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OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

Choice: This means an employee’s sense of autonomy in making work related decisions in their day to day work tasks.

Competence: It is the extent to which an employee can perform work activities skilfully and with the required knowledge. Competence emanates from self-efficacy, the belief that one can successfully perform a given task.

Demographic factors: These are the human characteristics of the respondents, such as, age, gender and education levels.

Empowerment: Employees’ competent perceptions in their ability to execute the assigned tasks, their autonomy on the job and decision-making power for task action.

Extrinsic factors: These are factors which are related to the work environment, for instance, salaries, promotion, work conditions, working equipments and employee welfare.

Guest houses: These are non-classified hotel facilities that provide reasonably good accommodation, food and beverage services at lower rates to their guests.

Hospitality industry: These are organizations involved in provision of accommodation, food and beverage services to guests. These include hotels, lodges, guest houses and restaurants.

Impact: It is the extent to which an employee believes he/she can make a difference in organizations’ operational outcome and the decisions made in the organization and/or the department.
**Job satisfaction:** Employees’ feelings or emotional responses to a job, which can be the result of the employee’s expectations and actual outcomes from the work and environments.

**Labour turnover:** This is a characteristic of a given hospitality establishment showing the rate at which the employer gains or loses staff.

**Meaning:** This refers to the alignment between employees’ work activities and their beliefs, attitudes, values and behaviours. It is the value of work goal and purpose as perceived by the employee in relation to his own personal mission and expectations.

**Overall psychological empowerment:** This is the mental perception that involves the alignment between one’s job and personal values. It is the perception that one has the necessary knowledge, skills and autonomy to perform their job well, so as to make a difference in the organization.

**Supervisors:** These are employees who are in charge of the various operations of a guest house enterprise, for instance, restaurant, kitchen and housekeeping supervisors.
# ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Analysis of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FKE</td>
<td>Federation of Kenyan Employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRM</td>
<td>Human Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAHC</td>
<td>Kenya Association of Hotelkeepers and Caterers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMO</td>
<td>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin</td>
</tr>
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<td>KNCCI</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTB</td>
<td>Kenya Tourism Board</td>
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<tr>
<td>LED</td>
<td>Local Economic Development</td>
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<td>MoT</td>
<td>Ministry of Tourism</td>
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<tr>
<td>MSQ</td>
<td>Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACOSTI</td>
<td>National Council of Science, Technology and Innovation</td>
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<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Psychological Empowerment</td>
</tr>
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<td>PERAK</td>
<td>Pubs, Entertainment and Restaurants Association of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
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</table>
ABSTRACT
Psychological empowerment and job satisfaction are critical human resource issues in guest house operations. Compared to classified hotels, guest houses have a larger percentage of untrained personnel. Employees who might have some hospitality training are usually the supervisors. However, the owners of guest houses tend to dictate and control almost all the operations, thus low employee empowerment. Lack of empowerment is a major cause of job dissatisfaction and eventually high staff turnover. Hence, this study sought to determine the influence of psychological empowerment and extrinsic factors on job satisfaction among guest house supervisors in Mombasa County. The study used a descriptive survey study design. The research focused on the seventy-six registered guest houses in Mombasa County. The study utilized census, where all the supervisors in all the registered guest houses in Mombasa County were included. Secondary data was collected by reviewing documented information concerning the study variables. Primary data was collected through a semi-structured questionnaire and an observation checklist. Pre-testing was done in three guest houses and the remaining seventy-three were included in the study. Data analysis utilized quantitative tests such as means, percentages and standard deviations. Pearson correlation coefficient, linear and multiple regressions were used to establish the relationship between the study variables. The response rate for the supervisors’ questionnaire was 94%. Findings from the questionnaires revealed that there existed a positive and significant influence (p< 0.05) of ‘competence’ on job satisfaction (r= 0.554); ‘impact’ on job satisfaction (r= 0.868); ‘meaning’ on job satisfaction (r= 0.765); and ‘choice’ on job satisfaction (r= 0.734). The overall job satisfaction was mean rated at 3.52 out of a total score of 5. From the model, (R² =.857) showed that the overall psychological empowerment accounted for 85.7% variation in job satisfaction of guest house supervisors and hence there was a positive relationship between the variables. The age of supervisors had a weak positive relationship with job satisfaction (β= 0.054, p> 0.05) while gender (β= -0.151, p< 0.05), number of years worked (β= -0.140, p< 0.05) and education (β= -0.063, p> 0.05) had negative relationships with job satisfaction. Results from the observation checklist revealed an above average level of the dimensions of ‘meaning’ and ‘impact’ at 65% and 69% of the guest houses respectively. However, observations for ‘competence’ and ‘choice’ were below average at 49% and 24% of the total number of guest houses respectively. The major extrinsic factors identified to affect job satisfaction were salaries, working conditions, terms of employment and employee welfare. This study would be of critical importance to the various stakeholders of the hospitality industry. For instance, it would be of great help to guest house entrepreneurs and managers who would be able to formulate and implement empowerment strategies for their supervisors and other staff. In addition, this study would be helpful to organizations such as Federation of Kenyan Employers, Kenya Association of Hotelkeepers and Caterers and Pubs Entertainment and Restaurant Association of Kenya in sensitizing their members on the importance of employee psychological empowerment. The study recommends that guest house supervisors should be accorded necessary support in terms of empowering them in their work tasks. This would go a long way in enhancing their job satisfaction.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

This chapter laid the foundational base and served as the blueprint for the whole study. It comprises eleven sections, beginning with an introduction section. The subsequent sections examined the background of the study, problem statement and justification, purpose of the study, research objectives, study hypotheses, significance of the study, conceptual framework, delimitations, limitations and assumptions of the study.

1.2 Background to the Study

Psychological empowerment and job satisfaction are important issues in the management of human resources in any organization. They have been emphasized as major ways of reducing employee labour turnover, improving customer satisfaction and helping effective functioning of organizations in the hospitality industry (Lee, 2010). By psychologically empowering employees in hospitality organizations, managers do not only have the solution for leadership problems but in addition help increase employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Kim, Lee, Murrmann & George, 2012).

Managers, entrepreneurs and researchers in the field of management have argued that the employee is the major resource bringing competitive advantage to organizations (Elbeyi,
Yüksel & Yalçın, 2011). Researchers and managers have revealed that the involvement and empowerment of employees is key to the success of organizations and has yielded positive results for employees as well (Elbeyi, *et al.* 2011; Zhang & Bartol, 2010). Psychological empowerment leads to, among others, employee satisfaction and motivation, improved organizational performance and customer satisfaction (Chebat & Kollias, 2009; Sigler & Pearson, 2011; Col, 2008). According to Kim, *et al.* (2012) all the above studies have overwhelmingly posited the importance of employee psychological empowerment which has numerous benefits, as enumerated for the organizations, the employees and the customers.

Ponton (2011) in a study on empowerment, employee job satisfaction and organizational loyalty of managers in South East Queensland, Australia, established that empowered employees are willing to take responsibility for the service encounter. He further explained that psychologically empowered employees respond fast to customer problems, needs and wants. This leads to improved customer satisfaction and profitability for the hospitality organization. In addition, Ponton (2011) pointed out that in organizations where employees were empowered, low labour turnover with higher levels of employee morale and satisfaction were experienced. Psychologically empowered employees take responsibility for their own performance and the organization’s improvement (Kim & George, 2012).

Esther and Allen (2012) in their study on staffing issues among hotels in the Volta Region of Ghana argued that as global competition intensifies in the hospitality industry,
good staffing would provide sustainable competitive advantage. They indicated that staffing comprises matters related to employee psychological empowerment, labour turnover, retention, job satisfaction among others. Esther and Allen (2012) further reported that the operational challenges that hotel businesses faced in Ghana included low job satisfaction, lack of empowerment, lack of skilled labour and high staff turnover. Similarly, in his study on service quality, empowerment and ethics in the South African hospitality industry, Nicolaides (2012) posited that it was vital to have psychologically empowered employees who were also committed to the objectives of the organization.

Guest houses are an important component of the hospitality industry. Ramukumba and Ferreira (2016) examined the contribution of guest houses to the Local Economic Development (LED) through procurement of locally produced products and services for their operations in the Eden district municipality of South Africa. They found out that majority of the guest houses (64.2%) were using locally produced products to a large extent. In addition, majority of these guest houses spend between 5,000 Rands and 10,000 Rands per month purchasing local products. This South African study revealed that guest houses were indeed making a positive contribution to LED through their usage of locally produced products. This was of great importance towards the growth of the local economy as money was circulating within the local economy to the benefit of community members in employment opportunities (Ramukumba & Ferreira, 2016).

Further, guest houses offer an opportunity for small and medium entrepreneurs to invest in the sector and provide more accommodation services to guests (Kivuva, Kihima &
Nzioka, 2014). Guest house proprietors are often independent operators who obtain customers by word of mouth (Ramukumba & Ferreira, 2016). Guest houses are a cheaper alternative to classified hotels as they offer their services at reasonably lower rates. They are usually smaller than an average hotel and only have a limited number of guest rooms and food and beverage outlets (Kivuva, et al., 2014). Supervisors in these establishments are a critical link between the operational staff and the management. They are close to the operatives and therefore they dictate the quality of services rendered to customers as well as addressing customer complaints promptly. On the other hand, they are also close to managers of the guest houses in the chain of management and hence they might influence the kind of policies adopted for their institutions. Supervisors who are empowered psychologically and perceive that they are satisfying their customers would be more likely to be satisfied in their jobs (Sigler & Pearson, 2011). Supervisors who are satisfied in their jobs are less likely to leave the organization and therefore reduction of labour turnover (Chebat & Kollias, 2009). In addition, supervisors’ job satisfaction would in turn lead to customer satisfaction (Sigler & Pearson, 2011) which is critical to guest houses. This is because guest houses mostly depend on repeat customers and word of mouth as mentioned earlier. To date, however, very little research attention has been given to guest house operations.

In today’s competitive business environment, a top priority for any hospitality business is to deliver quality products to its customers. It is important to note that employees play the most critical role in this process (Bouranta, Chitiris & Paravantis, 2012; Yavas, Karatepe & Babakus, 2010). They represent the organization to customers, serve the customers and
are expected to enhance the image of the organization (Crick & Spencer, 2011). Consequently, employees are the ones who are expected to return disgruntled customers to satisfaction after a service failure, as posited by Yavas, et al. (2010) in their study on job performance among hotel staff in Turkey. As such, employees in hospitality firms could help regain customer confidence and strengthen customer loyalty. Therefore, it is excusable to enhance their psychological empowerment to handle guests’ issues effectively and efficiently.

Psychological empowerment and job satisfaction enhancement can be used as some of the human resource strategies to motivate employees and curb the high labour turnover witnessed in the hospitality industry (Taal, 2012). In analysing labour markets in the hospitality sector, Hospitality Guild (2013) reported global turnover in the industry to be as high as 50%. Worldwide, researchers have suggested that staff turnover in the hospitality industry is among the highest (Taal, 2012). The average staff turnover among hospitality industry staff has been reported to be about 50% in the United States of America (CHA, 2009). This figure rose to about 66.3% in the year 2014 (National Restaurants Association, 2015).

In South Africa, a major human resource challenge facing the hospitality industry is high staff turnover rates, lack of empowerment and low job satisfaction levels (Taal, 2012). Taal (2012) further reported that a large number of employees consider hospitality jobs to be a “pass-through” to other jobs in a different and higher level industry, rather than as a life-time career commitment. In Kenya, a study by Kuria, Wanderi & Ondigi (2011) on
staff turnover in hotels established that labour turnover in some sectors of the hospitality industry was as high as 68%. They further noted that poor human resources policies were the main cause of labour turnover in the industry in Kenya. They therefore suggested the need to develop appropriate retention strategies. Some of these strategies could include employee psychological empowerment and job satisfaction. The study area for the current research was Mombasa County in Kenya. It is one of the leading tourist destinations in the country for both domestic and international leisure arrivals (MoT, 2015). Guest houses in the county offer a cheaper alternative to the expensive classified hotels to customers travelling on a tight budget.

1.3 Problem Statement and Justification

Though Kim, et al. (2012) posited that psychological empowerment leads to enhanced employee job satisfaction, the idea of empowerment of hospitality employees has remained an illusion and has been met with great deal of skepticism (Brancato, 2011). Most hospitality organizations praise the concept of empowerment, yet not much has been realized on the ground (Davidson & Timo, 2011). On the other hand, various researchers across the globe have reported low levels of job satisfaction among hotel employees. Tian & Pu (2008) in their study on Chinese hotel employees reported the problem of low job satisfaction. Similarly, Gallardo, Sanchez-Canizares, Lopez-Guzmán & Jesus (2009) also reported unacceptable low levels of job satisfaction among hotel workers in the Iberian hotel industry. Further, Ineson, Benke & Lászlo (2013) in their study on
employee loyalty among Hungarian hotel workers reported the problem of low levels of job satisfaction.

Locally, a research by Mokaya, Musau, Wagoki & Karanja (2013) revealed low levels of job satisfaction among hotel workers in Kenya. They further posited that job satisfaction was mean rated at 3.368 out of a total score of 5, implying that a lot of efforts were needed to achieve total job satisfaction among hotel employees. Because of this problem of lack of adequate employee empowerment and low job satisfaction among hotel workers, labour turnover rates in the hospitality industry across the world have remained high, that is, about 50% in the UK (Hospitality Guild, 2013), 66.3% in the USA (National Restaurants Association, 2015) and 68% in Kenya (Kuria et al., 2011). Additionally, inadequate employee empowerment and low job satisfaction have been reported to subsequently lead to reduced employee morale, decreased organizational performance and productivity and eventually dissatisfied customers (Kim & Han, 2013).

