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Abstract:

Background: Importance of human capital as a competitive advantage to organizations is to the extent that human capital has becoming into most important component for organizations. Empowerment of individuals in order to provide an innovative has a vital role in moving the organization towards excellence. Experts suggest that today’s, sometimes, up to 60% incomes and 90% of profits in large and leading organizations are result of these innovations.

Purpose: The purpose of this study was to examine the influences of Psychological Empowerment on Employee Innovation Behavior in the organization in the Social Security Organization of Khorasan Razavi (Mashhad branches).

Method: A descriptive and survey methods, co relational design was used. A sample of 235 registered employee from the Social Security Organization of KhorasanRazavi (Mashhad branches) completed an survey that included questions related to individual demographics, items related to Psychological Empowerment Survey of Spreitzer&Quinn(2001) which consisted of four sections: feeling of Competency, feeling of Self-determination, feeling of Impact and feeling of Meaning that had a reliability coefficient (0.8811) and items related to employee innovation behavior scale of Amo(2005) which consisted of three Sections: idea generation, idea promotion, and idea realization that had a reliability coefficient (0.8958). Data analysis included descriptive statistics, Pearson’s r Correlations, Regression Analysis, ANOVA analyses, and Friedman's chi square test and SPSS software (package of Spss / pc + + ver16) and Lisrel to determine if there was a relationship and influence between Psychological Empowerment and employee innovation behaviors.

Finding: Results indicated a positive correlation between Psychological Empowerment and employee innovation behaviors (r=0.498, p<0.000), Psychological Empowerment and idea generation (r=0.479, p<0.000), Psychological Empowerment and idea promotion (r=0.417, p<0.000), Psychological Empowerment and idea realization (r=0.421, p<0.000). Also, the results showed that employee's Innovation Behavior is predictable by Psychological Empowerment (F=26,463; p=, 000).
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1. Introduction

Since the 1980s, simultaneous with the rapid technological changes in the workplace and corporate downsizing, organizational theorists and researches have been exploring the concept of worker empowerment and its outcomes. They suggest that for workers to successfully initiate and sustain their own learning in the workplace, they must have a sense of personal control over their learning and learning goals. From a broader perspective, this type of perceived control is an example of what is known in the literature as “Psychological Empowerment.” Empowerment enables an employee to develop psychological and physical skills that would benefit the organization (Brancato, 2003). Empowerment enables employees to utilize knowledge and skills to respond to complexities facing the profession’s future. Now that organizations have recognized the value of employee’s knowledge, they are encouraging and often requiring, employees to engage in continuous learning to keep current or to advance their careers.

Innovation is important to organizational growth and the ability to provide innovative solutions to pressing problems (Knol & van Linge, 2008). Attracting and retaining high performing employees is more likely when organizations support them in implementing creative, innovative ideas (Faugier, 2005). Spritzer (1995) suggests that the consequences of Psychological Empowerment are effectiveness and innovative behavior. Empowerment and innovation are necessary for the evolution of practice and organizational success. As competition increases in the marketplace, innovative ideas and creativity of workers have become a highly valued resource (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008), and learning about the employees who have higher levels of innovation behavior within an organization is important.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the influences of Psychological Empowerment on Employee Innovation Behavior.

2. A Review on Theoretical Literature

2.1. Psychological Empowerment

Psychological Empowerment focuses on the individual’s self-efficacy and on shared power in the organizational structure and decision-making processes (Morrison, Jones, and Fuller, 1997). Conger and Kanungo (1988) define Psychological Empowerment as a motivational process. Thomas and Velthouse (1990) developed a broader concept and developed the Cognitive Model of Empowerment. They identified empowerment as a type of motivation, referring to it as intrinsic Task motivation with a set of task assessments (choice, competence, impact, and meaning) that produces motivation. To Spritzer, empowerment is an interaction of person and situation. Empowerment reflects the ongoing ebb and flow of one’s perceptions about the co-variation among the self (an agent), behavior and outcomes (Spritzer, 1997, p.50). Spritzer model of Psychological Empowerment, shown in figure 1, emphasizes the four “task assessment” of (meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact). What Thomas and Velthouse called “task assessment” Spritzer called “cognitions”, equating them to cognitive empowerments. Spritzer focused on one aspect of the Thomas and Velthouse model. Spritzer noted it is individual’s self-perception of empowerment, rather than other perceptions (Spritzer, 1999, p.49).

