the internal consistency coefficient was only moderate.

Organizational Commitment

There are two possible explanations why the level of commitment felt by the volunteers in the experimental group did not significantly change. The first reason may be that the volunteers' commitment to the program was the motivating factor

for them to not abandon the program, but instead attempt to change it. This speaks to the possibility that commitment may determine the dynamic interaction between the individual and the organization. The interaction in this case is the congruence between the volunteers' personal expectations of rewards and the monitor program mission: to improve the quality of life in the group homes. Thus, it might have been inappropriate to measure the success of the intervention in terms of its influence on the level of volunteer commitment. As stated by Mowday, Porter and Steers (1982), three aspects comprise organizational commitment. They are (a) a strong belief in organizational goals, (b) a willingness to exert effort and, (c) a desire to remain. All three characteristics were present at pre-test as demonstrated by volunteers' responses to the OCQ items. The fact that only 7% of the volunteers terminated the program between pre-test and post-test demonstrates that, in light of the frustrations that the volunteers felt about the monitor program, they were willing to remain.

The second reason for the lack of a significant change in the level of commitment felt by the volunteers may be that perhaps the volunteers had a greater sense of commitment to their children than to the program. This is somewhat supported by the fact that the majority of the volunteers joined the program with the expectation that they would improve the quality of life in the group homes. As stated earlier, 79% of the volunteers indicated that their main reason for choosing to volunteer was to improve the quality of life for their children. The monitor program was the only formal mechanism that these individuals had to influence the conditions of the group homes. Thus, the decision to affiliate with the program and later

revamp it, may have been the result of the commitment the volunteers felt toward their children and not toward the program.

The major implication here is that the level of commitment may have been a strong motivating factor in influencing the volunteers' desire to change the program rather than abandon it. The fact that the level of commitment remained stable for both groups of volunteers suggests that this might be the case. In addition, the attrition rate for both groups is quite low. Only 7% of the total volunteer population terminated the program between pre-test and post-test.

The Process of Empowerment

Although, the data in the present study demonstrate that the empowerment intervention did occur and had a significant impact on the volunteers' perceived program self-efficacy, general satisfaction and level of participation, it is possible that factors other than the intervention strategies influenced the outcomes observed in the experimental group. One such factor may be the attention that the researcher gave to the volunteers. In order to rule out an attention factor, the study design would have called for a third group of volunteers who did not meet with the researcher on a regular basis, but who did implement the intervention strategies on their own. If significant increases in the dependent variables were observed in this third group, attention could be ruled out as a possible cause. However, there were not enough

participants in this study to form a third group. Groups with small numbers of subjects lowers the power or the ability to detect differences.

It is also possible to suggest that part of the empowerment process does include paying attention to a group. Although, it is difficult to assess how much the attention from the researcher affected the outcome behaviors of the volunteers, there is empirical evidence that shows that the volunteers in the experimental group did not significantly decrease their levels of frustration with all aspects of the program. If one assumes that attention could influence behavior, then one would expect to see significant changes in the variables across the board. This was not the case in the present study.

The definition of empowerment used in this study implies that empowerment is more than just involvement, which primarily entails engagement in some type of behavior regardless of the relationship of that behavior to anything else. Empowerment, as defined in the present study indicates the use of behavior that is directly related to role clarification and access to information deemed necessary by the study participants. In order to articulate this definition of empowerment, the study design would have called for a third group of volunteers who did not engage in the empowerment strategies or other behaviors that were directly related to goal attainment. If no significant increases in the dependent variables were observed in this third group, then we could assume that the empowerment strategies in this study were not indicators of involvement. However, there were not enough participants in this study to form a third group.

This empirical study has contributed to the explication of two unique concepts that have not been fully articulated in published articles; the first is that of empowerment as a feedback process, which was treated as the independent variable and manipulated by the study participants. The second contribution, discussed in the next section, was the application of the O'Connor model of competence (1989).

