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Author's response to reviews:

REFEREE
May I suggest that the authors consider making the following amendments: What significant contribution does this study have to make to the literature. What is new here? This should be clarity.

AUTHOR
The most important contribution of this study is testing the validity and reliability of the Turkish version of Spreitzer's scale in primary health care personnel. Similar studies conducted in different groups in Turkey, but this is the first study in this group. The structure of factors examined in previous studies but they did not give any evidence about the construct validity of the scale.

REFEREE
Methods: The study survey giving a 67.5% response rate. #s there sufficient this response rate?
This situation, be described as limited its investigation, the reasons must be specified in method.
The participants: There is no mention of the inclusion/exclusion criteria for the study. What was the criteria for the exclusion and included for samples? The author(s) should describe them as the rationale for her/him exclusion and included criteria for samples. Sampling method is not clear; some information on how the sample was selected would be useful.
-how the sample numbers was determined.

AUTHOR
It is a methodological study and the external validity was not examined in the study we aimed to estimate the scale’s reliability, to study its dimensionality, and to evaluate its construct validity. Our sample size is enough for this kind of studies. According to literature sample size participants must be over 100, 300 subjects can be define as “good” and 1000 subject as “perfect”. (Kline P. An easy guide to factor analysis. London and New York: Routledge, 2000; Tabachnick BG, Fidel LS. Using Multivariate Statistic. Fourth Edition. Boston: Ally and
Bacon, 2001) It is also recommended to test the scale on a sample group (at least 200 people) similar to the original group can be helpful in scale development studies (Erkuş, A, Measurement and Evaluation for Classroom Teachers: Concepts and Applications (in Turkish), Ankara: Ekinoks, 2006.)

The participants were recruited from all primary health care centers (38) in a district in Ankara. The questionnaires were sent to all the health personnel in these centers. We didn’t select a sample group and try to reach the universe. Subjects voluntarily participated in the present study.

REFEREE
Measurement, Spreitzer’s Psychological Empowerment Scale
Why was the Spreitzer’s Psychological Empowerment Scale selected for a target instrument in this study? Should be explored this scale, how many items were included,

It is unclear what the clinical significance of Spreitzer’s Psychological is Empowerment Scale. For example what was the mean high score? Good or bad?

AUTHOR
The importance of empowerment for health is stressed by the World Health Organization. The lack of methods for measuring psychological empowerment in the context of work has obstructed research on empowerment. There are different questionnaires for measuring empowerment in working life. We choose Spreitzer’s Psychological Empowerment Scale. This scale has undergone the most comprehensive investigation, including the measures of reliability and regression analyses as well as the examination of the control variables (gender, age, education and unit size). (Arneson H, Ekberg K, Measuring empowerment in working life: A review, Work 26 (2006)37-46)

Spreitzer’s measure, comprising four 3-item sub-scales (total 12 items), taps the empowerment dimensions of meaning, perceived competence, self-determination and impact

“The higher scores indicate the perception of being more psychologically empowered.” This information is added to the section of “Method-measurement”.

REFEREE
Validity Study: This study, what was not used content validity and language validity. What was used only construct validity. At study should include this.

AUTHOR
The scope of the scale defined clearly based on a broad theoretical foundation in Spreitzer’s study. (Spreitzer GM: Psychological empowerment in the workplace: dimensions, measurement, and validation. Academy of Management Journal 1995, 38 (5): 1442-1465). We agree the definition related to this scope in our study.
The translation of scale to Turkish was done in another study by Hancer. The reliability and dimensions of the Turkish version analyzed in this study. The translation procedure of this study found adequate and appropriate and we didn’t need to re-translation into Turkish (Hancer M: Dimensions of the Turkish version of the psychological empowerment scale. Psychological Reports 2005, 97: 645-650.)

REFEREE
Construct validity. What were the results of Barlett’s. What were the results of the diagnostic test for sampling adequacy?

AUTHOR
We add the results of Barlett’s test and KMO test to the “Results-Dimensionality” section. Both of the results show that the sample size is appropriate for the analyses.

REFEREE
Reliability. What was not used each item analysis and internal consistency of the Spreitzer’s Psychological Empowerment Scale. Only for subscale used internal consistency and test could be re test reliability but not done.

AUTHOR
Cronbach’s alpha coefficient gives internal consistency in Likert type-response scales. Internal consistency is calculated for both sub-scale and whole scale (Tezba#aran AA, guide for developing Likert type scale (in Turkish), Turkish Psychological Association Publications, 2. Edition, 1997). Explanatory factor analyses can also be used for item analyses, and the items which have lower factor loadings from a certain level excluded from analyses. (Özcelik DA, Measurement and evaluation, Higher Education Council Student Selection and Placement Center Publications, 1992; Baykul Y, Measurement In Education And Psychology: The Classical Test Theory And Practice (in Turkish), Higher Education Council Student Selection and Placement Center Publications 2000;).

REFEREE
Tables 1: in Table 1 not included Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. It includes only the average and standard error. In this section, are there deficiencies in writing? Or are there error/deficiencies in Table 1. This situation must be corrected.

AUTHOR
The means, standard deviations and group differences are presented in Table 1. It was an unintentional mistake to write Cronbach’s alpha coefficient in the table name. We have corrected this mistake.