

University of Richmond

UR Scholarship Repository

Honors Theses

Student Research

4-14-1997

Empowerment in the United States Congress

James D. Mark
University of Richmond

Christopher J. Poulos

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.richmond.edu/honors-theses>



Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mark, James D. and Poulos, Christopher J., "Empowerment in the United States Congress" (1997). *Honors Theses*. 760.

<https://scholarship.richmond.edu/honors-theses/760>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND LIBRARIES



3 3082 00638 4258

97631

Empowerment in the United States Congress

By

James D. Mark and Christopher J. Poulos

Senior Project

Jepson School of Leadership Studies

University of Richmond

Richmond, VA

April, 1997

**LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND
VIRGINIA 23173**

Empowerment in the United States Congress

by

James D. Mark
Christopher J. Poulos

Senior Project

Jepson School of Leadership Studies

University of Richmond

Richmond, Virginia

April 14, 1997

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND
VIRGINIA 23173

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the forthcoming study is to gain an understanding of how empowerment is utilized in the political arena. The project will primarily deal with Congress and the relations between Members. With all of the facets of the legislative branch, it is necessary to narrow this study to several aspects of the body. Due to the diversity of Congressional Members and the formal structure of House and Senate committees, this investigation will serve to provide a concentrated, yet thorough analysis of the presence of empowerment.

There will be many pieces of literature searched through for the latest developments in the concept of empowerment. Before the concept of empowerment will be explored, the concept of power needs to be touched upon. Empowerment is derived from the concept of power, therefore, an understanding of the traditional views of power in Congress is necessary in developing the concept of empowerment in Congress. The rest of our paper will concentrate on four cases that we hope will illustrate empowerment and how it is tied to power in Congressional situations.

Case study analysis will be the methodology that will be employed throughout the study. The case work has been carefully selected to in order to remove partisan bias from the analysis. Most of the material that will be used will be from current

sources such as the Congressional Quarterly Weekly and information packets from the Library of Congress. Finally, the results from the data collection will be applied to the information gathered in the literature review.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Traditional Views of Power in Congress

Before a discussion on empowerment can begin, the construct of power and influence in Congress needs to be addressed. The elected officials are in leadership positions shaping legislation that is directed to ease our transition into the twenty-first Century.

The Framers of the Constitution made it abundantly clear that the legislature was to be the most powerful of the three branches of government. Article I, section 8, sets forth nineteen duties that both the House of Representatives and the Senate would have complete power over. By this being the basis of our legislative body, it on occasion fosters a feeling of oppression by the constituents that fall under each elected official. The very purpose of government was to alleviate this problem by assuring the constituents in the writings of the Constitution that all Members are to be servants of the people. Unfortunately, society has the impression that the workings on Capitol Hill are predominantly based around corruption and logrolling.

The notion that Members of Congress are in powerful positions

is indisputable by any scholar or student studying Congress. However, we believe that there has been too much emphasis on the concept of power. Empowerment is an aspect of power, yet it is frequently overlooked and not expanded upon by scholars. There are five hundred and thirty-five Members of Congress, each with the ability to exercise power to his constituency, to other Members and on certain issues. Our study focuses on the exercising of power within both the Senate and House.

Party leadership stems from the formal structure that was set by the framers of the Constitution. In both the House and Senate the party leadership is crucial to the smooth functioning of the legislative process.

Leaders help to organize orderly consideration of legislative proposals, promote party support for or against legislation, attempt to reconcile differences that threaten to disrupt the chambers, plan strategies on important bills, consult with the president, and publicize legislative achievements. (Oleszek 32)

Some of the responsibilities of a party leader are to influence committee assignments, intervene with the White House, share media attention with colleagues, select members to serve on special committees or panels, raise money and campaign for colleagues, or mobilize support or opposition to policy proposals. The above responsibilities are evidence of party leadership in both the House and Senate being very powerful and influential.

A more specific example of power extended by a party leader

can be traced to Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich (R-GA). In 1995, Gingrich appointed four freshmen to the four most powerful committees of the House. Gingrich was exercising his power as Speaker to appoint members to various committees. Putting freshmen on the most powerful committees was unprecedented. Some argue that this was done in order to develop legislative skills and experience for the freshmen (Thurber 16).

Along with the powerful party leadership within the House and Senate, there exists a multitude of committees that demonstrate similar power influences. Both the House of Representatives and the Senate are arranged in committees that deal with various issues. This forces each of the elected leaders to work together as a team to get legislation passed. There is a definitive leader, the chairman of the committee, and as in every other organization, older Members serve as a leadership figure merely by having expert power.

In *Congressional Procedures and the Policy Process*, Walter Oleszek states, "To a large extent, the options available to a committee in dealing with a bill are exercised by the chairman, who has wide discretion in establishing the committees legislative priorities" (106). He summarizes the chair's authorities into five points:

- control of the committee's legislative agenda;
- control over referral of legislation over to the subcommittees;
- management of committee funds;

- control of committee staff, and
- the designation of majority party conferees.

The first authority mentioned above is the most important in order to assure committee success. The other four stem off of the main responsibility which in essence is to mark the path for the committee and lead it. These five points define the chairman as a clear leader among the all the members of the committee. The chairman has clear cut responsibilities to exercise on the other members of the committee.

Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D-MA), the chairman of the Labor and Human Resources Committee in the 103rd Congress, demonstrated these power tactics to expedite action on President Clinton's health proposal. He set the agenda for the legislation and made health care the committee's top priority. He presided over marathon mark up sessions for nearly three weeks. Kennedy's power and influence as chairman lined up the backing for the committee's bill and inserted special provisions in the legislation to win member support and eventually passage of the bill (Oleszek 113).

Outside of committees and the formal leadership structure of both the House and Senate, the independent power and influence of individual members is also prevalent. In both chambers seniority, which is a basis for expert power, plays a power role. Not all members can serve as a party leader or a committee chairman, but nevertheless their experience in the legislative process is invaluable. This will be illustrated in detail throughout our case studies. Below are brief examples of the concepts that will

be elaborated upon in our analysis.

Senator Don Nickles (R-OK) has been in the Senate for 16 years and is a senior member. Although he did not hold a leadership position in the 104th Congress, he was the author of the quite controversial Defense of Marriage Act. He was able to introduce the bill on the floor and get it passed quite easily. His ability to present a bill and command the attention of other Senators, through his presentation and cogent prose, could be compared to many of the Members on the leadership team. This is why he was elected to serve as Majority Whip when Senator Robert Dole (R-KS) resigned from the Senate.

Since the 1970's, the House has been undergoing fundamental changes in its patterns of power and influence. More recently, in the 1990's, through the introduction of creative rules, the House has witnessed the extension of power and influence from powerful committee chairmen to scores of individual law makers, including subcommittee chairmen, factional leaders, and rank and file members (Oleszek 144).

The fundamental structure of Congress will remain consistent with what the framers drafted in the Constitution over 200 years ago. Each member has the ability to shape legislation by exercising their power that they obtained by being elected to their position. We have demonstrated a variety of situations where power and influence exist on many levels in Congress. We would like to concentrate on individual power from both the formal aspect of committee chairmen and from Members not involved in

formal leadership roles.