This study did not empirically measure empowerment as a dependent or outcome variable. The empowerment process was the independent variable which was directly manipulated by the volunteers who had specific expectations as to the outcome; namely to be more effective in their monitoring activities. The main point is that the explication of empowerment as an outcome; namely that individuals acquire power, was not the focus of the present study. Rather, this study provided an example of empowerment as a feedback process through which volunteers clarified their monitoring roles and obtained information that they deemed necessary for them to effectively make changes in the program.

Access to information and clarification of roles are the two key elements of an empowerment process as identified by Rappaport (1984). Both aspects, that of access to information and role clarity, were incorporated into the opportunities for influence strategy of the present intervention.

Defining the empowerment process in terms of information accessibility is further supported by the research findings on feedback and performance (Ilgen, Fisher & Taylor, 1979; Greller & Harold, 1975). The notion that the volunteers should have control of and direct access to information that they deemed necessary

to improve the monitor program was in part, borrowed from the work of Greller and Harold (1975) who maintained that the closer the source of information is to an individual, the more reliable the individual will find the information. In terms of the present intervention, the volunteers were the source of the information for identifying and rectifying problems.

The second key element of an empowerment process as defined by Rappaport, that or role clarity, has been articulated by the research findings of Ivancevich and McMahon (1982) who maintained that if individuals perceive that they have control over the setting of program goals, their expectation for future outcomes is more positive. Not only did the volunteers in the present study identify the program and personal goals, but they also reformulated their roles as monitors in terms of those goals.

The impact of combination of information access and role clarity on outcome behaviors (which represents the major strategies of the present intervention) has been examined by Mento, Steel and Karren (1987) who found that specific feedback and specific goals most effectively enhanced individuals' motivation and performance. The fact that the volunteers utilized self-generated feedback processes to develop and implement the present intervention, and were successful in increasing their perceived self-efficacy, satisfaction and their own level of participation, namely group home visits and meeting attendance, is strong evidence for the influential role of such feedback.

Since these processes represented the independent variable in the present

study, and a manipulation check verified that such activities did occur in the experimental group and significant changes were observed in both the mediating and dependent variables, it can be assumed that the feedback processes positively influenced the outcomes of the study. Such results lend support to the notion that specific goals and feedback are the most effective means to enhance positive perceptions and performance (Mento, Steel & Karren, 1987). This has one important implication in terms of the present study. It offers a possible explanation for the change in the volunteers' perceptions and behavior within a three month period. Although, the volunteers were eager to change the monitor program, they were not swayed by the prospect of any type of change. They had a specific agenda, and they were seeking specific ways to address that agenda. As articulated earlier, the intervention strategies were designed to address very specific issues through the manipulation of specified mediating factors that were considered to act as barriers to the volunteers' abilities to be effective. Changes in the perceptions of volunteers were linked to specific aspects, such as program self-efficacy versus general self-efficacy.

An example of the role of specificity will further clarify this important assertion. Prior to the intervention, the volunteers identified several problems and developed strategies that specifically alleviated those problems. For example, at pre-test, 63% of the volunteers found the assessment forms to be frustrating to use for a variety of reasons. At post-test, only 7% of the volunteers in the experimental group found the forms to be frustrating, where as 69% of the volunteers in the

control group were still frustrated with the forms. The dramatic jump of over 57% of the volunteers in the experimental group who were no longer frustrated with the forms was due to the fact that the volunteers revised the forms and the process of reporting the information. The revision of the forms partly enhanced the volunteers' perception of self-efficacy and level of satisfaction. This change, coupled with the manipulation of other mediating factors, lead to the significant increase in the dependent variables.

This intervention provided an innovative method to identify and manipulate factors that can influence the relationship between goal commitment and performance. As Latham (1982) and Locke, Latham and Erez (1988) concluded, internal and external factors and their interactions can strongly influence the role of goal setting in performance outcome. By utilizing the internal sources of standards (goals) and achievements, namely the volunteers, as developers and implementors of the intervention, salient factors that could impact on the ability of the volunteers to enhance the quality of life in the group homes have been identified and incorporated into the monitoring process.

Since the results of past studies that have examined the relationship between goal setting and performance have been inconclusive, perhaps the tenets of goal commitment theory may be best served through studies such as this one, which is longitudinal and places the manipulation of the influential factors, as identified by the participants in their control. This study demonstrates that empowerment and feedback processes compliment each other and appropriately operationalize models

of competency building and goal setting.

