

## **Empowerment Perceptions of Employees in Hotel Enterprises**

**Şenol ÇAVUŞ**  
Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas  
University, Vocational School  
of Tourism and Hotel  
Management,  
Kyrgyzstan  
[senol.cavus@manas.edu.kg](mailto:senol.cavus@manas.edu.kg)

**Cüneyt TOKMAK**  
Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas  
University, Vocational School  
of Tourism and Hotel  
Management,  
Kyrgyzstan  
[cuneyttokmak@gmail.com](mailto:cuneyttokmak@gmail.com)

**Nasiykat MAMBETOVA**  
Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas  
University, Institute of Social  
Sciences, Department of  
Business Administration,  
Kyrgyzstan

### **Abstract**

The concept of empowerment, which is applicable for any social group that the person belongs to, is an essential phenomenon for continuity and success of the organization. The main purpose of this study is to determine the empowerment perceptions of employees in hotel industry. The research was conducted in four and five star hotels that operate in the city of Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, and 170 employees were reached at those hotels. Empowerment perceptions of the employees were measured using the scales “*Conditions of Work Effectiveness Questionnaire-II, CWEQ-II*” and “*Psychological Empowerment Scale, PES*”. As a result of factor analysis made on the scales, it was observed that structural empowerment and psychological empowerment perceptions were grouped into three sub-dimensions. And in comparisons based on demographic factors; it was observed that perceptions of empowerment have clearly differentiated according to level of education, level of income, hotel class, tourism education position, employee position.

**Keywords:** Employee Empowerment, Structural Empowerment, Psychological Empowerment, Hotel Enterprises. Bishkek

### **Introduction**

Hotel enterprises are the areas of tourism sector which are known as having the largest job opportunities and require intensive hours of labor and high-level guest relationship. Hotel enterprises, which draw their most important strength from their employees, can as well create the quality perception with their employees. Accordingly, it is not wrong to say that the way to be a powerful enterprise for hotel enterprises is possible by having powerful or empowered employees. The empowerment concept has a vital importance for hotel enterprises when considered with this point of view. It is observed that other than tourism discipline, empowerment topic is also reviewed in many areas such as political sciences, organizational behaviour, social studies, social welfare, education, management, studies related with health, community psychology, sociology (Prati and Zani, 2013: 852). In this study, perceptions of the employees related with structural and psychological empowerment were tried to be reviewed in the hotels which are considered as leading factors of the tourism industry. In the study, literature information about the empowerment concept were given at first and then staff

empowerment concept was discussed. In the last part, the data for method and field research were analyzed and findings were interpreted.

### **Empowerment Concept**

Being a powerful organization depends on powerful organization members. The time has reached a point in which the power concept is collected in the organization instead of person, and organization gets strength from its qualified members. Empowerment efforts are considered important in order to increase organizational effectiveness and performance of employees and improve their creativity, and such efforts yield positive results. (Logan and Ganster, 2007; Pieterse et al., 2010; Choudhury and Giri, 2013) According to Leach, Wall and Jackson (2003), if the experience, information and self-efficacy related with work are desired to be increased, empowerment efforts should be taken into consideration.

Empowerment concept has become a concept used almost in every field. In total, it is possible to state an empowerment concept for the entire humanity, which is required by the era. With the increase in population of the mankind, social groups have appeared such as ruled-ruling, leader-follower, rich-poor, authorized-unauthorized, in which power distribution is unbalanced. The disadvantageous part of those social groups gave different reactions in USA, England, Germany and France (Revolutions which took place during 17th and 18th centuries) than they did in Middle East countries (The Arab Spring) and former Soviet Union Countries (Break up of communism, green revolution and colour revolution). Based upon such events, Welzel (2013) considered the empowerment concept as a way of liberation and pointed out that values related with liberation were larger process of individual empowerment concept. Indeed, there is a linear relationship between being powerful and being free, and every kind of activity made to empower the person contributes to his/her liberation. There is even a fact that the social section of the society, which is weaker in terms of social and economic sense, can not even exercise their democratic rights. Therefore; political reforms, institutions and efforts made for empowering the disadvantageous social section do not only contribute to people in this group, but also considerably to entire society and the state (Manor, 2004; Pigg, 2002). Empowerment is a participating mechanism that provides persons, groups, families and societies to have power and control on their own destiny and increase their level of control (Prati and Zani, 2013: 852), and contributes particularly to individuals for the following issues (Kirst-Ashman, 2008: 30):

- A positive perception for self confidence and competence,
- Ability to control his/her own life,
- Skill in working with others and emotions that make think he/she is effective in social life,
- Approach to affect decision making mechanisms in social life.

Individuals who make progress in above defined issues live their lives as more effective and more successful persons with full self confidence. Petersen and Speer (2000), who discussed the empowerment concept that turned into an obligation, stated that this change consisted of three stages. First one of those is a political and objective change at macro level, the second is a change that focuses on personal and individual development at micro level, and the third one can be stated as a kind of interface that appears as a mixture of the first two. It can be said that the change stated at third level is applicable for other social groups between the individual and society. To say the truth,

in a fast changing and developing world, efforts for empowerment are inevitable requirements. Schwahn and Spady (2010) referred today's world a kind of "empowermentland", and stated that when compared to previous generations, current generation had much more opportunities to improve themselves and accomplish something.

