Research Article

To read the paper online, please scan this QR code

Determining the relationship between psychological empowerment and commitment in selected star rated Hotels in Kisumu City, Kenya

Lucy Jumah & Rita Nthiga
School of Tourism, Hospitality and Events Management, Moi University, Kenya
Correspondence: lujumah@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9513-2422

Abstract
This study sought to assess the relationship between psychological empowerment and commitment in selected star rated Hotels in Kisumu City, Kenya. It adopted both descriptive and explanatory research designs. 1372 employees and 130 managers from 34 star-rated hotels made up the target population. Thirty-one non-managerial employees and thirteen management personnel made up the study's sample. Random and stratified sampling was used to select the respondents. Surveys and interviews were used to gather data. Expert judgment was used to assess the validity of the questionnaires. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. In addition to this, inferential statistics included linear regression and hierarchical multiple regression, whereas descriptive statistics include things like mean, frequency, and standard deviation. According to the findings, psychological empowerment and commitment to perform their duties in certain star-rated hotels have a substantial positive link. The study found that employee involvement in particular hotels was influenced by psychological empowerment and commitment. Employees should be able to utilize their own principles and standards to accomplish organizational objectives.

Keywords: empowerment, commitment, employee, hotels, Kisumu, psychological

Public Interest Statement

Employee motivation depends on structural, psychological, and behavioral empowerments, which improve workers' capacity to carry out their tasks and responsibilities at work. Structural and psychological empowerment constitute a process of guiding and enabling people to think, behave, and act independently. For public interest, it is evident that these forms of employee empowerment encourage them to take ownership of their job and accountability for the outcomes.

Introduction

Employee empowerment can be conceived in three ways; as a set of managerial practices aiming at increasing employees' autonomy and responsibilities (psychological empowerment); as an individual active work orientation (behavioral empowerment); and focus on the power to create and sustain a work environment (Structural empowerment). (Boudrias, Gaudreau, Savoie & Morin, 2009). Behavioral dimension of empowerment deals with the role of top management in employee empowering (Pelit *et al.*, 2011), while psychological empowerment is the perception by employees that they have the opportunity to help determine work roles, accomplish meaningful work, and influence important decisions (Yukl & Becker, 2006). Empowerment is in itself a multifaceted concept that can either be structural, psychological or behavioural.

Structural, psychological and behavioural empowerments are prerequisites for the motivation of employees and they enhance their ability to perform their duties and roles in their workplaces. Structural and psychological empowerment therefore create a process of orienting and enabling individuals to think, behave and act in an autonomous way (Hong & Yang 2009). These types of empowerment help workers to own their work and take responsibility for the results. Although the relationships between managerial practices and a psychological and behavioural state of empowerment have been investigated, none has examined the effect of the structural, psychological and behavioural empowerment together on employee commitment.

Globally, the construct of employee empowerment started in the private sector. Mehrabi *et al.,* (2013) carried out a study on the relationship between employee empowerment and commitment of university staff and found that there was a significant relationship between employee empowerment and commitment. In Kurdistan, Vorya *et al.,* (2013) found a significant positive relationship between empowerment and employees' commitment to their organization. In Turkey Pelit *et al.,* (2011) in a research conducted on 5-star hotel employees, considered empowerment in two dimensions as behavioral and psychological, and found out that psychological and behavioral empowerment have a significant effect on job satisfaction.

In Kenya, a study by Nzuve and Bakari (2012) on the relationship between empowerment and performance in the city council of Nairobi, found that there was a very strong positive correlation between employee empowerment and performance. In a study by Oloko (2012) on the influence of power distance and employee empowerment, he concluded that employee empowerment led to favorable performance. Although the idea of empowerment comes from business and industrial efforts to improve productivity, empowering employees can benefit both private and public organizations. Since empowered workers feel competent and confident to influence their job and work environment in a meaningful way, they are likely to be proactive and innovative (Boudrias *et al*, 2009). Workplace empowerment has been hailed as the new management intervention. Organizations have to be ready to create an environment which generates empowerment and enhances development of their employees. For instance, Meyer and Natalya (2010) stated that employees' commitment for their job depended on perceived organization offerings which also affected employees' attitude toward work and their satisfaction level. Service industries are

required to deliver better services to the general public as well be in line with the competition from the private sector, and this is only possible with a committed workforce.

This study however, endeavored to assess the relationship between psychological empowerment and commitment in selected star rated Hotels in Kisumu City, Kenya.