The task of identifying the key players in the monitor program system and developing strategies for intervention with those key players was the primary responsibility of the volunteers. The investigator chose to collaboratively design the intervention with the volunteers, because they represented internal sources of feedback, standards and assessment of achievement as articulated by O'Connor (1989).

Application of the O'Connor Model of Competence

The use of the O'Connor (1989) model of competence in the present intervention demonstrates that strategies can be developed which identify potential conflict between the various constituents of an organization, and impel change agents to seriously consider that the group who is implementing an empowerment intervention is a formidable one. Thus, in the present case the volunteers were chosen to be the internal source of standards and assessment of achievement, because they were responsible for the execution of the program, and thus the most appropriate group to identify the barriers as well as the solutions. The end result was that 15 different local chapters accomplished the general goals of ARC/M while setting their own goals, strategies and measures of achievement.

The theoretical tenets of the O'Connor model are very similar to the tenets

of goal setting and performance outcome models, which basically state that the relationship between goal setting and performance is mediated by both personal and situational factors (Locke, 1986; Ivancevich & McMahon, 1982). When internal sources of standards and achievement identify the problems, as well as the factors and mechanisms needed to rectify the problem, the processes and outcomes are closely linked to such sources. In this case, the processes had been identified as access to information and role clarity, which are components of goal setting and feedback processes. These two processes were operationalized through the opportunities for influence and social support strategies of the intervention.

The O'Connor model provides a useful framework for future interventionists and groups desiring change to identify the sources, targets and strategies involved in change. Future research in the area of empowerment and intervention should involve the application of this model or its derivative.

Methodological Considerations

The measurement model used in this study treated the mediational variables of self-efficacy, general satisfaction, organization-based self-esteem and commitment as separate constructs. Since this measurement model has received empirical support, that these variables represent separate constructs, in the organization behavior research, it seemed valid to utilize this measurement model here. However,

as demonstrated in Table 1 in the results section, significant correlations were obtained between several of the mediational variables, which may call into question the validity of the measurement model used. Justification for using the present measurement model comes from the fact that very few measurement models of psychological constructs have been developed and tested with a volunteer population. Thus, it seems appropriate to use existing measurement models that have been developed and supported by research on populations with similar characteristics as the population presently being tested. The apparent lack of differentiation of the mediational variables may be due to a variety of factors including, but not limited to the type of population being tested. Until further research using this measurement model on the volunteer population is done, it is imprudent to deem this measurement model to be invalid.

A question may be raised as to whether volunteers in the experimental group were particularly receptive to change. Since there was random assignment, and if the outcome of the experimental group was the product of an inclination or a simple receptivity to change, it should have been similarly evident in the control group as well. That the control group not only did not increase, but displayed significant decreases (which is the opposite of the experimental group) in the mediating and dependent variables is evidence of the experimental group's responsiveness to treatment and not just a receptivity to change.

Another issue related to design is that random assignment cannot take into account the possible demoralization factor in the control group, as evidenced by their

downward trend in most of the major variables of the study. Although this trend may be the result of a sense of demoralization, this finding is consistent with the theoretical orientation of this study.

Longitudinal designs are more appropriate than cross-sectional designs for assessing trends, as evidenced by the present study. The pre-test post-test design of this study allowed for the assessment of significant increases and decreases in the mediating and dependent variables over time for both experimental groups. Although, significant trends were detected, it may be more conclusive to measure changes over a longer time period. For example, several pre-test and follow-up measures before and after the implementation of the intervention with both groups of volunteers would have provided more evidence to detect a trend in volunteer perceptions and behavior as well as the impact of the intervention over time.

The fact that one local chapter chose to not participate in the study may have caused a sampling bias problem. However, this was not viewed as a substantial threat, because the supervisors of the monitor program in that local chapter were operating under a different set of goals, principles and procedures than the rest of the local chapters involved in the study. For example, this local chapter was involved in monitoring group homes prior to the initiation of the present ARC program. Thus, the volunteers in that local chapter did not have the same expectations or problems as the participants in this study.