The goal of this study is to gain an understanding of how empowerment is utilized in the political arena. The basis of our propositions on the concept of empowerment stems from the concept of power. Many scholars, historians, and students have studied and analyzed the construct of power, but have ignored empowerment. It was necessary to gain an understanding of the concept of power before we could understand and analyze the concept of empowerment. We believe that empowerment would not exist without the presence of power itself. This notion guided our literature review. Our literature review will demonstrate current ideas and theories associated with the study of empowerment.

Current Views on Empowerment

In relation to the United States Congress, there was no literature found on empowerment in the United States Congress. Therefore, the focus was changed to literature on empowerment in the leadership field. Throughout the leadership field, there has been a growing interest in the topic of empowerment. However, "the understanding of the construct of empowerment and its underlying processes remains limited" (Conger and Kanungo 471). Currently, we have vague definitions that really do not lend themselves to a basis for a substantive study. Nevertheless, many scholars in the leadership field have been making a concerted effort to make strides in the area of empowerment.

An essential difficulty in the literature is that management scholars tend to group it in with the construct of power. It becomes implied that if one has an understanding of power, then empowerment should be easy to understand and has no need for further development. We believe that empowerment is related to power, but there are certain criteria that separates the two constructs.

The first priority is to define empowerment. There are many different definitions of empowerment, but they are mainly based on the same principle. In the work, *Empowered Teams*, by Richard Wellins, William Byham, and Jeanne Wilson, the authors come up with a new definition based on the prefix. They state that the word *Power* means "control, authority, dominion." The prefix *em-* means "to put on to" or "to cover with." Empowering, then, is passing on authority and responsibility (22).

The authors continue to elaborate on the meaning. They state: "Empowered individuals know that their jobs belong to them. Given a say in how things are done, employees feel more responsible. When they feel responsible, they show more initiative in their work, get more done, and enjoy the work more" (22). They also go on to make the proposition that the degree of empowerment is directly proportional to the amount of responsibility. Increasing responsibilities yield corresponding amounts of empowerment.

In Ron Archer's book, *On Teams*, he defines empowerment as:

An attitude that reflects a belief that the people

who do the work everyday have the knowledge, the insight, and the experience to plan, implement, and control the work processes as well as the ability to accept (19).

Archer then talks about some of the principles an individual needs in order to empower another. He states that "to empower requires of people in positions of power a readiness and willingness to evaluate their controls and transfer power and authority for significant areas of judgment and decision making to the people performing specific tasks" (19). Those who are being empowered will have more responsibilities, therefore, their workload will increase.

Our study, being concerned with the United States Congress, fits directly into Archer's propositions. Each Member of Congress, as we have stated before, is in a power position. Therefore, each Member, if they have a readiness and willingness to evaluate their controls and transfer power and authority, can empower others. They don't necessarily have to be part of the party leadership or a chairman position in order to empower. All of the Members of Congress have the ability to empower, because they all hold power by being an elected official.

Archer then sites four things that constitute true empowerment. The four cornerstones are: authority, input, resources/training, and accountability (20). A team needs to have the authority to make its own decisions and they also need to have input in setting the goals it needs to meet. After that is set,

the team must be given the proper resources and training in order to be successful. After the three cornerstones are met, the last principle is that the team is accountable for their own decisions and goal setting.

In another work based around empowerment, Nancy Foy tries to define the concept and develop it into the empowered group. In her book, *Empowering People at Work*, she states that "empowerment is simply gaining the power to make your voice heard, to contribute to plans and decisions that affect you, to use your expertise at the work to improve your and the organization's performance" (Foy 5). This work is important because it is shifting the focus of empowerment to groups rather than focusing on the individual.

Nancy Foy argues that an empowered group is one where the group itself decided what measures were most appropriate (17). She continues to state that these principles are based around a mutual trust and respect between group members. This observation may capture some of the principles of empowerment, but they don't really shed light on the essence of empowerment. This is predominantly the course taken on studying empowerment.

Stephen Wall wrote about empowerment in his book, *The New Strategists*. Wall debates that "people are not truly empowered as long as they believe that the organizations's strategies are being handed down from on high" (Wall 48). Instead, true empowerment exists when individuals from all levels have input into the organization's strategy and actually become active players in the

strategy making process (48). This work is focusing on empowering individuals through the strategy making process. The focus has changed from the final decision making process, as presented by Nancy Foy, to the initial strategy formation. This is perfect for studying the role of Members of Congress. There is no higher level, so everyone, whether it be in a committee or based around a single issue, has a voice in the strategy making process.

Wall's work primarily focuses on the strategy and planning aspects of a group. The argument is focused on individuals being empowered when they have an active voice in the planning of the organizations strategy. It doesn't focus on different points needing to be present in order to constitute the concept of empowerment. Therefore, we felt that his definition and analysis of empowerment was only insightful in regards to strategy making. As a whole, his analysis of empowerment is incomplete.

Most of the literature encountered substituted the word empowerment with self-directed work teams, delegation of authority, and participatory leadership. This was not encompassing the whole essence of the empowerment concept. The basic problem in the literature review was that substantive information was hard to find. There was a lot written about empowerment, but it was mainly linked to the concept of power or participatory leadership.

The practice of empowerment had some different criteria. Some authors, such as Gary Yukl, in *Leadership in Organizations*, and John Gastil in *Democracy in Small Groups*, address empowerment

as merely delegating or sharing power with other individuals.

Robert Daft, in his book *Organizational Theory and Design*, defines empowerment as "giving power to others in the organization so they can act more freely to accomplish their jobs" (394). Rabindra Kanungo and Manuel Mendonca in their text, *Ethical Dimensions of Leadership*, state that there are five main characteristics that define empowerment. They are:

- Changing followers' core attitudes, beliefs, and values
- Increasing self-efficacy belief and self-determination
- Expert and referent power base
- Identification and internalization leading to followers' self-growth and to their functioning as autonomous persons
- Has an ethical moral implication.

The most substantive material we found was in an article written by Jay Conger and Rabindra Kanungo. Because it will become central to the ensuing analysis, this source is worthy of extensive treatment in its own right.

Jay Conger and Rabindra Kanungo: The Empowerment Process: Integrating Theory and Practice

The article, found in *The Academy of Management Review*, 1988, starts off with reasons why the concept of empowerment has had a growing interest, i.e.- its perceived link to managerial and organizational effectiveness. However, Conger and Kanungo make it clear that the understanding of the construct is limited and often

confusing (471).

"In many cases, scholars have assumed that empowerment is the same as delegating or sharing power with subordinates and, hence, that the construct requires no further conceptual analysis beyond the power concept" (Conger and Kanungo 471). After stating this fact, the authors propose two different ways in which to view empowerment. The first is empowerment as a relational construct and the second as a motivational construct.