All the humans become a member of a group when they are alive. These groups may be structures as family, social organization, neighbourhood relations, working organization, religious community, society and nation (Stewart, 2005). Accordingly, it is possible to mention more than one group for each individual which they are members of. Roles, statuses, influences of people in a group also bring up the empowerment concept. In general, empowerment can be considered as a development process which the governors and leaders wish to achieve for the ruled, and a part of personal and individual development. World Bank has addressed the empowerment concept which it socially considered, as the institutional and organization oriented efforts to be done in order to increase the capacities and existences of poor social classes. (Narayan, 2002). The main point here is to increase opportunities of the people who are less heard compared to upper classes of society and have relatively limited freedom due to their disadvantageous positions. For example, efforts for women empowerment to make female population more effective (Swai, 2010), efforts made to increase effectiveness of disabled persons in society, efforts for empowerment of low-salaried employees are all in that scope.

### **Staff Empowerment**

Enterprises can increase their quality and organizational success with their employees. When considered in terms of organizational point of view, empowerment efforts also include the development of individual, participation to decision making, enhancing his/her own area of freedom, having more qualified personality and increase his/her level of knowledge, skill and training. In the research conducted by Toplu and Akça (2013), it was stated that empowerment perceptions of members of an organization that attaches importance to learning and training was higher. Training and development efforts in individual sense makes positive contributions to the organization, while training and development efforts in organizational sense makes positive contributions to the individual.

The empowerment concept is generally considered as a concept that targets organization members and particularly the ruled persons having weaker positions. With this point of view, the topic is discussed with staff empowerment concept. Koçel (2011) evaluates staff empowerment concept as the process of participation to decisions, and extension of delegation and motivation. As an important concept of management area, he defines empowerment as the process to increase decision powers of employees and develop them through helping each other, sharing, education and team work. It is stated that since it has a broader meaning, it differs from motivation, accession period and delegation concepts. Staff empowerment is used in providing power, authority and energy for the staff, and considered as an obligatory term imposed to organization executives by global competition (Çavuş, 2008). Staff empowerment is deemed as a process which allows people to develop their current status and increase their personal, interpersonal and political powers (Kirst-Ashman, 2008: 29). In terms of management science, this concept began to popularize during 1990s, and it was aimed to make staff

feel more free by giving them more power to take decision (Robbins, 1996: 17). As Gummer (1998) indicated the leadership in organizations, he pointed out that empowerment could contribute important benefits to a sense of leadership that increases the effectiveness of organization members (cited by; Peterson and Speer, 2000: 41).

Empowerment has added a very different dimension to working together in the organization phenomenon. Abilities, performances and innovative senses of employees develop, in case they are working in an organization having empowered members (Scott and Jaffe, 1991). Basically, it is possible to mention two types of empowerment which are physiological and structural empowerments. Particularly, number of studies that associate psychological empowerment concept with job satisfaction and employee performance are quite much. According to the research results on teachers made by one of those studies by Khany and Tazik (2015), a strong relationship was found between psychological empowerment and job satisfaction. Fernandez and Moldogaziev (2013) refer to many studies in the literature and state that there is a positive relationship between staff empowerment and performance. In the research made by Çöl (2008), the relationship between staff performance and psychological empowerment was tried to be measured. This study was conducted on academicians, psychological empowerment concept was described as "perceived empowerment" and its relationship was tried to be measured with four sub dimension. According to results of this study, it was as well revealed that meaning and competence sub dimension of psychological empowerment are the most important sub dimensions affecting the work performance. The four sub dimensions of psychological empowerment concept stated as well in the said study are as follows:

- Meaning attributed to the work by staff,
- Sense of competence or self-efficacy regarding the staff can do his/her best for the job.
- Self determination, which points out the power of decision making for starting, continuation, termination of the job and making necessary amendments.
- The sense of impact, which the staff has on method, strategy and results of the job that mostly concerns with decision making process.

Structural empowerment is related with the right employment of empowerment mechanisms in an organization. Existence of instruments in the organization such as delegation, budget, technology, training opportunity, design of works, physical environment, which are necessary to empower staff, is among the main factors affecting individual power (Koçel, 2011: 417). In order to mention structural empowerment, the organization should create opportunities for its members and make knowledge and source support. In the literature, six sub dimensions of structural empowerment are stated which consist of opportunities, knowledge, sources, support, formal and informal power (Sürgevil, Tolay and Topayan, 2013: 5374). Although perceptive dimension of psychological empowerment concept is in the foreground, it can be said that organizational structure and empowerment instruments became more apparent.

## Method

### Population and Sample

Main population of the research consists of staff working in 4 and 5 star hotel enterprises in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan. During the period the research was conducted, it was identified that there were sixteen active hotel enterprises in Bishkek five of which was 5 star and eleven of which was 4 star, and that number of staff working in such hotels was 500. Approximately 35% (170 people) were selected as sample from the determined population, and in distribution of sampling by hotels, stratified sampling method was applied.

### Measuring Instrument

In collecting the research data, validity and reliability study was applied by using *Conditions Of Work Effectiveness Questionnaire-II, CWEQ-II* developed by Laschinger et al. (2001) and *Psychological Empowerment Scale, PES* developed by Spreitzer (1995), both of which were adapted into Turkish language by Sürgevil, Tolay and Topoyan (2013).

*CWEQ-II Structural Empowerment scale* consists of six sub dimensions which are *opportunity, knowledge, support, access to sources, formal power (Job Activities Scale-JAS)* and *informal power (Organizational Relationships Scale-ORS)* each having three expressions, and *Global Empowerment* with two expressions which is only used for structural validity and not included in total empowerment point. And Psychological Empowerment Instrument-PEI consists of four sub groups which are *meaningfulness, competence, self-determination and impact*, each of which consist of three expressions (Sürgevil, Tolay and Topoyan, 2013).

