



## The Relationships Between Psychological Empowerment Organizational Trust and Employee Motivation: An Empirical Research on Hotel Employees in Istanbul\*\*

Nihal YILMAZ<sup>a</sup> , \*Nilüfer VATANSEVER TOYLAN<sup>a</sup> 

<sup>a</sup> Kırklareli University, Faculty of Tourism, Department of Tourism Management, Kırklareli/Turkey

### Article History

Received: 28.02.2021

Accepted: 24.03.2021

### Keywords

Hotel employees

Employee empowerment

Psychological empowerment

Organizational trust

Employee motivation

### Abstract

Today, with the understanding of employee empowerment, it is possible to respond quickly to customer demands and expectations in hotel businesses where intense competition exists. With employee empowerment, the employee who receives some powers from their managers, feels free to make decisions and believes that their superiors will exhibit consistent behaviors is ensured to have trust in the organization. In addition, having a say in their duties will positively affect their motivation. In this context, it is aimed to examine the effects of psychological empowerment which is one of the components of employee empowerment in hotel businesses on organizational trust and employee motivation separately. The employees of three-, four- and five-star hotel in Istanbul are included in the sampling. Face-to-face and online data were collected from 388 hotel employees using convenience sampling method in hotel businesses selected as samples between 18.06.2018 -04.08.2018 with survey technique, which is one of the quantitative research methods. The data were analyzed by correlation and multiple regression analysis using SPSS 25 package program. As a result of the research, it was determined that psychological empowerment sub-dimensions had an effect on both organizational trust sub-dimensions and employee motivation. In this context, the results provide advantages in terms of empowerment in hotel businesses where competition is intense and knowing what contributions they will make to the organization when they empower the employees of the businesses that prioritize the human element.

### Article Type

Research Article

\* Corresponding Author

E-mail: nilufer.vatansever@klu.edu.tr (N. Vatansever Toyulan)

DOI: 10.21325/jotags.2021.780

\*\*This study is derived from the thesis "Personel Güçlendirmenin Örgütsel Güven ve Çalışan Motivasyonuna Etkisi: Otel İşletmelerinde Bir Araştırma".

## INTRODUCTION

Today, businesses need management mindsets where the employee plays an active role. In the labor-intensive tourism sector, it is inevitable that businesses will pay attention to management practices based on employees. In this sense, it is considered among the key success factors to be able to respond quickly to customer needs and create value for customers in the tourism sector where production and consumption occur simultaneously. Tourism businesses know that employees have a high role in creating value for customers (Nazarian, Atkinson & Foroudi, 2017; Avci, 2020). Hotel businesses are heavily competitive in terms of customer satisfaction. Therefore, hotel businesses know that customers will only be provided with qualified employees to feel valued. Thus, businesses in an intensely competitive environment empower the employee to ensure customer satisfaction and ultimately gain a competitive advantage.

Since 1980s, there has been a growing interest in empowerment in the fields of psychology and management (Meng & Sun, 2019). Although a common framework has been drawn from different disciplines, a common definition of empowerment has not been clear yet (Peccei & Rosenthal, 2001). Empowerment is defined as capacity in terms of ensuring that employees achieve superior achievements and building synergy power. There are two aspects as structural empowerment recommended by Kanter and psychological empowerment recommended by Spreitzer (Jha & Nair, 2008; O'Brien, 2011; Royer, 2011). Structural empowerment often includes transferring managers' powers to employees in hierarchical structures. Therefore, it is regarded as an external motivation. It is more about the organizational environment in which official control over power, decision-making and resources is shared (Zhang, Ye, & Li, 2018). Structural empowerment simply describes the conditions of the working environment. However, it falls short of explaining the employee's reaction to these conditions. Such reactions form the basis of psychological empowerment. Psychological empowerment consists of elements of meaning (1), (2) competence, (3) self-determination, (4) impact (Spreitzer, 1995). The dimension of meaning includes comparing the purpose of the study with the ideals and value of individuals. The dimension of competence expresses a belief in the capacity and self-competence of the individual to succeed in his work. The dimension of self-determination is related to the individual taking the initiative and having coordinated choices. The impact dimension includes the degree of influence on the individual's strategic, administrative and operational output (Avci, 2020).

Some of the research conducted employee on empowerment reveals that empowered employee causes organizational trust (Andrews, 1994; Berraies, Chaher & Yahia, 2014; Culbert & McDonough, 1986; Harari, 1999; Libres & Mabasa, 2014; Moye & Henkin, 2006; Owen, 1996;) and motivation (Caudron, 1995; Janssen, Schoonebeek & Looy, 1997) for the employee. According to Petit et al., (2011), the close association of employee empowerment with management techniques and tools such as motivation, business enrichment, communication, trust, participatory management, empowerment, training and feedback requires to examine the concept and its administrative dimension from different perspectives.

Empowerment, which is observed as a prerequisite for developing trust in the organization, the work leader feels like he belongs to the business, has a say in solving problems, establishes a team spirit with the friends he works with and establishes an environment where he will trust the words of his subordinates and his superiors (Berraies et al., 2014, p. 86).

Empowerment covers all practices that motivate employees, increase faith in knowledge, validate themselves and find the tasks they take on more meaningful by taking initiative (Koçel, 2005). Conger and Kanungo (1988) see the empowerment as a motivational concept of self-competence and defines empowerment as improving employees' sense of self-competence.

In this study, a comprehensive study has been presented, which was discussed in separate studies in the literature, revealing how empowerment explains organizational trust and motivational structures. Comprehensive studies revealing the relationship of psychological empowerment with the sub-dimensions of organizational trust are not found much. An empirical study of these relationships is presented based on arguments that theoretically say that the motivation and empowered employee who are considered to be at the root of psychological empowerment place more trust in their organization. In this context, it has been determined that employee empowerment sub-dimensions have an effect on both organizational trust sub-dimensions and employee motivation. Thus, it is thought that the findings of this study will make practical contributions for hotel businesses to know what contributions they will make to the organization when they empower their employees.

### **Literature Review and Research Hypotheses**

Psychological empowerment primarily focuses on the personal beliefs of an employee about the organization (O'Brien, 2011; Ibrahim, 2020) and employee motivation (Kim, Lee & Carlson, 2010). Unlike traditional management techniques, the concept of empowerment is a concept that arises as a result of power, according to Thomas and Velthouse (1990, p. 667) expresses power and authority to mobilize the worker. Thomas and Velthouse (1990) define empowerment as "internal motivation that can be explained by four perceptual dimensions: meaningfulness, competence, choice and impact." This definition highlights the psychological components of empowerment also mentioned and included in the study of Conger and Kanungo (1988) and Spreitzer (1995) in which the conceptual framework of this work was adopted. Spreitzer (1995) adds that each component is required for empowerment and is a unique element of the overall empowerment structure. These dimensions include meaning, competence, self-determination of one's destiny and impact.