This study relied heavily on self-report measures, which typically represent a possible threat to validity. To compensate for this extensive use, selected behavioral

data were collected and established the validity of those measures.

In any field experimental design there must be concern about spill-over effects from the experimental to the control group. In this study control group members were carefully assessed at post-test to identify their involvement in any of the empowerment strategies. Only 2% of possible activities were engaged in by the volunteers in the control group, indicating there was not significant spill-over.

Conclusion

The major contribution of this study is the articulation and application of a theory of empowerment as a process. The results of this study suggest that it is possible to articulate a general paradigm that describes empowerment as a process to guide the development of intervention strategies rather than the more common consideration of empowerment as an outcome. In this instance, citizen volunteers articulated their own needs which led to the development of particular intervention strategies that addressed those needs. This process became ongoing as volunteers felt more efficacious and satisfied and thus increased their involvement. These enhanced levels of perceptions and participation by the individuals led to the increased effectiveness of the overall monitor program.

It is not necessary for researchers to identify those factors or their interactions that can influence changes in outcome behavior, because the most effective identification of such factors should come from the volunteers themselves. It is the

responsibility of the researcher to provide a model through which to implement interventions that enhance outcomes specified by study participants, as demonstrated in the present study.

Future research in this area should explore the interactions between the volunteer and agency with the purpose of enhancing the ability of volunteers to realize important personal goals and to increase the likelihood of agencies accomplishing necessary social goals. In conjunction with this needed research endeavor, it is time to move empowerment to a more articulated level through which models of social change interventions can be developed and implemented.

The major theoretical contribution of this study is the attempt to advance the theory of empowerment and to articulate an intervention that manipulated structures and processes rather than individuals. Such manipulation forces one to rethink the nature of the context around them, which is the initial step to change.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

Table 1

χ^2 coefficients of major categorical variables of the study at pre-test

	Group		
	Experimental(n = 66)	Control(n = 59)	
Variable	n(%)	n(%)	χ^2
Know someone with a disability	65(98)	56(95)	—
Relationship to a person with a disability			
parent	40(60)	40(89)	—
friend	12(18)	8(14)	—
relative	8(12)	3(5)	—
Reasons for volunteering			
improve the quality of life	41(62)	36(61)	—
Frustration with assessment form	38(58)	32(55)	5.60**
Frustration with group home staff	20(30)	17(28)	—
Frustration with group home access	25(38)	28(48)	—
Frustration with group home visits	7(10)	5(9)	—

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .001$

APPENDIX A

Table 2

Results of a test for homogeneity of conditions between the groups at pre-test

Variable	Group				
	Experimental		Control		
	n	M(SD)	n	M(SD)	F(df)
General self-efficacy	64	3.10(.77)	59	3.20(.86)	.46(1,123)
Program self-efficacy	66	3.30(.44)	59	3.15(.43)	2.47(1,123)
General satisfaction	66	5.50(.82)	59	5.60(.85)	.90(1,123)
Level of frustrations	66	2.20(1.80)	59	1.70(1.60)	2.08(1,123)
Commitment	65	5.50(.86)	59	5.50(.73)	.06(1,122)
Self-esteem	64	1.80(.76)	58	2.00(.85)	1.49(1,120)
Age (years)	64	52.00(13.50)	59	54.00(13.00)	1.15(1,123)
Length of program service (months)	64	20.00(12.60)	58	21.00(13.00)	.64(1,120)
# of monitor meetings attended within three months	65	1.70(1.70)	59	1.40(1.10)	1.75(1,122)
# of monitor vists within one month	65	2.70(1.90)	59	2.50(2.50)	2.11(1,122)
Level of education	55	2.50(1.40)	54	1.90(1.30)	7.48(1,107)*

* $p < .05$

APPENDIX A

Table 3

Results of a between group test for differences between Wayne County and the remaing counties (Wayne, n=34; the remaing counties, n=91)