Despite the importance of two variables in the hospitality industry, very little or negligible empirical research on psychological empowerment in relation to job satisfaction among guest house employees had been done in Kenya, and more specifically in Mombasa County. Additionally, very little empirical evidence on how the various cognitions of psychological empowerment affect job satisfaction in the hospitality sector was available. Most of the studies on employee empowerment had focused on classified hotels (Aksu & Aktas, 2010; Antonis & van den Berg, 2013; Elbeyi, et al. 2011) and left out other hospitality service providers, such as guest houses.
Other studies had dwelt on the operational staff and the top management and left out the supervisory staff (Karetepe, Uludag, Menevis, Hadzimehmedagic & Baddar, 2006; Mohd, Salleh, Rahman, Azahar, Razlin & Nazarudin, 2009; He, Murrmann & Perdue, 2010). In Mombasa County, most guest houses are owned by independent entrepreneurs who are not necessarily trained in hospitality management. It was, therefore, important to establish whether their supervisors were psychologically empowered in their work roles; which might in turn have lead to greater job satisfaction. Consequently, this would lead to low labour turnover, build customer satisfaction and enhance performance and productivity of the guest house establishments.

1.4 Purpose of the Study

This study aimed at creating a positive awareness on the importance of psychologically empowering supervisors in guest houses and the hospitality industry at large and how this would affect job satisfaction. The study also aimed at revealing the major extrinsic factors which influence guest house supervisors’ job satisfaction. It was anticipated that through supervisors’ psychological empowerment and job satisfaction, guest houses in Mombasa County would be able to reduce the high staff labour turnover witnessed in the hospitality industry and therefore enhance their organizational performance as well as customer satisfaction.
1.5 Study Objectives

This study sought to achieve the following objectives:

1.5.1 General Objective

The study sought to find out the relationship between psychological empowerment and extrinsic factors and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County, Kenya.

1.5.2 Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of this study were to:

1. Establish the influence of the ‘meaning’ dimension of psychological empowerment on job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County.
2. Determine the influence of the ‘competence’ dimension of psychological empowerment on job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County.
3. Assess the relationship between the ‘choice’ dimension of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County.
4. Establish the influence of the ‘impact’ dimension of psychological empowerment on job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County.
5. Determine the relationship between overall psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County.

6. Find out the relationship between guest house supervisors’ demographics and their job satisfaction in the County of Mombasa.

7. Determine the major extrinsic factors that might influence job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County.

1.6 Study Hypotheses

The study hypothesized that:

\( H_0 \)\textsubscript{1} There was no significant relationship between the ‘meaning’ dimension of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County.

\( H_0 \)\textsubscript{2} There was no significant relationship between the ‘competence’ dimension of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County.

\( H_0 \)\textsubscript{3} There was no significant relationship between the ‘choice’ dimension of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County.

\( H_0 \)\textsubscript{4} There was no significant relationship between the ‘impact' dimension of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County.
There was no significant relationship between the overall psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County.

There was no significant relationship between demographics of guest house supervisors and their job satisfaction in the County of Mombasa.

1.7 Significance and Anticipated Output

While contributing to the body of knowledge in the hospitality and work psychology fields, the results of this study would enable guest house proprietors gain an in-depth understanding of psychological empowerment and how it relates to job satisfaction. Their employees would be able to deliver a satisfactory hospitality product to customers, hence foster repeat business and new business as well. This would boost the performance of individual guest houses and the hospitality industry as a whole. In addition, hospitality organizations would be able to formulate strategies that would enhance psychological empowerment and job satisfaction, hence increase productivity and profits for the organizations.

Hospitality associations such as the Kenya Association of Hotelkeepers and Caterers (KAHC) and Pubs Entertainment and Restaurants Association of Kenya (PERAK) would gain useful information and be able to sensitize their members on the importance of employee empowerment and job satisfaction of their staff. This would go a long way in helping to mitigate high staff turnover in the hospitality industry, consequently enhancing customer satisfaction and organizational performance and productivity. The national and
county governments, through affiliated organizations such as Kenya National Chamber of Commerce and Industry (KNCCI), Ministry of Labour and Federation of Kenyan Employers (FKE) would gain important ideas that would inform their encouragement of other sectors of the economy to do similar research in their organizations so as to improve their workforce productivity.

1.8 Delimitations of the Study

This study limited itself to supervisors of guest houses in Mombasa County at the Kenyan Coastal region. Therefore, the results might not be generalized to represent other components of the hospitality industry, such as classified hotels, lodges and independent restaurants. The results of this study might also not be applicable to guest houses in other parts of the country.

1.9 Limitations of the Study

This study utilised a questionnaire and an observation checklist as the data collection tools. First, there was the limitation of lack of control of the environment where the respondents provided answers to the questions in the survey. Secondly, the questionnaire was semi-structured and most of the items measuring the variables under study were closed ended. This meant that the respondents had a limited choice in their responses which were presented by the researcher. Thirdly, the study was expensive and time
consuming as all the guest houses and their supervisors were included in the study. Hence, time was needed to visit each guest house and explain to the respondents the importance of the study. Some of the respondents were working night shifts and the researcher had to arrange a way of accessing them.

Further, this study was carried out at the Coastal region of Kenya which is normally highly affected by tourism seasonality. It was therefore feared that supervisors of the guest houses might be quite busy during the high seasons or very few during low seasons. Since data collection for the study was done during the high season (October to December 2016), this challenge was mitigated by meeting guest house managers first and scheduling the convenient dates to access all their supervisors. Though there were few previous studies on psychological empowerment and job satisfaction, this study depended greatly on studies done for other components of the hospitality industry and other sectors of the economy. Lastly, some of the supervisors did not understand the concept of psychological empowerment. However, this was solved by explaining to them what it entailed and assisting them in understanding the components in the research instrument (questionnaire).

1.10 Assumptions

The major assumption of this study was that the respondents would be honest and truthful in their responses. It was also assumed that the researcher would be able to access all the guest house supervisors in Mombasa County.
1.11 Conceptual Framework

This study was conceptualized as shown in Figure 1.1.

**Fig. 1.1: Relationship between the Study Variables**

*Source: Adopted from Thomas and Velthouse (1990)*

This model was adopted from Thomas and Velthouse (1990) Cognitive theory. The theory suggests that psychological empowerment influences job satisfaction. Psychological empowerment lays emphasis on how employees’ perceive and experience empowerment. Based on this approach, emphasis is laid on how the employees’ perceive the various psychological empowerment dimensions, that is, impact, competence,
meaning and choice. Each of these four dimensions individually might have various levels of influence on job satisfaction. The dimensions additively combine to dictate the level of job satisfaction in any given organization.

This theory was utilised in conceptualising the current study. The current study sought to determine the influence of each of the four dimensions of psychological empowerment towards guest house supervisors’ job satisfaction. It further sought to determine the level of importance of the four dimensions of psychological empowerment relative to each other towards job satisfaction. However, it was important to point out that psychological empowerment might not solely influence job satisfaction. Job satisfaction might also be affected by other factors. Therefore, in addition to the critical importance of psychologically empowering hospitality employees, attention should also be given to these other factors (extrinsic factors) which might affect job satisfaction. Since it was not clear what the major extrinsic factors affecting job satisfaction of supervisors in guest houses might have been, this study sought to unravel this. However, it was also conceptualised that the relationship between psychological empowerment and job satisfaction might also be affected by the supervisors’ demographics. Employees’ satisfaction in their jobs might be affected by their demographics such as age, gender and education levels. However, the kinds of relationships between these variables were unknown and the study sought to establish these.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviewed literature hinging on the two major concepts of the study, that is, psychological empowerment and job satisfaction. The first section outlines the theories that relate to psychological empowerment and job satisfaction. The next section provides an overview of the major study variables, that is, psychological empowerment and job satisfaction in the hospitality industry. The subsequent sections reviews the various dimensions of psychological empowerment and the overall psychological empowerment and their relationship with job satisfaction; demographics and their relationship with employee job satisfaction; and the extrinsic factors related to job satisfaction. The last section summarises the gaps identified from the literature reviewed.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

Various researchers have suggested different models of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction. However, the two discussed models were deemed suitable for this study.
2.2.1 Psychological Empowerment Model

The Cognitive Model

The definition of empowerment according to Thomas & Velthouse (1990) is that it is a set of dimensions which help to provide an active-orientation to an employee’s work role. Their cognitive model of empowerment gave four psychological dimensions that contribute to an employee’s intrinsic motivation towards his/her work role. The four included; impact, competence, meaning and choice.

According to this model, *impact* was defined as the degree to which employee behaviour is perceived to be 'making a difference' when it comes to realising the goal of the work task. This model defined *competence* as the extent to which an employee can perform their job efficiently with the required skills and knowledge. Thirdly, *meaning* was defined as the perceived value of a work task. It has been further defined to be involving the employee's intrinsic caring about their work roles. Lastly, *choice* has been defined to involve the extent to which an employee has the autonomy to make decisions in their work roles. These four dimensions of psychological empowerment individually might have various levels of contribution to an employee’s job satisfaction. Further, they additively contribute towards job satisfaction of employees. This theory was utilised in the current study in evaluating how the four cognitions of psychological empowerment influenced job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County. In addition, the study evaluated how the overall perception of empowerment by guest house supervisors was related to job satisfaction. Thomas & Velthouse (1990) also suggested
that other factors such as leadership, delegation, employee welfare, promotion systems and reward systems may influence the feeling of empowerment. They referred to these as extrinsic factors. The current study sought to determine among the various extrinsic factors, the ones which were of great importance to guest house supervisors in Mombasa County.

This model has been used successfully by quite a number of researchers: George (2013) in a research about bank employees in India; Ponton (2011) in a study among managers in the hospitality industry in Australia; and Lee (2010) in a study among university dining student workers in Iowa State University. Their findings indicated that psychological empowerment is a component of various dimensions. The current study sought to establish the presence of these dimensions in guest houses and their level of relevance in relation to job satisfaction. The components of this model were evaluated individually on how they were related to the dependent variable, which had not been done in guest houses in Mombasa County in the past. Consequently, this led to determination of how the overall psychological empowerment of guest house supervisors was related to their job satisfaction.

2.2.2 Job Satisfaction Model

The Dual-Factor Theory

Herzberg (1959) suggested the existence of two types of factors which affected job satisfaction, namely; Hygiene and Motivating factors. Herzberg’s first type of factors is
related to the psychological empowerment dimensions captured by the Cognitive Model of Thomas & Velthouse (1990). These factors are related to the “job content, recognition, responsibility, skills, the nature of work and personal growth”. These factors are known as the “motivators”. Basically, the motivating factors lead to low or high job satisfaction and are the dimensions of psychological empowerment. According to his theory, these factors were associated with job satisfaction or no satisfaction, as their strength could affect those feelings. If present in the job, motivator factors can cause the actual job satisfaction by increasing a person’s willingness, desire, ambitions, and full potential to work.

The second set (Hygiene Factors) included elements such as working conditions, quality of supervision, salary, employee welfare and interpersonal relations. The presence as well as the level of quality of these factors is crucial to the well-being of an employee due to the fact that they could cause dissatisfaction if lacking or inadequate. Hygiene factors should be there, should be conscious and well maintained because they refer to the way an organization interacts with the staff. An important aspect to consider about this group of factors is the inability to provide satisfaction. Proper attention to hygiene factors tends to overcome dissatisfaction and brings motivation to normal (a zero-state), but does not by themselves create a positive attitude or increase motivation to work. Herzberg emphasized that both sets of factors are equally important and should be taken into consideration by the organizations’ management.
Job satisfaction is a powerful method of taming high labour turnover and reinforcing organizational commitment, and is closely associated with employee empowerment (Yang, 2012). This model was used in the current study to determine the level of the ‘motivating factors’ in guest houses in Mombasa County which in turn provided supervisors’ job satisfaction. It was further utilised in determining the major ‘hygiene factors’ affecting job satisfaction of supervisors in guest houses in Mombasa County. This had not been done in guest houses in Mombasa County in the past. This model has been used by many researchers successfully, among them, Ebru, Mehmet & Nilufer (2010), Jalayer, Giacomo, Jafar & Hamid (2013) and Sut & Chad (2011).

2.3 Overview of the Major Study Variables

2.3.1 Empowerment

The concept of empowerment has been defined by various researchers using different words but explaining similar ideas (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Spreitzer, 1995a; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). There seems to be two headings for the definitions, one dealing with management practice and the other dealing with employees’ mental perceptions of the environment at the work place. The first heading of empowerment definition involves the delegation of authority among subordinates. According to Erstad (1997) and Thomas & Velthouse, (1990), this theme of empowerment is about power delegation to
subordinates, assigning them work roles and motivating them in order to meet organizational goals.

The second facet of the definition of empowerment puts into consideration employees’ mental perceptions and reflects on each employee’s orientation towards their work roles. It is from this perspective that Conger and Kanungo (1988) defined empowerment. Similarly, Spreitzer (1995a) used this orientation of empowerment to elaborate on how employees perceived empowerment based on their orientation to work. The second perspective of the definitions is what is referred to as psychological empowerment and it was the major focus of this study. Psychological empowerment concerns employees’ perception regarding the empowerment process (Hempel, Zhang & Han, 2012; Wallace, Johnson, Mathe & Paul, 2011).

2.3.2 Psychological Empowerment in the Hospitality Industry

This concept of employee empowerment, specifically the psychological part of employee empowerment in business organizations, has constantly received a great deal of scrutiny from researchers in the area of organizational psychology (Hashemi, Nadi & Hosseini 2012). For the last thirty years, quite a large amount of investigation has been done enriching the concept of employee psychological empowerment (De Zilva, 2014).
However, despite this, there is notably very little research done on psychological empowerment in small hospitality institutions, for instance, guest houses.

Psychological empowerment which basically includes the participation of employees is a complex management tool that if and when applied properly, could be effective in enhancing job satisfaction (Mohd et al., 2009). Psychological empowerment is an ongoing exercise and people can be viewed as more or less empowered, instead of being empowered or not empowered (Mohd et al, 2009). Results from the perception of empowerment at work leads to organizations achieving their desired objectives. Hence, successful implementation of such a work concept is intended to have a significant positive effect on the organizational and employee outcome variables such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Cho, Lo, Sha & Hong, 2011). For the employee psychological empowerment process to succeed, the management of the organization should ensure proper resources, provision of information, right climate and proper training of employees (Bordin, Bartram & Casimir, 2012; Ghani, Hussin & Jusoff, 2009; Ongori & Shunda, 2008).