In some studies, conducted in later years, the dimensions of meaning and competence in the literature were collected under the "attitude" factor, and the self-determination and impact dimensions were collected under the name of "influence" factor with a two-factor structure (Kim & George, 2005). According to the authors, attitude expresses the feelings of the employees and their ability to do so. The impact is defined as the belief that employees can influence their business results and decisions. Motivates the employee, and ensures that those who work are committed to the organization, that those who work can take risks and be open to new things (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). Hancer, George and Kim (2005) argued that this two-factor structure has distinctive validity and called for additional efforts to examine Spreitzer's scale of psychological empowerment. According to Gazzoli, Hancer and Park (2010), U.S. restaurant employees have overcome this challenge. They have also reported a two-factor structure, but defined its factors "task meaningfulness and freedom to perform".

Authorizing employees allows the decision makers and employees to be closer, hence shortening the duration of tasks. Any management style that can lead to developing a sense of self-competence will ensure the empowerment of employees. Empowered persons will take a more active role in the organization, make initiatives and increase their participation in the activities of the organization (Pelit et al., 2011). Researchers see psychological

empowerment as one of the key factors in the tourism and hospitality industry (Chiang & Jang, 2008, Chiang & Hsieh, 2012). Because, in terms of hotel businesses, the fact that production and consumption occur at the same time and the problems that arise are solved on the spot will increase both customer satisfaction and job satisfaction. Therefore, the importance of empowerment in the hospitality industry is even greater (He, Murrmann & Perdue, 2010). As a result, empowerment is concept of developing the biggest development process, creating motivation, participating in decision-making and removing any boundaries between employee and senior management. Therefore, employee empowerment can be considered as a motivational application aimed at improving performance by improving employee participation opportunities and increasing their participation in decision-making processes (Hanaysha, 2016, p. 300).

### **Organizational Trust**

As a concept within the social structure, trust is covered by many disciplines. Psychologists, sociologists, political scientists, economists, anthropologists and those working on organizational behavior have made the extent that trust shapes social relationships and why people trust each other a central topic in their work (Lewick & Bies, 1998, p. 438). There are three sub-dimensions in the organizational trust literature; namely trust in the manager, trust in the organization, interpersonal trust (Omarov, 2009; Örucü & Kambur, 2017, p. 1111). Mishra (1996) defines organizational trust as "the desire of individuals to act openly, honestly, relevantly and realistically to each other in relationships and interactions in the organization and to be aware of the main objectives, norms and values". Nyhan and Marlowe (1997) defined it as "a whole consisting of the trust of the employees of the organization in the manager and the organization." According to the authors, trust in the individual and the organization are interconnected concepts and form the concept of organizational trust as a whole, as there are individuals who create organizational trust and evaluate trustworthiness. There are also definitions that accept trust in the organization and trust in managers as interrelated concepts and call it organizational trust as a whole (Tan & Tan, 2000, p. 246). Furthermore, trust in colleagues, which falls under the scope of interpersonal trust, is important for maintaining social order in a business. McAllister (1995) has defined interpersonal trust as "the degree to which one person is willing to act on the basis of another person's words, actions and decisions, and the belief that their decision is correct."

In the literature, the relationships between empowerment and different forms of trust have been revealed in different research samples (Nyhan, 2000; Hassan, Toylan, Semerciöz & Aksel, 2012). In a study examining empowerment and organizational trust and commitment in the healthcare industry, it was found that empowered nurses had a higher level of organizational trust and emotional commitment (Laschinger, Finegan, Shamian & Shelley, 2000). Another study found that Moye and Henkin (2006) tended to have a higher level of trust in managers of empowered employee. Similarly, Berraies and his friends (2014) found that employee empowerment had a positive effect on trust, innovation and organizational performance. Libres and Mabasa (2014) aimed to measure various relationships with empowerment on 113 university employees. Accordingly, a high level of relationship was found between empowerment and organizational trust, and between empowerment and employee satisfaction. In addition to studies that reveal significant relationships between the dimensions of employee empowerment and organizational trust (Demiralp & Koçak, 2018), there are also studies that reveal strong relationships between structural empowerment and psychological empowerment and organizational trust (Uygur & Arabacı, 2019). Finally, some studies state that trust is a part of employee empowerment (Ergeneli, Arı & Metin, 2007; Ugwu, Onyishi &

Rodriguez-Sanchez, 2014). In this context, research highlights that empowerment behaviors of the leader predict psychological empowerment (Greco, Laschinger & Wong, 2006), and that organizational trust and trust in the manager increases in organizations thanks to organizational empowerment behaviors originating from leaders (Joseph & Winston, 2005, p. 9). Therefore, the intrinsic motivation involved in psychological empowerment (Thomas and Velthouse, 1990) can serve as empowering in a situation where employees perceive the organization as less trustworthy. In addition, employee trust can be created through motivational strategies such as empowerment and enrichment strategies (Ruiz-Palomo, León-Gómez & García-Lopera, 2020).

There have been very few studies in the tourism industry that examine empowerment affects the sub-dimensions of trust (Spreitzer & Mishra, 2002; Kim, Lee, Murrmann & George, 2012). However, we believe that the trust in the organization, especially in the tourism industry, is the consequence of empowering employees. Accordingly, six hypotheses have been created to examine the effects of the sub-dimensions of psychological empowerment on the sub-dimensions of organizational trust:

**H1:** The attitude (meaning-competence) dimension of psychological empowerment has a significant effect on trust in the manager.

**H2:** The attitude (meaning-competence) dimension of psychological empowerment has a significant effect on trust in colleagues.

**H3:** The attitude (meaning-competence) dimension of psychological empowerment has a significant effect on trust in the organization.

**H4:** The influence (self-determination-impact) dimension of psychological empowerment has a significant effect on trust in the manager.

**H5:** The influence (self-determination-impact) dimension of psychological empowerment has a significant effect on trust in colleagues.

**H6:** The influence (self-determination-impact) dimension of psychological empowerment has a significant effect on trust in the organization.

## **Employee Motivation**

Basically, motivation means achieving organizational main goals by meeting the needs or demands of the individual employee (Haque, Haque & Islam, 2014, p. 62). Review of the literature shows that elements such as job satisfaction, business motivation, productivity, effectiveness and organizational commitment are examined as potential consequences of empowerment (Gagne, Senecal & Koestner, 1997; Chiang & Jang, 2008). A general opinion has been prevalent in the literature for many years that empowerment provides motivation and is even one of the important foundations of motivation. In other words, at the heart of all forms of empowerment is the state of intrinsic motivation (Pelit et al., 2011). Conger and Kanungo (1988) consider empowerment as a motivational structure. Here, empowerment is more of a facilitating process than a process of granting competence. From this perspective, empowerment includes creating conditions to increase motivation for the success of the task through the development of a strong sense of personal competence (Moye & Henkin, 2006). In addition, it expresses a sense of self-control in the person's work and an internal motivation for duty that reflects an active participation in the work

role (Meng & Sun, 2019). Empowerment is a form of motivation, and limited research on motivation at multiple existing levels shows that motivational mechanisms have similar precursors and influences in individual and team analysis levels (Seibert, Wang & Courtright, 2011).