Literature review

Relationship between Psychological empowerment and commitment

The psychological perspective of empowerment involves the cognitive elements of empowerment, which reflect how individuals experience their working life in an organization, and the degree to which a sense of empowerment is perceived by individuals (Muqadas *et al.*, 2017). It has been widely accepted that the psychological dimension of empowerment could enhance employees' involvement and motivation at work. Psychological empowerment (PE) could provide employees with more flexibility and personal control over their job responsibilities, which eventually could lead to valuable managerial consequences in organizations (Kara, 2012).

Avan *et al.,* (2016), described psychological empowerment as an intangible and emotional state consisting of a variety of perceived feelings. PE involves employees' experience of being authoritative and dependable in their working life. The practice of psychological empowerment in an organization involves supervisors giving employees more discretion and autonomy since it made the employees more committed to their organization (Mohsen, 2014). PE also generates many other positive behaviors towards the workplace, for instance job involvement, organizational citizenship behaviors, and higher-quality performance (Özaralli, 2015; Kara, 2012). Therefore, hotels need to adopt various empowerment initiatives that could boost employees' level of commitment. This could include spreading a culture of participation based on rewards that do not penalize risk taking, sharing power, giving responsibility, granting decision-making authority, and developing continuing involvement programs (Chiang & Jang, 2008).

Ambad and Bahron (2012), found that many organizations, especially organizations in the public-sector in developing countries, had not been able to, nor had even wanted to put PE into practice. This was attributed to two main reasons; the fear of losing control over the employees and, the problems that might occur as a result of the wrong decisions being taken by employees. A hierarchical management perspective may affect employees' level of commitment and cause many negative organizational outcomes, such as employees' dissatisfaction, poor performance, and high turnover rates.

Psychological empowerment is a multidimensional concept comprising four cognitive dimensions through which employees may appraise their empowerment in organizations (Spreitzer, 1995; Muqadas *et al.,* 2017). These dimensions are shaped through the work environment and can be described as follows:

Impact: the degree to which an employee can make a difference at work through his/her actions. As noted by Avan *et al.,* (2016), empowering employees in terms of the impact dimension could improve their inner beliefs and create a cognitive state through which they are able to influence their work and create positive outputs at all organizational levels.

Meaning: Employees' acceptance of work values and task goals. This refers to the consistency between the requirements of one's work responsibilities and one's own values, thoughts, standards, and attitudes (Mohsen, 2014). Taamneh and Al-Gharaibeh (2014), stated that meaning reflects the degree to which an individual feel that his/her own efforts contribute towards the work of their organization as a whole.

Competence: this inherently reflects individuals' beliefs that they have the abilities and skills to perform job tasks adeptly (Kara 2012; Stander & Rothmann 2010). It indicates a person's trust in his/her self-efficacy and his/her ability to produce high quality job outcomes.

Self-determination: individuals' independence and perceived freedom in carrying out their work roles, as well as the authority granted to them to make decisions regarding work systems, techniques, and processes (Chiang & Jang, 2008). Spreitzer (1995) pointed out that, ultimately, each component of psychological empowerment is essential for achieving the structure of the term "empowerment". Thus, hospitality firms should enhance each psychological empowerment aspect through specific managerial practices.

Chiang and Jang (2008) stated that PE is specifically important for the hotel industry, since the nature of service providers' work requires higher standards of service, quick responses, and a high level of customer satisfaction. Therefore, empowering employees contributes to achieving customer satisfaction and enhances organizational effectiveness. Moreover, a hospitality sector that encourages autonomy, facilitates participative decision-making, and expresses confidence in employee competence, remains with the employees who feel more empowered in their work settings.

Maynard, Mathieu, Gilson, O'Boyle, and Cigularov (2013) examined the relationships between PE and its antecedents (structural empowerment, organizational support, external managerial support, and team competencies), and outcomes (team members' affective reactions and team performance). Maynard *et al*., (2013) positioned team PE as a mediating variable in the input-process-output model and found that structural empowerment, organizational support, and external managerial support all had significant positive correlations with team PE. Maynard *et al*., (2013), stated that results always underscore the fact that, structural arrangements are salient in terms of their influence on team PE and not only the influencing factors.

A study carried out by (Chen and Chen 2008), in Taiwan to establish a framework to explain how to use work redesign and psychological empowerment to strengthen employee commitment to an organization that was undergoing change, found out that self-determination had no significant relationship with employee commitment, whereas the other three cognitions had significant relationships with employee commitment.