Spritzer defined the cognitions as follows:

- Meaning was described as “the value of a work goal or propose, judge in relation to an individual’s own ideals or standards” (p.40).
- Competence was equated with self-efficacy, and described as “an individual’s belief in his or her capability to perform activities wills skill” (p.40).
- Self-determination was described as “an individual’s sense of having choice in imitating and regulating action” (p.41).
- Impact was described as “the degree to which an individual can influence strategic, administrative or operating outcomes in the organization or larger environment” (p.43).
2.2. Employee Innovation Behavior

The term innovation has become a buzz word over the last decade. Everyone exalts the importance of innovation, yet few know what it means to be innovative (Weberg, 2009). “innovation is an idea, practice, or object that is perceived as new by an individual or other unit of adoption” (Rogers, 2003, p. 12). Innovation occurs when the ideas are implemented within a unit or organization (Amabile, 1996). Innovation researchers have similarly suggested that idea generation alone can be considered creativity, in contrast to innovation which has an inherent application element, and thus includes both idea generation and implementation (Amabile, 1996). Innovation scholars have similarly developed a substantial base of research knowledge over the past several decades (Anderson et al, 2004), including the individual, group or team, and organizational factors which facilitate or inhibit innovation. At the individual level, a number of motivational (Amabile & Conti, 1999), job design (Waterson, & Harrington, 2000), personality (George & Zhou, 2001), cognitive ability (Kirton, 1976), and affective (Zhou & George, 2002) dimensions have been found to facilitate innovation (Anderson et al., 2004; West, 2002). One way to learn about the individual is to examine the innovation behavior of the person. Employee innovation behavior has been examined in a few studies. Studies have been conducted by Amo (2005a, 2005b, 2006a, & 2006b), Janssen (2000, 2001, 2003, & 2005) and Knol and van Linge (2008) in relation to employee innovation behavior. Amo (2006) defines innovation behavior as behavior from an employee towards developing new products, developing new markets, or improving business routines in their employing organization. Janssen (2000) defines innovative work behavior as encompassing idea generation, idea promotion, and idea realization (Figure 2). Innovative initiatives are widely claimed to contribute to organizational effectiveness (Amabile, 1996; Janssen, 2003; Kanter, 1988; Scott & Bruce, 1994).

Figure 1: Spritzer model of Psychological Empowerment (1995)

Figure 2: Janssen model of employee innovation behavior (2003)
3. Theoretical framework of the Research

Figure 3 shows the research model for this study.
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Figure 3: Theoretical framework of the Research

4. Research Objectives

The proposed study was non-experimental. It did not involve manipulation of the treatment, a control group, an intervention. The following research objectives were asked:

4.1. Main objectives:

1) The explore of the influence of Psychological Empowerment on Employee Innovation Behavior of Employees in the Social Security Organization of Khorasan Razavi
2- To identify and ranking of four dimension of psychological empowerment on Innovation Behavior of Employees.

5. Research Questions

The research questions for this study were:

5.1 Main Questions

1. Does an employee's Innovation Behavior is predictable by Psychological Empowerment?
2. What is the most significant Psychological Empowerment factors that Predicts employee's Innovation Behavior?

5.2 sub- Questions

3. Is there a significant difference in the viewpoint of employees about the influence of Psychological Empowerment on the Innovative Behaviors of Employees in Social Security Organization of Khorasan Razavi?
4. Is there a significant difference in the viewpoint of employees about Existence Innovative Behaviors of Employees in Social Security Organization of Khorasan Razavi?
5. Is there a significant difference in the viewpoint of employees about the degree of importance of each four dimension of psychological empowerment that predicts the Innovative Behaviors of Employees in Social Security Organization of Khorasan Razavi?
6. How is the ranking of Psychological Empowerment in Social Security Organization of Khorasan Razavi?
6. Research methods:

6.1 Design

A descriptive, quantitative, co-relational design was used. A descriptive design allowed for more understanding about how employees perceive their work environment in relation to innovation. Psychological Empowerment is the independent variable and the model is based on Spreitzer model of Psychological Empowerment and Employee innovation behavior is the outcome measure (dependent variable) for this study. Employee innovation behavior reflects the stages of idea generation, idea promotion, and idea realization (Janssen, 2003).