Empowerment is a broad structure and therefore implements broader motivational effects beyond the transfer of autonomy by encouraging employees to set their own goals, sharing knowledge, rewards and knowledge with employees, and increasing employee self-competence and personal control in their own work (Sharma & Kirkman, 2015). For example, assume that a hotel attendant is empowerment to respond to a guest's complaints but does not have sufficient knowledge and support. This does not represent a real empowerment because the organization does not create conditions and does not allow employees to use the competence effectively (Lin, Wu & Ling, 2017). Gagne et al., (1997) examined the effect of the dimensions of empowerment on internal motivation in the workplace in his research with technical and telemarketing employees in a business. According to the research findings, there have been findings that empowerment supports internal motivation. The studies carried out in the education, health and banking sectors in Turkey have shown that empowerment has an effect on different motivation processes such as internal motivation, external motivation and job motivation (İhtiyaroğlu, 2017; Tutar, Altınöz & Çakıroğlu, 2011; Yüksel & Adıgüzel, 2015).

From the perspective of self-competence theory, psychological empowerment is similar to internal motivation, which is not an organizational intervention or a trendy trait, but it is a cognitive condition obtained when individuals ultimately have a sense of personal competence and self-determination that pushes them to perform effectively (Seibert, Silver, & Randolph, 2004). Humborstad and Kuvaas (2013) revealed the interaction between leaders' perception of expectations to empower subordinates and their subordinates' expectations of self-empowerment in predicting role uncertainty and intrinsic motivation. Subordinates with high expectations of empowerment may have different motivational orientations than those with low empowerment expectations. Using survey data of professional employees and their supervisors at a large information technology company in China, as expected, empowerment leadership has been observed to positively affect psychological empowerment, which affects both internal motivation and creative process engagement (Zhang & Bartol, 2010).

Psychological empowerment can change an employee's internal motivation, according to a study in the hospitality industry; this feeling can increase one's personal motivation and stimulate active organizational behavior (Yen, Lin & Tai, 2004). In particular, psychological empowerment compared to other industries allows employees to properly deal with the complaints and demands of customers in the hospitality industry, which ultimately lead to a high level of customer satisfaction (Namasivayam, Guchait & Lei, 2014). Empowerment in tourism and hospitality businesses has a special importance. For example, the empowerment principles and practices adopted within the Ritz Carton Hotels are shown as one of the most important examples in the tourism and hospitality sector. Empowering managers and front-ranked employees with significant budgets to improve customer experiences while addressing creative service practices or customer complaints is part of the empowerment program carried out at this hotel. Similarly, hotel businesses such as Marriot Hotel, Hilton Hotel, Aria Resort and other tourism companies such as Casino Las Vegas, TGI Fridays and Harvester Restaurants are implementing empowerment approaches in which they support employee participation (Lin et al., 2017). The empowerment practices carried out in these businesses provide customer satisfaction and therefore the competitive feature is important for the businesses. Such applications increase

the motivation to work with various rewards and feedback. Therefore, Seibert et al., (2011) suggests in their meta-analysis study that the theory of psychological empowerment should be integrated with motivational theories.

From this point of view, two hypotheses were developed in the research to examine the effect of the sub-dimensions of psychological empowerment on employee motivation:

**H7:** The attitude (meaning-competence) dimension of psychological empowerment has a significant effect on employee motivation.

**H8:** The influence (self-determination-impact) dimension of psychological empowerment has a significant effect on employee motivation.

## **Material and Method**

### **Method of the Research**

The population of the study is made up of employees of 5-, 4- and 3-star hotels located in Istanbul. According to the data of the Istanbul Provincial Directorate of Culture and Tourism in August 2018, there are a total of 379 hotels including 105 five-star, 141 four-star and 133 three-star hotels with business and investment certificates ([www.istanbulkulturturizm.gov.tr](http://www.istanbulkulturturizm.gov.tr)). Surveys were distributed to the regions only where hotels such as Taksim, Levent, Beşiktaş, Sultanahmet and Beyazıt located on the European side in Istanbul, due to resource and time limitations. However, since it is not possible to reach all employees, convenience sampling method was applied. In the convenience sampling method, everyone is attempted to be reached in a certain period of time, taking into account no criteria in the environment (Kozak, 2014, p.118). The survey application was carried out between 18.06.2018-04.08.2018 with the drop-collect technique by going to the hotel businesses selected as samples. In addition, the survey form was created online as an online form and the link to the form was sent to the members of the Istanbul Hoteliers Federation. In total, 600 surveys were distributed, but a total of 409 surveys were obtained, including 22 online surveys covered by the study. However, some surveys are excluded for reasons such as missing data and coding. Thus, a total of 388 valid data were analyzed using the SPSS 25.0 package program. Since no exact information about the number of employees in Istanbul can be accessed in the calculation of the sample size, it is stated that 384 people should be reached for the representation of even the main population of 10 million which Sekaran explained the acceptable sample size. Therefore, the sample size of 388 people is considered sufficient for the research.

Different scales are used to measure variables. A total of 12 statements were used by Spreitzer (1995) to determine employee perceptions of psychological empowerment, measuring the dimensions of meaning, competence, self-determination and impact of psychological empowerment, and using three questions for each dimension. The 10 questions used to measure trust in the manager were made using the Organizational Trust Inventory developed by Nyhan and Marlowe (1997) and the Interpersonal Trust in Business Environment scale developed by Cook and Wall (1980) in order to measure trust in colleagues. In the measure of trust in the organization itself, 7 questions were created using the scale of Nyhan and Marlowe (1997). In order to measure employee motivation a scale used with 6 items from Wright's (2004) study. All surveys are designed in accordance with five-point Likert scales. In the last section of the question form, some demographic data such as age, gender, education and various questions are included.

In the validity and reliability analyses of the scales used in the research, item analysis was performed first and then explanatory factor analyses (EFA) were performed to determine the validity of the scales. Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency analysis was conducted to determine the reliability levels of the scales. Correlation and regression analyses were carried out to measure the relationships between independent and dependent variables.

**Reliability and Validity Analyses for Scales**

Explanatory factor analysis was used to measure the structure validity of the scales. As a result of the correlation between variables that are preliminary acceptances of factor analysis; KMO value, Bartlett Sphericity test and correlations between variables are based on deciding the compliance of the collected data with factor analysis (Tabachnick & Fidel, 2013). The KMO value greater than 0.60 suggests that factor analysis can be performed on the data (Williams, Onsman & Brown, 2010).