Both scale was evaluated using 5 Point Likert Scale. According to that, participants were asked to state at what level they were agree with structural and psychological empowerment expressions by choosing one of these options “1-I strongly disagree, 2-I don't agree, 3-I am neutral, 4-I mostly agree, 5- I strongly agree” High values obtained from the scale indicate high structural and psychological empowerment perception. Results can be obtained for each dimension by evaluating sub dimensions of scales are in themselves, and *total structural and psychological empowerment* point is obtained by adding all dimensions.

### Collecting data

Research data were collected by questionnaire. Questionnaire form was first prepared in Turkish, then translated into Kyrgyz and Russian languages. Translations were made by academicians who work in Kyrgyzstan-Turkey Manas University and are expert between Turkish-Kyrgyz and Turkish-Russian languages. Translation validity of Turkish forms were tested by reverse translation technique.

In the questionnaire, there were expressions in Structural and Psychological Empowerment Scales as well as questions related with personal characteristics of participants such as gender, age, income, level of education and job characteristics. The questionnaire was conducted by face to face talking to hotel employees.

## Data Analysis

In analysis of research data, descriptive statistics as well as Exploratory Factor Analysis and parametric tests were applied to data. In order to determine whether there is a difference in averages of responses for empowerment perceptions of the participants according to their demographic attributes, independent groups t-test and one way variance analysis (One Way Anova) were made.

In order to review the empowerment perceptions of people who participated the research, factor analysis was applied to Structural Empowerment Scale and Psychological Empowerment Scale separately. In this frame, in order to determine that it arranges with factor structures validity and reliability of which were tested by Sürgevil, Tolay and Topoyan (2013), Maximum Likelihood method was applied by limiting Structural Empowerment Scale with 6 factors and Psychological Empowerment Scale with 4 factors. As result of this method, it was observed that factor structures appeared were compatible with the factor structures recommended by Sürgevil, Tolay and Topoyan (2013), however, two factors for Structural Empowerment Scale and Eigen value of one factor for Psychological Empowerment Scale were below 1. Thereupon, it was decided to evaluate the scales by Principal Components Analysis and Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

As result of analyses, it was understood that the expressions in "formal power" and "informal power" factors in six sub dimensional Structural Empowerment Scale which was recommended by Sürgevil, Tolay and Topoyan (2013) and referred to this study, and two expressions in the "source" factor prevented formation of significant factor structures. It was observed that the expressions in "sufficiency" factor of four sub dimensional Psychological Empowerment Scale also destroyed the structure of Psychological Empowerment factors. As result of recurring analysis, three sub dimensions appeared related with Structural Empowerment. While two of those dimensions (knowledge and opportunity) were compatible with the dimensions recommended by Sürgevil, Tolay and Topoyan (2013), an expression was placed into support dimension from source dimension. Therefore, support dimension was named as "**support/source**". In Psychological Empowerment Scale, after excluding sufficiency dimension expressions from the analysis, three sub dimensions compatible with dimensions recommended by Sürgevil, Tolay and Topoyan (2013) were present.

According to factor analysis results, it was seen that value of Sample Sufficiency Scale (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin:KMO) was 0,863 for Structural Empowerment Scale and 0,746 for Psychological Empowerment Scale. These values indicate that both two scales explained the factor structures of their data at good level. Moreover, values of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity [For Structural Empowerment Scale ( $p=.000$ , Chi Square 770,869, degree of freedom  $df=45$ ); For Psychological Empowerment Scale ( $p=.000$ , Chi Square 689,939, degree of freedom  $df=36$ )] show that there is enough relationship between the variables to make factor analysis and that the collected data set is suitable for making factor analysis (Leech et al., 2005: 82).

And according to internal reliability results, it was seen that internal reliability results of both scale's sub dimensions were over Cronbach  $\alpha=0,80$ . These values show that scales are reliable.

## Findings and Interpretation

### Demographic Attributes of Participants

Most of the hotel employees who participated the research work in 4 star hotels. 78% of the participants do not have any tourism education and most of them consist of females (61,8%). When employees working in hotel enterprises are reviewed by age groups, it is understood that young employment level, which is generally seen in tourism sector, is also available here. 68.8% of total participants consist of people within 20-30 age group. Besides, when participants are reviewed by their duration of work, it is observed that the great majority (% 69,5) is included within 1-3 year range. So, these results reveal that the situation is parallel to short term employment which is common in tourism industry, particularly in accommodation sector.

**Table 1: Demographic Attributes of Participants**

Criteria	Frequency	Percentage	Criteria	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Hotel Stars</b>			<b>Any Educational Background on Tourism?</b>		
4 Star	110	64,7	Yes	34	20
5 Star	60	35,3	No	134	78
<b>Gender</b>			No answer	2	2
Male	65	38,2	<b>Duration of Work In the Hotel</b>		
Female	105	61,8	Less than 1 Year	55	32,4
<b>Age Groups</b>			1-3 Years	63	37,1
20-25	67	39,4	4-6 Years	27	15,9
26-30	50	29,4	7 or more	22	12,9
31-35	26	15,3	No answer	3	1,7
36-40	13	7,6	<b>Departments of Participants</b>		
41-45	6	3,5	Front office	50	29,4
46 or more	8	4,7	Housekeeping	35	20,6
<b>Educational Status</b>			Food-Beverage	38	22,4
High School	28	16,5	Accounting	5	2,9
Associate Degree	56	32,9	Marketing	2	1,2
Bachelor Degree	83	48,8	Kitchen-Service	5	2,9
Master's Degree	2	1,2	Human Sources	2	1,2
Doctorate	1	0,6	Guest Relations	13	7,6
<b>Marital Status</b>			Technical Services	13	7,6
Married	66	38,8	No answer	7	4,1
Single	93	35,7	<b>Positions of Participants In Hotel</b>		
Divorced	9	5,3	Low Level Personnel	54	31,8
No answer	2	1,2	Mid Level Personnel	88	51,8
<b>Monthly Average Level of Income (Som)</b>			Top Executive	21	12,4
5000 or below	7	4,1	No answer	7	4,0
5.001-10.000	80	47,1	<b>Duration of Work In Current Position</b>		
10.001-15.000	55	32,4	Less than 1 Year	62	36,5
15.001-20.000	15	8,8	1-3 Years	67	39,4
20,001 or more	9	5,3	4-6 Years	21	12,4
No answer	4	2,4	7 or more	19	11,2
<i>Note: 1 USD is approximately 60 SOM</i>			No answer	1	0,6

### Findings Related With Factor Analysis

As result of factor analyses, findings related with factors concerning the Structural Empowerment and Psychological Environment of employees working at 4 and 5 star hotels in Bishkek are presented in Table 2 and Table 3.