Similarly, Kazlauskaite, Buciuniene & Turauskas (2012) intended to provide a clarification on the purpose of the empowerment concept and decide its role in the Human Resource Management (HRM) performance linkage. They surveyed 211 frontline employees in Lithuania hotels about organizational empowerment and how it is related to employee attitudes.
There appears that various studies have been done across the globe on empowerment among large classified hospitality organizations’ employees. On the contrary, very little empirical research had been done on guest houses. There was a glaring lack of interest in research in small hospitality organizations. In addition, most of the research studies have concentrated on non-hospitality sectors of the economy, for instance, the financial and manufacturing sectors. The studies done on the hospitality sector have concentrated on classified operations’ frontline and or top management staff. Ponton (2011) pointed out that a prominent characteristic of hospitality empowerment researches was the relative lack of appeal in the supervisory standpoint, yet supervisors are critical in the sense that they have more authority over operational staff in their teams and departments. They do assist in assessing, recommending training and development programmes and promoting employees in their departments. Therefore, there was a need to establish the supervisors’ psychological empowerment situation in guest houses, and more specifically at the Kenyan coastal county of Mombasa which is the bedrock of leisure tourism in the country.

2.3.3 Job Satisfaction in the Hospitality Industry

The term “job satisfaction” was coined by Hoppock (1935) who suggested that job satisfaction means employees’ emotions and attitude towards their jobs. It is their subjective reaction towards their jobs. Job satisfaction can also be defined as an emotional reaction to a person’s work roles that emanates from the individual’s comparison of what he/she desires and the actual outcomes (Hamborstad & Perry, 2011).
The element of job satisfaction is one of the most researched in the field of organizational behaviour (Snipes, Oswald, LaTour & Armenakis, 2010). Generally, job satisfaction has been defined as the feelings workers have about their work roles. It includes the perceptions they develop towards the various tenets of their work activities. In addition, it involves the employees’ mental insight that impact on the extent of alignment between them and their institution (Ivancevic & Matteson, 2009; Rothman & Coetzer, 2010). Due to the uniqueness of the hotel industry, and further the close interaction between employees and customers, employee job satisfaction has also been closely associated to quality service and customer satisfaction (Elbeyi, Yüksel & Yalçın, 2011). Research work done in the past has suggested that there is a significant and positive correlation between quality of service rendered to customers and employee job satisfaction (Yee, Yeung & Cheng, 2008; Oh & Yoon, 2011; Kim & Han, 2013).

Karatepe (2013) emphasized that service workers who are well satisfied with their work roles and tasks have the ability of handling customers’ requests effectively. This is because engaged workers devote all their resources to their work tasks. A number of factors in the whole working environment also influence the extent to which employees are satisfied to perform their jobs effectively (Michael, Kavanagh & Tracey, 2012). Employees’ job satisfaction occurs in various ways, considering their different posts in an institution. For example, a front office manager could be inspired in his work when given considerable work activities and given the authority and decision making freedom, whilst another one might have preference to financial rewards (Haiyan, Ning & Qi, 2016). Job
satisfaction has been closely related to low labour turnover rates (Yang, 2012); which is of great importance in the hospitality industry.

Job satisfaction is a very complicated concept that includes a variety of different facets. Job satisfaction may be intrinsic, that is, derived from internally mediated rewards such as the job itself and opportunities for personal growth and accomplishment. It may also be extrinsic, resulting from externally mediated rewards such as satisfaction with pay, company policies and support, supervision, teamwork, employee welfare, chances for promotion and customers (Barsky & Nash, 2014; Dimitriou, 2012). Job satisfaction can significantly and positively affect the outcomes of organizational commitment, decrease employees’ intention to leave, and subsequently result in low turnover rates (Aksu & Aktas, 2010; Chiang, Back & Canter, 2005; Yang, 2012).

The current study was informed by a clear lack of empirical research on job satisfaction especially of guest house staff. Guest houses are an important component of the hospitality industry and they provide opportunities for employment (Ramukumba & Ferreira, 2016). It is presumed that job satisfaction in guest houses would lead to low labour turnover and attract more qualified personnel, eventually improving performance of this sector. Psychological empowerment has been fronted by researchers as powerful tool of achieving employee job satisfaction (Mohd et al, 2009). However, to the best knowledge of the researcher, there had been very little research attention on employee job satisfaction in guest houses. This formed a research gap which was addressed by this study.
2.4 Psychological Empowerment Cognitions and their Relationship with Job Satisfaction

The work of Conger and Kanungo (1988) in most cases serves as the departure mark in research on employee psychological empowerment. They were the first researchers to critique the strategy of power delegation and delegation of authority to achieve empowerment. They came up with the ‘self-efficacy theory’ approach to empowerment. The self-efficacy theory stipulates that employees who have self believe and that they are capable usually set more challenging goals.

Conger and Kanungo (1988) defined empowerment as “a process of enhancing the feelings of the ability to succeed among organizational members through the identification of conditions that foster lack of capacity or authority and through their removal by both formal organizational practices and informal techniques”. Conger and Kanungo (1988) came up with 5 steps while elaborating the approach of psychological empowerment as shown on Table 2.1 explained thereof:
### Table 2.1: Stages of Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Step 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situations which lead to psychological condition of lack of capacity/authority</td>
<td>Utilization of managerial techniques and strategies</td>
<td>Provision of the ability to subordinates by use of four sources</td>
<td>This results in The subordinate experiencing empowerment</td>
<td>This leads to behavioral changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Factors within the organization</td>
<td>- Participation in management</td>
<td>- Enactive attainment</td>
<td>- Effort performance expectancy strengthened or belief in personal capacity is strengthened</td>
<td>- Initiation and persistence of behavior to achieve work role objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Employee supervision</td>
<td>- Setting of goals</td>
<td>- Vicarious experience</td>
<td>- Vicarious persuasion</td>
<td>- Emotional arousal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The system of reward</td>
<td>- The system of feedback</td>
<td>- The system of feedback</td>
<td>- Emotional arousal</td>
<td>- Emotional arousal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The nature of work</td>
<td>- Modeling</td>
<td>- Modeling</td>
<td>- Enactive attainment</td>
<td>- Enactive attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contingent/competence based reward</td>
<td>- Enrichment of jobs</td>
<td>- Enrichment of jobs</td>
<td>- Effort performance expectancy strengthened or belief in personal capacity is strengthened</td>
<td>- Effort performance expectancy strengthened or belief in personal capacity is strengthened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enrichment of jobs</td>
<td>- Removal of conditions enumerated in step 1</td>
<td>- Removal of conditions enumerated in step 1</td>
<td>- Removal of conditions enumerated in step 1</td>
<td>- Removal of conditions enumerated in step 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Conger and Kanungo (1988)*

In the first step, they specified four conditions which lead to an employees’ psychological feeling of lack of capacity or authority. The first condition is organizational factors such as accessing information of relevance, unavailability of work equipment and changes in technology; second condition is the style of supervision utilized in the organization like high or some or non control; third, is the system of rewarding employees used by the organization; and the fourth is the job design, for instance, setting unclear and meaningless goals to employees. These conditions were stated as the cause of lack of
capacity in institutions. In the second step, Conger & Kanungo (1988) had the suggestion that by the organizations’ management implementing techniques like proper goal setting, employee participation in decision making, job enrichment and competence system of reward, the feeling of lack of capacity or authority employees experience in the first step can be reduced or eliminated completely.

In the third step, the management provides employees with information on their ability to succeed in their work tasks. This leads to removal of the condition of employees’ feeling of lack of capacity and authority. This creates the feeling of employee empowerment in the fourth step. The empowerment experienced in the fourth step leads to behavioural changes of employees. Therefore, the employees feel enabled and their feeling of authority and capacity is believed to be enhanced. This whole process leads to employees’ perception of being empowered to perform their work roles. The initiation and persistence of empowerment behaviour leads to job satisfaction.

In critiquing of the self-efficacy theory, Thomas and Velthouse (1990) explained that the idea of psychological empowerment was complicated and can not be exhaustively be described in one dimension as earlier proposed in the self efficacy theory by Conger and Kanungo (1988). They therefore came up with four psychological dimensions that contribute to an employee’s intrinsic motivation towards their job. The four dimensions of Thomas and Velthouse’s (1990) theory were: competence, impact, meaning and choice. They defined ‘Impact’ as the extent to which employees’ behaviour is seen as 'making a difference' in terms of accomplishing the goal of the work role. They defined
‘Competence’ as the extent to which an employee perceives that he or she can execute his or her job efficiently and effectively with the required skills. ‘Meaning’ was defined to involve the fit between the employee’s values and beliefs and their work goals. Finally, ‘Choice’ was defined as the perception involving the extent of authority to make decisions concerning the employees’ work responsibilities.

Using the Thomas & Velthouse (1990) model as a foundation, Spreitzer (1995a) conducted a study in the service sector consisted of middle-level employees from a ‘Fortune 500’ industrial company. She also found that there were four cognitions of psychological empowerment concerning the service sector, namely: meaning, competence, choice and impact. The current study utilised the four dimensions of psychological empowerment for the service sector as postulated by Spreitzer (1995a). These dimensions together create an overall perception of psychological empowerment which results in managerial effectiveness.

When there is absence of any of these cognitions, the feeling of empowerment would reduce though it would not totally remove the overall feeling of empowerment experienced (Bhatnagar, 2011; Stander & Rothmann, 2010). Moreover, low rating in any of the dimensions lowers the overall feeling of empowerment (Van Dierendonck & Dijkstra, 2012). The dimensions of psychological empowerment should be well understood by the employees, while it is the responsibility of the organizations’ management to closely examine each of these dimensions and take the necessary steps to
enhance the level of psychological empowerment among the employees (Brancato, 2011).

2.4.1 The ‘Meaning’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment and its Relationship with Job Satisfaction

Buitenbach & Hlalele (2005) postulated that the feeling of ‘meaning’ involves the sense that an employee feels a match between their job and their personal goals. According to Spreitzer & Mishra (2002), 'meaning' involves employees’ connection to their work which in turn might affect employee job satisfaction. ‘Meaning’ could also be explained as the employee’s ideals and standards when seen in the light of the value of the work goal or purpose (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). In cases where the employee perceives the work roles assigned as important, then these tasks become meaningful. If the tasks are perceived as less important, then the tasks become meaningless.

Employees would be satisfied and loyal to the organizations if they perceive the work roles they perform as meaningful. On the other hand, they would be less interested if they perceive the job to be less meaningful (Buitenbach & Hlalele, 2005). For intrinsic job motivation, meaning is among the four important psychological states. In addition to the intrinsic caring of the work roles, it also involves other external factors which affect an employee’s cognition about how they feel.
The relevance of a personally meaningful work tasks for employees’ job satisfaction has been notable from many theories. Koen, and Maaike van, (2011) in their study in Belgium on leadership empowerment behaviours and employee attitudes argued that employees whose perception of their jobs was that it was significant and worthwhile felt higher levels of job satisfaction than employees who saw their jobs as having little value to them. From their research, there was the notion of personal value fulfillment, which was based on the belief that job satisfaction results from the perception that one’s work fulfils or allows the fulfillment of one’s desired work values.

Employees’ perception about how meaningful their job is affects their job satisfaction (Ponton, 2011). In his analysis of the relationship between psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of hotel managers in Australia, Ponton (2011) further pointed out that ‘meaningful’ work which was rated highly by experienced employees was work that was freely entered into; the employee exercised autonomy and supported the moral development of an employee. Hancer and George (2009) in their research also found out that the dimension of ‘meaning’ was rated higher by the more experienced hospitality employees who were more satisfied with their jobs. This translated to a positive correlation between the cognition of ‘meaning’ of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction. Meaning is an internal or intrinsic factor that affects a job, therefore inferring that the more experienced employees are more intrinsically motivated than the less experienced employees.
Hsiang-Fei, Sheng-Hshiung & Ya-Yun (2014) in their study about empowering hospitality employees in China posited that if there is a perception of employees that the work they do is meaningful and important to them, they make extra efforts to understanding and solve problems. They further argued that psychologically empowered employees are more confident in their work resulting in the display of a higher degree of satisfaction in their work. In addition, Patah, Radzi, Abdullah, Adzmy, Zain and Derani (2012) in their study in Kuala Lumpur hotels examined the influence of psychological empowerment on job satisfaction of receptionists. Their study posited that the construct of ‘meaning’ of psychological empowerment does have a significant influence on the overall job satisfaction of the receptionists. This meant that receptionists who perceived that their jobs had higher levels of connection to their lives, developed work skills and confidence and most likely experienced a higher level of job satisfaction.

Buitendach & Hlalele (2005) in their study on psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of engineers in a petrochemical industry in South Africa found a positive correlation of large effect between the cognition of meaning and job satisfaction. Their findings implied that the two variables were related, that is, those employees who found their work to be meaningful had a correspondingly high level of job satisfaction. Similarly, Nassar (2017) in his study of psychological empowerment and organizational change among hotel employees in Egypt surveyed 386 employees in chain hotels. He posited that employees who found a close fit between their beliefs and values with their work tasks had high levels of job satisfaction.
Further, in his study on psychological empowerment and job satisfaction in the hotel industry on Egyptian employees, Mohsen (2014) found a significant correlation between the cognition of meaning and job satisfaction. Locally, Gachunga, Maina & Kabare (2016) in their study on the influence of psychological empowerment on organizational commitment in Kenyan civil service found that the cognition of meaning was positively correlated to job satisfaction, leading to loyalty to the organization.

These studies clearly demonstrated the relationship between the ‘meaning’ cognition of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction in other parts of the world in the larger hospitality industry and other sectors of the economy. The current study sought to determine whether there existed a relationship between the two variables among guest house supervisors in the county of Mombasa.