When empowerment is considered in terms of the relational context, the authors state, it becomes the process by which a leader shares his or her power with subordinates. "Power, in this context, is interpreted as the possession of formal authority or control over organizational resources. The emphasis is primarily on the notion of sharing authority" (473). The authors are quick to note that this manner of treating empowerment does not adequately address the nature of empowerment. This simple notion of empowerment merely being the sharing of authority has been so common a practice that "often employee participation is simply equated with empowerment" (473).

This becomes the portion of the essay where Conger and Kanungo raise important questions about the study of empowerment. Does the sharing of authority and resources with subordinates automatically empower them? Many previous scholars, as we have stated above, have argued that it does. Granted there is a relational aspect to empowerment, but it should not be the only defining principle. The second way empowerment can be viewed is

as a motivational construct.

Conger and Kanungo introduce this idea stating that in most psychology literature, power and control are used as motivational and/or expectancy belief-states that are internal to individuals (473). A fundamental need that people have is one for power. "Individuals' power needs are met when they perceive that they have power or when they believe they can adequately cope with events, situations, and/or the people they confront" (473). When individuals feel powerless, they become frustrated and believe that they cannot cope with their situation.

The motivational construct is related to anything that strengthens self-determination or self-efficacy belief of employees that makes them feel more powerful. We propose that it doesn't have to be restricted to employees or subordinates. This construct can be used with colleagues as well. For instance, in the United States Congress, since they all have power, they can use empowerment as a motivational construct in trying to propose and pass legislation. This is a conceptualization which will become central to the ensuing discussion of Congressional empowerment practices.

Conger and Kanungo state that the Oxford English Dictionary defines the verb empower as "to enable" (473). This is in contrast to the previous notion that it meant "to put on to power" or "to cover with power" as defined in the work, *Empowered Teams*. Conger and Kanungo propose that "empowerment should be viewed as a motivational construct--meaning to enable rather than simply to

delegate" (474). They rationalize this proposition by stating that enabling implies creating conditions for heightening motivation for task accomplishment through the development of a strong sense of personal efficacy.

After obtaining the information through the literature we have researched, we have combined a few of the propositions that leadership scholars have offered on empowerment. We agree with Conger and Kanungo about empowerment being a motivational construct. The notion of enabling is more of an empowerment strategy, because the delegation of power makes the individual being empowered feel as if he really did not have a voice in what he is supposed to be doing.

We also agree with the five points in which Rabindra Kanungo and Manuel Mendonca proposed in their, *Ethical Dimensions of Leadership*. They are:

- Changing followers' core attitudes, beliefs, and values
- Increasing self-efficacy belief and self-determination
- Expert and referent power base
- Identification and internalization leading to followers' self-growth and to their functioning as autonomous persons
- Has an ethical moral implication.

If the majority of the five points are met and empowerment is used as a motivational and enabling construct, empowerment is occurring. We still propose that empowerment is just not between leader and subordinates. It is directly linked to power. If an

individual has power, he/she has the power to empower others. This is the situation with Members of Congress. Every member has power, therefore, Members who are technically equals, have the power to empower each other. This will be the basis for our methodology to research our cases.

Methodology

As Robert Yin states in his book, Case Study Research, there are five components of a case research design that are especially important (Yin 13). The first component is to define a study question that will be developed. The second is to point out its propositions if there are any. Then, the units of analysis are presented along with a logical linking of the data to the propositions. Lastly, there needs to be criteria for interpreting the findings. This research project has all of these components and will help maintain the focused of the hypothesis.

Our hypothesis is that empowerment strategies exist between members of Congress. Specifically, we propose that empowerment exists as a leadership strategy used by Members in order to successfully put forth legislation and facilitate self-efficacy and determination for individual Members. We have defined this project with five study questions which will guide our research and lead to proving our hypothesis. We believe that the six questions have a logical progression which will form the structure of our study.

The questions that we have developed are as follows:

- What is empowerment and what are its characteristics?
(Previously discussed in the literature review)
- What aspects of power are relevant to this study of empowerment?
- Are these characteristics present in interactions between Members?
- Specifically, how do Members demonstrate empowerment among their colleagues?
- Where is empowerment most prevalent?

The answers to these questions come from the foundations of the literature review. Evidence from the case analysis will provide conclusive results relevant to the context of the study. The cases will provide us with specific data which will be used to test our hypothesis. Empowerment has been defined above in our literature review as occurring when the majority of Kanungo and Mendonca's five points are met in a motivational and enabling construct. These characteristics of empowerment, as previously outlined, include key leadership concepts such as leading as a change agent, fostering growth and development, increased productivity, expert power and ethics.

Through our case research we will investigate the extent to which these characteristics are present in interactions between Members. Our thesis is that throughout both houses of Congress, empowerment between Members is likely to be most prevalent in

committees and on specific issues of the legislative body. We have chosen cases in both areas that will test this notion.

Our cases will include the current investigation of Newt Gingrich by the Standards of Official Conduct in the House of Representatives and the Whitewater investigation by the Special Committee on Whitewater in the Senate. The other two cases will be on specific issues presented before each body. We will focus on minimum wage and health care. We believe that these cases will yield sufficient data so that we can apply our hypothesis.

We have turned to Robert Yin to develop the framework of our data collection and analysis. Yin outlines three principles to data collection. First, he stresses using multiple, not just single, sources of evidence. Second, he recommends creating a case study data base. Lastly, Yin recommends maintaining a chain of evidence throughout the case study. These principles are extremely important for doing high-quality case studies (Yin 79).

Throughout our data collection we have adhered to Yin's principles. Our research on empowerment has come from a large sampling of literature written by the scholars considered to be the "experts" on the issue. Expert status has been attributed to those authors who have conducted current and in depth research in the field of empowerment. We have created a data base of information from which we have determined a definition we will use throughout our case analysis. The results from our case analysis will demonstrate the thorough citation from a variety of our research findings.

Data collection for our cases will involve three of Yin's six sources of evidence. They are documentation, archival records, direct observations (Yin 79). Documentation evidence will come in several forms:

- letters, memoranda, and other communiques between members;
- agendas, announcements and minutes of meetings, and other written reports of events;
- administrative documents -- proposals, progress reports, and other internal documents;
- newsclippings and other articles appearing in the mass media;
- internet home pages and web sites.

The Library of Congress Congressional Research Service has provided much of the documentation we will be using. Info Packs on Congressional events and legislation provide a myriad of the above document types recommended by Yin.

The use of archival records will also compliment our case research and analysis. Our major sources here will be organizational records such as the Congressional Record and successfully passed legislation.

Finally, direct observation will be used in evaluating our cases. From our internships and frequent return visits to Capitol Hill, we have been able to observe first hand many of the empowerment strategies that we are proposing exist on the House and Senate floors. Also, C-Span, CNN, and other national news

broadcasts have provided us with tremendous sources of information. Although, these forms of evidence are not as tangible as the Congressional record, they have and will continue to serve in the development process of our argument.

After the data was collected, relevant findings were chosen which analyze and answer the research questions. "Data analysis consists of examining, categorizing, tabulating, or otherwise recombining the evidence, to address the initial propositions of the study" (Yin 99). After reviewing several general analytic strategies presented in Yin's book, it has become quite obvious that our analysis will rely on theoretical propositions.