**Table 2. Findings of Structural Empowerment Scale Factor Analysis**

Factors	Factor Load	Eigenvalue	Explained Variance (%)	Rel. ( $\alpha$ )
<b>1. Support/Source</b>		4,803	48,034	,805
D3. <i>I receive useful tips or troubleshooting suggestions.</i>	,827			
D1. <i>I receive feedback for the things I've done good.</i>	,784			
D2. <i>I receive explanatory information about the things I can improve.</i>	,758			
K3. <i>I can receive assistance when I need.</i>	,672			
<b>2. Information</b>		1,242	12,419	,851
B3. <i>I have information about the aims of top management.</i>	-,853			
B2. <i>I have information about the values of top management.</i>	-,844			
B1. <i>I can access information about the current status of the establishment.</i>	-,764			
<b>3. Opportunity</b>		1,088	10,879	,815
F3. <i>I have duties in which I can use all my knowledge and skills.</i>	-,871			
F2. <i>I think I found an opportunity to get new knowledge and skills.</i>	-,778			
F1. <i>I think the job is challenging but also contributing to me.</i>	-,755			
<b>Total Variance 71,333 (%)</b>				
<b>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Sampling Adequacy Scale : ,863</b>		<b>Bartlett Sphericity Test: p value .000 Chi Square 770,869, df=45</b>		

As seen in Table 2, structural empowerment perceptions of employees working at 4 and 5 star hotels in Bishkek are collected in 3 factors which are support/source, information and opportunity. These factors explain 71,333% of the variance in structural empowerment measurement model. The first factor (support/source) in factor structure explains 48,034 % of the total variance while the second (information) explains %12,419 % of that and the third (opportunity) 10,879 %. Those findings show that perceptions of the participants on structural empowerment centred upon support/source dimension; but in information and opportunity dimensions, that explanation of their structural empowerment perceptions was weaker.

As seen in Table 3, Psychological Empowerment perceptions of employees working at 4 and 5 star hotels in Bishkek are collected in 3 factors which are significance, impact and self-determination. These factors explain 75,569% of the variance in Psychological Empowerment measurement model. The first factor (significance) in factor structure explains 41,832 % of the total variance while the second (impact) explains %17,585 % of that and the third (self-determination) 16,132 %. Those findings show that perceptions of hotel employees on psychological empowerment centred upon whether they find their work meaningful, and that impact of employees on their work and their perceptions on the work are secondary and tertiary explanatory factors.

**Table 3. Factor Analysis Findings of Psychological Empowerment Scale**

Factors	Factor Load	Eigenvalue	Explained Variance (%)	Rel. ( $\alpha$ )
<b>1. Meaningfulness</b>		3,767	41,852	,820
A2. <i>Activities that I do while performing my job seem meaningful to me.</i>	,861			
A3. <i>The work I do is meaningful for me.</i>	,851			
A1. <i>The work I do is very important for me.</i>	,839			
<b>2. Impact</b>		1,583	17,585	,828
E2. <i>I have control over the incidents taking place in my department.</i>	,927			
E1. <i>I have a big impact over the incidents taking place in my department.</i>	,840			
E3. <i>I have a voice in the incidents taking place in my department.</i>	,785			
<b>3. Self-Determination</b>		1,452	16,132	,845
O2. <i>I can decide how I will do my work.</i>	-,932			
O1. <i>I have a considerable self-determination in determining how I will do my job.</i>	-,837			
O3. <i>I have substantial opportunities to do my job free and independently.</i>	-,823			
<b>Total Variance (%)</b>			75,569	
<b>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Sampling Adequacy Scale :</b> ,746		<b>Bartlett Sphericity Test: p value .000 Chi Square 689,939, df=36</b>		

### Comparison Analyses Performed According to Demographic Attributes of Participants

In order to determine whether there are differences in averages of answers relating with empowerment perceptions of the participants according to their demographic attributes, independent groups t-test was performed for paired comparisons and one way variance analysis (One Way Anova) was performed for multiple comparisons. In multiple comparisons, homogeneity of between-groups variances was considered first. Since homogeneity assumption of variances was not met, Games-Howell test was applied in multiple comparison tests, which is an assumption depending on variances are not homogeneous. In result of analyses, findings identified related with differences between groups were presented and evaluated in the below tables.

In table 4, it is observed that there is a significant difference in averages of points relating to information dimension of structural empowerment according to age groups of participants ( $F=2,331, p=0,45$ ). It is understood that this difference results from the averages of 20-25 age group and 41-45 age group. Point averages of 20-25 age group related to information dimension is higher than 41-45 age group.