6.2 Sample

The population consists of 600 non-management employees. The researcher obtained the data for the study from a sample of the 235 employees in the Social Security Organization of Khorasan Razavi who were selected by Morgan’s Formula and through Stratified sampling method.

\[
n = \frac{Nt^2 \cdot p(1-p)}{N \cdot d^2 + r^2 \cdot p(1-p)} = 600 \times 1.96^2 \times 0.5(1-0.5) = 235
\]

6.3 Instrumentation

The instruments used in this study were previously developed by other researchers. Spreitzer, G. M. & Quinn, R. E. (2001) Likert scale Psychological Empowerment Instrument (PEI) was used to collect quantitative data on employee’s empowerment and the employee innovation behavior scale was developed by Amo (2005) and was used to learn more about innovation behavior. The instrument was developed based on the literature and research conducted on corporate innovation and employee involvement. It was a 6-point instrument which used a 5-point scale with 1=very little to 5=very large. In addition to the Amo scale, the Janssen Innovative Behavior scale was used to measure innovation behavior in this study. The scale by Janssen is a 9-item scale on individual innovation behavior. The scale has three items related to idea generation, three items related to idea implementation, and three items related to idea realization. The instrument has been used in four separate studies by Janssen (2000; 2001; 2003; 2005) and had acceptable Cronbach’s alpha.

6.4 Validity and reliability

The content validity of the questionnaire was established by a panel of experts prior to initiation of this study. Experts included authors of the initial instrument, PhD faculty, and at least one employee innovator. And Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were used for to determine the reliability of the instrument the results are presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach's alpha coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Psychological Empowerment</td>
<td>0/8811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Employee Innovation</td>
<td>0/8958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Cronbach’s alpha

6.5 Data Analysis method

In the study, several statistical methods, including Descriptive Statistics (Means and standard deviations were obtained for all interval level data. Frequencies and percentages were calculated for categorical variables, such as education level. All scales were assessed for reliability by calculating Cronbach’s alpha scores), Pearson Product Moment Correlation,
Regression Analysis, One-way Analysis of Variance (One-way ANOVA) were used to analyze the collected data. The data was analyzed by the Statistical analysis software SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) Version 16.0 and Lisrel software.

7. Finding

7.1 Sample Demographics

Of the 235 respondents, they were primarily male (66.5%) with only one female respondent (32.8%). Only 0.9 of these employees did not provide answers to the questions. Data for educational level showed that 38.3 percent of the respondents had a possessing below a Bachelor’s degree, 50.2 percent had a Bachelor’s degree while11.1 percent of the respondents had an undergraduate degree. Only 0.4 of these employees did not provide answers to the questions. The number of years the sampled has worked in their current position was as follows: 5 years or less (6.8%), 5-10 years (20.9%), 10-15 years (25.1%), and over 15 years (45.5%). Only 1.7 of these employees did not provide answers to the questions. Data for age was as follows: 20-30 years of age or less (13.6%), 30-40 years of age (40%), 40-50 years of age (44.3%), and over 50 years of age (0%). Only 2.1 of these employees did not provide answers to the questions.

7.2 Descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Psychological Empowerment</td>
<td>5/35</td>
<td>0/728</td>
<td>3/88</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Employee Innovation</td>
<td>5/43</td>
<td>0/797</td>
<td>3/33</td>
<td>6/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Self-determination</td>
<td>4/77</td>
<td>0/920</td>
<td>2/33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of variables

7.3. Research Hypotheses Testing and Presentation of Finding

1. Does an employee's Innovation Behavior is predictable by Psychological Empowerment?

In this study, Pearson's correlation was used to analyze the relationship between the dependent Variables and independent variables (based on the questions). According to results, all Psychological Empowerment types had a significant relationship with variables of employee's Innovation Behavior. As can be seen in Table 3, there is a direct relationship between the subscale of Psychological Empowerment and employee's Innovation Behavior(r=0.498; p < 0.05). Also, multiple regressions were used to investigate the role of each four dimension of psychological empowerment (Competence,
Meaning, Self-determination and Impact) in the prediction of employee's Innovation Behavior. The results are shown in Tables 4, 5 and 6. Even after controlling for these two variables positive relationship between PE and the results of the ANOVA shown in Table 3 indicated that the Employee Innovation were significantly affected by Psychological Empowerment in the organization and employee's Innovation Behavior is predictable by Psychological Empowerment (F=26.463; p=.000). Thus, there is support for S1.