Nabila (2008), in his study on the relationship between psychological empowerment and commitment among employees in the construction sector in Kota Kinabalu, found that the meaning and self-determination cognitions had no significant relationship with employee commitment, but the competence and impact dimensions had a significant relationship. In India, Jha (2010), examined the linkages between psychological empowerment and factors of organizational commitment and found that psychological empowerment influenced affective and normative commitment positively. However, no relationship was found between psychological empowerment and continuance commitment.

Moughlee *et al*. (2009) investigated the relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational commitment in staff of Education organizations in 19 districts of Tehran city and the results showed that there was no relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational commitment. Abbasi *et al*. (2012), studied the relationship between staff empowerment and organizational commitment and concluded that there was a significant correlation and a positive relationship between staffs' empowerment and commitment.

Raza *et al*. (2015) found that there was a significant positive relationship between psychological empowerment, affective and normative commitment. Chen & Chen, (2008) and Nabila (2008) also conducted a research to assess the relationship between psychological empowerment and commitment and found out that compared to structural empowerment, psychological empowerment had not received

a lot of attention in literature.

Kiprop (2012), found out that there was a positive relationship between empowerment and commitment. According to his research, lack of motivation among employees in the public sector was the major reason for deteriorating performance of the sector in terms of service delivery. Specifically, there is lack of empirical literature in Kenya focusing on the effect of psychological empowerment on employee commitment in hotels.

Research Designs and Methods

This study adopted explanatory design to explain the phenomena under study by testing hypotheses and by measuring relationships between variables. According to Saunders *et al*., (2011), studies that establish causal relationships between variables use explanatory design. The design is also deemed appropriate for the study as it allowed the study to be carried out in the natural settings and to employ probability sampling. The design allowed for statistical inferences to be made on populations and permitted generalizations of findings (Frankfort-Nachmias &Nachmias, 2008).

Target Population

The target population consisted of employees drawn from the selected hotels. Target population refers to the group of people or study subjects who are similar in one or more ways and form the subject of the study in a particular survey (Kerlinger, 2003). Target population of a study is a group of individuals taken from the general population who share common characteristics and can be used to generalize certain phenomena in the star-rated hotels. The target population was 1372 non-managerial employees and 130 management employees from 34star rated hotels.

Table 1.0 Target population

Star rating	Hotels	Subordinate Employees	Managerial (Managers)
Four	4	312	24
Three	8	400	40
Two	22	660	66
Total	34	1372	130

Source: TRA & Hotel Records, (2018)

Sample Size

Using Yamane's (1973) sample size formula at 95% confidence level, P = 0.05, the sample size   for employees was computed as below:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where;

n = the sample size; **N** = the population size; **e** = the acceptance sampling error

= 1372/1+ 1372 (.05)^2 = 310 employees

From the target population of 1372 non-managerial employees, a sample size of 310 respondents was selected. With regard to the managerial employees, out of a target of 130, a sample size of 13 was used.

This was 10% of the population, derived using a formula from Mugenda and Mugenda, (2008). A summary is presented in table 2.0.

Table 2.0 Sample Size determination

		Non-Managerial			Managerial	
Star Rating	No of Hotels	Target Population	Percentage	Sample	Target Population	Sample 10%
Four	4	312	22.74	70	24	3
Three	8	400	29.15	90	40	4
Two	22	660	48.10	149	66	6
Total	34	1,372	100.00	310	130	13

Source: Author computation, (2018)

Results and Findings

Descriptive statistics for psychological empowerment

Before examining the relationship between psychological empowerment and commitment a quantitative analysis of questionnaire responses was conducted to identify respondents' perception on psychological empowerment. The variable psychological empowerment comprised of four sub-variables: competence cognition, impact cognition, meaning cognition and self-determination. A total of 22 statements were used to determine the psychological empowerment as shown in Table 4.4. 71.7% (192) of the respondents agreed that they were willing to exert more effort and persistence in the face of obstacles in their job, 43(16%) moderately agreed and 33(12.3%) disagreed (*M=3.89; SD=1.05*). Most of the respondents 164(61.2%) agreed that they had an effect on the environment of their department, 28(17.2%) disagreed and 58(21.6%) moderately agreed (*M=3.61; SD=1.12*). 75.3 %(202) of the respondents agreed that they focused on learning in their work environment, 16(6.0%) disagreed and 50(18.7%) moderately agreed (*M=3.98; SD=0.90*).