Alpha Model (Cronbach Alpha Coefficient), the most commonly used method of calculating reliability, was used. All Cronbach's Alpha values were looked at separately in the reliability analysis for "all statements". As a result, the reliability coefficients of the scales in the survey were found to be greater than 0.80 and sufficient.

*Psychological Empowerment Scale*

**Table 1.** Constructs of Factors, Explained Variances and Reliability of Items in Each Factor

Factors and Items	Mean	SD	Factor Loads	Eigenvalue	Explained Variance	Reliability coefficient
<b>Self-determination-Impact (Influence)</b>				<b>4.195</b>	<b>30.191</b>	<b>0.832</b>
9.I have a chance to use personal initiative in my work.	3.96	1.01	0.638			
8.I decide how to go about doing my work.	3.86	0.99	0.725			
11.I have a great deal of control over my job.	3.80	1.01	0.877			
12.I have influence over what happens in my work group.	3.70	0.98	0.878			
10.My opinion counts in the work group decision making.	3.80	0.98	0.883			
<b>Meaning-Competence (Attitude)</b>				<b>2.417</b>	<b>29.920</b>	<b>0.862</b>
6.I have mastered the skills to do my job.	4.56	0.61	0.572			
5. I am confident about my ability to do my job.	4.58	0.56	0.627			
4. My job is well within the scope of my abilities.						
2.My job activities are meaningful to me.	4.56	0.60	0.696			
1.My work is important to me.						
3.I care about what I do on my job.	4.50	0.67	0.808			
<b>Total</b>	4.59	0.66	0.812			
	4.54	0.62	0.834			
KMO: 0.828 Bartlett sphericity: 2198.762 Degrees of freedom (df): 55 P< 0.000					<b>60.111</b>	<b>0.833</b>

As shown in Table 1, the KMO value was 0.828 and this value was determined to be greater than 0.60. At the same time, the Bartlett sphericity test was found to be significant at the level of p<0.001 importance. These findings suggest that the sample size is suitable for factor analysis and that the data is obtained from the multi-variable normal distribution. Varimax vertical rotation method, which is a vertical rotation method, from Basic Components Analyses, was preferred to determine factor distributions. Upon examining Table 1, it is observed that factor loads vary between 0,572-0,883. Psychological empowerment scale was determined to be grouped under two factors with an eigenvalue greater than 1.00. The first factor explains 30,191% of the total variance while second explains

29,920% of the total variance and the total variance explained by two factors is 60,111%. It is considered sufficient in social sciences that the explained variance is between 40% and 60% (Scherer, Wiebe, Luther & Adams, 1988). In this case, it can be said that the total variance is quite sufficient. When Table 1 is examined, the items collected under the factors are taken into account when naming the factors and the first factor is called "**Self-Determination-Impact (Influence)**" and the second factor is called "**Meaning-Competence (Attitude)**" (Kim & George, 2005).

**Organizational Trust Scale**

**Table 2.** Constructs of Factors, Explained Variances and Reliability of Items in Each Factor

Factors and Items	Mean	SD	Factor Loads	Eigenvalue	Explained Variance	Reliability coefficient
<b>Trust in manager</b>				<b>10.110</b>	<b>27.145</b>	<b>0.929</b>
10. My supervisor takes our opinion in business decisions and procedures.	4.12	0.88	0.550			
8. I can easily tell my supervisor about the issues related to my work.	4.38	0.77	0.666			
7. I believe that what my supervisor told me on any subject is true.	4.28	0.77	0.668			
6. When help is needed by staff, my supervisor is supportive and helpful.	4.41	0.74	0.689			
9. I trust that my supervisor can do things smoothly and easily.	4.35	0.73	0.732			
5. What the supervisor says and what he does are consistent with each other.	4.29	0.80	0.753			
1. I trust my supervisor to have sufficient knowledge and skills regarding the job.	4.36	0.77	0.755			
4. I trust my supervisor to keep his promises.	4.33	0.73	0.778			
2. I trust my supervisor to make the right business decisions.	4.34	0.72	0.806			
3. I trust my supervisor that he will fully fulfill his job-related duties.	4.36	0.71	0.850			
<b>Trust in organization</b>				<b>2.259</b>	<b>21.983</b>	<b>0.917</b>
16. The hotel I work for always treats me fairly.	4.12	0.90	0.725			
22. I trust the policies of my hotel regarding the employees.	4.01	0.93	0.728			
17. The hotel I work for always fulfills its promises.	4.05	0.87	0.742			
20. My hotel will reward and support me if I do my job well.	3.84	1.07	0.776			
21. The hotel I work for deals with my problems.	3.94	0.97	0.781			
19. I trust the hotel I work for as a matter of being honest with employees.	4.23	0.84	0.795			
18. The hotel I work for always supports me when I need it.	4.18	0.83	0.803			
<b>Trust in Colleagues</b>				<b>2.011</b>	<b>16.235</b>	<b>0.878</b>
11. I believe that my colleagues will help me when I encounter any business problems.	4.35	0.73	0.662			
15. I trust my colleagues' expertise	4.20	0.75	0.749			
12. I trust my colleagues that they do their job best.	4.24	0.81	0.785			
13. My colleagues do their jobs even when the managers are not around.	4.19	0.85	0.811			
14. I trust my colleagues that they will not complicate my work in jobs that require attention.	4.29	0.72	0.845			
<b>Total</b>					<b>65.363</b>	<b>0.942</b>
KMO: 0.934						
Barlett Sphericity: 6002,241						
Degrees of freedom (df): 231						
P < 0.000						

As shown in Table 2, the KMO value was 0.934 and this value was determined to be greater than 0.60. At the same time, the Bartlett sphericity test was found to be significant at the significance level of  $p < 0.001$ . Varimax vertical rotation method, which is a vertical rotation method, from Basic Components Analyses, was preferred to determine factor distributions. In Table 2, it is observed that factor load values vary between 0.550-0.850. The eigenvalue of the Organizational Trust scale indicates a 3-factor structure with a value greater than 1.00. The first factor explains 27,145% of the total variance while second explains 21,983% of the total variance and the third factor explains 16,235% of the total variance. The total variance explained by the three factors together is 65,363%. When Table 2 is examined, the items collected under the factors are taken into account when naming the factors and the first factor is called "**Trust in Manager**", the second factor is called "**Trust in Organization**" and the third factor is called "**Trust in Colleagues**".