2.4.2 The ‘Competence’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment and its Relationship with Job satisfaction

‘Competence’ reflects whether an employee can succeed in the performance of a given work role (Spreitzer & Mishra, 2002). It is the extent to which an employee can do his/her work roles with the required skills and knowledge (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). Competence refers to the ability of employees to execute their work roles with the required level of knowledge and skills (Spreitzer, 2008). Competence makes employees
feel more empowered (Buitenbach & Hlalele, 2005). Buitenbach & Hlalele (2005) further stated that the knowledge and the skills that the employees possess have a significant contribution to ‘competence’. Employees usually feel competent when they have the confidence about their capability of executing their job responsibilities well (Hsiang-Fei, et al. 2014).

It has been indicated that workers who have the perception that they are competent, and have confidence that they will succeed in their daily work tasks are happier and satisfied with their jobs than employees who fear that they might fail (Koen & Maaike van, 2011). Further, Ponton (2011) in his study in Australia posited that the more experienced employees seemed to be more confident and competent in their jobs. He argued that the more competent the employees felt, the more satisfied they were in their work. Hancer & George (2009) too found out that competence was rated higher by the more older and experienced hospitality employees. This had a direct relationship with satisfaction with their jobs. Employees who have had longer tenure in the hospitality industry are better adapted to the work environment and this can lead to feelings of competence and more likely to the feeling of satisfaction (Bhatnagar, 2012).

Moreover, Tsai, Cheng and Chang (2013) in their analysis of the drivers of hospitality industry employees’ job satisfaction in Taiwan observed that employees’ perceived that their competence empowerment was high. This correlated with the high levels of job satisfaction advanced by the researchers in their sample of these Taiwanese hotels. This meant that the employees had very good training background and excellent skills to
perform their work roles, which positively affected their job satisfaction. Patah et al. (2012) in their study of Kuala Lumpur hotel receptionists posited that the tenet of ‘competence’ of psychological empowerment does have a significant influence on the overall job satisfaction. This meant that receptionists who had a higher level of competence experienced a higher level of job satisfaction.

Dehkordi, Kamrani, Ardestani and Abdolmanafi (2011) in their study revealed that the overall psychological empowerment and its dimensions- impact, meaning, and choice- seemed to have a significant and positive relationship with job satisfaction and consequently organizational loyalty. However, interestingly they found that the cognition of competence had no positive relationship with job satisfaction. This meant that the perception of having the required skills to do the work had no relationship with job satisfaction.

Nassar (2017) in his study of psychological empowerment and organizational change among hotel employees in Egypt surveyed 386 employees in chain hotels. He posited that employees who had the required skills in performing their work tasks had high levels of job satisfaction. Further, Buitendach & Hlalele (2005) in their study of South Africa engineers found a positive correlation of medium effect between the cognition of competence and job satisfaction. This implied that the two variables were related, that is, those employees who perceived that they had the required knowledge and skills to perform their jobs had high level of job satisfaction. In addition, Gachunga, Maina & Kabare (2016) in their study on the influence of psychological empowerment on
organizational commitment in Kenyan civil service found that the dimension of competence was positively correlated to job satisfaction, which in turn lead to organizational commitment.

The reviewed studies demonstrated some contradicting findings on how the ‘competence’ cognition of psychological empowerment was related to job satisfaction in the larger hospitality industry in other parts of the world and other sectors of the economy. The current study sought to determine whether there exited a relationship between the two variables among guest house supervisors in the county of Mombasa.

2.4.3 The ‘Choice’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment and its Relationship with Job satisfaction

‘Choice’ which has also been referred to as ‘self-determination’ connotes autonomy in decision making in the work place (Spreitzer & Mishra, 2002). Whereas competence connotes a mastery of skills and behaviour, choice means the selection of behaviour (Sprietzer, 2008). To have ‘choice’ connotes to have a sense of prudence in starting and governing one’s own activities in their jobs. Employees’ autonomy and interest in their work can be increased by a supporting work environment, hence boosting the levels of job satisfaction.
Spreitzer (2008) further defined choice as the autonomy exercised in performance of an employee’s job. It also involves the chance of choosing activities that make sense and performing them in methods that look appropriate to the employee (Buitenbach & Hlalele, 2005). Employees who have ‘choice’ feelings in their work activities are more likely to display quick and appropriateness in their responses in service recovery efforts on a consistent basis. Autonomy would be displayed when making decisions concerning procedure, work methods, time and effort from employees who have ‘choice’ empowerment (Spreitzer, 2008).

Ponton (2011) in his study in the Australian hospitality industry posited that the more experienced employees rated choice higher than the less experienced ones. As employees gained experience, senior management seemed to trust them more and therefore more autonomy was granted and they were monitored less. The higher feelings of autonomy suggested that the more experienced employees were more satisfied with their jobs and hence less likely to leave (Fiksembaun, Jeng, Koyunku & Burke, 2010; Ponton, 2011). In their study of the drivers of employees’ job satisfaction in Taiwanese hospitality industry, Tsai, Cheng and Chang (2013) observed that employees’ perceived that their choice empowerment was very low. This meant that they had limited opportunities in terms of making job related decisions, hence affecting their job satisfaction negatively.

Further, Sut & Chad (2011) argued that Chinese hotel managers used the cognition of choice to give workers autonomy to find solutions to problems themselves. These actions fostered job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and eventually ensured low
turnover intention among Chinese hospitality employees. Additionally, Hsiang-Fei, Sheng-Hshiung & Ya-Yun, (2014) in their study on empowering hospitality employees in China argued that if employees possess autonomy in performing their duties, this generates a sense of job satisfaction. Their study revealed a positive correlation between autonomy of decision making among employees and their job satisfaction.

Karthik, Priyanko & Puiwa (2014) surveyed 365 frontline employees at forty (40) units of restaurant chain in the USA in their study about leader empowering behaviors and employee psychological empowerment. They posited that there were two methods of achieving empowerment: through the demonstrating trust of employees; and by giving them to discretion to make own decisions in their job related activities. They found that employees recognized that they felt more empowered because they were less monitored by their superiors, hence, they felt trusted and empowered. However, they indicated that employees were quick to point out that they should not be ‘abandoned’ but ‘trusted’ in decision making without the constant direction of their seniors. In addition, Karthik, Priyanko & Puiwa (2014) pointed out that this ‘trust’ is not something which should be given freely but it is earned through experience and proper training. This translated to the employees’ feeling of satisfaction with their jobs.

In the Turkish hospitality industry, Elbeyi, et al. (2011) surveyed 1,854 participants employed at five-star hotels in their research. Their research posited that employees felt that they were well qualified and had confidence in their job tasks. Hence, they felt that they were the best positioned to make their daily decisions. This was because they were
close to their job roles and were aware of the best way a particular task should be tackled. This meant that employees felt more empowered when they were left to make the daily decisions on their work roles. In addition, they further found that decision making not only allowed the employees a feeling of empowerment, but it might also improve job satisfaction, efficiency and performance.

According to Sut & Chad (2011) in their research on employee empowerment in China, employees of luxury hospitality organizations perceived that power and authority were distributed unequally which led to low job satisfaction. These employees were used to hierarchal structures and leadership so much that they even often feared to have the initiative of make decisions without consulting their superiors. It is also important to point out that employees should be willing to accept empowerment as one of the conditions for its successful implementation (Humborstad, Humborstad, Whitfield & Perry, 2008b). That is, even though empowerment can be used as a management tool to achieve job satisfaction and better performance, it requires employee willingness to accept it (Bordin, Bartram & Casimir, 2012; Gumusluoglu & Ilsev, 2009). Nassar (2017) in his study of hotel employees in Egypt also posited that employees who had high levels of autonomy in making decisions in their jobs had high levels of job satisfaction.

Buitendach & Hlalele (2005) in their study of South Africa engineers found a positive correlation of large effect between the choice cognition of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction. In essence, this finding implied that the two variables were related, that is, those employees who perceived that they had authority and autonomy in making
decisions at their work stations had a correspondingly high level of job satisfaction. In addition, in his study on psychological empowerment and job satisfaction in the hotel industry on Egyptian employees, Mohsen (2014) found a significant correlation between the cognition of choice and job satisfaction. Gachunga, et al. (2016) in their study on the influence of psychological empowerment on organizational commitment in Kenyan civil service surveyed 384 respondents from four public organizations. Their study posited that the choice tenet of psychological empowerment was positively correlated to job satisfaction, which subsequently lead to organizational commitment.

Direct employee participation in decision making is widely advocated for as an intervention which can be utilized in enhancing the levels of employee job satisfaction and organizational loyalty (Stephen, Marc & Likian, 2012). Employee participation in making decisions also helps in enhancing the quality of service and therefore meeting customer needs (Clinton & Wong, 2012). Empowerment is needed for employees whose job entail having direct contact with customers so they can exercise discretion in making decisions and hence improving the service level accorded to guests (Wirtz, Heracleous & Pangarkaroizo, 2008).

These studies demonstrated the correlation between the ‘meaning’ cognition of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction in other sectors of the hospitality industry. The current study sought to determine whether there exited a relationship between the two variables among guest house supervisors in the county of Mombasa.
2.4.4 The ‘Impact’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment and its Relationship with Job satisfaction

‘Impact’ is the degree to which an employee can influence activities and work outcome in his/her department or the larger organization (Spreitzer, 2008). Buitenbach & Hlalele (2005) stated that the triumph an employee feels when they achieve their goal is known as ‘impact’. Employees will only feel a sense of impact if they perceive they are influencing decisions in their departments and organizations (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). The employees who believe that they are influencing outcomes in the hotel institution would expect to be able to utilize the information about customer needs and wants, to influence departmental operations and perceived quality of service (Spreitzer, 2008).

Sut & Chad (2011) in their research in the Chinese hotel industry argued that managers should be able to encourage divergent opinions and ideas so that all the employees feel committed, that someone is listening to their voices and that their contributions have some impact on the organization’s performance. In their research, they established that this had a direct influence on the feeling of employees’ satisfaction in the job. Moreover, when employees have influence on decisions, they can alter activity implementation and may attempt to give helpful solutions to problems. Thus, employees given power and impact to organizational decisions are conducive to displaying a higher degree of job satisfaction (Hsiang-Fei, et al. 2014).
Elbeyi, et al. (2011) in their study on the effects of employee empowerment on employee job satisfaction in the Turkish hospitality industry found that there is often an emotional outcome of job satisfaction to having ‘impact’ psychological empowerment. Many of the interviewees in their study identified that when they influence a work activity, they felt a great sense of satisfaction. In addition, these Turkish hospitality employees indicated that this emotional response is prompted as they felt that they were valuable members of the whole team and that their contribution indeed counted. Without empowerment, employees could easily feel that they are treated like robots, particularly if the work that they are doing is repetitive and monotonous (Elbeyi, et al. 2011). Hence, ‘impact’ was identified as having a positive relationship with the intrinsic satisfaction derived from an employee’s job activities. Haiyan, Ning & Qi, (2016) carried out a study on new generations’ psychological empowerment and their relationship with career competencies and job satisfaction in China. They found out that the dimension of impact of psychological empowerment contributed positively to job satisfaction of hospitality employees.

Buitendach & Hlalele (2005) in their study of South African engineers found a positive correlation of large effect between the tenet of impact and job satisfaction. This finding implied that the two variables were related, that is, those employees who perceived that they had influence on decisions made at their organizations had a correspondingly high level of job satisfaction. Similarly, Gachunga, Maina & Kabare (2016) in their study on the influence of psychological empowerment on organizational commitment in Kenyan
civil service surveyed 384 respondents from four public organizations. Their study posited that the impact tenet of psychological empowerment had a positive correlation with job satisfaction, which subsequently lead to organizational commitment.

These studies demonstrated the relationship between the ‘impact’ cognition of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction in the larger hospitality industry and other sectors of the economy. The current study sought to determine whether there exited a relationship between the two variables among guest house supervisors in the county of Mombasa. The empirical researches relating psychological empowerment and job satisfaction have found that psychological empowerment has a positive and significant relationship with job satisfaction. However, the findings from different studies concerning the relationship between the four dimensions of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction vary from one research to another. Moreover, there existed an information gap concerning whether the various dimensions of psychological empowerment were present in guest houses in Mombasa County and the extent of their relevance to job satisfaction. The level of contribution to job satisfaction of the individual dimensions of psychological empowerment of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County was not known. This study sought to determine the level of relevance of these dimensions of psychological empowerment in relation to job satisfaction in guest houses. This formed a research gap which was addressed by this study. To this point, the discussions indicate that this area of psychological empowerment is still developing. The dissention about the contribution of these cognitions and its confirmation in the
hospitality business in particular reflected the real need for more studies to evaluate the construct itself, its antecedents, and its outcomes in guest houses.

2.5 Relationship between Overall Psychological Empowerment and Job Satisfaction

The four dimensions together contribute to a state of overall employee psychological empowerment. If one of these dimensions is missing, this reduces the overall feeling of empowerment (Sut & Chad, 2011). In addition, lower overall feeling of empowerment would be the result if any of the dimensions has a low rating. Therefore, higher rating in all the four dimensions is needed to ensure a high level of overall psychological empowerment (Clinton & Wong, 2012). According to Brancato (2011), these dimensions of psychological empowerment should be well understood by the employees while the management should scrutinize each of these cognitions and take the necessary actions to enhance the level of overall psychological empowerment experienced by employees.

Empowerment programmes aiming at strengthening employee job satisfaction have been introduced by different hospitality organizations (Elbeyi, et al. 2011). This is because empirical researches relating psychological empowerment and job satisfaction have found that overall psychological empowerment has a positive and significant relationship with job satisfaction. Haiyan, et al. (2016) carried out a study on new generations’ psychological empowerment and their relationship with career competencies and job satisfaction in China. They found the overall psychological empowerment to be
positively related to job satisfaction. Their finding implied that those employees who perceived that they were empowered in their work tasks had high levels of job satisfaction.

Osman & Georgiana (2015) did a study about psychological capital and work engagement and how they foster hotel customer contact staffs’ satisfaction. They gathered data from frontline employees in international five- and four-star chain hotels in Romania. The findings of their study indicated that employees high in psychological empowerment would be more satisfied with their work roles and careers. The results further reported that psychological empowerment boosts work engagement that in turn leads to low labour turnover.