Most of the respondents 207(77.3%) agreed that they carried out their job effectively within the work environment, 33(12.3%) disagreed and 28(10.4%) moderately agreed (*M=3.92; SD=1.09*). 75.4 %(202) of the respondents agreed that they were capable of performing skillfully the tasks assigned to them, 35(13.1%) moderately agreed and 31(11.6%) disagreed (*M=4.01; SD=1.15*). Most of the respondents 211(78.7%) agreed that they often solved customers' problems, 15(5.6%) disagreed and 42(15.7%) moderately agreed (*M=4.07; SD=0.96*). 60.5 %(162) of the respondents agreed that they had opportunities to give opinions and suggestions about operational changes and their work environment, 59(22%) disagreed and 47(17.5%) moderately agreed (*M=3.47; SD=1.21*).

Most of the respondents 129(48.1%) agreed that they had influence in their department, with 72(26.9%) disagreed and 67(25%) moderately agree (*M=3.26; SD=1.29*). 64.5 %(173) of the respondents agreed that they were able to contribute to the hotel's operating outcome, 40(14.9%) moderately agreed and 55(20.5%) disagreed (*M=3.57; SD=1.19*). Most of the respondents 195(72.7%) agreed that they were able to make a difference in their department by being creative, 31(11.6%) disagreed and 42(15.7%) moderately agreed (*M=3.94; SD=1.06*). 58.3 %(156) of the respondents agreed that the tasks assigned to them were compatible with their personal values, 45(16.8%) disagreed and 67(25%) moderately agreed (*M=3.56; SD=1.20*). T Most of the respondents 161(60.1%) agreed that their ideas about the achievements of the department's goals were valued, with 50(18.7%) disagreed and 57(21.3%) moderately agree (*M=3.61; SD=1.16*). 73.1 %(196) of the respondents agreed that they

regularly acted on behalf of their department for its greater good, with 35(13.1%) moderately agreed and 37(17.6%) disagreed (*M=3.79; SD=1.13*). Most of the respondents 143(53.3%) agreed that they engaged in activities that were worth their time, energy and effort in their department, 100(37.3%) disagreed and 25(9.3%) moderately agreed (*M=3.15; SD=1.40*). 90.2 %(242) of the respondents agreed that they felt that their job was important, 8(3%) disagreed and 18(6.7%) moderately agreed (*M=4.32; SD=0.79*. Most of the respondents 201(75%) agreed that they had opportunities to pursue worthy goals in the hotel, 20(7.4%) disagreed and 47(17.5%) moderately agreed (*M=3.96; SD=0.99*). 59.4 %(159) of the respondents agreed that they had a feeling of personal accomplishment from their work, 54(20.1%) moderately agreed and 55(20.5%) disagreed (*M=3.56; SD=1.27*).. Most of the respondents 194(72.4%) agreed that they were interested and optimistic in their work even when difficulties arose, 51(19%) disagreed and 23(8.6%) moderately agreed (*M=3.69; SD=1.22*).

Table 3.0 Psychological Empowerment Indicators

	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Moderately agree		Agree		Strongly agree		Mean	Std. Dev	α
	FQ	%	FQ	%	FQ	%	FQ	%	FQ	%			
I am willing to exert more effort and persistence in the face of obstacles in my job.	7	2.6	26	9.7	43	16.0	105	39.2	87	32.5	**3.89**	1.05	.887
I have an effect on the environment of my department.	15	5.6	31	11.6	58	21.6	103	38.4	61	22.8	**3.61**	1.12	.895
I am focused on learning in my work environment.	4	1.5	12	4.5	50	18.7	121	45.1	81	30.2	**3.98**	0.90	.889
I carry out my job effectively within my work environment.	14	5.2	19	7.1	28	10.4	120	44.8	87	32.5	**3.92**	1.09	.887
I am capable of performing skillfully the tasks assigned to me.	16	6.0	15	5.6	35	13.1	87	32.5	115	42.9	**4.01**	1.15	.887
1 often solve customers' problems.	9	3.4	6	2.2	42	15.7	111	41.4	100	37.3	**4.07**	0.96	.889
I have opportunities to give opinions and suggestions about operational changes and my work environment.	27	10.1	32	11.9	47	17.5	113	42.2	49	18.3	**3.47**	1.21	.889
I have influence in my department.	37	13.8	35	13.1	67	25.0	78	29.1	51	19.0	**3.26**	1.29	.888