Dependent variable	Group				
	Wayne		Other Counties		
	n	M(SD)	n	M(SD)	F(df)
General satisfaction	34	5.70(.76)	91	5.50(.85)	2.54(1,123)
level of frustration	34	2.20(1.60)	91	2.00(1.70)	.47(1,123)
Program self-efficacy	34	3.10(.38)	91	3.00(.36)	1.71(1,123)
General self-efficacy	34	3.00(.70)	91	3.10(.84)	.53(1,123)
Organizational-based self-esteem	33	1.70(.58)	89	2.00(.86)	3.70(1,120)
Organization commitment	34	5.60(.73)	90	5.40(.81)	1.33(1,122)
Age(years)	34	53.00(12.30)	91	52.00(14.00)	.01(1,123)
Group home visits (per month)	34	3.10(2.10)	90	2.60(1.90)	1.43(1,122)
Attendance at meetings (per three months)	34	1.70(1.00)	91	1.50(1.20)	.33(1,122)
Length of program involvement (months)	34	24.00(17.00)	88	19.00(11.00)	4.70(1,120)

APPENDIX A

Table 4

χ^2 coefficients for engagement in intervention strategies by each volunteer group posttest (N=109)

	Group		
	Experimental(n = 55)	Control(n = 54)	
Strategy	n(%)	n(%)	χ^2
Presentation in local community	16(29)	4(7)	8.47***
Presentation for state agencies	15(27)	5(9)	5.84**
Newsletter	2(3)	2(3)	.00
People first grp	7(13)	0(0)	5.37*
Attended other local chapters	3(6)	0(0)	1.33
Workshop for providers	21(38)	6(3)	16.73***
Attended training	8(10)	4(2)	5.7*
Trained DD to self-monitor	5(9)	1(2)	2.71
Compiled a manual	7(13)	0(0)	5.37*
Local coordinator dyads	7(13)	0(0)	8.75*

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

Table 1

Items of the generalized self-efficacy scale

---

1. I am a very determined person.
2. Sometimes things just don't seem worth the effort.
3. I would rather not try something that I'm not good at.
4. I can succeed in most any endeavor to which I set my mind.
5. Nothing is impossible if I really put my mind on it.
6. When I have difficulty getting what I want, I just try harder.
7. I have more will power than most people.

Based on a 7 point scale with 1 representing completely agree and 7 representing completely disagree.

APPENDIX B

Table 2

Program self-efficacy items

---

1. What is your overall impression of the citizen monitoring program as a whole in terms of having an impact on group homes?

Based on a 5 point scale (1 represents very bad impression and 5 represents very good impression).

2. My efforts as a volunteer monitor have made a difference in the group homes that I monitor.

Based on a 5 point scale (1 represents strongly disagree and 7 represents strongly agree).

3. Do you feel that the collective efforts of the state-wide volunteer monitoring program can make a difference? (yes/no).

4. Do you feel that you as a single volunteer can make a difference in the group homes that you monitor? (yes/no)

APPENDIX B

Table 3

Items of the organization-based self-esteem scale

1. I count around here	2. I am taken seriously
3. I am important	4. I am trusted
5. There is faith in me	6. I can make a difference
7. I am valuable	8. I am helpful
9. I am cooperative	

Based on a 5 point scale with 1 representing strongly agree and 5 representing strongly disagree.

APPENDIX B

Table 4

Items of the "general satisfaction" subscale of the job diagnostic survey

1. Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with the monitoring program.
2. I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I monitor.
3. I frequently think of quitting the monitoring program.
4. My own feelings generally are NOT affected much one way of the other by how well do my monitoring.

Based on a 7 point scale, with 1 representing strongly disagree and 7 representing strongly agree.

1. The amount of personal growth and development I get through monitoring.
2. The staff I talk to in the group homes.
3. The degree of respect and fair treatment I receive from my ARC supervisors.
4. The degree of respect and fair treatment I receive from the group home staff.
5. The feeling of worthwhile accomplishment I get from monitoring.
6. The amount of support and guidance I receive from my ARC supervisors.
7. The amount of independent thought and action I can have in my monitoring activities.
8. The chance to help the residents of the group homes.
9. The amount of challenge in monitoring.
10. The overall quality of the supervision I receive on my volunteer work.
11. The training I received to become a monitor.