In addition, Chan and Lam (2011) in their Chinese hospitality industry study on employee empowerment and employees’ service performance found out that psychological empowerment may enhance employees’ job satisfaction, leading to a lower level of staff turnover. Equally, in Taiwan, a manager of one of the leisure resorts opined that if employees had a higher level of psychological empowerment, they would be more confident in expressing their thinking and ideas and subsequently leading to higher levels of job satisfaction (Marane, 2012). Humbostard, et al. (2008b) also reported a positive relationship between overall psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of frontline hotel workers in China.
Kim, Losekoot & Milne (2011) conducted a study to investigate the effects of psychologically empowering employees in their work on outcomes such as employee job satisfaction and performance in restaurants in the USA. The findings of their study revealed a positive relationship between psychological empowerment and job satisfaction and performance of restaurant workers. Ukil (2016) in a study about employee empowerment and satisfaction in financial institutions in Bangladesh posited that employee satisfaction significantly depended on employee empowerment. He further suggested that by empowering the employees, an organization can enhance the satisfaction of its employees.

Nicolaides, (2012) in his analysis of the South African hospitality industry also posited a positive relationship between psychological empowerment and job satisfaction. He established that the major challenge facing the hospitality industry in South Africa was low empowerment levels which was a decisive contributory factor to low job satisfaction and high labour turnover. There was the perception of low psychological empowerment and a large number of employees considered hospitality work to be a pass-through to a job in a different and higher level industry, rather than as a life-time career commitment (CATHSSETA, 2010). The same scenario of low empowerment was reported by Esther and Allen (2012) in their study on staffing issues among hotels in the Volta Region in Ghana. Low levels of psychological empowerment had a negative influence on job satisfaction and high staff turnover (20-30%) reported in the Ghanian hospitality industry.
Similarly, Osman (2012) studied the Cameroonian hospitality industry based on perceived career satisfaction and performance outcomes. Based on data obtained from the frontline hotel employees and their immediate supervisors, he found that perceived psychological empowerment influenced job satisfaction. Additionally, Buitendach & Hlalele (2005) carried out a study on South African engineers. Their study revealed through a multiple regression that 70.5% of variance of job satisfaction was explained by psychological empowerment. In essence, this meant that there was a significant relationship between psychological empowerment and job satisfaction. Locally, Mutiso (2017) in his study on the effects of employee empowerment on job satisfaction among employees of Machakos Level 5 Hospital in Kenya found that there was there was a significant relationship between psychological empowerment and job satisfaction. He further recommended that organizations should empower their employees in order to achieve job satisfaction and therefore remain competitive.

However, findings of studies on empowerment conducted have been inconclusive in some cultural contexts (Littrell, 2010; Powpaka, 2012). For instance, Robert, Probst, Martocchio, Drasgow & Lawler (2000) as quoted by Sut & Chad (2011) in their study about employee empowerment, job satisfaction and organizational commitment, obtained inconclusive results. Their study indicated a negative relationship between empowerment and job satisfaction in an Indian sample.

It was, therefore, important to further explore this uncertainty because of the growing economic importance of the hospitality industry across the globe and the number of staff
with possibly misleading thoughts on empowerment programmes. Due to the existing uncertainty about psychological empowerment in some cultures, the current study aim was to more explicitly investigate how psychological empowerment was related to employee job satisfaction in guest houses. These are important issues for hospitality organizations because they dictate the rate of labour turnover, the quality of service and organizational performance (Sut & Chad, 2011).

Osman (2012) further suggested that more studies on employee empowerment were needed in sub-Saharan Africa. Majority of researchers’ efforts have focused on the management role in creation of empowerment conditions as evidenced by literature from the hospitality industry. Hence, there is a lack of adequate literature as far as psychological empowerment in the service sector is concerned (George, 2013). This formed a research gap which was addressed by this study. Additionally, research studies in Western countries have consistently shown positive effects of psychological empowerment on outcomes such as job satisfaction (Spreitzer, 2008). However, the inconsistency of study results in other areas seem not to fit in. Sledge, Miles, & Coppage (2012) also argued that very little research has been done on the relationship between psychological empowerment and job satisfaction, hence the need for this study. While psychological empowerment in Western countries has been widely opined to stimulate untapped human resources (Spreitzer, 2008), its use in Kenyan guest houses needed evidence like this research.
2.6 Relationship between Demographic Factors and Job Satisfaction

The demographic characteristics of employees in the hospitality industry such as age, gender, and level of education have been suggested to affect the level of job satisfaction (Chan, Ng & Casmir, 2010; Gallardo, Sanchez-Canizares, Lopez-Guzman & Jesus 2012). Nadiri & Tanova (2010) in their investigation on the role of justice in turnover intentions, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour in the hospitality industry in Turkey argued that male and female employees tend to think, feel, value and act differently from each other in the workplace and therefore perceptions of empowerment, job satisfaction and eventually labour turnover may differ.

Ng & Pine (2010) in their study about men and women hotel managers in Hong Kong explained that the hospitality industry demanded similar skills of men and women. They further noted that despite their gender, both female and male employees can be successful in the industry. However, many studies have shown that women and men do not receive equal opportunities for employment and promotion. Women tend to be satisfied with and committed to their jobs when they can interact with others who understand their role in the organization. On the other hand, men tend to be satisfied only when their performance itself is valued by others (Kim et al., 2012).

Moreover, Ruta (2011) in his study about organizational and psychological empowerment in hotels in Lithuania found that older and long-tenured employees demonstrated higher job satisfaction. Ruta (2011) further argued that employees under
permanent employment demonstrated higher job satisfaction. However, it is important to point out that he noted that none of the variables was significantly associated with gender of the employees.

Other researchers have also found out that job satisfaction may be influenced by demographic factors such as gender (Akinbayo 2010), age and job tenure (Akinbayo 2010; Aina, Adeyeye & Ige 2012). Kuo, Ho, Lin & Lai, (2013) in their research on employee psychological empowerment in an advanced technological environment posited that employees who have a long experience have more emotional attachment and their desire of meaningful contribution to the organization is greater. Committed, satisfied and experienced employees are likely to render high quality services (Sigler & Pearson, 2011). They have the will to go an extra mile to get solutions to customer complaints and therefore provide better services (Kuo, Ho, Lin & Lai, 2013) leading to improved organizational performance.

Ponton (2011) in his analysis of middle-level managers in the hospitality industry in Australia found that young employees were less satisfied with their jobs than older employees due to unsatisfied early expectations. Similarly, Dehkordi et al. (2011), when studying psychological empowerment, job satisfaction and organizational commitment argued that a positive linear relationship between age and job satisfaction occurred up to the age of 60. This meant that the older and experienced the employees were, the more they were satisfied with their jobs, until they reached retirement age of about 60 years. Furunes & Mykletun (2010) in their study on managers’ perceptions of older workers in
hotels and restaurants also noted that job satisfaction was stronger among older employees.

Fiksenbaum, *et al.* (2010) in their analysis on work hours, work intensity, satisfaction, and psychological well being among hotel managers in China found that with an increase in age and experience, employees became more empowered and satisfied with their jobs. However, it is important to note that Clark, Oswald and Warr (1996) stated that longer experience and tenure may sometimes result in low levels of job satisfaction and boredom. This is due to daily routines leading to monotony of work. Furthermore, Aksu & Atkas (2010) in their research on job satisfaction of managers in tourism also had a dissenting finding. They argued that there was no relationship between employee demographics and job satisfaction.

Patah *et al.* (2012) in his examination of receptionists in Kuala Lumpur hotels suggested that their age and tenure affected their sense of job satisfaction. This meant that the more employees advanced in age and experience, the more they were likely to be satisfied with their jobs. There tends to be an accompanying increase in creativity from employees when job satisfaction is enhanced. This would also lead to reduction of the rate of staff turnover and tame absenteeism (Dickson and Lorenz, 2009). Thus, this is of significant interest to the hotel managers.

Some studies have shown that gender has a direct relationship with job satisfaction. Some other studies have revealed lack of any relationship between the two variables (Jung, Jae
Moon & Hahm, 2007). Derya, Muzaffer & Vincent (2012) in their study designed to address gender differences and employee job satisfaction in Turkey noted that there existed a great deal of inconsistency in the literature with regard to the issue. Their findings revealed that the two genders have varied satisfaction on different aspects of the job. For example, they found that male employees were more satisfied with ‘management conditions’ while female employees were more satisfied with ‘personal fulfillment’.

Jung et al. (2007) in their analysis of gender and age in relation to job satisfaction in Korean hotels posited a relationship between job satisfaction and employees’ expectations and realities. They further noted that employees who are disappointed and frustrated are likely to have low levels of job satisfaction. However, the realities and expectations may also vary according to gender, education, age and cultural background. These characteristics can be important determinants of job satisfaction (Jung et al., 2007). Based on the literature reviewed, this research sought to find out whether the findings from guest houses in Mombasa County was in conformance with results from other studies done in the past in other parts of the world.

2.7 Extrinsic Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction

Factors of extrinsic nature are those beyond the control of the employees. They include the job and organizational aspects that can affect employee job satisfaction (George, 2013). One attitudinal factor alone cannot effectively be used to measure job satisfaction.
There is a two broad categorization of the basic factors determining job satisfaction, that is, intrinsic factors (motivating factors) and extrinsic factors (hygiene factors) (Buitendach & De Witte, 2013). Employees are more satisfied and motivated when they enjoy their work (Aamodt, 2010). Employees also like freedom and variety in their jobs. They like when their performance provides regular feedback.

Aamodt (2010) argued that an important extrinsic source of employee job satisfaction is promotion. He posited that when employees perceive that there is fair manner of appraisal and fair methods of promotion are made, then they will experience higher job satisfaction. Opportunities to advance, interesting work and open ways of communications were reported as the top priorities employees desired in their jobs (George, 2013). Further, Tsai, et al., (2013) in their study about the drivers of hospitality industry employees’ job satisfaction in Taiwan, found that employees’ job satisfaction was influenced by the perceived fairness in promotions and growth. Esther and Allen (2012) in their study on staffing issues in Ghana hotels argued that for job satisfaction to be achieved in the hospitality industry, issues which should be addressed included such aspects as promotion.

Moreover, it has been suggested that salary is also a significant factor in determining job satisfaction (George, 2013). Elbeyi, et al. (2011) in their study, which aimed at determining the effect of employee empowerment on job satisfaction of employees in hotels in Turkey, established that the majority of the employees surveyed reported that they were not satisfied with the salary they received from hotel businesses. It was,
therefore, a clear fact that job satisfaction was closely related to the payment policies of a hospitality establishment. Moreover, Aksu and Aktas (2010) in their study on job satisfaction of Turkish managers in first-class hotels discovered that factors which affected job satisfaction included salaries. Derya, Muzaffer & Vincent (2012) in their study designed to address gender differences and job satisfaction in five-star hotels in Ankara, argued that the salary an employee is paid plays a critical part towards his/her job satisfaction. Tsai, et al., (2013) in their study about Taiwanese hospitality industry employees found that job satisfaction was influenced by the level of wages. Esther and Allen (2012) in their Ghana hotels study argued that for job satisfaction to be achieved the issue of financial rewards needed to be addressed.

Other studies further reported positive interactions at the work place between employees and their supervisors makes them more satisfied (Aamodt, 2010). Job satisfaction will automatically increase with emotional support and willingness to listen from the managers. Aamodt (2010) further notes that employees’ preference is managers who respect them and satisfy their needs. Karthik, Priyanko & Puiwa (2014) surveyed 365 frontline employees at 40 units of a chain restaurant in the USA. In their study which analysed leader empowering behaviors and employee psychological empowerment, they posited that one of the major elements that impacted the level of job satisfaction was the type of supervision on employees. They further indicated that managers had the ability to affect employee satisfaction with their jobs by the kind and amount of supervision.
Teamwork is the other main source of employee job satisfaction. Staff who have cooperative colleagues at the work place are more satisfied with their work roles. Job satisfaction will depend on friendliness and support of co-workers, that is, teamwork spirit (Robbins, 2012). Further, Aksu and Aktas (2010) in their study on job satisfaction of Turkish managers in first-class hotels discovered that colleague support was one of the factors which affected job satisfaction. Similarly, Tsai, et al., (2013) in their study about the drivers of hospitality industry employees’ job satisfaction in Taiwan, found that employees’ job satisfaction was influenced by the perceived relationship with their colleagues at place of work (teamwork).

In their study on the role of holistic factors in job satisfaction, Connolly & Myers (2011) posited that the work setting and conditions might also have a relationship with job satisfaction. Components they included in the work setting were factors such as the working hours, temperature, ventilation, humidity, lighting and noise levels. They stated that these working conditions affected employee job satisfaction. Aksu and Aktas (2010) in their study on job satisfaction of Turkish managers in first-class hotels posited that working hours affected job satisfaction. It has also been reported that employees prefer physical settings that are clean, comfortable, safe and with a minimum degree of distractions (Robbins, 2012). It is therefore the responsibility of the management of the hospitality facility to ensure that employees are well provided with these factors. Further, Esther and Allen (2012) in their study on Ghana hotels argued that for job satisfaction to be realised, issues which should be addressed included the working conditions and working hours.
Tsai, et al. (2013) in their study on hospitality employees’ job satisfaction in Taiwan, also found that employees’ job satisfaction was influenced by the employers’ welfare initiatives for their employees. Similarly, Esther and Allen (2012) in their study on Ghana hotels posited that for job satisfaction to be achieved issues which should be looked into included welfare of employees. This is an important factor that affects the job satisfaction levels of hospitality employees (Aksu & Aktas, 2010; Karatepe et al., 2006).

In this light, the current study sought to unravel the major extrinsic factors which affected supervisors’ job satisfaction in guest houses in Mombasa County. These were the important issues which could enhance job satisfaction, that guest house supervisors felt needed to be addressed.