Statement											Mean	SD	
I am able to contribute to the hotel's operating outcome.	22	8.2	33	12.3	40	14.9	115	42.9	58	21.6	**3.57**	1.19	.884
I am able to make difference in my department by being creative.	8	3.0	23	8.6	42	15.7	100	37.3	95	35.4	**3.94**	1.06	.884
The tasks assigned to me are compatible with my personal values.	25	9.3	20	7.5	67	25.0	91	34.0	65	24.3	**3.56**	1.20	.889
My ideas about the achievement of the department's goals are valued.	15	5.6	35	13.1	57	21.3	94	35.1	67	25.0	**3.61**	1.16	.885
I regularly act on behalf of my department for its greater good.	19	7.1	18	6.7	35	13.1	123	45.9	73	27.2	**3.79**	1.13	.889
I engage in activities that are worth my time, energy and effort in my department.	49	18.3	51	19.0	25	9.3	96	35.8	47	17.5	**3.15**	1.40	.892
I feel that my job is important.	4	1.5	4	1.5	18	6.7	121	45.1	121	45.1	**4.32**	0.79	.889
I have opportunities to pursue worthy goals in this hotel.	10	3.7	10	3.7	47	17.5	116	43.3	85	31.7	**3.96**	0.99	.888
I get a feeling of personal accomplishment from my work.	27	10.1	28	10.4	54	20.1	87	32.5	72	26.9	**3.56**	1.27	.885
I am interested and optimistic in my work even with difficulties	26	9.7	25	9.3	23	8.6	127	47.4	67	25.0	**3.69**	1.22	.889
I am able to complete my work effectively.	2	.7	6	2.2	19	7.1	111	41.4	130	48.5	**4.35**	0.77	.890
I complete the tasks assigned to me freely.	5	1.9	4	1.5	27	10.1	118	44.0	114	42.5	**4.24**	0.84	.892
I have control over the tasks which I perform in my department.	3	1.1	18	6.7	34	12.7	112	41.8	101	37.7	**4.08**	0.93	.891

I have autonomy/ power over how I carry out my job.	11	4.1	36	13.4	45	16.8	100	37.3	76	28.4	**3.72**	1.13	.897
Mean											3.81	0.61	.893

Source: Data Analysis, 2019

9.9 % (241) of the respondents agreed that they were able to complete their work effectively, 8(2.9%) disagreed and 19(7.1%) moderately agreed (*M=4.35; SD=0.77*). Most of the respondents 234(86.5%) agreed that they completed the tasks assigned to them freely, 9(3.4%) disagreed and 27(10.1%) moderately agreed (*M=4.24; SD=0.84*). 79.5 % (213) of the respondents agreed that they had control over the tasks which they performed in their department, 34(12.7%) moderately agree and 21(7.8%) disagreed (*M=4.08; SD=0.93*). Most of the respondents 176(65.7%) agreed that they had autonomy/ power over how they carried out their job, 47 (17.5%) disagreed and 45(16.8%) moderately agreed (*M=3.72; SD=1.13*). From the findings of the study, it was evident that responses to the 22 statements used to explain psychological empowerment had an overall mean of 3.81 and a standard deviation of 0.61. This shows that majority of the respondents agreed with the statements used to measure the psychological empowerment in selected star rated Hotels in Kisumu City.

Results and Discussion

Psychological empowerment and commitment

On competence; the findings indicated that employees were willing to exert more effort and persistence in the face of obstacles in their job, focused on learning in their work environment and carried out their job effectively within the work environment. The subordinate employees were capable of performing skillfully the tasks assigned to them and often solved customers' problems. The results complement Krishna (2007), argument that high self-efficacy will result in initiating behaviors, willingness to exert more effort and persistence in the face of obstacles. However, if employees have low self-efficacy, they will tend to avoid confronting their fears and improve their perceived incompetence. Competence is achieved through accomplishments and learning. The results of the study imply that the competence cognition positively influenced employee commitment to the organization This implies that instilling a sense of competence cognition among employees will highly instill the ability to believe in their skills and capability to perform their work better.

On impact; the findings indicated that employees had opportunities to give opinions and suggestions about operational changes and their work environment and sometimes had influence in their department. The employees were able to contribute to the hotel's operating outcome and make a difference in their department by being creative. When impact exists, employees would feel that they could perform better and have significant influence in the organization and therefore managers should provide their subordinates substantial opportunities to give opinions and suggestions about their operational changes in their work environment. This had positive impact on their work outcomes. Managers needed to affirm their employees that they can affect the organization outcome by completing the assigned tasks. The implication is that impact cognition among the employees would instill the belief that they can be change-agents in these organizations. The implication of impact cognition for this study is that empowered employees will positively impact on their work outcomes leading to organizational commitment and performance.