**Employee Motivation Scale**

**Table 3.** Constructs of Factors, Explained Variances and Reliability of Items in Each Factor

Factors and Items	Mean	SD	Factor Loads	Eigenvalue	Explained Variance	Reliability coefficient
<b>Employee Motivation</b>				<b>2.664</b>	<b>44.393</b>	<b>0.717</b>
2. If my job takes too much time due to workload or technical difficulties, it does not cause any trouble for me.	3.93	1.05	0.468			
1. I make the best effort to deal with the difficulties in my job.	4.50	0.64	0.621			
3. It is not easy to get to this position in my work.	4.10	1.02	0.643			
6. When I am at work, I feel that time passes quickly.	4.19	0.85	0.702			
4. I work in this job as hard as my colleagues.	4.43	0.67	0.756			
5. I make extra effort, beyond what is expected of me.	4.48	0.66	0.763			
KMO: 0.779 Bartlett sphericity: <b>485.224</b> Degrees of freedom (df): 15 $p < 0.000$						

As shown in Table 3, the KMO value was 0.779 and this value was determined to be greater than 0.60. At the same time, the Bartlett sphericity test was found to be significant at the significance level of  $p < 0.001$ . The fact that the factor load values of the items in the scale is  $\pm 0,30$  and above was taken as a criterion for whether the questions are kept on the scale (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998). As observed in the table, factor load values vary between 0.468-0.763. The eigenvalue of the employee motivation scale indicates one factor structure with a value greater than 1.00. A single factor explains 44,393% of the total variance. Since a single-factor structure is obtained when Table 3 is examined, the factor is called "**Employee Motivation**".

**Research Findings**

**Demographic Findings**

As shown in Table 4, 388 employees, 35.6 percent are female and 64.4 percent are male. 20 years and below of employees are 8.5%, between the ages of 21 and 30 years are 41.5%, with 29.6% between the ages of 31 and 40 years

and 41 years and above are 20.4%. Looking at their educational background, 7.7 percent graduated from primary school, 13.1 percent graduated from secondary school, 38.4 percent have a high school degree, 16.5 percent have a college degree and 24.2 percent have an undergraduate and above degree. Regarding the duration of their employment in the tourism sector, 17.5 percent of the employees had been employed in the tourism sector for one or less year, 13.2 percent for 1-2 years, 22.9 percent for 3-5 years, 14.7 percent for 6-8 years, 13.1 percent for 9-11 years, and 18.0 percent for 12 years and/or more. Most of the employees work in F&B department (33.0%) and the hotels which include to the sample in the research have 5 stars rating (50.8%).

**Table 4.** Demographic Characteristics of Employees

Gender	F	%	Department	F	%
Female	138	35.6	Front Office	85	21.9
Male	250	64.4	Food and Beverage	128	33.0
Age (Years)	F	%	Housekeeping	60	15.5
20 and bellow	33	8.5	Technic Service	36	9.3
21-30	161	41.5	Other	79	20.4
31-40	115	29.6	Tenure	F	%
41 and above	79	20.4	Under one year	68	17.5
Education	F	%	1-2 years	53	13.7
Primary	30	7.7	3-5 years	89	22.9
Secondary	51	13.1	6-8 years	57	14.7
High School	149	38.4	9-11 years	51	13.1
Collage	64	16.5	12 years	70	18.0
Undergraduate and above	94	24.2	Star Rating	F	%
			5 stars	197	50.8
			4 stars	107	27.6
			3 stars	84	21.6

**Findings on Correlation Analysis Between Variables**

In order to test the research hypotheses, correlation analyses should be performed to determine inter-variable relationships before regression analyses should be performed. As a result of correlation analysis, the Pearson correlation coefficient is valued between -1 and +1 ( $-1 \leq r \leq +1$ ). r coefficient shows the direction and strength of the relationship. In this sense, although there are no sharp limits, the correlation below 0.50 has low-strength; medium-strength relationship between 0.50-0.70 and high/very high strong relationship over 0.70.

**Table 5.** The Correlation between psychological empowerment and organizational trust

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1.Meaning-Competence	4.56	.46	1				
2.Self determitaion-impact	3.82	.81	0.277**	1			
3.Trust in Manager	4.32	.59	0.394**	0.273**	1		
4.Trust in colleagues	4.26	.63	0.352**	0.263**	0.525**	1	
5.Trust in Organization	4.05	.75	0.287**	0.295**	0.591**	0.476**	1

\*\* p<0.01

According to Table 5, it was determined that there is a positive and limit-appropriate (acceptable) relationship between psychological empowerment dimensions and organizational trust dimensions. The analysis showed that psychological empowerment dimensions were closely related to organizational trust dimensions significantly.

**Table 6.** The Correlation between psychological empowerment and employee motivation

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3
1.Meaning-Competence	4.56	.46	1		
2.Self determination-impact	3.82	.81	0.277**	1	
3.Employee motivation	4.27	.54	0.486**	0.316**	1

\*\* p< 0.01

According to Table 6, it was determined that there is a positive and limit-appropriate (acceptable) relationship between psychological empowerment dimensions and employee motivation. The analysis showed that psychological empowerment dimensions were closely related to motivation dimensions significantly.

**Multiple Regression Analysis Results**

Multiple linear regression analysis was implemented between independent and dependent variables to test hypotheses of the models in the study.

**Table 7.** Multiple Regression Analysis of Hotels employee’ Psychological Empowerment on trust in manager

Variables	B	Std. Error	t	p	Tolerans	VIF	F	F Sig.
Constant	1.771	0.28	6.318	0.000**				
Meaning-competence	0.345	0.062	7.212	0.000**	0.923	1.083	43.537	0.000**
Self determination-impact	0.177	0.035	3.696	0.000**	0.923	1.083		

\*\*p<0.01;

R<sup>2</sup>=0.180, Durbin Watson= 1.900

Independent Variables: Meaning-Competence, Self determination-impact

Dependent Variable: Trust in Manager

It has been determined that meaning-competence (t=7.212; p=0.000, p<0.01) and self-determination-impact (t=3.696; p=0.000, p<0.01) have a significant effect on manager trust levels. It was determined that meaning-competence and self-determination-impact explained 18% of the level of trust in the manager (R<sup>2</sup>=0.180). As shown in Table 7, two variables (meaning- competence and determination-impact) predicted 18% of the variance of trust in manager, while the contributions of meaning-competence and self-determination-impact reached to significant level. Both of the variables had significantly positive effects on the dimension of trust in manager.