2.8 Summary of Gaps from Literature

It was evident that psychological job satisfaction and psychological empowerment in the hospitality sector were critical issues. The two aspects could be utilized as some of the human resources strategies in curbing the high staff turnover witnessed in the hospitality industry. From the literature reviewed, it was evident that information and knowledge gaps concerning the presence of the various dimensions of psychological empowerment in guest houses in Mombasa County existed. It was not clear about the individual psychological dimension’s relevance on job satisfaction. To the best knowledge of the
researcher, there was very little or no empirical research to determine psychological empowerment and job satisfaction levels in guest houses in Kenya, more specifically in Mombasa County had been made. Additionally, it was unclear whether a relationship existed between psychological empowerment and job satisfaction in the Kenyan hospitality context, more so in the guest house subsector of the industry.

It was also unclear about the demographics of guest house supervisors and if they had any relationship with their job satisfaction. Further, the major extrinsic factors affecting job satisfaction of guest house supervisors were unknown in the Kenyan context. This study was, therefore, geared towards addressing these gaps; so that guest houses would be able to retain the most important resource for their organizations, that is, man power. This would in turn lead to enhanced customer satisfaction, improved organizational performance and productivity.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents information on the research design, study area, target population, sample size and sampling procedures, research instruments, pre-test of data collection tools, validity and reliability of research instruments, data collection techniques and data analysis.

3.2 Research Design

This study adopted a descriptive survey research design. This design looks at individuals in order to describe, compare, contrast, classify, analyse and interpret the entities and the events that constitute their various fields of inquiry (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011). This research design further provides a reasonable description and interpretation of the respondents’ attitudes and behaviour (Fink, 2003). Descriptive research is an innovative tool for researchers; it presents an opportunity to fuse both quantitative and qualitative data. This design provided a deep insight into the psychological empowerment concept and it captured attitudes and patterns of behaviour with regard to psychological empowerment and job satisfaction. As such, the descriptive survey study design was used for profiling, defining, estimating, predicting, and examining associative relationships (Brotherton, 2008).
The study explored relationships between the independent and the dependent variables. The independent variable was psychological empowerment together with its dimensions (impact, competence, meaning and choice) while the dependent variable was job satisfaction. Other variables such as the demographics and extrinsic factors and their relationship with the dependent variable (job satisfaction) were also explored by use of this design. The design enabled the researcher gather, summarize, present and interpret information for the purpose of clarification and answer the research hypotheses (Orodho, 2003).

3.3 Variables of the Study

This study had two main variables, namely, psychological empowerment and job satisfaction. The independent variable was guest house supervisors’ psychological empowerment while the dependent variable was their job satisfaction. Determination of these variables was done after thoroughly reviewing relevant literature.

3.3.1 Psychological Empowerment

For the purpose of this study, psychological empowerment was defined as an employee’s feeling of a fit between their jobs and personal values, that was reflected in four dimensions, that is, competence, meaning, choice and impact, in relation to their job activities. Psychological empowerment was measured using a 12-item scale developed by
Spreitzer (1995a) and as used successfully by among others, Ponton (2011). The scale constituted four subscales: competence, meaning, impact and choice. Three items were included to represent each of the sub scales. A sample of the items included: ‘The work I do is very important to me’ to represent ‘meaning’, ‘I am confident about my ability to do my job’ to represent ‘competence’, ‘I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job’ to represent ‘choice’ and lastly ‘My impact on what happens in my department is large’ to represent ‘impact’. The respondents were requested to indicate their level of satiety with each of the items in the scale on a five-point likert scale. The scale scores ranged from 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neither), 4 (agree) and 5 (strongly agree). These four sub facets collectively create psychological empowerment (Spreitzer’s, 1995a), and thus an average of the total score from the sub scores represented overall psychological empowerment.

3.3.2 Job Satisfaction

Guest house supervisors’ job satisfaction was the dependent variable which was measured against the sub-variables of psychological empowerment (independent variable). Job satisfaction was measured using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) short form as designed by Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist (1967) and reviewed by Lo & Aryee (2003). This tool has been used successfully by among others, Dimitriou (2012). This scale was used to explore employees’ satisfaction with their work roles. MSQ short form is a 20- item scale. The respondents were asked to indicate how
they felt about different aspects of their job. The respondents were requested to rate each of the items on the MSQ on a five-point scale which ranged from 1 (very dissatisfied), 2 (dissatisfied), 3 (neither), 4 (satisfied) and 5 (very satisfied).

3.3.3 Extrinsic Factors

At the end of the questionnaire, open ended questions were presented to the respondents to probe more on the major work environment factors which were of greatest importance to them. Instructions were provided to the respondents to highlight just one extrinsic factor, so as to reveal the major ones.

3.4 Study Location

This study was carried out in Mombasa County (Appendix V) located at the coastal strip of Kenya. The County lies on the shores of the Indian Ocean located on the South Eastern part of Kenya (4°03’S 39°40’E / 4.050°S 39.667°E). Mombasa County was formed on 4th March 2013 when the then new constitution of 2010 took effect. It has a total area of 294.7 km² and a total population of 939,370 persons. It is the smallest county in Kenya, covering an area of 229.7 km² excluding 65 km² of water mass. The county is divided into four divisions: Mombasa island/Mvita (14.1 km²), Changamwe (54.5 km²), Likoni (51.3 km²) and Kisauni (109.7 km²). The weather averages temperatures of 84°F (29°C) and 79% humidity. It borders Kilifi County to the North, Kwale County to the South

The study area was purposively selected because it is one of the leading and most popular tourist destinations in Kenya (MoT, 2015). It is the epicentre of leisure tourism in the country; hosting travellers from other parts of the country and the world who flock the county during holidays and other festive seasons (Oketch, 2009). It is favoured by travellers because of its close proximity to the sea, its weather and leisure activities. Most domestic travellers and a good percentage of foreign guests travelling on a tight budget prefer guest houses which are a cheaper alternative to the expensive classified hotels. Guest houses charge reasonable prices for their hospitality products. Additionally, the county is home to Kenya’s second largest city, Mombasa, and the sea gateway to East and Central Africa. Mombasa is a cosmopolitan county with local communities and foreign immigrants well represented.

3.5 Target Population

The target population for this study was supervisors in all the guest houses in Mombasa County. At the time of this study, there were a total of seventy-six (76) guest houses (Appendix 5.3) registered with the Mombasa County Government. These guest houses had a total of 233 supervisors who were in-charge of various operations in their respective establishments. Supervisors were chosen because they were in direct contact
with operational staff and as such, influenced service quality and customer satisfaction. Additionally, they were also in direct contact with the managers and hence were in a position to influence policies in their respective guest houses. Psychological empowerment would help enhance their job satisfaction, minimize their turnover and maximize customer satisfaction.

3.6 Sample Size and Sampling Technique

The study utilized a census where all the 76 guest houses in Mombasa County were included in the study. The number of guest houses was small and manageable, hence their inclusion in the study (Levy & Lemeshow, 2008). Census sampling was also utilised in determining the number of supervisors in these guest houses to be included in the study. The guest houses had a total of two hundred and thirty three (233) supervisors, who were all included in the study. This was adopted after considering that the number of supervisors was not big and therefore was also manageable.

3.7 Research Instruments

The study used a self-administered semi-structured questionnaire (Appendix II) and a structured observation checklist (Appendix III). A questionnaire was utilised because it is a widely used and useful instrument for collecting survey information, which oftenly provides structured and numerical data. Furthermore, it has the ability of being
administered without the presence of the researcher, and often being comparatively straight forward to analyze (Cohen, Marion & Morrison, 2011). A semi-structured questionnaire was adopted considering the number of respondents included in the research. The bigger the number of respondents involved in a study, the more structured, closed and numerical the questionnaire should be (Cohen et al., 2011). The closed and more structured questionnaire enabled the researcher to analyze patterns and make comparisons clearly.

The first part of the questionnaire consisted of six (6) demographic and general information questions. These questions were appropriate at this stage as they could be quickly coded and aggregated to give frequencies of response (Cohen et al., 2011). The second and third parts of the questionnaire consisted of closed ended items adopted from the Spreitzer’s Psychological Empowerment and Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire scales. These were standardized likert-type tests on a scale of one to five geared towards obtaining in-depth information that was quantifiable (Orodho, 2003). These closed questions generated frequencies amenable to statistical treatment and analysis and enabled comparisons of the variables. The questions were deliberately more focused (Cohen et al., 2011). They sought to establish levels of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction respectively. The fourth part of the questionnaire consisted of three (3) open-ended questions seeking to establish the major extrinsic factors influencing job satisfaction in guest houses in Mombasa County, the aspects of the job that supervisors were most satisfied with and their perception on the relationships of the study variables. This part was used to probe for more information which was not captured in the likert-
scale tests. Respondents had the freedom to explain their opinions in details which was made possible by the inclusion of the open ended questions. This gave them a chance to answer as much as they wished which enhanced the richness of their responses (Cohen et al., 2011).

Guidance was given on the completion of the closed ended questions, requesting the respondents to tick only one response. Clear instructions were given before presenting the likert scale questions. This was aimed at ensuring that the respondents provided only one response to each of the questions. Overall, the questionnaire was framed in such a manner that leading, sensitive, complex and too many open-ended questions were avoided. Efforts were made to make the questionnaire look easy, attractive and interesting to respond to.

The two main variables under study were validated through factor analysis. Factor analysis was carried out to identify the actual number of statements that measured each variable construct as perceived by the respondents. Before performing the inferential analysis, the suitability of the data was assessed through factor analysis: Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (KMO) and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity. The KMO should basically be greater than 0.50 and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity be significant in order to allow the inferential statistics to be carried out. The KMO for the psychological empowerment variables statements were above 0.6 as recommended by Chakraborty (2010) as shown on Table 3.1.
The principle component analysis using Varimax rotation was conducted on the independent variable to extract factors from the scales of each construct. According to Hair, Black, Anderson & Tatham, (2006) all items loading below 0.50 should be deleted and those with more than 0.50 loading factor chosen. The principle component analysis and Varimax rotation were performed and as postulated by Hair et al. (2006), all the items that have factor loadings lower than 0.50 were eliminated. All items were loaded into their various underlying variable structure of dimensions based on the rotated component matrix.

Table 3.1: Factor Analysis of Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rotated Component Matrixa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The work I do is meaningful</td>
<td>.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work I do is very important to me</td>
<td>.686 .619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job activities are personally meaningful to me</td>
<td>.720 .587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident about my ability to do my job</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am self-assured about my capability to perform my work</td>
<td>.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have mastered the skills necessary for my job</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can decide on my own how to go about doing my work</td>
<td>.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do my job</td>
<td>.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My impact on what happens in my department is large</td>
<td>.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a great deal of control over what happens in my department</td>
<td>.732 .592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have significant influence over what happens in my department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KMO = .674;
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity = .000 (df =66)
Percentage of variance Explained = 83.31

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.

The factor analysis results of psychological empowerment statements, indicated that the KMO was 0.674 and a significant (p<.05) Bartlett’s Test of sphericity was found as shown on Table 3.1. The Varimax rotated principle component resulted in four factor
loading on psychological empowerment variable that explained 83.31% of variance with Eigen values larger than 1. All the statements used in the psychological empowerment were therefore retained for analysis.

Factor analysis was further done on the MSQ statements (dependent variable) and the results indicated that the KMO was 0.565 and the Bartlett’s Test of sphericity was significant (p< .05) as shown on Table 3.2. The Varimax rotated principle component resulted in four factor loading on job satisfaction variable that explained 71.98% of variance with Eigen values larger than 1. Therefore, all the statements used to measure job satisfaction were retained for analysis.

Table 3.2: Factor Analysis of Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rotated Component Matrix$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To keep busy all the time</td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To work alone on the job with minimum supervision</td>
<td>.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To do different things from time to time</td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get praised for doing a good job</td>
<td>.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To do things that don’t go against my conscience</td>
<td>.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have a steady employment</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To do things for other people</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To tell people what to do</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To do things that make use of my abilities</td>
<td>.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have a chance for advancement on the job</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To use my own judgment in decision making</td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To try my own methods of doing my duties</td>
<td>.737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KMO = .565;
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity = .000 (df =66)
Percentage of variance Explained = 71.98
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.
The second research instrument utilized in the study was a structured observation check list. The observation focused on the four dimensions of psychological empowerment behaviours displayed by guest house supervisors as they did their jobs (competence, meaning, impact and choice). Each of these cognitions of psychological empowerment was broken down into various aspects which were observed. Using the items in the check list, the researcher made observations as the guest house supervisors were performing their daily activities and what was taking place at their work stations. The use of this direct cognition yielded more valid and authentic data (Cohen et al., 2011) and this unique strength of using observation was employed in triangulating the information which was obtained from the questionnaires. Additionally, this observation acted as a reality check; what supervisors did might have differed from what they said they did. It further enabled the researcher to look at the respondents’ daily behaviour that otherwise might have been taken for granted, expected or go unnoticed (Cooper & Schindler 2001; Robson, 2002). Observation checklists were filled for each guest house on the day allocated for data collection for every particular organization. In total, eight (8) aspects which were further broken down into specifics were used in the observation checklist.

3.8 Pre-test of Data Collection Tools

The research instruments were pre-tested in three guest houses obtained from the total population. Pretesting was aimed at Parts I and IV of the questionnaire. This assisted in assessing clarity, ease of use of the instrument and timeliness of data collection (Mugenda & Mugenda, 1999). According to Orodho (2003), the pre-test sample should
be small, between 1 and 10% of the entire sample size. Therefore, the three guest houses used for pre-testing represented 3.9% of the number of guest houses in Mombasa County. The three guest houses had a total of ten supervisors who were all included in the pre-test, representing 4.3% of the total number of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County. The three guest houses and ten supervisors who were used for pre-testing were not included in the actual study.

3.9 Validity and Reliability

3.9.1 Validity

Validity can be defined as the extent to which a research instrument measure actually taps the underlying concept that it purports to measure (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh & Sorensen, 2006). There were three types of validity sought, that is, content validity, construct validity and face validity. Content validity was about ensuring that the research instruments fairly and comprehensively covered the constructs of the study. On the other hand, construct validity was aimed at agreeing on the operationalization of the constructs, hence clarity of terms used. Lastly, face validity sought to ensure the correct wordings, order, form, clarity and ease of use of the research instruments (Cohen et al., 2011).