Table 3: Psychological Empowerment and employee's Innovation Behavior Variables Q1 Correlation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>The level of significance</th>
<th>The correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE And Employee Innovation</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE And idea generation</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE And idea promotion</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE And idea realization</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence And Employee Innovation</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence And idea generation</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence And idea promotion</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence And idea realization</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning And Employee Innovation</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning And idea generation</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning And idea promotion</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning And idea realization</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination And Employee Innovation</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination And idea generation</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination idea promotion</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination And idea realization</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact And Employee Innovation</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact And idea generation</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact And idea realization</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Psychological Empowerment Variables and employee's Innovation Behavior Q1 model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.561a</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>7.98763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Meaning, Self-determination, Impact Competence
Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F       | Sig.
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
1 | Regression | 6753,679 | 4 | 1688,420 | 26,463 | .000
Residual | 14674,508 | 230 | 63,802 | 26,463 | .000
Total | 21428,187 | 234 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Meaning, Self-determination, Impact Competence
b. Dependent Variable: Employee Innovation

Table 5: Psychological Empowerment Variables and employee's Innovation Behavior Q 1 ANOVA Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficientsa</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>28,972</td>
<td>4,757</td>
<td>6,090</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>2.808</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>2.648</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>1.335</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>5.374</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>-.579</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>-2.599</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Innovation

Table 6. Psychological Empowerment Variables and employee's Innovation Behavior Q 1 Regression Summary

2. What is the most significant Psychological Empowerment factors that Predicts employee's Innovation Behavior?

The results of Regression Analysis to examine the role of each of the four Psychological Empowerment in Employee Innovation Behavior showed in Table (6). Standardized Coefficients Beta for Psychological Empowerment dimensions Is as follows. Competence :( Coefficients Beta=.199; p=.005) is Significant . Self-determination: (Coefficients Beta=, 174; p=.009) is Significant. Meaning :( Coefficients Beta=.383; p=.000) is Significant . Impact :( Coefficients Beta=.167; p=.010) is Significant . As can be seen in Table 1, the correlation coefficient between Competence and Employee Innovation behavior equal to (r=0. 447; p = 0.000).

And Meaning and Employee Innovation(r=0.497; p = 0.000) and Self-determination and Employee Innovation(r=0.351; p = 0.000) and Impact and Employee Innovation(r=0. 152; p = 0.2). Thus, According to beta weights and correlation coefficient between Variables, the Meaning have an important role and correlation with Employee Innovation Behavior, followed by Competence, Self-determination, and Impact.

3. Is there a significant difference in the viewpoint of employees about the influence of Psychological Empowerment on the Innovative Behaviors of Employees in Social Security Organization of Khorasan Razavi?

Since, variables in this study are normal. ANOVA test was used to analyze difference between the viewpoints of employees about the influence of Psychological Empowerment on the Innovative Behaviors of Employees. As can be seen in Table 7, because, in all cases the significance level is higher of 0/05.thus; there is no significant difference between the viewpoints of employees about the influence of Psychological Empowerment on the Innovative Behaviors of Employees.
4. Is there a significant difference in the viewpoint of employees about Existence Innovative Behaviors of Employees in Social Security Organization of Khorasan Razavi?

Since, variables in this study are normal, ANOVA test was used to analyze difference between the views of employees about Existence of Innovative Behaviors of Employees. As can be seen in Table 8, because, in all cases the significance level is higher of 0/05.thus; there is no significant difference between the views of employees about Existence of Innovative Behaviors of Employees in Social Security Organization of Khorasan Razavi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Significant level of variance homogeneity test</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment</td>
<td>0/679</td>
<td>0/191</td>
<td>0/966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>0/929</td>
<td>0/434</td>
<td>0/825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>0/724</td>
<td>0/308</td>
<td>0/908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination</td>
<td>0/639</td>
<td>0/145</td>
<td>0/981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>0/993</td>
<td>0/206</td>
<td>0/96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: A comparative analysis of variance

5. Is there a significant difference in the viewpoint of employees about the degree of importance of each four dimension of psychological empowerment that predicts the Innovative Behaviors of Employees in Social Security Organization of Khorasan Razavi?