**Table 8.** Multiple Regression Analysis of Hotels employee’ Psychological Empowerment on Trust in organization

Variables	B	Std. Error	t	P	Tolerans	VIF	F	F Sig.
Constant	1.556	0.365	4.263	0.000**				
Meaning-Competence	0.222	0.081	4.492	0.000**	0.923	1.083	29.449	0.000**
Self determination-impact	0.234	0.046	4.737	0.000**	0.923	1.083		

\*\*p<0.01;

R<sup>2</sup>=0.128, Durbin Watson= 1.735

Independent Variables: Meaning-Competence, Self determination-impact

Dependent Variable: Trust in organization

Meaning-competence (t=4.492; p=0.000 p<0.01) and self-determination-impact (t=4.747; p=0.000 p<0.01) have a significant effect on the levels of trust in the organization. It was determined that meaning-competence and self-determination-impact explained 12.8% of the level of trust in the organization (R<sup>2</sup>=0.128). As shown in Table 8, two variables (meaning- competence and determination-impact) predicted 12.8% of the variance of trust in organization, while the contributions of meaning-competence and self-determination-impact reached to significant level. Both of the variables had significantly positive effects on the dimension of trust in organization.

**Table 9.** Multiple Regression Analysis of Hotels employee’ Psychological Empowerment on trust in colleagues

Variables	β	Std. Error	t	p	Tolerans	VIF	F	F Sig.
Constant	1.807	0.304	5.946	0.000**				
Meaning-Competence	0.302	0.068	6.195	0.000**	0.923	1.083	34.953	0.000**
Self determination-impact	0.180	0.038	3.682	0.000**	0.923	1.083		

\*\*p<0.01;  
R<sup>2</sup>=0.149, Durbin Watson= 2.014  
Independent Variables: Meaning-Competence, Self determination-impact  
Dependent Variable: Trust in Colleagues

Meaning-competence (t=6.195; p=0.000 p<0.01) and self-determination-impact (t=3.682; p=0.000 p<0.01) were found to have a significant effect on their level of trust in their colleagues. it was determined that meaning-competence and self-determination-impact explained 14.9% of the level of trust in colleagues (R<sup>2</sup>=0.149). As shown in Table 9, two variables (meaning- competence and determination-impact) predicted 14.9% of the variance of trust in colleagues, while the contributions of meaning-competence and self-determination-impact reached to significant level. Both of the variables had significantly positive effects on the dimension of trust in colleagues.

**Table 10.** Multiple Regression Analysis of Hotels employee’ Psychological Empowerment On employee motivation

Variables	β	Std. Error	T	p	Tolerans	VIF	F	F Sig.
Constant	1.457	0.239	6.096	0.000**				
Meaning-Competence	0.432	0.053	9.542	0.000**	0.923	1.083	71.884	0.000**
Self determination-impact	0.196	0.030	4.337	0.000**	0.923	1.083		

\*\*p<0.01;  
R<sup>2</sup>=0.268, Durbin Watson= 1.702  
Independent Variables: Meaning-Competence, Self determination-impact  
Dependent Variable: Employee Motivation

Meaning-competence (t=9.542; p=000 p<0.01) and self-determination-impact (t=4.337; p=0.000 p<0.01) have a significant effect on employee motivation levels. It was determined that meaning-competence and self-determination-impact explained 26.8% of employee motivation (R<sup>2</sup>=0.268). As shown in Table 10, two variables (meaning-competence and determination-impact) predicted 26.8% of the variance of employee motivation, while the contributions of meaning-competence and self-determination-impact reached to significant level. Both of the variables has significantly positive effects on employee motivation variable.

**Conclusion and Suggestions**

In this study aimed at determining the effect of employee empowerment in hotel businesses on the trust and motivation of employees. It was determined that the scale used to create the perception of psychological empowerment of hotel employees consisted of 2 dimensions. The 12-point scale of Spreitzer (1995) consists of 4

factors in the studies carried out in the relevant field literature. In some studies, Fulford and Enz (1995) and Hancer and George (2003) revealed a 3-factor structure. In this study, similar dimensions to Kim and George (2005) study emerged with the findings obtained as a result of the analysis of the data. The meaning and competence factors in the two-factor structure were collected under the "attitude" factor, and the self-determination and impact factors were collected under the name of "influence" factor. Hancer, George and Kim (2005) state that this two-factor structure has distinctive validity. Similarly, Gazzoli, Hancer and Park (2010) reported a two-factor structure that they named task meaningfulness and freedom to perform in their study conducted with U.S. restaurant workers. In the study, it was determined that the scale used to create the organizational trust perception of hotel employees consisted of three dimensions (trust in the manager, colleagues and organization) (Omarov, 2009). The motivation scale consists of a single factor with a similar factor structure to the researches in the literature (Wright, 2004).

In the study, the relationships between psychological empowerment and organizational trust, trust in superiors and trust in colleagues were examined and it was determined that they affected the trust in the manager at the highest level. In other researches, these relationships revealed that empowered employee affect only the trust in the organization (Laschinger et al., 2000; Joseph and Winston, 2005; Libres and Mabasa, 2014), trust in manager (Moye and Henkin, 2006; Joseph and Winston, 2005) trust of subordinates and superiors on each other (Berraies et al., 2014) and additionally effect of empowerment on interpersonal trust in public organizations (Nyhan, 2000) were addressed. In the tourism industry, there are similar studies stating that empowerment effects on trust in the manager (Kim et al., 2012). Managers should take this situation into consideration and transfer the necessary empowerment practices to the employee. Employees who trust their manager and have authority and responsibility will respond to customer demands in the hotel as soon as possible with their rising motivations and ensure the satisfaction of customers. It is observed that the lowest level of effect with psychological empowerment of employees working in hotel businesses is in the dimension of trust in the organization. In hotel businesses with a busy working pace, employees may not have sufficient trust in the organization they are in, even if they sometimes trust their manager or the friend they work with. In raising trust in the organization; developing mutual relations and communication, establishing a sense of belonging to the organization, teamwork, fulfillment of promises, establishing a fair and transparent organizational policy are among the necessities.

One of the most important findings of this study is that psychological empowerment has a significant relationship with motivation. Empowerment, which aims to create conditions to increase motivation for the purpose of succeeding in the duty (Moye and Henkin, 2006), will help the hotel employees empowered by their managers to get more motivation. This finding can provide a useful framework for analyzing the concept of motivation as a contribution to individuals' perceptions of empowerment. Thus, one of the main factors of managerial and organizational activity is revealed. On the other hand, findings of the various studies that indicated that psychological empowerment, similar to these study findings, had an effect on various types of motivation, such as internal motivation (Gagge et al., 1997), success motivation (Tutar et al., 2011), work motivation (Yüksel & Adıgüzel, 2015).

The results provide significant advantages for organizations to know what contributions they will make to the organization when they empower the employees and to be able to realize the weaknesses and strengths of the organization. Empowering the human factor in hotel businesses where changing conditions increase competition ensure customer satisfaction (He et al., 2010; Namasivayam et al., 2014), bringing profitability and continuity. As

with all businesses, the purpose of the existence of hotel businesses is profitability and continuity. Empowered employee is an important managerial practice in creating differences for today's hotels, where trust and motivation are not easily achieved. As a result of empowerment in hotel businesses, there will be a decrease in the turnover rate with the employees gaining trust and motivation. Additionally, the desire of the employees to stay in the business will increase thanks to the decrease in the intention to leave. Thus, businesses will not lose the empowered employee that please the customer and can find quick solutions to their requests and complaints, thus helping the profitability of the hotel. In other words, it should not be ignored that it is an important factor not to lose the human element in the service sector and that more efficiency should be obtained by empowering it. In this context, hotel businesses should consider empowerment practices as an investment in the future.