Validity for the research instruments was aimed at Parts I and IV of the questionnaire and the observation check list. It was determined by using a panel of experts, as suggested by
Nachmias & Nachmias (1992) as a successful method of assessing validity. The panel of experts consisted of two experts in the field of study (the supervisors of the study) and one statistician. The experts in the field of study were well qualified and trained persons with considerable experience in research (holders of Doctor of Philosophy in Hospitality Management) while the statistician was well versed with various aspects of data analysis.

The panel of experts engaged was first informed of the area of study and the objectives of the study. The research instruments were then presented with the various components and concepts under study. The two parts of the questionnaire (Part I and IV) and the observation check list were closely scrutinized, ranging from their contents, wordings, general appearance and appeal to the respondents and their ability to capture the information needed to answer the study objectives. At the end of the process, one sensitive item concerning age in Part I of the questionnaire was modified while two items in Part IV which were identified as confusing and repetitive were omitted. The observation check list was also expanded and broken down to cover specific items which were to be monitored.

The psychological empowerment and job satisfaction variables’ items, however, were not subjected to validity scrutiny. The Spreitzer’s Psychological Empowerment scale has been verified in the past and used successfully in other studies in the service industry (Chan et al., 2010; Chow et al., 2011; Hancer & George, 2009; Kazlauskaite et al., 2012; Ro & Chen, 2011). The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire scale has also been extensively used by various researchers in the past for measuring job satisfaction (Chen
& Chen, 2006; Dimitriou, 2012; Gunlu et al., 2010; Snipes et al., 2010) and the validity of the scale has been demonstrated.

3.9.2 Reliability

Reliability is the extent to which a research tool measure yields consistent results and the extent to which scores are free of random error (Ary et al., 2006). To test the internal consistency of the study variables, Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was utilized. Cronbach’s alpha coefficient is the most commonly used measure of reliability for two or more construct indicators (Cohen et al., 2011). The reliability of the questionnaire (Part I & IV) and the observation checklist was established at the pre-testing stage. Once the data for pre-testing was collected in the three guest houses from the ten supervisors and through observation, coding and entering the data into SPSS was done. Reliability tests were then done using the Cronbach’s alpha model. The correlation coefficient values usually range from 0 to 1. The higher the value, the better the reliability (Hair et al., 2009).

The questionnaire was found to have a reliability coefficient of 0.869 as shown on Table 3.3. The observation checklist had a reliability of 0.873. According to Serbetar & Sedlar (2016) the alpha should ideally be around 0.90 and never be below 0.70. Hence the instrument was found to be highly reliable.
Table 3. 3 Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Instrument</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guest house supervisors’ questionnaire (Part I &amp; IV)</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation checklist</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study adopted the Spreitzer’s Psychological Empowerment (PE) and Herzberg’s Job Satisfaction (JS) Scales. The two scales have been tested in the past and found to be reliable. While for the PE scale; meaning scale $\alpha = 0.87$, competence scale $\alpha = 0.81$, choice scale $\alpha = 0.81$ and impact scale $\alpha = 0.88$ (Spreitzer, 1995a). The JS scale has been found to have a high reliability coefficients ranging from 0.77 to 0.92 for intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction for different occupational groups (Lo & Aryee, 2003).

3.10 Data Collection Procedures

Data collection was sub-divided into two stages. Stage one was a pre-visit to the guest houses for introduction and sensitizing the staff on the importance of the study. With consultation with their managers, the supervisors were requested to suggest the dates and time they would like to be accessed for filling the questionnaire. Care was taken to ensure the appointments did not overlap.
The second phase was the actual days given for data collection which now targeted the respondents (supervisors). The two methods of collecting data using a self-administered questionnaire were employed, that is, filling the questionnaire in the presence or absence of the researcher (Cohen *et al*., 2011). Most of the questionnaires were completed in the presence of the researcher or his assistants. This was beneficial to both the researcher and the respondents. The supervisors were assisted in clarification of the questions so that they could respond to the whole questionnaire and provide the appropriate responses. This helped in boosting the response rate (Cohen *et al*., 2011).

However, supervisors who said that they understood the concepts under study were given freedom of completing the questionnaire in the absence of the researcher. This saved on researcher’s time and gave the respondents ample time to complete the questionnaire. The questionnaires which were left for filling were collected at a pre-agreed upon date. The researcher also made arrangements with the guest house managers to access supervisors who were not available on the scheduled dates at a later date. Arrangements were put in place of reminding the respondents on completion and return of the questionnaires. Data collection was done between the months of October and December 2016.

Data collection for the structured observation check list was done exclusively by the principal researcher, because he knew exactly what to watch out for. This was done concurrently with the data collection for the questionnaires (October to December 2016). The researcher visited the reception area, the guest rooms, the kitchen and the food and
beverage service outlets in the guest houses and this helped in filling out the observation checklists. He observed the supervisors as they were carrying out their daily work roles to gauge their level of competence in discharging their duties. This included issues such as their grooming and how they handled guests and their staff at their work place. In addition, the researcher also talked to the supervisors and asked for particular information to gauge their level of empowerment. For example, the researcher asked the supervisors whether he could access their work areas to check whether they will allow him to do so without consulting their managers. This helped the researcher in gauging the level of autonomy in decision making for the respondents.

The researcher further asked for work charts made by the supervisors for their sections such as duty rotas and menu cards to gauge the level of the respondents’ involvement in departmental and organizational decisions. Additionally, the researcher also visited the work areas of the supervisors and observed the finished hospitality product as he filled the relevant items in the observation check list. For instance, the guest rooms were checked for cleanliness at the corners, under the bed, dust on the table and the door and the way the beds were made. The restaurants were checked for furniture arrangements, table set up and cleanliness.
3.11 Data Analysis and Presentation

Analysis of data was done in accordance with the formulated research objectives for this study. Analysis was done using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS). Presentation was by use of tables.

Table 3.4 Data Analysis Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Method of analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O₁</td>
<td>‘Meaning’ tenet of psychological empowerment</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Frequencies, Percentages, Means, Pearson Correlation, Linear regression, ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₂</td>
<td>‘Competence’ tenet of psychological empowerment</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Frequencies, Percentages, Means, Pearson Correlation, Linear regression, ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₃</td>
<td>‘Choice’ tenet of psychological empowerment</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Frequencies, Percentages, Means, Pearson Correlation, Linear regression, ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₄</td>
<td>‘Impact’ tenet of psychological empowerment</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Frequencies, Percentages, Means, Pearson Correlation, Linear regression, ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₅</td>
<td>Overall psychological empowerment</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Mean, Standard Deviation, Multiple regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₆</td>
<td>Demographic factors</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Frequencies, Percentages, Means, Pearson Correlation, Linear regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₆</td>
<td>Extrinsic factors</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Frequencies, Percentages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive statistics such as frequencies, means and percentages were done for all the objectives. This was considered because as argued by Boone & Boone (2012), the
analysis of likert-type and likert scale data requires unique data analysis procedures. They recommended for descriptive statistics to be used during data analysis.

Before performing the inferential statistics, the variables under this study were validated through factor analysis. Two factor analysis tests were done, that is, KMO and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity. To establish the influence of the independent variables, that is, the cognitions of psychological empowerment (meaning, competence, impact and choice) on job satisfaction (dependent variable), Pearson correlation analyses were done. In addition, linear regression models were done to ascertain the level of significance the individual independent variables (meaning, competence, impact and choice) had on the dependent variable (job satisfaction). Regression models were utilized in testing the research hypotheses. To concretize regression, ANOVA was done to establish whether the regression models were significantly predicting the outcomes. Multiple regression was done to determine strength of the four tenets of psychological empowerment relative to each other towards job satisfaction.

The fifth objective was established using linear regression and ANOVA. This was carried out to determine whether a statistically significant relationship existed between demographic factors and job satisfaction. For the extrinsic factors affecting job satisfaction in guest houses, a conventional content analysis was performed, where the coding categories were derived from the responses provided by the guest house supervisors. This was achieved through the process of enumeration where terms, words and ideas were counted. This enabled occurrences to be recorded and statistical analysis
of frequencies to be performed. From this, frequencies and percentages were generated which explained the major extrinsic factors which affect job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County. Descriptive statistics, i.e., frequencies and percentages, were used to analyse data collected from the observation checklist. This information was used for triangulating the guest house supervisors’ questionnaire.

3.12 Ethical Considerations

A clearance letter from Kenyatta University through the Dean, Graduate School, was obtained. This letter was presented to National Council of Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI) for a research permit. After the research permit was obtained, the researcher notified Mombasa County Commissioner, Mombasa County government and the Ministry of Education before the study commenced. Guest house managers were consulted before the research was carried out in their premises. Participants’ (guest house supervisors’) consent was also sought and participation was purely voluntary. However, the respondents were strongly encouraged to be involved in the study. Specific days were allocated for each guest house. This depended on the day the researcher had made appointment with the participating guest house.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the findings obtained from the study and provides a comprehensive discussion of these findings. The demographics of the respondents for the study were presented first in an outline of the characteristics of the sample. Thereafter, the analysis of the constructs relevant to the study, that is, psychological empowerment and job satisfaction, was presented with the aid of descriptive and inferential statistical procedures. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations were used to present information on variables under investigations.

Later inferential statistics which included Pearson correlation coefficient, linear and multiple regressions and ANOVA were utilised in establishing the relationship between the variables. This chapter specifically presents and interprets the results addressing the objectives of the study: to establish the relationship between the meaning, competence, choice and impact dimensions of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors; to determine the relationship between guest house supervisors’ demographic factors and their job satisfaction; and to establish the major extrinsic factors which affected job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County. Tables were used in presenting research findings.
4.1.1 Response Rate

A total of 223 questionnaires were administered to the respondents. However, only 210 questionnaires were returned and therefore used in analysis of the data. This translated to a response rate of 94%. This was in line with Wyse (2012) who opined that a response rate of over 80% is needed for a survey to be considered significantly valid.

4.2 Demographics and Other General Information of Respondents

The demographic information sought from the guest house supervisors included gender, age and educational level. Other general information about the respondents included department of work, number of years worked in the hospitality industry (experience) and terms of service. These were summarized as shown on Table 4.1.

Respondent’s Gender

From the study, majority of the respondents (n=154, 73%) involved were male while 56 (27%) were female as shown on Table 4.1. This implied that majority of guest houses’ workforce were male. Hence, there was a big gender disparity in supervisors working in guest houses in Mombasa County.
Table 4.1 Demographics and Other General Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>210</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>210</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary education</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate(hospitality)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma(hospitality)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher diploma(hospitality)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree(hospitality)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>210</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department (Work Station)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Beverage</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation(housekeeping and reception)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>210</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Worked (Experience)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 and above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>210</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terms of Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>210</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondent’s Age

Half of the respondents accessed (n=105, 50%) were between the age bracket of 20 and 29 years, with 77 (36.7%) being between 30 and 39 years and 28 (13.3%) were aged between 40 and 49 years, as summarized on Table 4.1. These findings implied that majority of the supervisors working in the guest house sub-sector of the hospitality industry in Mombasa County were young persons (below 39 years). Guest houses could actually take advantage of the youthful and energetic supervisors to enhance their performance.

Highest Level of Education

From the study findings, majority of the respondents (n=133, 63.3%) had attained secondary as their highest education level, with 53 (16.7%) having certificate level, 21 (10%) having diploma level, 6.7% had primary education and 3.3% higher diploma as shown on Table 4.1. The highest level of qualification attained by guest house supervisors in Mombasa County was found to be higher diploma, with only a few respondents (n=7) having attained it. These results implied that majority of the respondents (70%) had their highest level of education as secondary school and below and therefore lacked any formal hospitality training. This could possibly be explained by the fact that most independent guest house owners could be insisting on employment of youthful untrained individuals in their quest of cutting down on labour costs. As such, there was need of some formal training for employees working in the guest house sub-
sector of the hospitality industry. It is important to note that formal hospitality education is a crucial part of training as it not only instills operation skills to employees but also inculcates the hospitality culture and human resource aspects into them.

**Department Working (Workstation)**

Regarding the departments the respondents worked in, the results showed that majority of them (n=175, 83.3%) worked in housekeeping and reception, and actually they were also in charge of a small food and beverage facility provided by the particular guest house. The remaining 16.7% worked particularly in the food and beverage department of guest houses which provided elaborate food and beverage services. This was summarized as shown on Table 4.1. This implied that although some of the guest houses had elaborate food and beverage services for their guests, a large number of them had peripheral food and beverage services. Their major concentration was in provision of the guest room to guests while somehow ignoring the equally important role of the food and beverage services.

**Years Worked in the Hospitality Industry (Experience)**

The results from respondents’ experience showed that 53.3% (n=112) had worked for between 2 and 4 years, with 33.3% (n=70) had an experience of less than 2 years as indicated on Table 4.1. The remaining 13.4% (n=28) had a working experience of between 4 and 6 years. The findings showed that most of the respondents (86.6%) had
worked in the hospitality industry for less than 4 years. None of the respondents had worked for more than six years. These results exposed guest houses as a sector which was unable to retain employees in the supervisory cadre for a long period (over 6 years). This finding concurred with the findings by Talaal (2012) who in his study about the issues affecting the hospitality industry in South Africa found that most hospitality employees have no long-term commitment in their jobs and they only see it as a stepping stone to jobs in other sectors.

**Terms of Service**

From the research findings, majority of the respondents (n=140, 66.7%) were employed on casual terms, 23.3% on contract and only 10% on permanent employment as shown on Table 4.1. These findings indicated that majority of the employees working in guest houses in Mombasa County were on casual employment. This could also explain the reason why there was a likelihood of huge turnover of employees in guest houses in Mombasa County, as indicated by the low levels of experience revealed earlier.