**Table 4. Results of One Way Variance Analysis (Anova) Performed According to Age Groups**

Empowerment Dimension	Source of Variance	One Way Variance Analysis (Anova)					Multiple Comparison Test (Post-Hoc-Games-Howell)			
		Sum of Squares	df	Aver. Of Squares	F	p	(I) Age	(J) Age	Aver. Difference (I-J)	p
Information (YG)	Between-groups	14,222	5	2,844	2,331	,045	20-25	41-45	,75290*	,033
	Within-groups	200,106	164	1,220						
	Total	214,327	169							

There is a significant difference between meaningfulness ( $F=3,272, p=0,040$ ) and self-determination ( $F=2,331, p=0,002$ ) dimensions of psychological empowerment scale in point averages related to empowerment perceptions of participants according to their marital status. In meaningful dimension, while married and single ones find their work more meaningful compared to divorced ones, only the married ones feel themselves more self-determined than singles.

**Table 5. Results of One Way Variance Analysis (Anova) Performed According to Marital Status**

Empowerment Dimension	Source of Variance	One Way Variance Analysis (Anova)					Multiple Comparison Test (Post-Hoc-Games-Howell)			
		Sum of Squares	df	Aver. Of Squares	F	p	(I) Marital Status	(J) Marital Status	Aver. Difference (I-J)	p
Meaningfulness (PG)	Between-groups	4,970	2	2,485	3,272	,040	Divorced	Married	-,76599*	,016
	Within-groups	125,310	165	,759				Single	-,76225*	,015
	Total	130,280	167							
Self-Determination (PG)	Between-groups	8,824	2	4,412	6,439	,002	Divorced	Married	-,99663*	,020
	Within-groups	113,059	165	,685						
	Total	121,883	167							

When empowerment perceptions of participants are evaluated according to their educational status (Table 6), it is observed that there are significant differences between point averages related to all sub dimensions of structural empowerment that took place in this study (support/source:  $F=3,807, p=0,011$ ; information:  $F=5,490, p=0,001$ ; opportunity:  $F=3,169, p=0,026$ ). In support/source dimension, it is understood that participants having bachelor education have higher point averages than associate graduates; and the ones having master's degree have higher point averages than associate and bachelor graduates both in support/source dimension and in terms of information and opportunity dimension. These findings show that as the level of education increases, empowerment perception increases as well and employees participate more in management decision and application processes.

**Table 6. Results of One Way Variance Analysis (Anova) Performed According to Educational Status**

Empowerment Dimension	Source of Variance	One Way Variance Analysis (Anova)					Multiple Comparison Test (Post-Hoc-Games-Howell)			
		Sum of Squares	df	Aver. Of Squares	F	p	(I) Education	(J) Education	Aver. Difference (I-J)	p
Support/Source (YG)	Between-groups	8,058	3	2,686	3,807	,011	Bachelor Degree	Associate Degree	,42013*	,028
	Within-groups	117,120	166	,706				High School	,84524*	,000
	Total	125,178	169					Master's Degree	Associate Degree	,92113*
								Bachelor Degree	,50100*	,012
Information (YG)	Between-groups	19,346	3	6,449	5,490	,001	Master's Degree	High School	2,11508*	,000
	Within-groups	194,981	166	1,175				Associate Degree	2,16865*	,000
	Total	214,327	169					Bachelor Degree	1,70415*	,000
Opportunity (YG)	Between-groups	8,692	3	2,897	3,169	,026	Master's Degree	High School	,86111*	,003
	Within-groups	151,753	166	,914				Associate Degree	1,07540*	,000
	Total	160,445	169					Bachelor Degree	,62918*	,018

**Table 7. Results of One Way Variance Analysis (Anova) Performed According to Income Status**

Empowerment Dimension	Source of Variance	One Way Variance Analysis (Anova)					Multiple Comparison Test (Post-Hoc-Games-Howell)			
		Sum of Squares	df	Aver. Of Squares	F	p	(I) Income (Som)	(J) Income (Som)	Aver. Difference (I-J)	p
Information (YG)	Between-groups	32,530	4	8,133	7,577	,000	10.001-15.000	5.001-10.000	,519*	,038
	Within-groups	172,803	161	1,073				5.001-10.000	1,448*	,000
	Total	205,333	165					15.001-20.000	10.001-15.000	,929*
Opportunity (YG)	Between-groups	20,293	4	5,073	5,923	,000	10.001-15.000	5.001-10.000	,6117*	,001
	Within-groups	137,890	161	,856						
	Total	158,183	165							

Impact (PG)	Between-groups	37,279	4	9,320	9,941	,000	10.001-15.000	5.001-10.000	,682*	,001
	Within-groups	150,946	161	,938			15.001-20.000	5.001-10.000	1,258*	,001
	Total	188,226	165							
Self-Determination (PG)	Between-groups	8,712	4	2,178	3,134	,016	20.001 or more	10.001-15.000	,898*	,024
	Within-groups	111,881	161	,695						
	Total	120,592	165							

In Table 7, the findings empowerment point averages of which are identified according to income status of participants are presented (*Information (YG)*  $F=7,577, p=0,000$ ; *Opportunity (YG)*  $F=5,923, p=0,000$ ; *Impact (PG)*  $F=9,941, p=0,000$ ; *Self-Determination (PG)*  $F=3,134, p=0,016$ ). As can be seen in Table 7, participants having monthly average income between the range of 10.001-15.000 Soms have higher averages compared to participants having monthly average income between the range of 5.001-10.000 soms in information and opportunity dimensions of structural empowerment scale and impact dimension of psychological empowerment. Participants having monthly average income between the range of 15.001-20.000 soms have higher average values compared to participants having monthly average income between the range of 5.001-10.000 and 10.001-15.000 soms in information dimension of structural empowerment scale; and higher values compared to ones having monthly average income between the range of 5.001-10.000 in impact dimension of psychological empowerment. And in self-determination dimension of psychological empowerment scale, participants having monthly average income of -20.001 and more soms have higher average values compared to participants having monthly average income between the range of 10.001-15.000.