Yin explains that this strategy should follow the theoretical propositions that initially led to the case study. "The original objectives and design of the case study presumably were based on such propositions, which in turn reflected a set of research questions, reviews of literature, and new insights. The propositions have also given priorities to the relevant analytic strategies" (Yin 100).

The theoretical structure that we are using will guide our research and study analysis. By continually referring to the propositions that we began our study with, we will remain focused on the relevant data which will serve as the define clear explanations to our hypothesis. "Theoretical propositions about causal relations -- answers to 'how' and 'why' questions -- can be very useful in guiding case study analysis in this manner" (Yin 101).

We believe empowerment is more important than the control strategy used in transactional leadership. Kanungo and Mendonca write, "unlike the transactional leader, empowerment designed by the transformational leader increases the followers' self-growth, enhances their self-worth, and enables them to function as autonomous persons" (Kanungo and Mendonca 74). They continue to state that the empowerment process is more likely to be ethical, more effective, and more enduring. We are not trying to deny that transactional leadership and the control strategy exists in the deliberations throughout Congress, however, we propose that empowerment is also a strategy used in many situations.

CASE STUDIES

The United States Senate

Whitewater/Madison Guaranty S&L Affair

The Whitewater affair involves President Bill Clinton's and Hillary Rodham Clinton's investment in 1978, along with James and Susan McDougal, in a northern Arkansas vacation home project called the Whitewater Development Corp., which later failed.

In March 1992, the *New York Times* published an article alleging that one of the causes of the Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan failure was the Whitewater Development Corp. The article accused the Clintons of taking a Whitewater Development Corp. Deduction on their 1984 and 1985 tax returns, which saved them

roughly \$1,000 in taxes. The article continued to raise issues on whether or not a Governor should be involved in a business deal with the owner of a business regulated by the state. Another issue raised was whether or not the wife of the Governor should be involved through her law firm in receiving legal fees for work done for the business. The Clintons have denied the accusations.

Since then, the Clintons have had to field different questions facing them that stem back to their relationship with the McDougals and the Whitewater Development Corp. Robert Fiske Jr. is the special counsel on the Whitewater investigation. One of the main objectives of the prosecutor is to find out whether or not White House officials withheld documents found in the office of Vince Foster, the deputy White House counsel who died in July 1993, relating to Madison and Whitewater. The purpose is to find out if the White House is covering up any information regarding the Whitewater/Madison affair since they have been in Washington.

In the Senate, interest is focused on what happened in Washington, not back in Arkansas. At the start of the investigations, the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee took the issue under its wing. The Democrats were in control with Senator Paul Sarbanes (D-MD) as the Chairman. The sentiment in the Senate was that the Republicans were trying to use this as a tactic to gain votes for the 1996 election. The Republicans were led by Ranking Member Senator Alfonse D'Amato and he was willing to delay hearings so that Robert Fiske could finish his deposing administration officials. The Ranking Member is the

appointed leader of the minority party. This was to provide the committee with some testimonies that could help shape the scope of the hearings.

In 1995, when the Republicans took over Congress, the tables turned and the special committee on Whitewater was now headed by the Republicans under Senator D'Amato. On January 3, 1995, both the Republicans and Democrats released their reports, and they both reached different conclusions about the extent of wrongdoing by administration officials in the Whitewater affair. "Now that the Republicans have taken control of Congress, however, the disparate reports confirm that the scope and reach of the congressional investigation will surely widen once the new GOP leaders decide on their timing and strategy" (Taylor 35).

It was now time for the leadership of the committee to set a clear scope and have a focused investigation. Now that the Republicans were in the power position, Senator D'Amato realized that it was his duty to continue the fight for a wider scope that would include areas still under criminal investigation. "The next round of hearing likely will start with a probe into whether Whitewater-related papers were improperly removed from Deputy White House Counsel Vincent W. Foster's office after his suicide in July 1993" (Taylor 35).

In order to understand whether or not empowerment existed in the Senate Special Committee to Investigate Whitewater Development Corporation and Related Matters, it is necessary to understand the issues and key players within the committee. There are clear

leaders, the Chairman and Ranking Member of the committee, but we need to keep in mind that all Senators are to be considered equals. As we have stated in our introduction, empowerment can exist when there is a formal hierarchy or when dealing with colleagues. The main prerequisite is that the person empowering others needs to have some sort of power base. As the Chairman of the committee, Senator D'Amato has power over the members of the committee. Senator Sarbanes has power over the Democratic side of the committee because he is the Ranking Member.

The first aspect of empowerment that can be touched upon is in regards to the planning and strategy of the Whitewater committee. Scholar Stephen Wall wrote that "true empowerment exists when individuals from all levels have input into the organization's strategy and actually become active players in the strategy making process" (48). The Members of the committee designed a strategy and reinforced Wall's criteria for empowerment. Senator D'Amato didn't have a specific agenda because he wanted to have the committee set the plan and strategy.

At this point in time, the Republicans and the Democrats were focused on an agenda. They agreed to a variety of principles and issues that they were going to probe. The Republicans would conduct their investigation and the Democrats would conduct their own and file a report after they decide that there was enough substantive information. Some areas of investigation would include: the Whitewater investment itself and the Clintons role in it, other financial institutions, loans and transaction involving

Clinton and other Arkansas politicians, whether there were any attempts by the White House to impede regulators or the Justice Department in pursuing Madison Guaranty and its failure, and the 1993 suicide of White House Deputy Counsel Vincent Foster and the handling of documents in Foster's office that related to the Whitewater corporation (Washington Post, Jan. 30th, p.A6).

At this point in the investigation, the methods that Chairman D'Amato was using could be considered empowerment. Using the model that Conger and Kanungo present in their article, *The Empowerment Process: Integrating Theory and Practice*, the Whitewater Committee has been empowered by its Chairman. Conger and Kanungo propose that "empowerment should be viewed as a motivational construct--meaning to enable rather than simply to delegate" (474). Senator D'Amato has enabled, rather than delegated authority to the Members of the committee. In conjunction with Wall's article, the Chairman "created conditions for heightening motivation for task accomplishment through the development of a strong sense of personal efficacy" (Conger and Kanungo 474).

Every member of the committee, both Republicans and Democrats, had input in the strategy and agreed upon all of the investigative areas that will be focused on. Each member now was in charge of themselves obtaining information on the agreed upon issues. Their need for power, conducting the investigation under each Members discretion, is fulfilled. Their feelings of powerlessness, as some may perceive because they are Members under

a definitive leader, have diminished because they are motivated by their Chairman to have a direct voice in planning the strategy and investigating the issues themselves.

When the Republicans took over the Congress in 1995, many of the Republicans had ambitious plans for the 104th Congress. It has been no secret that Senator D'Amato is pugnacious, but he is very driven by his ideals, attitudes and beliefs. It was evident in the take over of the Chairman spot on the special committee that he wanted to change some of the members, mainly the Democrat's, core attitudes and beliefs on how to investigate the President. In putting this case up to the five characteristics pointed out in Kanungo and Mendonca's, *Ethical Dimensions of Leadership*, the committee meets most of the requirements.