Based on a 7 point scale with 1 representing extremely dissatisfied and 7 representing extremely satisfied.

APPENDIX B

Table 5

Items of the frustration index

We also want to know what aspects of your monitoring experience are frustrating to you, which will help us decide how to make changes in the program. Please place a check mark by those aspects of the monitoring experience that have been frustrating to you. You may mark as many as you feel are appropriate.

1. _____ The monitoring forms you use
2. _____ Working only with the group home staff
3. _____ Having little access to others/agencies who can make change happen in the group homes
4. _____ Monthly visits to the group homes
5. _____ The feedback you give to the group home staff
6. _____ The feedback you receive from ARC/M
7. _____ The lack of contact with the overall state monitoring efforts
8. _____ The local monitor meetings
9. _____ The communication channels between you and the rest of ARC/M
10. ____ Other (Please Specify) _____

APPENDIX B

Table 6

Items of the organization commitment questionnaire

___1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this program be successful.

___2. I talk up the ARC local chapter to my friends as a great organization to volunteer for.

___3. I feel very little loyalty to the local ARC.

___4. I find that my values and ARC's values are very similar.

___5. I could just as well be volunteering for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar.

___6. This local ARC really inspires the very best in me.

___7. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave ARC.

___8. I am extremely glad that I chose ARC to volunteer for over other organizations.

___9. There's not too much to be gained by sticking with ARC indefinitely.

___10. I really care about the fate of ARC monitoring program.

___11. For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to volunteer.

___12. Deciding to volunteer for ARC was a definite mistake on my part.

The items are based on a 7 point rating scale with 1 representing strongly disagree and 7 representing strongly agree.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

Anderson, J., Moore, L. (1977). The motivation to volunteer. Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 7(3), 120-125.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavior change. Psychological Review, 84, 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency.American Psychologist,37, 122-147.

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Conger, J., & Kanungo, R. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. Academy of Management Review, 13(3), 471-482.

Cook, T., & Campbell, D. (1979). Quasi-experimentation: design and analysis issues for field settings. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Dailey, R. (1986). Understanding organizational commitment for volunteers: Empirical and managerial implications. Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 15(1), 19-31.

Gamm, L., & Kassab, C. (1983). Productivity assessment of volunteer programs in not-for-profit human services organizations. Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 12(3), 23-38.

Gidron, B. (1987). Integration of vounteer workers into formal human service agencies: An organizational theory perspective. Journal of Applied Social Sciences, 11(2), 191-205.

Greller, M., & Herold, D. (1975). Sources of feedback: A preliminary investigation. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13, 244-256.

Hackman, J., & Lawler, E. (1971). Employee reactions to job characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 55, 259-286.

Hackman, J., & Oldham, G. (1974). The Job Diagnostic survey: An instrument for the Diagnosis of Jobs and the Evaluation of Job Redesign Projects. (Report No. 4). New Haven, CT: Department of Administrative Sciences, Yale University.

Hackman, J., & Oldham, G. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 159-170.

Houghland, J., Turner, H., & Hendricks, J. (1988). Rewards and impacts of participation in a gerontology extension program. Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 17(3-4), 19-35.

Huck, S., Cormier, W., & Bounds, W. (1974). Reading statistics and research. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Ilgen, D., Fisher, C., & Taylor,. (1979). Consequences of individual feedback on behavior in organizations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 64, 349-371.

Ilsley, P., & Niemi, J. (1981). Recruiting and training volunteers. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ivancevich, J., & McMahon, J. (1977). Task-goal attributes, higher order need strength and performance. Academy of Management Journal, 20(4), 552-563.

Ivancevich, J., & McMahon, J. (1982). Effects of goal setting, external feedback, and self-generated feedback on outcome variables: A field experiment. Academy of Management Journal, 25(2), 359-372.

Jenner, J. (1982). Participation, leadership and the role of volunteerism among selected women volunteers. Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 11(4), 27-38.

Kieffer, C. (1984). Citizen empowerment: A developmental perspective. Prevention in Human Services, 3, 9-36.