Two independent t test results, which are performed for point averages related to empowerment perceptions of participants according to hotel groups they work in, are presented in Table 8. When table values are reviewed, it is seen that there is significant difference between the point averages of the ones working in 4 star hotels and 5 star hotels in support/source ( $t(168) = -2,311, p = ,022$ ), information ( $t(168) = -4,074, p = ,000$ ) and opportunity dimensions of structural empowerment scale, and in impact dimension of psychological empowerment scale ( $t(168) = -3,100, p = ,002$ ). Such differences are in favour of 5 star hotel staff for all dimensions. In other words, 5 star hotel staff feel themselves more empowered than 4 star hotel staff in terms of support/source, information and impact dimensions.

**Table 8. Results of Independent Two Sampling T Test Performed According to Hotel Groups**

Empowerment Dimensions	Group	N	Aver.	Standard Deviation	t	df	p																																
Support/Source (YG)	4 star	110	3,3682	,82514	-2,311	168	,022																																
	5 star	60	3,6833	,89356				Information (YG)	4 star	110	2,7455	1,11694	-4,074	168	,000	5 star	60	3,4500	1,00061	Opportunity (YG)	4 star	110	3,0576	,96615	-4,824	168	,000	5 star	60	3,7667	,81488	Impact (PG)	4 star	110	2,7091	1,05420	-3,100	168	,002
Information (YG)	4 star	110	2,7455	1,11694	-4,074	168	,000																																
	5 star	60	3,4500	1,00061				Opportunity (YG)	4 star	110	3,0576	,96615	-4,824	168	,000	5 star	60	3,7667	,81488	Impact (PG)	4 star	110	2,7091	1,05420	-3,100	168	,002	5 star	60	3,2278	1,02049								
Opportunity (YG)	4 star	110	3,0576	,96615	-4,824	168	,000																																
	5 star	60	3,7667	,81488				Impact (PG)	4 star	110	2,7091	1,05420	-3,100	168	,002	5 star	60	3,2278	1,02049																				
Impact (PG)	4 star	110	2,7091	1,05420	-3,100	168	,002																																
	5 star	60	3,2278	1,02049																																			

The results of independent t test, which was performed in order to determine whether there is a difference between point averages for empowerment perceptions of participants according to having education on tourism, are presented in Table 9. As seen in the table, point averages of employees having tourism education related to support/source  $t(166)=1,985, p=,049$ , information  $t(166)=3,999, p=,000$  and opportunity  $t(166)=2,150, p=,033$  dimensions of structural empowerment scale are higher than the ones not having tourism education. Those findings present that the staff who had tourism education feel themselves more empowered than the staff not having tourism education.

**Table 9. Results of Independent Two Sampling T Test Performed According to Having Education in Tourism**

Empowerment Dimensions	Group	N	Average	Standard Deviation	t	df	p
Support/Source (YG)	Yes	34	3,7426	,87794	1,985	166	,049
	No	134	3,4179	,84559			
Information (YG)	Yes	34	3,6569	1,01000	3,999	166	,000
	No	134	2,8333	1,08745			
Opportunity (YG)	Yes	34	3,6176	,95393	2,150	166	,033
	No	134	3,2214	,96119			

**Table 10. Results of One Way Variance Analysis (Anova) Performed According to Departments They Work In**

Empowerment Dimension	Source of Variance	One Way Variance Analysis (Anova)					Multiple Comparison Test (Post-Hoc-Games-Howell)			
		Sum of Squares	df	Aver. Of Squares	F	p	(I) Department	(J) Department	Aver. Difference (I-J)	p
Information (YG)	Between-groups	18,991	8	2,374	1,945	,047	HR	Front office	,76667	,001
	Within-groups	188,003	154	1,221				Housekeeping	1,24762	,000
	Total	206,994	162					Food - Bev.	1,21053	,000
								Tech. serv.	1,53846	,000
Opportunity (YG)	Between-groups	14,697	8	1,837	2,032	,046	Front office	HR	,52000	,009
	Within-groups	139,253	154	,904			Accounting	Housekeeping	1,02857	,033
	Total	153,950	162							

In Table 10, findings are presented in which difference is identified between point averages related to empowerment perceptions of participants according to department they work in (*Information (YG) F=1,945, p=0,047; Opportunity (YG) F=2,032, p=0,046*). According to values in the table, in information dimension of structural empowerment scale, it is observed that participants working at human resources department have higher point averages than the ones working at front office, housekeeping, food-beverage and technical service departments. And in opportunity dimension of structural empowerment scale, it is understood that the ones working at front office department have higher point averages than the ones working at HR

department, and the ones working at accounting department have higher point averages than the ones working at housekeeping department.

In Table 11, findings are presented in which significant difference is identified between empowerment perception point averages of participants according to their positions in hotels they work in (*Support/Source (YG) F=3,974, p=0,021; Information (YG) F=7,384, p=0,001; Opportunity (YG) F=3,816, p=0,024; Meaningfulness (PG) F=4,912, p=0,009; Impact PG) F=7,123, p=0,001*).