On meaning; the findings indicated that the tasks assigned to non-managerial employees were compatible with their personal values and their ideas about the achievement of the department's goals

were valued. The employees regularly acted on behalf of the department for its greater good and engaged in activities that were worth their time, energy and effort in the department. The subordinate employees felt that their job was important, had opportunities to pursue worthy goals in their hotel and had a feeling of personal accomplishment from their work. Organizations have to make sure that the objective of assigned work task is compatible with their employees' value systems, in order to be perceived as meaningful to ensure that employees are motivated and committed to the organization. This implies that it is paramount for the hotels in Kenya to orient their employees to the goals of these organizations.

On self-determination; the findings indicated that the non-managerial employees were interested and optimistic in their work even when difficulties arose and were able to complete their work effectively. The employees completed the tasks assigned to them freely, had control over the tasks which they performed in their department and autonomy/power over how they carried out their job. According to the descriptive statistics, employees felt a greater sense of autonomy when they were free to make independent decisions and took initiative without pressure from the organization resulting to a greater sense of accountability and responsibility positively influencing the self- determination cognition leading to organizational commitment.

When employees believe that they are just following the order from their superior, then they will not feel a sense of empowerment due to the little autonomy and freedom given. The self-determination of employees will give employees the freedom in completing the assigned tasks competently. The implication is that empowered employees in the selected hotels had some control over what they did, how much effort they put in their work, and when they had a say in when to start and stop their task.

The study findings depicted that there was a significant relationship between psychological empowerment and commitment (β_2=0.168 and p=0.099). Therefore, a unit increase in psychological empowerment leads to an increase in employee commitment. Since $p > 0.05$, the null hypothesis ($\mathbf{Ho_2}$) failed to be rejected. Therefore, it was concluded that psychological empowerment had no significant influence on employee commitment. This implies that a change in psychological empowerment, does not lead to an improvement in employee commitment.

This agrees with (Jha 2010) study 'to examine the linkages between psychological empowerment and factors of organizational commitment in India' that psychological empowerment influences affective and normative commitment positively. This finding is congruent with previous research (Chang, Shih & Lin, 2010; Dewettinck & Ameijde, 2011). The results revealed that psychological empowerment is an effective intervention in the educational context. It also contradicts Seibert *et al*. (2011) concluded that feelings of autonomy, competence, and impact are likely to increase the individual's commitment to the organization.

Bhatnagar (2012) and De Villiers and Stander (2011) in their studies found similar results and are of the opinion that psychologically empowered employees are more engaged, more loyal and less likely to engage in turnover intention. Empowered employees see themselves as more capable and were able to influence their job and organizations in a more meaningful way, act independently, and had a higher commitment to their organization. These findings collaborate Humborstad and Perry (2011) argument that when employees are self-determined, they can then complete their work more effectively. This implies that it is paramount for the hotels in Kenya to orient their employees to the goals of these organizations. This means that when employees cannot possess a sense of freedom or autonomy in the organization, their affective commitment goes low.

Conclusion

The findings showed that collective decision-making and the fair distribution of power and responsibility among all employees in an organization not only boost productivity, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment, but they also help employees better meet expectations and deal with change. Hotels must act to empower their staff members and not ignore this situation. In addition to employee empowerment initiatives, hotels should work to address the psychological issues that make staff members feel insecure by constituting a process of guiding and enabling people to think, behave, and act independently. Such staff members enable hotels to remain productive, profitable, and competitive in the service sector. The competitive advantage and financial performance of the hotel will be enhanced by empowerment efforts, which will also increase employee productivity, job satisfaction, and loyalty to the company.

Conflicts of Interest: -The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Disclaimer Statement

This work is part of my PhD thesis, 'Moderating effect of job characteristics on the relationship between employee empowerment and commitment in selected star rated hotels in Kisumu city, Kenya', submitted to the school of Tourism, Hospitality and Events Management, Moi University. Supervisors: Prof. Jacqueline Korir & Dr. Rita Nthiga

Author Bionote

Lucy Jumah is currently a Tutorial Fellow in the Department of Management science, Marketing, Tourism and Hospitality, University of Kabianga. She has completed her PhD in hospitality management and has an interest in human resource management in hospitality operations. Prof. Jacqueline Korir is an Associate Professor of Hospitality and Events management. Dr. Rita Nthiga is a senior lecturer in hotel and hospitality management.