In one instance, the Senator from Alabama, Richard Shelby, changed parties at the start of the 104th Congress. Granted it wasn't solely because of the Whitewater issue, but he was swayed on to their side. Senator D'Amato, as well as other Republicans, were able to change or at least have him reevaluate his core attitude, beliefs, and values. This was the first characteristic of Kanungo and Mendonca. In dealing with politics, it is extremely hard, especially in dealing with a controversial partisan issue, to change Members' attitudes, beliefs, and values. However, that doesn't always measure success in empowerment. There are still four other characteristics on top of it being a motivational construct that enables instead of delegates.

The second point in Kanungo and Mendonca's five propositions

is that it increases self-efficacy belief and self-determination. The only evidence that can be drawn on this point is through the beginning stages of the investigation. Senator D'Amato had an agenda that was designed for all the Members of the committee to come up with the scope of investigation. In knowing that, each Member was determined to have input in the planning stages and they knew that it was up to them to conduct the investigation themselves, as well as with the committee during hearings. Each Member knew that they had the opportunity to affect the outcome of the investigations.

For example, during hearings of administration officials, each member has an opportunity to question the individual on testimony. They can bring things up from their own investigations and each of the Members has something to add to the hearing, hence producing an outcome themselves. Therefore, that is evidence for them having an increased self-efficacy and self-determination. This is standard procedure for Senate committee hearings, but nonetheless it is evidence to support empowerment.

The third point is whether or not Senator D'Amato had an expert and referent power base. Kanungo and Mendonca believe that one needs to have one of those power bases in order to have empowerment exist. Being appointed Chairman of a committee means that your party believes that you have an insight to those issues that exceeds any other Member. It was not, in this case, an issue of seniority since there were members on the committee that were more senior. Therefore, he technically has expert power. We came

to the conclusion that Chairman D'Amato indeed has expert power.

The fourth point is a characteristic of empowerment is identification and internalization leading to followers' self-growth and to their functioning as autonomous persons. This was established in the beginning stages of the committee under D'Amato's control. By giving each Member the ability to help plan and to investigate themselves has each of them function as autonomous persons. They have the discretion to do what they believe is worthwhile in the investigation of the Whitewater affair. After all of the investigations are completed they presented the information as unified partisan groups within the whole committee.

The last point is whether or not the intentions of the leader have a moral ethical implication. We felt that given the context of the situation, it would be too difficult to conclude whether or not the intentions of Senator D'Amato had a moral ethical implication. We hope that as an elected official and appointed chairman, his actions would be nothing short of being moral and ethical.

In conclusion, we believe that Senator D'Amato empowered the Members of the Special Committee to Investigate Whitewater Development Corporation and Related Matters. We have discussed how he met the criteria pointed out in Wall's work, Conger and Kanungo's work, and the five points outlined in Kanungo and Mendonca's article. Since he has met the criteria, we can come to the conclusion that there was empowerment involved within the

Special Whitewater committee.

The Issue of Health Care in The United States Senate

The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 was signed into law by President Clinton on August 21, 1996. This measure improves the availability of health insurance and makes it easier for people to move from one source of health insurance to another without restrictions on coverage for preexisting health conditions. Other provisions include an increase in the self employed deduction for health insurance, tax incentives to purchase private long-term care insurance, and a pilot program for medical savings accounts.

This conclusion didn't come easy for it took over two years of deliberations and conferencing in order for compromise to take place. The original intention of the Health Insurance Reform Bill was to propose something that was legitimate but more realistic than the health plan proposed by President Clinton in 1994.

The bill generally requires group health insurance plans "to offer coverage to all employers and their employees and dependents, regardless of pre-existing conditions or medical history" (Langdon 616). One of its aims is also "to guarantee what is called group-to-group portability: Workers leaving one job where they had group health insurance would be guaranteed coverage at the next job, assuming the new employer offers insurance" (Langdon 616).

Health Insurance Reform falls under the Labor and Human

Resources Committee in the Senate. The Chairman of the committee is the junior Senator from Kansas, Nancy Landon Kassebaum. The bill is sponsored by Senator Kassebaum and the ranking Democrat Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts. One of the most promising aspects of the legislation was that Senator Kassebaum had the bill pass unanimously in her committee and has accumulated cosponsors from all across the political spectrum. The main challenge of the bill is to transform the views of some of the very conservative and liberal Senators that are favoring the bill with provisions. Many Senators want to expand the scope of the bill, and that is against the original intentions of both Kassebaum and Kennedy.

The potential for empowerment is very high in this case. Both the Chairwoman and the Ranking Member are working together to pass legislation in the Senate. Their influence and power in the Senate could easily be used to empower other Members to become cosponsors for the bill. Senator Kassebaum has always been highly regarded in the Senate, hence her position as chairwoman for one of the most influential committees. Senator Kennedy has been regarded as the top legislator in the Senate. His thirty-four years in the Senate is the third longest among current Members and his track record is very impressive. The Kennedy mystique has been passed on from his brothers to him and he has a tremendous amount of responsibility as well as power.

Kassebaum and Kennedy want the bill to pass without any amendments tacked on to it during floor action. The bill was passed unanimously in committee and the bill was a product of

those 16 Senators' ideas. This falls under Wall's work on strategic planning. The main ideas were formulated by Kassebaum and Kennedy. "Kassebaum and Kennedy decided to pull from the ashes of President Clinton's failed health system overhaul the two policies that everyone agreed on: portability and the elimination of pre-existing condition exclusions" (Rubin 1171). It was a collaborative effort in which each had a voice in how the bill was going to be presented. This falls under a category of empowerment proposed by Stephen Wall.

It is true that both Senators are opposites on the political spectrum, but after many years working together in the Labor and Human Resources Committee, "they have developed a strong friendship and mutual trust" (Rubin 1171). This idea falls under the literature we accumulated from Nancy Foy. She stated in her text, *Empowering People at Work*, that there needs to exist a mutual trust and respect for others in order to have an empowered group. It is clearly evident that this aspect of empowerment exists between Senator Kassebaum and Senator Kennedy.

The problem with this issue arose after the bill was passed by the House. When the first draft was brought up, it was passed 100-0 before it was sent to the House. The House version had many provisions tacked on to it, so it was now up to both bodies to compromise and come up with one bill to send to the President. This is when Senator Kassebaum and Senator Kennedy realized they needed to change some values and beliefs in order to get legislation that would satisfy the original authors. The major

debating point deals with medical savings accounts.

"Medical savings accounts (MSA) would allow people with high deductible health plans to accrue tax-deductible savings in a special account to be used solely for medical expenses" (Langdon 990). One of the main activists for MSA's was Senator Bob Dole. This was a major obstacle, since he was the Senate Majority Leader and potential GOP presidential candidate. Proponents of medical savings accounts assert that they would make health insurance more affordable and more available. Since individuals would be taking money out of their own savings to cover high deductibles of their insurance package they will be more prudent customers.