**Table 11. Results of One Way Variance Analysis (Anova) Performed According to Positions**

Empowerment Dimension	Source of Variance	One Way Variance Analysis (Anova)					Multiple Comparison Test(Post-Hoc) Games-Howell			
		Sum of Squares	df	Aver. Of Squares	F	p	(I) Position	(J) Position	Aver. Difference (I-J)	p
Support/Source (YG)	Between-groups	5,688	2	2,844	3,974	,021	Top position	Lower level	,53042*	,015
	Within-groups	114,507	160	,716						
	Total	120,195	162							
Information (YG)	Between-groups	17,511	2	8,755	7,384	,001	Mid level	Lower level	,46086*	,047
	Within-groups	189,706	160	1,186			Top position	Lower level	1,03968*	,001
	Total	207,216	162							
Opportunity (YG)	Between-groups	6,777	2	3,389	3,816	,024	Top position	Lower level	,62257*	,033
	Within-groups	142,080	160	,888						
	Total	148,858	162							
Meaningfulness (PG)	Between-groups	7,358	2	3,679	4,912	,009	Top position	Lower level	,64198*	,017
	Within-groups	119,841	160	,749						
	Total	127,198	162							
Impact PG)	Between-groups	15,078	2	7,539	7,123	,001	Mid level	Lower level	,51431*	,010
	Within-groups	169,359	160	1,058			Top position	Lower level	,90212*	,013
	Total	184,438	162							

When table values are reviewed, it is seen that point averages of top level staff are higher than lower level staff in support/source, information and support dimensions of structural empowerment; and also higher in meaningfulness and impact dimensions of psychological empowerment scale. Again, point average of mid-level staff in opportunity dimension of structural empowerment scale and impact dimension of psychological empowerment were also found higher than point averages of lower level staff. These findings indicate that the ones working at top level feel themselves more empowered than the staff working at lower level.

## Conclusion and Recommendations

Among the industries in which manpower and labor force is considered important, tourism sector should probably be ranked as the one having the highest priority. When it comes to tourism sector, perhaps one of the most important sub sectors that comes to mind is the accommodation sector. Since hotel enterprises provide 24 hour service and particularly the city hotels are open 365 days, they are the units which need to employ more personnel. Therefore, empowerment perceptions of employees working in such establishments are quite important.

In this study, in order to measure the empowerment perceptions of employees, Laschinger's structural empowerment scale and Spreitzer's psychological empowerment scale were taken as basis validity and reliability of which were tested by Sürvegil et al. (2013) In the research, scales used for measuring the empowerment perceptions of hotel employees were tested by factor analysis, and dimensions of empowerment revealed by related scales presented differentness in this study. It is estimated that the differences experienced in the said sub dimensions arise from cultural diversity and difficulties of employees to understand the questionnaire. Moreover, empowerment perceptions of employees were compared to different demographic dimensions and it was tried to identify if there were significant relationships. Detailed information about these comparisons are presented in the findings section, and the results featured here were tried to be collected.

As result of factor analysis applied to structural empowerment scale, perceptions of employees are collected in support/source, information and opportunity sub dimensions. Likewise, Roman and Bretones (2013) applied structural empowerment scale on employees, and tested its validity and reliability on opportunity, information, support and source sub dimensions as result of explanatory factor analysis. In that research, structural empowerment scale was identified as a valid and reliable scale with its four sub dimensions. As result of factor analysis performed on psychological empowerment scale, it is observed that perceptions of employees are collected at meaningfulness, impact and self-determination sub dimensions. Similarly, results of factor analysis appeared with three sub dimensions in the study of Çavuş (2008). According to factor analysis results of psychological empowerment scale applied by Albar et al. (2012) by translating them into Spanish, the scale was accepted with its four sub dimensions, only one factor was not supported.

In this study, empowerment sub dimensions obtained differently from original scale was taken as basis with various demographic information, and different levels of perception between groups were tried to be revealed as result of those comparisons, some results has come into prominence. In comparison made according to level of education, it was seen that empowerment perception has increased positively in parallel to level of education. The highest empowerment perception was identified to be available at master education level. In comparison made according to level of income, staff group with higher income has as well higher empowerment perception than the staff group with lower income. Employees having tourism education feel themselves more empowered than the employees not having tourism education. This result can be interpreted as the tourism education is also important due to its positive contribution to empowerment perception. Koçel (2011) states that empowerment has a kind of education and self improvement dimension. The results here support this assessment.

When empowerment perceptions of employees working in hotel enterprises are compared according to hotel star they work in, it was revealed that the ones working in five star hotels feel themselves more empowered than the ones working in four star hotels. The reason the ones working in five star hotels feel themselves more empowered might be due to five star hotels being more qualified in organizational and corporate sense. In hotel enterprises; organizational climate, organizational culture and organization format might change substantially according to their qualifications and thus number of stars. In the study conducted by Peterson and Speer (2000), although they were not able to find a relation in general terms between empowerment and organizational characters, in one of the compared organizations, it was stated that it had the highest level of perception compared to other organizations at two basic dimension of psychological empowerment perceptions. It can be stated that based on that study by Peterson and Speer (2000) and the results obtained from that, organizational characteristics might affect empowerment perception. In the research conducted by Pelit and Öztürk (2011) in hotel enterprises, the enterprises were compared as city hotels and summer place hotels. And according to results of this research, empowerment perceptions of employees working at city hotels resulted higher than empowerment perceptions of employees working at summer place hotels. Authors attributed this differentness to seasonal operation of summer place hotels and city hotels being more professional in organizational sense. Another important result came up in the comparison made according to position of employees. According to this comparison, the ones working at top level feel themselves more empowered than the ones working at lower level. This perception might have appeared differently since top level personnel has decision making power and have a voice in management. However, in case top level managers empower the employees in lower levels, their power will not decrease and even fulfill their duties in a more effective way (Karakoç, 2007). Thus, it is possible that lower level staff might feel themselves more empowered.