Koch, J., & Steers, R. (1978). Job attachment, satisfaction, and turnover among public sector employees. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 12, 119-128.

Latham, G. (1983). The role of goal setting in human resource management. In K. Rowland, & G. Ferris (Eds.), Research in personnel and human resources management, vol. 1 (pp. 169-199). Connecticut: Jai Press Inc.

Latham, G., Mitchell, T., & Dossett, D. (1978). Importance of participative goal setting and anticipated rewards on goal difficulty and job performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 63(2), 163-171.

Locke, E., Latham, G., & Erez, M. (1988). The determinants of goal commitment. Academy of Management Review, 13 (1), 23-39.

Locke, E., Frederick, E., Lee, C., & Bobko, P. (1984). Effect of self-efficacy, goals, and task strategies on task performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 69, 241-251.

Mento, A., Steel, R., & Karren, R. (1987). A meta-analytic study of the effects of goal setting in task performance, 1966-1984. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 39, 52-83.

Morris, J., & Sherman, J. (1981). Generalizability of an organizational commitment model. Academy of Management Journal, 24(3), 512-526.

Mowday, R., Porter, L., & Steers, R. (1982). Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism and turnover. New York: Academic Press.

Mowday, R., Steers, R., & Porter, L. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14, 224-247.

Naylor, J., Pritchard, R., & Ilgen, D. (1980). A theory of behavior in organizations. New York: Academic Press.

O'Connor, P. (1989, June). A competency model of community interventions: A theoretical proposal for change agents. Paper presented at the Biennial Division 27 Conference, Community Action and Research, East Lansing, Michigan.

Oldham, G., & Hackman, J. (1980). Work design in the organizational context. Research in Organizational Behavior, 2, 247-278.

Pierce, J., Gardner, D., Cummings, L., & Dunham, R. (1989). Organization- based self-esteem: Construct definition, measurement, and validation. Academy of Management Journal, 32(3), 622-648.

Porter, L. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14, 224-247.

Porter, L. & Lawler, E. (1968). Managerial attitudes and performance. Homewood, Illinois: Dossey Press.

Porter, L., Steers, R., Mowday, R., & Boulian, P. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatric technicians. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59, 603-609.

Rappaport, J. (1981). In praise of paradox: A social policy of empowerment over prevention. American Journal of Community Psychology, 9(1), 1-25.

Rappaport, J. (1984). Studies in Empowerment: Steps toward understanding and action. New York: Haworth Press.

Rappaport, J. (1987). Terms of empowerment/exemplars of prevention: Toward a theory of community psychology. American Journal of Community Psychology, 15(2), 121-147.

Roberts, K., & Glick, W. (1981). The job characteristics approach to task design: A critical review. Journal of Applied Psychology, 66 (2), 193-217.

Rothman, J., Erlich, J., & Teresa, J. (1981). Changing organizations and community programs. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Schorr, A. (1970). The tasks of volunteerism in the next decade. Child Welfare, 47(8), 425-434.

Shavelson, R. (1988). Statistical resoning for the behavioral sciences. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Scheffé, H. (1959) Analysis of variance. New York: Wiley Press.

Shore, L., & Martin, H.L. (1989). Job satisfaction and orgnizational commitment in relation to work performance and turnover intentions. Human Relations, 42(7), 625-638.

Steers, R. (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. Administrative Science Quarterly, 22, 46-56.

Steers, R., & Braunstein, D. (1976). A behaviorally-based measure of manifest needs in work settings. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 9, 251-266.

Steers, R., & Porter, L. (1974). Task-goal attributes. Psychological Bulletin, 81, 343-452.

Tipton, R., & Worthington, E. (1984). The measurement of generalized self- efficacy: A study of construct validity. Journal of Personality Assesment, 48, 545-548.

Van de ven, A., & Ferry, P. (1980).Measuring and assessing organizations. New York:Wiley.

Vroom, V. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: Wiley.

Wood, R., & Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory of organizational management. Academy of Management Review, 14(3), 361-384.

Zimmerman, M., & Rappaport, J. (1988). Citizen participation, perceived control, and psychological empowerment. American Journal of Community Psychology, 16(5), 725-750.