The opponents say that the MSA's will only benefit the wealthy and healthy. "They argue that poorer people would not have the money to invest in the accounts and that they would be less likely to tap their accounts for preventative care, instead waiting until they were very sick to go to the doctor" (Langdon 1049). Throughout debate, Kassebaum and Kennedy stuck to their protective, no-amendment strategy by opposing all major amendments to their bill. They had, as well as the committee, a vision for their legislation and that was what they wanted to have passed.

While we stated how some aspects of this issue meet some empowerment criteria, an attempt will be made to show how this case falls into the construct of empowerment as defined in our literature review. The first aspect is that there is a motivational construct that enables followers to strive for success. The motivation comes from the unsuccessful attempt by

the President to push forth legitimate legislation on health care. The issue of health care reform had been stagnant for years and Kassebaum and Kennedy were out to rekindle that flame.

Since Senator Kassebaum and Senator Kennedy had worked with each other for many years on the Labor and Human Resources Committee their relationship was based on enabling rather than delegating. They worked together and compromised some of their political principles in order to present intelligent legislation. They enabled each other and their committee to come up with a plethora of ideas and then consolidate them into a bill. After a different version was passed in the House, they needed to enable conferees to compromise with the House in order to come up with one bill. This is motivating and enabling Members to represent the Senate's views on the bill and try to reconcile differences between the two drafts.

In trying to relate the five points Kanungo and Mendonca present, it is relatively easy to point them out in the case. The chief sponsors of the bill were able to change each others as well as Members of the Senate's beliefs, attitudes, and values regarding the health insurance reform bill. In conference, the chief sponsors were able to compromise the MSA amendment to just having a pilot program to see how it works. Therefore, they were able to place some of their beliefs on the House's strong stance on MSA's.

The chief sponsors and Members of the Senate, in regards to the Health Insurance Reform Act had an increase in self-efficacy

and determination. It was the first time in years Congress focused on Health Care Reform. This was a major stepping stone, hence, many Members tried to be very involved with the progress. This can be seen by how many Amendments were brought up on the bill, just in the Senate. Everyone had a different viewpoint and approach to the subject. This helped in the end, when finally a version was accepted and signed into law by the President.

Both Kennedy and Kassebaum have expert and referent power. Both of these Senators have an uncommon amount of respect in the Senate. People look up to what they say and are willing to follow because of their experience in the legislative process. Even though, Ted Kennedy is a staunch liberal, most Senators hold him in high regard. This power base gives them the opportunity to empower others in anything they would like to do in the Senate. They used this in the Health Insurance Reform bill and it was successful. Members were empowered and enabled to come to a conclusion on this issue.

Lastly, this bill spawned a sense autonomy among Members. The many Amendments to the bill is evidence that many of the Members attacked the situation from a personal angle, therefore exercising autonomy. They would not have done that unless Senators' Kennedy and Kassebaum set the stage for reform. By establishing a vision on where they wanted to go in regards to health care reform, they enabled others to work on the issue as autonomous persons.

The case on health care reform shows signs of empowerment.

It met the requirements of being motivational as well as enabling. It also met the five characteristics pointed out by Kanungo and Mendonca. Our conclusion is that the leadership of Senator Kassebaum and Senator Kennedy showed signs of empowerment towards each other and their colleagues in order to pass legislation that has been ignored for years.

The United States House of Representatives

Committee on Standards of Official Conduct: In the Matter of Representative Newt Gingrich

In order to understand the role empowerment has played with the House of Representatives Committee on Standards and Official Conduct (referred to as the ethics committee), it is necessary to understand the background information associated with the investigation of Mr. Gingrich.

Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich was first accused of ethic violations in September of 1994. Throughout the past two and a half years he has been under investigation by the House ethics committee. Gingrich was charged on a number of issues including improper use of funds donated to a political action committee, controversial dealings with Harper Collins involving a \$4.5 million advance, accepting improper gifts, violation of federal tax laws, as well as several violations of the House rules. During the complicated investigations Representative David Bonior (D-MI), House Democratic Whip, continually opposed Gingrich and demanded sanctions be placed upon the Speaker for his ethics

violations. Until late 1996, due to political red tape and unsubstantial evidence, the majority of the charges against Representative Gingrich were dismissed.

In December of 1996, Gingrich opted to plead guilty to the alleged violations cited by the ethics committee and face whatever punishment the panel decided to impose. Since then and throughout the beginning of the 105th Congress, the ethics committee has held hearings in the matter of Representative Gingrich. Nancy L. Johnson (R-CT), chairman of the committee was faced with the task of evaluating testimony and arriving at a non-partisan decision.

"Lawmakers rarely lobby to win seats on the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. It is considered a politically sensitive, even thankless, job to stand in judgment of colleagues facing allegations of ethical misdeeds" (Carr 156). In 1991, Representative Johnson joined the ethics committee and by 1995 was selected to serve as the committee's chairman. This appointment to chairman is evidence that her colleagues (both republican and democratic) felt that her service, to that point and time, had proven to be non-partisan. As chairman of the committee, Johnson has attempted to continue leading the committee in a non-partisan manner. However a series of dueling press conferences and high level behind the scenes maneuvering between Johnson and Jim McDermott (D-WA), ranking minority member, created a breakdown in the non-partisan investigation. "With each side blaming the other for 'blowing up the process,' the ensuing blood sport represents a clear departure from the House's embedded tradition of quietly

self-policing the ethical transgressions of its members" (Carr 155). Although Chairman Johnson demonstrated her non-partisan judgment on the committee over the last six years, comments regarding her handling of the Gingrich case suggested that she was acting with Republican influences.

Johnson's reply to McDermott's branding of the ethics investigation as a "charade" and its chairman as arbitrary, authoritarian and autocratic clearly maintained her non-partisan leadership. She said, "I will not allow angry partisanship to divert the committee from its job of providing the public and Congress with complete information in the Gingrich case" (Carr 155). Although Representative Johnson strongly maintained this view, the friction between the two ranking members thrust the chairmen of the subcommittee investigating Gingrich -- Porter Goss (R-FL) and Benjamin Cardin (D-MD) -- into the role of leading the panel as defacto chairmen.

Goss and Cardin continued the work of the committee putting aside partisan differences and any questions of political motivation. They have become respected members of the committee for their actions and negotiations after the Johnson-McDermott communication breakdown. By late January 1997 Gingrich was sentenced to \$300,000 in fines and the hearings ended.

Chairman Johnson's role as leader of the ethics committee demonstrated several aspects of empowerment. Throughout her six years of experience on committee she has developed and demonstrated the non-partisan approach necessary for examining the

conduct of her Congressional colleagues. Mrs. Johnson's past activity is relevant because it is an example of the ideals, beliefs and values that she led with and transferred over to the committee members. Unfortunately, due to the nature of the Gingrich investigation, a breakdown in communications between Johnson and the ranking minority Member reduced the impact of her role. Goss and Cardin's activities however were quite commendable and serve to justify that empowerment exists between Members on a committee.