In this study, only a sample for city hotel management was utilized. A research with employees at resort hotels may reveal different results. Therefore, if future studies investigate and reveal the relationships of employees in resort hotels with the elements of empowerment, motivation and trust, the current situation in resort hotels will be revealed. Thus, comparisons can be made for the variables specified between the two types of hotel businesses. Some studies on empowerment recommend examining the two dimensions of empowerment behaviorally and psychologically (Pelit et al., 2011). Therefore, in future studies, these relationships can be dealt with more comprehensively and examined not only with psychological empowerment, but also with behavioral empowerment. In addition, Koberg et al. (1999) state that many factors affect empowerment at the level of individual, group and organization. For example, characteristics such as tenure, age, gender, self-determination, control focus, self-competence, self-respect, group-level leader approachability, group activity, group value, mutual influence, position in hierarchy at organizational level, organizational climate can be explored as antecedents and consequences of empowerment. Therefore, it is recommended to investigate the effects of many factors together with motivation and trust for further studies.

### **Declaration**

The contribution of all the authors of the article to the article process is equal. There is no conflict of interest to be declared by the authors.

### **REFERENCES**

- Andrews, G.M. (1994). Mistrust, the hidden obstacle to empowerment, *HR Magazine*, 39, 66-70.
- Avcı, N. (2020). Psychological empowerment: How can the tourism industry adopt it?. In Aydin, Ş., Dedeoglu, B. B., & Çoban, Ö. (Eds.), *Organizational Behavior Challenges in the Tourism Industry* (pp. 249-265). IGI Global.
- Berraies S., Chaher M., & Yahia K. (2014). Employee empowerment and its importance for trust, innovation and organizational performance. *Business Management and Strategy*. 5(2), 82-103.
- Caudron, S. (1995). Create an empowering environment. *Personal Journal*, 74, 28-36.
- Chiang, C.F., & 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), 40-61.

- Chiang, C-F., & Hsieh, T-S. (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.
- Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 471-482.
- Cook, J.D., & Wall, T.D. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment, and personal need nonfulfillment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 53, 39-52.
- Culbert, S. A., & McDonough, J. J. (1986). The politics of trust and organization empowerment. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 10(2), 171-188.
- Demiralp M., & Koçak R. (2018). Personel güçlendirme ve örgütsel güven ilişkisi: Kamu kurumunda ampirik bir araştırma. *Social Sciences Studies Journal*, 4(23), 4492-4502.
- Ergeneli, A., Arı, G. S., & Metin, S. (2007). Psychological empowerment and its relationship to trust in immediate managers. *Journal of Business Research*, 60, 41-49.
- Fulford, M., & Enz, C. (1995). The impact of empowerment on service employees. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 7(2), 161-175.
- Gagne M., Senecal C., & Koestner R. (1997). Proximal job characteristics, feelings of empowerment, and intrinsic motivation: A multidimensional model. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 27(14), 1222-1240.
- Gazzoli, G., Hancer, M., & Park, Y. (2010). The role and effect of job satisfaction and empowerment on customers' perception of service quality: A study in the restaurant industry. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 34 (1), 56-77.
- Greco, P., Laschinger, H. K. S., & Wong, C. (2006). Leader empowering behaviours, Staff nurse empowerment and work engagement/burnout. *Nursing Leadership*. 9(4), 41-56.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis*. 5(3), Prentice Hall.
- Hanaysha, J. (2016). Examining the effects of employee empowerment, teamwork, and employee training on organizational commitment. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 229, 298-306.
- Hancer, M., & George, R. T. (2003). Psychological empowerment of non-supervisory employees working in full-service restaurants. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 22, 3-16.
- Hancer, M., George, R. T., & Kim. B. P. (2005). An examination of dimensions of psychological empowerment scale for service employees. *Psychological Reports*, 97(2), 357-362.
- Haque, M. F., Haque M. A., & Islam, S. (2014). Motivational theories – a critical analysis. *ASA University Review*, 8(1), 61-68.
- Harari, O. (1999). The trust factor. *Management Review*, 88 (1), 28-32.
- Hassan, M., Toylan, N. V., Semerciöz, F., & Aksel, I. (2012). Interpersonal trust and its role in organizations. *International Business Research*, 5(8), 33-39.

- He, P., Murrmann, S.K., & Perdue, R.R. (2010). An investigation of the relationships among employee empowerment, employee-perceived service quality, and employee job satisfaction in a US hospitality organization. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 13(1), 36-50.
- Humborstad, S. I. W., & Kuvaas, B. (2013). Mutuality in leader–subordinate empowerment expectation: Its impact on role ambiguity and intrinsic motivation, *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(2), 363-377.
- Ibrahim, A. M. (2020). Psychological empowerment and organizational commitment among employees in the lodging industry. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 19(3), 277-295.
- İhtiyaroğlu, N. (2017). Yapısal ve psikolojik güçlendirmenin öğretmen motivasyonu üzerindeki etkisi. *Kırıkkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 7(2), 361-378.
- Janssen, O., Schoonebeek, G., & Looy, V.B. (1997). Cognitions of empowerment: The link between participative management and employees' innovative behavior. *Gedrag en Organisatie*. 10(4), 175-194.
- Jha, S. S., & Nair, S. K. (2008). Influence of locus of control, Job characteristics and superior subordinate relationship on psychological empowerment a study in five star hotels. *Journal of Management Research*, 8 (3), 147-161.
- Joseph, E. E., & Winston B. E. (2005). A correlation of servant leadership, leader trust and organizational trust. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26(1), 6-22.
- Kim, B., & George, T. (2005). The relationship between leader- member exchange (Lmx) and psychological empowerment: A quick casual restaurant employee correlation study. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 29(4), 468-483.
- Kim, B., Lee, G., Murrmann, S. K., & George, T. R. (2012). Motivational effects of empowerment on employees' organizational commitment: A mediating role of management trustworthiness. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 53(1) 10-19.
- Kim, B.P., Lee, G., & Carlson, K.D. (2010). An examination of the nature of the relationship between Leader-Member-Exchange (LMX) and turnover intent at different organizational levels. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(4), 591-597.
- Koberg C. S., Boss R. W., Senjem J. C., & Goodman E. A. (1999). Antecedents and outcomes of empowerment. *Group & Organization Management*, 24(1), 71-92.
- Koçel, T. (2005). *İşletme yöneticiliği*. İstanbul: Arıkan Basım Yayın.
- Kozak, M. (2014). *Bilimsel araştırma: Tasarım, yazım ve yayım teknikleri*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Laschinger, H. K. S., Finegan, J., Shamian, J., & Shelley, C. (2000). Organizational trust and empowerment in restructured healthcare settings. Effects on staff nurse commitment, *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 30(9), 1-13.
- Lewick, R. & Bies, D. (1998). Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 438-458.
- Libres, A., & Mabasa, M. (2014). Empowerment and organizational trust: Its impact on job satisfaction and turnover intention. *CHED Accredited Research Journal*, 10(1), 191-204.