### References

- ALBAR, Maria Jesus, RAMIREZ, Manuel Garcia, JIMENEZ, Ana Maria Lopez, and GARRIDO, Rocio (2012). *Spanish Adaptation of Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace*, The Spanish Journal of Psychology, Vol. 15, No. 2, 793-800.
- CHOUDHURY, Anuva, and GIRI, D.V. (2013). *Employee Empowerment: The Rourkele Steel Plant Experience*, The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, Vol. 48, No. 4, 634-650.
- ÇAVUŞ, Mustafa Fedai (2008). *Personel Güçlendirme: İmalat Sanayii İşletmelerinde Bir Araştırma*, Journal of Yaşar University, 3(10), 1287-1300.
- ÇÖL, Güner (2008). *Algılanan Güçlendirmenin İşgören Performansı Üzerine Etkisi*, Doğu Üniversitesi Dergisi, 9 (1), 35-46.
- FERNANDEZ, Sergio and MOLDOGAZIEV, Tima (2013). *Employee Empowerment, Employee Attitudes, and Performance: Testing a Casual Model*, Public Administration Review, Vol. 73. Iss. 3, 490-506.
- KARAKOÇ, Nihat (2007). *Ulusal Kalite Ödülüne Başvuran Büyük Ölçekli İşletmelerdeki İşgöreni Güçlendirme Düzeyini Belirlemeye Yönelik Bir Araştırma*, Öneri, Cilt: 7, Sayı: 28, 9-18.

- KHANY, Reza and TAZIK, Khalil (2015). *On the Relationship Between Psychological Empowerment, Trust, and Iranian EFL Teachers' Job Satisfaction: The Case of Secondary School Teachers*, Journal of Career Assessment, 1-18.
- KIRST-ASHMAN, Karen K. (2008). *Human Behavior, Communities, Organizations, and Groups in the Macro Social Environment, An Empowerment Approach*, Thomson, Brooks/Cole, USA.
- KOÇEL, Tamer (2011). *İşletme Yöneticiliği*, 13. Baskı, Beta, İstanbul.
- MANOR, James (2004). *Democratization with Inclusion: Political Reforms and People's Empowerment at the Grassroots*, Journal of Human Development, Vol. 5, No. 1, 5-29.
- LEACH, Desmond J., WALL, Toby D., and JACKSON, Paul R. (2003). *The Effect of Empowerment on Job Knowledge: An Empirical Test Involving Operators of Complex Technology*, Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 76, 27-52.
- LEECH, N.L., BARRETT, K.C., and MORGAN, G.A. (2005). *SPSS for Intermediate Statistics: Use and Interpretation*, 2nd Edition, New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
- LOGAN, Mary S. and GANSTER, Daniel C. (2007). *The Effects of Empowerment on Attitudes and Performance: The Role of Social Support and Empowerment Beliefs*, Journal of Management Studies, 44:8, 1523-1550.
- NARAYAN, Deepa (2002). *Empowerment and Poverty Reduction, A Sourcebook*, The World Bank, Washington, DC.
- PELİT, Elbeyi ve ÖZTÜRK, Yüksel (2011). *Otel İşletmeleri İşgörenlerinin Davranışsal ve Psikolojik Güçlendirme Algulamalarındaki Farklılıklar*, Ekonomik ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, Cilt: 7, Sayı: 7, 1-28,
- PETERSON, N. Andrew and SPEER, Paul W. (2000). *Linking Organizational Characteristics to Psychological Empowerment*, Administration in Social Work, Vol. 24 (4), 39-58.
- PIETERSE, Anne Nederveen, KNIPPENBERG, Daan Van, SCHIPPERS, Michaela, and STAM, Daan (2010). *Transformational and Transactional Leadership and Innovative Behavior: The Moderating Role of Psychological Empowerment*, Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31, 609-623.
- PIGG, Kenneth E. (2002). *Three Faces of Empowerment: Expanding the Theory of Empowerment in Community Development*, Journal of Community Development Society, Vol: 33, No: 1, 107-123.
- PRATI, Gabriele and ZANI, Bruna (2013). *The Relationship Between Psychological Empowerment and Organizational Identification*, Journal of Community Psychology, Vol. 41, No. 7, 851-866.
- ROBBINS, Stephen P. (1996). *Organizational Behavior, Concepts, Controversies, Applications*, Seventh Edition, Prentice-Hall International, China.
- ROMAN, Maria J. Jaimez and BRETONES, Francisco D. (2013). *Spanish Adaptation of the Structural Empowerment Scale*, Spanish Journal of Psychology, 16, 15, 1-7.

- SCHWAHN, Charles and SPADY, William (2010). *Total Leaders2.0, Leading in the Age of Empowerment*, Rowman&Littlefield Education, USA.
- SCOTT, Cynthia D. and JAFFE, Dennis T. (1991). *Empowerment: Building a Committed Workplace*, Fifty Minute Series, California.
- SÜRGEVİL, Olca, TOLAY, Ebru ve TOPOYAN, Mert (2013). *Yapısal Güçlendirme ve Psikolojik Güçlendirme Ölçeklerinin Geçerlilik ve Güvenilirlik Analizleri*, Journal of Yasar University, 8 (31), 5371-5391.
- STEWART, Frances (2005). *Groups and Capabilities*, Journal of Human Development, Vol. 6, No. 2, 185-204.
- SWAI, Elinami Veraeli (2010). *Beyond Women Empowerment in Africa, Exploring Dislocation and Agency*, Palgrave Mecomillan, New York.
- TOPLU, Duygu ve AKÇA, Meltem (2013). *Öğrenen Organizasyonun Psikolojik Güçlendirme Üzerindeki Etkisi: Kamu Sektöründe Bir Araştırma*, İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, Yıl:12, Sayı:23, 221-235.
- WELZEL, Christian (2013). *Freedom Rising, Human Empowerment and the Quest for Emancipation*, Cambridge University Press, New York.