Evidence that supports the above statement lies within the literature review of this study. Ron Archer discusses the power-empowerment relationship in his text. Congresswoman Johnson definitely possessed a power role throughout the Gingrich investigation. As chairman of the committee she had a great deal of decision making and delegation power amongst the other Members involved. After the communication breakdown between Johnson and McDermott, the chairman transferred much of the decision making power to the subcommittee chair Porter Goss and her minority colleague Cardin. Her rationale was that they would be more fit to carry out the hearings with the intended non-partisan approach. Archer contends that "to empower requires of people in positions of power a readiness and willingness to evaluate their controls and transfer power and authority for significant areas of judgment and decision making to the people performing specific tasks" (19). Chairman Johnson's ability to recognize the need to transfer the leadership and decision making of the investigative hearings

represents a direct correlation to Archer's view on empowerment.

Nancy Foy, another researcher of empowerment strategy supports Archer's premise and takes it one step further. She refers to the concept group empowerment. In *Empowering People at Work* she presents empowerment as the process of gaining the power to make one's voice heard by contributing plans and decisions that affect an organization. She continues to suggest that expert knowledge improves group performance" (Foy 5).

We can look at the activities of the House ethics committee from a another approach. As stated previously, Chairman Johnson's willingness to recognize the benefit of transferring her power and authority over the Gingrich investigation illustrates one of Archer's empowerment techniques. Foy's work argues that the chairman's decision to do this would be influenced by the other committee members' (empowered group) expert knowledge, ideas, and persuasions. We must realize that Johnson's voluntary will to transfer her power and authority is an example which relates to Foy's research (17).

Stephen Wall, author of *The New Strategists*, supports the group empowerment theory. He believes that true empowerment exists when individuals from all levels have input into the organization's strategy and actually become active players in the strategy making process (Wall 48). Wall and Foy's ideas suggest that Goss and Cardin entered the empowerment process by playing an active role in the decision making process of the investigation. The committee members' approach to working towards a non-partisan

decision demonstrates a defined strategy set forth for ethics investigations.

Finally Conger and Kanungo's theory of empowerment applies to this case. As explained in the literature review of this paper, Conger and Kanungo view empowerment as the delegating or sharing of power. They define two views of empowerment-- the relational construct and the motivational construct.

The relational construct of empowerment is the process in which the leader shares his or her power with subordinates (473) . This aspect of Conger and Kanungo's theory explains empowerment in a similar manner as Archer and Foy have. They discuss power as a possession of formal authority which we have attributed to Nancy Johnson throughout this case. The leadership actions of Porter Goss and Benjamin Cardin represent the shared power that these scholars associate with empowerment.

Although the relational context portion of the authors theory fits the Gingrich case nicely, Conger and Kanungo would maintain that unless the motivational construct is present empowerment does not exist. The belief here is that sharing power does not automatically empower colleagues or subordinates. Conger and Kanungo's second construct of empowerment involving motivation serves to further define the term.

The ethics committee and their internal actions during the Gingrich investigation demonstrates this construct which further emphasizes the presence of empowerment. Conger and Kanungo state that the motivational construct is based on one's fundamental need

for power. As stated in the literature review "Individuals' power needs are met when they perceive that they have power or when they believe they can adequately cope with events, situations, and/or the people they confront" (473). Goss and Cardin's ability to attend to the case while maintaining a non-political approach demonstrated their abilities to handle the breakdown in communications between the Nancy Johnson and Jim McDermott. If Goss and Cardin were unable to cope with situation Johnson would have failed at empowering her committee Members.

What motivated Goss and Cardin? Conger and Kanungo state that motivation is derived by expectancy belief-states (473). Goss has always been a longtime proponent of revamping the ethics committee process (Carr 156). His motivation towards accomplishing personal goals and towards subscription to the chairman's ideals served as a form of empowerment. The motivational construct served to strengthened Goss as a Congressman. He has become one of the most widely respected members of the committee (156).

In conclusion, the Members of the ethics committee demonstrated member to member empowerment throughout the activities of the Newt Gingrich Investigation. When partisan issues began to affect the judgment and leadership of the chairman and ranking democrat, Porter Goss was ready to take the lead of the investigation. Conger and Kanungo summarize their thoughts on empowerment as an enabling process, rather than simply a delegation of responsibility. The strategy is designed to

strength and increase the self-efficacy of the person being empowered (Conger and Kanungo 474). Porter Goss and Benjamin Cardin were not delegated an agenda after the communication breakdown. Through the motivation construct they were empowered by the ethics committee chair to continue the hearings in the way they were initially intended. This led to a non-partisan decision in the matter of Representative Newt Gingrich.

Minimum Wage in the House of Representatives

On May 23, 1996, the House of Representatives passed legislation (H.R. 1227) increasing the federal minimum wage and making certain other adjustments in the minimum wage structure, thereafter combining the measure with H.R. 3448 (tax and pension legislation) for dispatch to the Senate. Soon after the bill was approved by the Senate and on August 20, 1996, it was signed by President Clinton (P.L. 104-188). Under this law, the federal minimum wage was to be raised to \$4.75 per hour after October 1, 1996, and up to \$5.15 per hour on September 1, 1997.

During the time period before and after the House approved the minimum wage bill many aspects of empowerment were prevalent between Members. The passage of this legislation demonstrated a key factor of our government process. In many situations, when Members cross party lines to vote, they have been persuaded to do so by colleagues on the other side of the aisle. In order to accomplish this Members (usually of the same political party) must use certain strategic tactics to gain votes, from other factions

of Congress. While many think that log rolling, compromise, and last minute cloak room lobbying are used in this capacity, we believe that in the House passage of the recent minimum wage legislation the tactic of empowerment was used.

In mid-May 1996, after several failed attempts at compromise in the Senate, the House of Representatives was presented with the challenge of creating and passing legislation on the issue of minimum wage. Although favored mostly by the Democrats in Congress, minimum wage legislation became reality when Republican defectors helped propel the minimum wage bill to passage. Jonathan Weisman of the *Congressional Quarterly* stated that the victory for the Democrats would not have been possible if the core of Republican moderates that gave their support failed to see the value of the bill (1461). The democratic empowerment of the moderate republicans was the primary strategy used to achieve this goal.

The Republican defectors who supported the Democratic interests making the minimum wage pass through the House serve as the example of Member to Member empowerment in this case. Ron Archer's work presents the notion that teams with the authority to make their own decisions as well set their own goals are being empowered by an organization or facet of that organization (20). Therefore we must consider the moderate republicans who voted to increase the minimum wage a team within the House who has set their goal on passage of the bill. Remarks made by Amo Houghton (R-NY) can verify the existence of the political teams existence.

He claimed that the center of the Republican party and its defection from the conservative leadership would not be a one-shot deal (Weisman 1461).