- Lin, M., Wu, X., & Ling, Q. (2017). Assessing the effectiveness of empowerment on service quality: A multi-level study of Chinese tourism firms. *Tourism Management*, 61, 411-425.
- McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect and Cognitive-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38 (1), 24-59.
- Meng, Q., & Sun, F. (2019). The impact of psychological empowerment on Work Engagement Among University faculty members in China. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 12, 983-990.
- Mishra, A. K. (1996). Organizational responses to crisis: The centrality of trust. In Kramer, A. M. & Tyler, T. R. (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations* (pp. 262-87). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Moye M., & Henkin A. (2006). Exploring associations between employee empowerment and interpersonal trust in managers. *Journal of Management Development*, 25(2), 101-117.
- Namasivayam, K., Guchait, P., & Lei, P. (2014). The influence of leader empowering behaviors and employee psychological empowerment on customer satisfaction. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26(1), 69-84.
- Nazarian, A., Atkinson, P., & Foroudi, P. (2017). Influence of national culture and balanced organizational culture on the hotel industry's performance. *International Journal of Hospitality Management Volume*, 63, 22-32.
- Nyhan, R. C. (2000). Changing the paradigm: Trust and its role in public sector organizations. *American Review of Public Administration*, 30(1), 87-109.
- Nyhan, R. C., & Marlowe, H. A. (1997). Development and psychometric properties of the organizational trust inventory. *Evaluation Review*, 21(5), 614-635.
- O'Brien, J. (2011). Structural empowerment, psychological empowerment, and burnout in registered staff nurses working in outpatient dialysis centers. *Nephrology Nursing Journal*, 38 (6), 475-481.
- Omarov, A. (2009). *Örgütsel güven ve iş doyumunu: Özel bir sektörde uygulama* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir. <http://tez2.yok.gov.tr/> (Tez No. 236082).
- Owen, H. (1996). Building teams on a display of trust. *People Management*, 2 (6), 34-37.
- Örücü, E., & Kambur, E. (2017). Otel çalışanlarında örgütsel sessizlik ve örgütsel güven ilişkisi: Bandırma ilçesi örneği. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 10(52), 1109-1123.
- Peccei, R., & Rosenthal, P. (2001). Delivering customer-oriented behavior through empowerment: An empirical test of HRM assumptions. *Journal of Management Studies*, 38(6), 831-858.
- Pelit, E., Öztürk, Y., & Arslantürk, Y. (2011). The effects of employee empowerment on employee job satisfaction. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 23(6), 784-802.
- Royer, L. (2011). Empowerment and commitment perceptions of community/public health nurses and their tenure intention. *Public Health Nursing*, 28 (6), 523-532.

- Ruiz-Palomo, D., León-Gómez, A., & García-Lopera, F. (2020). Disentangling organizational commitment in hospitality industry: The roles of empowerment, enrichment, satisfaction and gender. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 90, 1-9.
- Scherer, R.F., Wiebe, F.A., Luther, D. C., & Adams J. S. (1988). Dimensionality of Coping: Factor Stability Using The Ways of Coping Questionnaire. *Psychological Reports*, 62(3), 763-770.
- Seibert, S. E., Silver, S. R., & Randolph, W. A. (2004). Taking empowerment to the next level: A multiple-level model of empowerment, performance, and satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(3), 332-349.
- Seibert, S. E., Wang, G., & Courtright, S. H. (2011). Antecedents and consequences of psychological and team empowerment in organizations: A Meta-Analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(5), 981-1003.
- Sharma, P., & Kirkman, B. L. (2015). Leveraging leaders: A literature review and future lines of inquiry for empowering leadership research. *Group & Organization Management*, 40(2), 193-235.
- Spreitzer, G. M., & Mishra, A. K. (2002). To stay or to go: Voluntary survivor turnover following an organizational downsizing. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23 (6), 707-729.
- Spreitzer, G.M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5), 1442-1465.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics*. USA: Pearson Education Limited.
- Tan, H. H., & Tan, C. S. (2000). Toward the differentiation of trust in supervisor and trust in organization. *Genetic Social General Psychology Monographs*, 126(2), 241-260.
- Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An "Interpretive" model of intrinsic task motivation. *The Academy of Management Review*, 15(4), 666-681.
- Tutar, H., Altınöz M., & Çakıroğlu D. (2011). The effects of employee empowerment on achievement motivation and the contextual performance of employees. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(15), 6318-6329.
- Ugwu, F. O., Onyishi, I. E., & Rodriguez-Sanchez, A. M. (2014). Linking organizational trust with employee engagement: The role of psychological empowerment. *Personnel Review*, 43 (3), 377-400.
- Uygur, K., & Arabacı, İ. (2019). Lise öğretmenlerinin personel güçlendirme algıları ile örgütsel güven algıları arasındaki ilişki: Elazığ ili örneği. *YYÜ Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16(1), 744-770.
- Williams, B., Onsman, A., & Brown, T. (2010). Exploratory factor analysis: A five-step guide for novices. *Journal of Emergency Primary Health Care (JEPHC)*, 8(3), 1-13.
- Wright, B. E. (2004). The role of work context in work motivation: A public sector application of goal and social cognitive theories. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 14, (1), 59-78.
- Yen, R.H.J., Lin, Y.L., & Tai, S.H. (2004). The impacts of service climate on service-oriented citizenship behavior – the mediating roles of psychological empowerment and role definition. *Management Review*, 23 (1), 25-48.

- Yüksel, O., & Adıgüzel, O. (2015). Kamu hastaneleri birliği kapsamında yer alan sağlık kurumlarında çalışanlar açısından personel güçlendirmenin iş tatmini ve iş motivasyonu üzerine etkilerinin çeşitli değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 8(39), 1019-1027.
- Zhang, X., & Bartol, K. M. (2010). Linking empowering leadership and employee creativity: The influence of psychological empowerment, intrinsic motivation, and creative process engagement. *Academy of Management*, 53(1), 107-128.
- Zhang, X., Ye, H., & Li, Y. (2018). Correlates of structural empowerment, psychological empowerment and emotional exhaustion among registered nurses: A meta-analysis. *Applied Nursing Research*, 42, 9-16.