Friedman non-parametric test was used to analyze viewpoint of employees about the degree of importance of each four dimension of psychological empowerment that predicts the Innovative Behaviors of Employees in Social Security Organization of Khorasan Razavi.

Null hypothesis: There is no priority between the four dimension of psychological empowerment

Suppose hypothesis: There is a priority between the four dimension of psychological empowerment

As can be seen from the table9, because the level significant in Friedman test is 0/000. We conclude that, zero hypotheses are rejected, and one hypothesis is accepted. Thus, there is a priority between four dimensions of psychological empowerment in the viewpoint of employees In Social Security Organization of Khorasan Razavi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Significant level of variance homogeneity test</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Innovation</td>
<td>0/913</td>
<td>0/277</td>
<td>0/926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idea generation</td>
<td>0/998</td>
<td>0/198</td>
<td>0/963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idea promotion</td>
<td>0/561</td>
<td>0/433</td>
<td>0/825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idea realization</td>
<td>0/999</td>
<td>0/153</td>
<td>0/979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: The results of a comparative analysis of employee’s perspectives on innovative behavior and it dimensions for each branch
Table 9: The results of Friedman test for the Priorities in dimensions of psychological empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Friedman Test</td>
<td>361/413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Degrees of freedom</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>0/000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How is the ranking of Psychological Empowerment in Social Security Organization of Khorasan Razavi?

As can be seen in Table 10, the mean ranks and rank the priority in dimensions of psychological empowerment is as follows: Competence has the most priority, followed by Meaning, Self-determination, Impact.

Table 10: The mean ranks and rank the priority in dimensions of psychological empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>mean ranks</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>4/32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>3/47</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination</td>
<td>2/13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>2/09</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Result

The following conclusions were drawn from the ten questions in this study:

1) Regarding the correlation between PE and Employee Innovation Variables, the results indicated that there was a correlation between PE and Employee Innovation. The results showed that only the Impact were not positively correlated to idea realization(r = 0/059; p = 0.000). The interpretation of these results can be stated that, When employee are strong in all four factors of psychological empowerment , they are Motivated to move towards idea generation and promotion. However, To what extent generated and promoted idea are practical, Is a function of Level of preparing the necessary infrastructure (i.e.: all of the content and structural factors, such as the following: culture, environment, technology, formality, hierarchy, career-oriented, etc).

2) Regarding the most significant employee's Psychological Empowerment factor that impact Employee Innovation Behavior, the results showed that employee meaning was the employee Psychological Empowerment factor which had the most significant impact on Innovation Behavior, followed by employee's Competence and employee's Self-determination and Impact.

3) Regarding which there is a significant difference between the viewpoints of employees about the influence of Psychological Empowerment on the Innovative Behaviors of Employees, The results showed that there is no significant difference between the viewpoints of employees.

4) Regarding which there is a significant difference between the views of employees about Existence of Innovative Behaviors of Employees, The results showed that there is no significant difference between the viewpoints of employees.
5) Regarding which there is a significant difference between the viewpoints of employees about The degree of importance of each four dimension of psychological empowerment that Predicts the Innovative Behaviors of Employees. The results showed that there is no significant difference between the viewpoint of employees.

6) Regarding which Psychological Empowerment factors could be most priority in viewpoint of employees In Social Security Organization of Khorasan Razavi. The results showed that Competence has a most priority, followed by Meaning, Self-determination, and Impact.

9. Practical Implications

This research offers some interesting practical insights for both employees and managers. The current results showed that self-perception of empowerment, (i.e. meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact) is necessary for Innovation Behavior from employees. Employees who are motivated to produce good work also need to be knowledgeable of their job processes and confident in their abilities. Therefore, when organizations desire Innovation output, managers must work to enhance a sense of meaning and competence in job coaching strategies and performance evaluations to examine job fit and training needs. The Social Security organization should ensure that team members understand that everyone is responsible for playing an active role in recognizing meaningful contributions and should regularly evaluate its recognition system. The organization should recognize employees so that individuals receive recognition consistent with their personal definition of meaningful development at every stage of their professional career. Impact should be fostered by allowing employee involvement in a number of possible areas such as strategic goal setting, shared governance, committees, and needs assessments, change initiatives, process studies and rotating team leadership. And, finally to encourage innovation behavior and increased empowerment an organization must develop a shared vision and strategic direction among all employees and to create a climate of openness and trust.
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