References

Abbasi, T.; Hassanpour, S. & Hassanalipour, R., (2012). Investigating the relationship between employees' empowerment and commitment. *J. Dev. Evol. Manage.*, 4(11): 17-23

Ahmad, N., & Oranye, O. (2010). Empowerment, job satisfaction and organizational commitment: a comparative analysis of nurses working in Malaysia and England. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 18(5), 582-591.

Ahmed, H. (2011). Impact of Employee Empowerment on Job Satisfaction: An Empirical Analysis of Pakistani Service Industry. *Interdisplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, Volume 2*(11), 680-683.

Ambad, S. & Bahron, A. (2012). Psychological empowerment: the influence on organizational commitment among employees in the construction sector. *The Journal of Global Business Management*, 8(2), 73-81.

Andika, R., & Darmanto, S. (2020). The effect of employee empowerment and intrinsic motivation on organizational commitment and employee performance. *Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen*, *18*(2), 241-251.

Avan, A., Zorlu, O. & Baytok, A. (2016). The effect of psychological empowerment on organizational silence in hotels. *Journal of Business Research-Türk*, 8(4), 277-295. https://doi.org/10.20491/isarder.2016.219.

Bhatnagar, J. (2012). Management of innovation: Role of psychological empowerment, work engagement and turnover intention in the Indian context. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(5), 928-951.

Boudrias, J. S., & Savoie, A. (2006). Behavioural empowerment at work: Development of a conceptual framework and a measurement instrument. *Psychologie du Travail et des Organisations*, 12(2), 119-138.

Boudrias, J. S., Gaudreau, P., Savoie, A., & Morin, A. J. (2009). Employee empowerment. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*.

Chen, G., Sharma, P.N., Edinger, S., Shapiro, D.L.,& Farh, J.L. (2011), "Motivating and demotivating forces in teams: Cross-level influences of empowering leadership and relationship conflict". *Journal of Applied Psychology,* Vol. 96 No. 3, pp. 541–557.

Chen, H. F., & Chen, Y. C. (2008). The impact of work redesign and psychological empowerment on organizational commitment in a changing environment: An example from Taiwan's state-owned enterprises. Public Personnel Management, 37(3), 279-302.

Chen, H., Ford, D.L. Jr., Kalyanaram, G. & Bhagat, R.S. (2013), "Boundary conditions for turnover intentions: exploratory evidence from China, Jordan, Turkey, and the United States", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 846-866.

Chiang, C. & Jang, S. (2008). The antecedents and consequences of psychological empowerment: the case of Taiwan's hotel companies. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 32(1), 40-46. Jha (2010)

Chiang, C., & Hsieh, T. (2012). The impacts of perceived organizational support and psychological empowerment on job performance: the mediating effects of organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(1), 180-190.

Dewettinck, K.,& Van Ameijde, M. (2011), "Linking leadership empowerment behavior to employee attitudes and behavioral intentions", *Personnel Review,* Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 284-305.

Frankfort-Nachmias, C., & Nachmias, D. (2008). Ethics in Social Science Research. *i Frankfort-Nachmias, C. & Nachmias, D.(red.) Research methods in the social sciences. 7e uppl. New*

York: Worth Publishers, 75-96.

Gunlu, E., Aksarayli, M., & Percin, N. S. (2010). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment of hotel managers in Turkey. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *22*, 693-717.

Hamborstad, S. & Perry, C. (2011). Employee empowerment, job satisfaction and organizational commitment: an in-depth empirical investigation. *Chinese Management Studies*, 5(3), 325-344.

Hong, S. Y., & Yang, S. U. (2009). Effects of reputation, relational satisfaction, and customer-company identification on positive word-of-mouth intentions. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 21(4), 381-403.

Humborstad, S. I. W., & Perry, C. (2011). Employee empowerment, job satisfaction and organizational commitment: An in-depth empirical investigation. *Chinese Management Studies*.

Kara, D. (2012). Differences in psychological empowerment perception of female employees working in hospitality industry. *Middle East Journal of Scientific Research*, 12, 436-443. 10.5829/idosi. mejsr.2012.12.4.6416.

Kerlinger, P. (2003). Addendum to the Phase I avian risk assessment for the Flat Rock Wind Power Project, Lewis County, New York: Phase One and Phase Two. March 31, 2003. *Report to Flat Rock Wind Power, LLC.*

Kiprop, C. R. (2012). Motivational Strategies For Public Sector Workers in Kenya. *International Journal of Research in Management*, 2(2), 71-86.