Democratic empowerment over this team of republicans was present because the initial ideologic support of the bill was generated by the Democratic faction of the House. The republican team made their own decision to defect and join the Democrats. They also contributed heavily to the process of designing the minimum wage legislation. This aspect of congressional lawmaking supports Kanungo and Mendonca's idea that changed attitudes and values are a result of empowerment. The empowered group was able to act freely and contribute their beliefs with the same vigor and determination as the Democrats leading the issue.

Further support for this theory is provided by Nancy Foy. The republican moderates, a minority in the House of Representatives, used the issue of minimum wage to make their position on social policy known to their colleagues. They presented their philosophy on the issue and assured that this attitude would not be a one-shot deal (Weisman 1461). Foy writes that "empowerment is simply gaining the power to make your voice heard, to contribute to plans and decisions that affect you" (5). This aspect of the republican defectors' actions helps to define group empowerment. It is important to note that not every vote on the winning side constitutes empowerment. Log rolling and lobbying may have played a role, but we believe that empowerment prevailed.

Stephen Wall is another academic whose definition of empowerment fits that of the actions of the republican moderates. In his book *The New Strategists*, he contends that true empowerment is the result of every individual being given the opportunity to have input in a strategy planning process (Wall 48). As we have established already, by working with the Democrats the Republican Moderates have done just this. When different interest groups are working towards the accomplishment of a particular goal, a great deal of strategy planning (i.e. round table discussions, formal meetings, brainstorming, and preparation of final product) is involved in the process. In an organization such as Congress where all Members are at the same level, theories such as Wall's are easily applicable.

The motivational construct of empowerment described by Conger and Kanungo is also relevant to this case. As stated in their work, power and control are used as motivational and expectancy belief-states that are internal to individuals (473). The fact that the moderate republican faction is demonstrating the desire to be heard by other republicans and democrats, the desire to be decision makers, and the desire to make a difference, are all examples of their overall need (goal) for power and influence. By gaining power in this manner, individuals or groups of individuals become more confident and competent. Self-efficacy is improved and strengthened and the end result becomes more frequently successful.

If we look at the issue of minimum wage this concept is well

demonstrated. For two years prior to the passage of the bill both parties of the House attempted to put forth minimum wage legislation. Until May 1996 all attempts failed. The reason success was finally achieved was due to the group of empowered moderate conservatives. By allowing the moderates to make a difference and fulfill their need for power and recognition in the House, the Democrats led the passage of the bill.

The issue of minimum wage and its role in the House of Representatives is a prime example of empowerment between Members. Specific to this case, a minority faction of republican congressmen were empowered by Democratic leaders who needed support in the passage of the minimum wage bill. The result of the motivational strategy employed in this situation, can also be viewed as a contribution to the development and leadership experience of the moderate republicans in the House.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of the study was to gain an understanding of how empowerment is utilized in the political arena. Scholars have concentrated their research primarily on power in the United States Congress. Throughout an extensive literature review, there was no literature written about empowerment and the United States Congress. However, there was a plethora of articles written on empowerment in the leadership field.

Each work dedicated to empowerment had a different focus that

was important to take into account in finding a definition. Nancy Foy concentrated on group empowerment and Stephen Wall concentrated on empowerment in the formulation of a strategy. Rabinda Kanungo and Manuel Mendonca proposed five characteristics that show the existence of empowerment. Conger and Kanungo focus their efforts on the idea of enabling others, rather than delegating. All of these works helped define empowerment for the study. If the majority of the five points Kanungo and Mendonca proposed are met and empowerment is used as a motivational and enabling construct, empowerment is occurring.

The four cases that were chosen to illustrate empowerment in the United States Congress have provided excellent support that empowerment does indeed exist in politics. The research conducted on empowerment in the United States Congress was done because it hasn't been done before. We are not trying to deny that transactional leadership and the control strategy exists in the deliberations throughout Congress, however, we wanted to prove that empowerment is also a strategy used in many situations. Our four cases successfully accomplished this thesis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Archer, Ron. 1996. On Teams. Chicago: Times Mirror Higher Education Group, Inc.
- Bigelow, John. 1991. Managerial Skills. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Conger, Jay A. and Rabindra Kanungo. "The Empowerment Process: Integrating Theory and Practice." *Academy of Management Review*. 1988. Vol 13. Pp. 471-482.
- Congressional Research Service. 1997. Info Pack: Medicare. Washington D.C.: Library of Congress
- Ibid. Info Pack: Medicaid.
- Ibid. Info Pack: Minimum Wage.
- Ibid. Info Pack: Whitewater/Madison Guaranty S&L Affair.
- Foy, Nancy. 1994. Empowering People at Work. Brookfield: Gower Publishing, Ltd.
- Frey, Lawrence. 1994. Group Communication in Context. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gastil, John. 1993. Democracy in Small Groups. Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.
- Johnson, Janet and Richard Joslyn. 1995. Political Science Research Methods. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc.
- Kanungo, Rabinda and Manuel Mendonca. 1996. "Ethical Implications of the Transactional and Transformational Influence Process," Ethical Dimensions of Leadership. Sage publications, Inc.
- Koszczuk, Jackie. "Embattled Speaker Scrambles To Save Eroding Power Base." *Congressional Quarterly*. January 4, 1997.
- Koszczuk, Jackie. "Imbroglia Darkens the Prospects For Bipartisan Cooperation." *Congressional Quarterly*. January 18, 1997.
- Langdon, Steve. "Push for Insurance Changes Moving to Front Burner." *Congressional Quarterly*. March 9, 1996.

Langdon, Steve. "Sponsors Want Senate Bill To Be Amendment Free." *Congressional Quarterly*. April 13, 1996.

Langdon, Steve. "Medical Savings May Hold Key to Measure's Fate." *Congressional Quarterly*. April 20, 1996.

Marshall, Catherine and Gretchen Rossman. 1995. Designing Qualitative Research. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Oleszek, Walter J. 1996. Congressional Procedures and the Policy Process. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

Pierce, Richard. 1991. Leadership, Perspective, and Restructuring for Total Quality. Milwaukee: ASQC Quality Press.

Rubin, Alissa J. "Kassebaum's Unlikely Stand." *Congressional Quarterly*. April 27, 1996.

Taylor, Andrew. "Stories Conflict, Tempers Flare in Marathon Week of Hearings." *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*. August 6, 1994. Pp.2225-28.

Thurber, James. "Thunder from the Right: Observations About the Elections." *The Public Manager*. Winter 1994-1995. p. 16.

Tichy, Noel, and Mary Anne Devanna. 1986. The Transformational Leader. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Wall, Stephen and Shannon Rye Wall. 1995. The New Strategists. New York: The Free Press.

The Washington Post, January 30, 1995. p.A6.

Weisman, Jonathan. "House Untangles Gridlock On Minimum Wage Deal." *Congressional Quarterly*. May 18, 1996.

Weisman, Jonathan. "Republican Defectors Help Propel Minimum Wage Bill to Passage." *Congressional Quarterly*. May 25, 1996.

Wellins, Richard S. 1991. Empowered Teams. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Yin, Robert. 1984. Case Study Research. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

Yukl, Gary. 1994. Leadership in Organizations. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.