Krishna, R. (2007). Psychological empowerment and organizational commitment. *The Icfa Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 6(4), 26-36.

Maynard, M. Travis, Lucy L. Gilson, & John E. Mathieu. (2012). Empowerment—Fad or Fab? A Multilevel Review of the Past Two Decades of Research. *Journal of Management* 38: 1231–81.

Mehrabi, J., Jadidi, M., AllamehHaery, F., & Alemzadeh, M., (A 2013).The Relationship between Organizational Commitment and Organizational Learning (Boroojerd Telecommunication Company as Case Study), *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 130-139.

Meyer, J. P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human resource management review*, *11*(3), 299-326.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review*, *1*(1), 61-89.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Sage publications.

Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of vocational behavior*, *61*(1), 20-52.

Meyer, J.P. & Natalya, M. P. (2010), "Normative commitment in the workplace: a theoretical analysis and re-conceptualization", *Human Resource Management Review,* Vol. 20 No. 2010, pp. 283-294.

Mohsen, M. (2014). Psychological empowerment and job satisfaction in the hotel industry: a study on Egyptian employees in KSA hotels. *32nd Euro CHRIE Dubai 2014 conference,* Dubai: UAE.

Moughlee, A.; Hassanpour, A. & Hassanpour, M., (2009), Investigating the relationship between employees empowerment and organizational commitment in education centers of Tehran. *J. Public. Admin.,* 1(2): 119-132

Muqadas, F., Rehman, C. & Aslam, U. (2017). *Organizational justice and employee's job dissatisfaction:*

a moderating role of psychological empowerment. Pakistan Business Review, 18, 848-864. http://dx.doi.org/10.22555/PBR.V18I4.1114.

Nabila, A. A. (2008). *The relationship between Psychological Empowerment and organizational Commitment*: A case study among employees in construction sector in Kota Kinabalu, *Sabah*. School of Business and Economic, UMS (unpublished Masters dissertation)

Narteh, B. (2012). Internal marketing and employee commitment: Evidence from the Ghanaian banking industry. *Journal of Financial Services Marketing*, 17(4), 284-300.

Nasurdin, A. M., & Khuan, S. L. (2011). Organizational justice, age, and performance connection in Malaysia. *International Journal of Commerce and Management*.

Nzuve, S. N., & Bakari, T. H. (2012). The relationship between empowerment and performance in the city council of Nairobi. *Problems of Management in the 21st Century*, 5, 83.

Oloko, M. (2012). Influence of relationship marketing on Performance of commercial banks in Kenya. *Education Research Journal*, 2(2), 37-42.

Özaralli, N. (2015). Linking empowering leader to creativity: the moderating role of psychological (felt) empowerment. In: 3rd International Conference on Leadership, Technology and Innovation Management. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 181, 366-376.

Pelit, E. Ozturk, Y., & Arslanturk, Y. (2011). The effects of employee empowerment on employee job satisfaction A study on hotels in Turkey. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 23(6), 784-802. https://doi.org

Spreitzer, G.M. (1995). Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace: Dimensions, Measurement, and Validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5), 1442-1465.

Stander, M. & Rothmann, S. (2009). Psychological empowerment of employees in selected organizations in South Africa. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 35, 196-203. http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v35i1.466.

Stander, M. & Rothmann, S. (2010). Psychological empowerment, job insecurity and employee engagement. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 36, 1-8. 10.4102/sajip.v36i1.849.

Sun, L., Zhang, Z., & Chen, Z. (2012). Empowerment and creativity: a cross-level investigation. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(1), 55-65.

Taamneh, M. & Al-Gharaibeh, S. (2014). The impact of job security elements on the work alienation at private universities in Jordan (a field study from employees' perspective). *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6(26), 56-69.

Turkyilmaz, A., Akman, G., Ozkan, C., & Pastuszak, Z. (2011). Empirical study of public sector employee loyalty and satisfaction. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*.

Vorya, J., Mohamad, A. M., & Mohamad, A. (2013). An examination of the relationship between empowerment and organizational commitment (Case study Kurdistan province electric staff). *Interdisciplinary journal of contemporary research in business*, 4(12).

Yukl, G.A., & Becker, W.S. (2006), "Effective empowerment in organizations", *Organization Management Journal,* Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 210-231.

Zaraket, W., Garios, R., & Malek, L. A. (2018). The impact of employee empowerment on the organizational commitment. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 8(3), 284.