**4.3 Job Satisfaction of Guest House Supervisors**

The dependent variable for the study was guest house supervisors’ job satisfaction. It was achieved by analyzing the results from the questionnaire using descriptive statistics.
4.3.1 Descriptive Statistics of Job Satisfaction

The job satisfaction statements were analyzed using descriptive statistics as shown in Table 4.2. Less than half (n=91, 43.4%) of the supervisors indicated that they were satisfied that their jobs kept them busy all the time. Another 43.4% (n=91) indicated that they were neutral on that statement while 13.3% (n=28) were dissatisfied that their jobs were not able to keep them busy all the time. A mean of 3.37 and a standard deviation of 1.113 was in support of this. Majority of the respondents (n=140, 66.7%) were satisfied that they did their work with minimum supervision, with 26.7% neutral and 6.6% dissatisfied on the statement. A mean of 3.77 and standard deviation of 0.922 was in support of this. Most of the respondents (n=140, 66.7%) were also satisfied that they got praised for doing a good job, with 23.3% neutral and 10% dissatisfied on the statement. A mean score of 3.70 and standard deviation of 1.04 was in support of this.

Majority of the respondents (n=168, 80%) were satisfied that they did things that did not go against their conscience, with 10% neutral and 10% dissatisfied on the statement. A mean of 3.90 and standard deviation of 0.946 was in support of this. Most of the respondents (n=133, 63.3%) were satisfied that they had a steady employment, with 16.7% neutral and 20% dissatisfied on the statement. A mean score of 3.60 and standard deviation of 1.17 was in support of this. Majority of the respondents (n=147, 70%) were satisfied that they did things that made use of their abilities, with 20% neutral and 10% dissatisfied on the statement. A mean of 3.63 and standard deviation of 0.838 was in support of this.
Table 4.2: Descriptive Statistics of Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To keep busy all the time</td>
<td>21 10.0</td>
<td>7 3.3</td>
<td>91 43.3</td>
<td>56 26.7</td>
<td>35 16.7</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To work alone on the job with minimum supervision</td>
<td>7   3.3</td>
<td>7 3.3</td>
<td>56 26.7</td>
<td>98 46.7</td>
<td>42 20.0</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To do different things from time to time</td>
<td>14 6.7</td>
<td>91 43.3</td>
<td>77 36.7</td>
<td>28 13.3</td>
<td>13.3 3.57</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get praised for doing a good job</td>
<td>14 6.7</td>
<td>49 23.3</td>
<td>98 46.7</td>
<td>42 20.0</td>
<td>20.0 3.70</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To do things that don't go against my conscience</td>
<td>7  3.3</td>
<td>21 10.0</td>
<td>119 56.7</td>
<td>49 23.3</td>
<td>23.3 3.90</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have a steady employment</td>
<td>14 6.7</td>
<td>28 13.3</td>
<td>84 40.0</td>
<td>49 23.3</td>
<td>43 18.3</td>
<td>1.175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To do things for other people</td>
<td>7  3.3</td>
<td>21 10.0</td>
<td>98 46.7</td>
<td>70 33.3</td>
<td>14 6.7</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To tell people what to do</td>
<td>14 6.7</td>
<td>126 60.0</td>
<td>35 16.7</td>
<td>14 6.7</td>
<td>60.0 3.07</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To do things that make use of my abilities</td>
<td>7   3.3</td>
<td>42 20.0</td>
<td>133 63.3</td>
<td>14 6.7</td>
<td>63 3.63</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have a chance for advancement on the job</td>
<td>28 13.3</td>
<td>49 23.3</td>
<td>105 50.0</td>
<td>14 6.7</td>
<td>105 3.30</td>
<td>1.133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To try my own methods of doing my duties</td>
<td>21 10.0</td>
<td>42 20.0</td>
<td>105 50.0</td>
<td>28 13.3</td>
<td>50.0 3.50</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To use my own judgment in decision making</td>
<td>21 10.0</td>
<td>105 50.0</td>
<td>50.0 21</td>
<td>10.0 3.50</td>
<td>50.0 1.027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The working conditions</td>
<td>21 10.0</td>
<td>35 16.7</td>
<td>98 46.7</td>
<td>56 26.7</td>
<td>56 3.90</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my co-workers get along with each other</td>
<td>21 10.0</td>
<td>49 23.3</td>
<td>98 46.7</td>
<td>42 20.0</td>
<td>42 3.77</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my boss handles his/her workers</td>
<td>7  3.3</td>
<td>105 50.0</td>
<td>70 33.3</td>
<td>14 6.7</td>
<td>70 3.33</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The competence of my supervisor in making decisions</td>
<td>63 30.0</td>
<td>126 60.0</td>
<td>21 10.0</td>
<td>21 10.0</td>
<td>21 3.80</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way company policies are put into practice</td>
<td>7   3.3</td>
<td>105 50.0</td>
<td>77 36.7</td>
<td>7 3.3</td>
<td>7 3.30</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My pay and the amount of work I do</td>
<td>7   3.3</td>
<td>63 30.0</td>
<td>70 33.3</td>
<td>21 10.0</td>
<td>21 3.23</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of the respondents (n=119, 56.7%) were satisfied that had a chance for advancement on their job, while 23.3% were neutral and 20% dissatisfied on the statement. A mean score of 3.30 and standard deviation of 1.13 was in support of this. Majority of the respondents (n=126, 60%) were satisfied that they used their own judgment in decision making, with 40% dissatisfied on the statement. A mean of 3.50 and standard deviation of 1.03 was in support of this. Most of the respondents (n=133, 63.3%) were satisfied that they tried their own methods of doing their duties, with 20% neutral and 16.7% dissatisfied on the statement. A mean score of 3.50 and standard deviation of 1.121 was in support of this.

Majority of the respondents (n=98, 46.7%) were neutral that their jobs enabled them to do things for other people, with only 40% satisfied and 13.3% dissatisfied on the statement. A mean of 3.30 and standard deviation of 0.864 was in support of this. Most of the respondents (n=126, 60%) were neutral on whether their jobs gave them a chance of telling other people what to do, with only 23.4% satisfied and 16.7% dissatisfied on the statement. A mean score of 3.07 and standard deviation of 0.894 was in support of this. Half of the respondents (n=105, 50%) indicated that they got a chance to try different things from time to time in their jobs, while 43.3% were neutral and 6.7% dissatisfied on the statement. A mean of 3.57 and a standard deviation of 0.805 was in support of this.
Majority of the respondents (n=154, 73.4%) were satisfied with the working conditions, with 16.7% neutral and 10% dissatisfied on the statement. A mean of 3.90 and standard deviation of 0.910 was in support of this. Most of the respondents (n=140, 66.7%) were satisfied with the way their co-workers got along with each other, with 23.3% neutral and 10% dissatisfied on the statement. A mean score of 3.77 and standard deviation of .885 was in support of this. Half of the respondents (n=105, 50%) were neutral about the way their boss handled his/her workers, with 40% satisfied and 10% dissatisfied on the statement. A mean of 3.33 and standard deviation of 0.832 was in support of this. Most of the respondents (n=147, 70%) were satisfied about the competence of their supervisors in making decisions while 30% were neutral on the statement. A mean score of 3.80 and standard deviation of .601 was in support of this. Half of the respondents (n=105, 50%) were neutral about the way their guest house policies were put into practice, with 40% satisfied and 10% dissatisfied on the statement. A mean of 3.33 and standard deviation of 0.783 was in support of this. Less than half of the respondents (n=91, 43.3%) were satisfied about the pay in comparison with the amount of work they did, 30% were neutral and 26.6% dissatisfied on the statement. A mean score of 3.23 and standard deviation of 1.025 was in support of this.

The mean value for job satisfaction was found to be 3.52 within a scale of 1 to 5; with a standard deviation of 0.479. This implied that guest house supervisors’ job satisfaction was just above average; hence, a lot of efforts were needed to achieve total job satisfaction.
4.4 Effect of ‘Meaning’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment on Job Satisfaction of Guest House Supervisors

The first objective of the study was to determine the effect of ‘meaning’ psychological empowerment on job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County.

4.4.1 Descriptive Statistics of ‘Meaning’ Dimension of Psychological Empowerment

The ‘meaning’ psychological empowerment statements were analyzed using descriptive statistics as shown in Table 4.3. Majority of the respondents (n=119, 56.6%) agreed that the work they did was meaningful to them, as also shown by a mean score of 3.7 and standard deviation of 0.692. However, 43.3% (n=91) of the respondents disagreed that the work they did was meaningful. The findings also indicated that majority of the respondents (n=147, 70%) had the opinion that the work they did was very important to them and 30% disagreed that the work they did was important to them. A mean of 3.67 and standard deviation of 0.909 was in support of this. Further, majority of the respondents (n=140, 66.7%) indicated that their job activities were personally meaningful to them while 33.4% disagreed that the work they did was meaningful to them. A mean score of 3.63 and standard deviation of 0.914 was in support of this.
Table 4.3: Descriptive Statistics of ‘Meaning’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The work I do is meaningful</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work I do is very important to me</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job activities are personally meaningful to me</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.66</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These findings were supported by the observation check list findings as shown on Table 4.4. It was observed that 68.5% of the guest houses had supervisors who seemed to have genuine interest in their jobs. Another 61.6% of the total number of guest houses had supervisors who handled their customers and employees in a professional manner. These were used by the researcher to gauge whether guest house supervisors in Mombasa County seemed to place some value in their jobs and hence ‘meaning’ psychological empowerment. The findings from the observation check list, therefore, implied an above average sense of ‘meaning’ of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.4: Descriptive Statistics of ‘Meaning’ from Observation Checklist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do supervisors look genuinely interested in their work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Average) Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do supervisors handle employees and customers well?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2 Correlation between ‘Meaning’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment and Job Satisfaction of Guest House Supervisors

Pearson moment-correlation was used to establish the relationship between ‘meaning’ psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors as shown on Table 4.5. The following conventional rules have been provided by Cohen et al. (2011)
for interpreting the correlation coefficient. He pointed out that “0” denoted no linear relationship, “±1” denoted perfect linear relationship while values between “0 and 0.3” denoted a weak linear relationship via a shaky linear rule. Values between “0.3 and 0.7” denoted a moderate linear relationship via a fuzzy- firm linear rule and values between “0.7 and 1.0” denoted a strong linear relationship via a firm linear rule.

From this, there was found to be a positive relationship between ‘meaning’ psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors \((r = .765, n = 210, p<.05)\). This indicated that there was a strong linear relationship between ‘meaning’ psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. Thus the more the ‘meaning’ psychological empowerment was implemented the higher the job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. This agreed with Chiang & Hsieh (2012) that meaning was a significant predictor of job satisfaction.

Table 4.5: Correlation between ‘Meaning’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meaning</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.765**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

b. Listwise N=210
The results of the current study agree with a study by Koen and Maaike van (2011) in Belgium hotels. They argued that employees who perceived their jobs to be significant and worthwhile also felt higher levels of job satisfaction than employees who saw their jobs as having little value. It further agreed with Ponton (2011) in his analysis of hotel managers in Australia, who found that there was a positive relationship between the sub variable of ‘meaning’ and job satisfaction. Additionally, the current study agreed with Hsiang-Fei, Sheng-Hshiung & Ya-Yun (2014) in their study about empowering hospitality employees in China who posited that employees who felt that they were empowered displayed more confidence in their work; resulting in feeling of a higher degree of satisfaction in their jobs. Therefore, this study agreed with other past studies and revealed that ‘meaning’ was an important construct of psychological empowerment and had considerable influence towards guest house supervisors’ job satisfaction in Mombasa County.

The results of the current study also agree with studies done in other sectors of the economy. It concurs with Buitendach & Hlalele (2005) who found a correlation between the cognition of meaning psychological empowerment and job satisfaction among South African engineers. Gachunga, Maina & Kabare (2016) in their study on the influence of psychological empowerment on organizational commitment in Kenyan civil service also posited that the meaning cognition was positively correlated to job satisfaction. The results also concur with an Egyptian study by Nassar (2017) who found that employees who found a close fit between their beliefs and values with their work tasks had high levels of job satisfaction.
4.4.3 Linear Regression of ‘Meaning’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment

To explore whether there was a significant relationship between the ‘meaning’ cognition of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County, a linear regression model was used. This was used to predict job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in the study as summarized in Table 4.6. The $R^2$ represented the measure of variability in job satisfaction of guest house supervisors that ‘meaning’ psychological empowerment accounted for as the predictor.

From the model, ($R^2 = .585$) showed that the predictor (meaning) accounted for 58.5% variation in job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. The predictor variable (meaning) used in the model captured the variation in the job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. The change statistics was used to test whether the change in adjusted $R^2$ was significant using the F-ratio. The model caused adjusted $R^2$ to change from zero to .585 and this change gave rise to an F-ratio of 293.299, which was significant at a probability of .05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R$ Square</th>
<th>Adjusted-$R$ Square</th>
<th>Std.Error-of-the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.-F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.765*</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.27449</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>293.299</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Meaning

Further, ANOVA was used to test whether the regression model was significantly fitting in predicting the outcome than using the mean as shown on Table 4.7. The regression
model significantly improved the ability of the ‘meaning’ dimension to predict job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. The F-ratio was 293.299 and significant (P<.05) and thus the model was significant. As such the null hypothesis that there was no significant relationship between the ‘meaning’ dimension of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County \( (H_01) \) was rejected; and the alternative that there was a significant relationship between the ‘meaning’ dimension of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction was adopted.

### Table 4.7: ANOVA of ‘Meaning’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>22.098</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.098</td>
<td>293.299</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>15.671</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37.769</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Meaning

In addition, the β coefficients for independent variable ‘meaning’ psychological empowerment were generated from the model and subjected to a t-test, in order to test the hypothesis under study. The t-test was used as to measure whether the predictor was making a significant contribution to the model. Table 4.8 shows the estimates of β-value and gives contribution of the ‘meaning’ psychological empowerment predictor to the model.

### Table 4.8: Coefficients of ‘Meaning’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zero-order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.060</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction
The $\beta$-value for ‘meaning’ psychological empowerment had positive coefficient, depicting a positive relationship with job satisfaction of guest house supervisors as summarized in the model as:

$$Y = 2.060 + .453X + \varepsilon \quad \ldots$$

Where: $Y = \text{job satisfaction}$, $X = \text{e- meaning psychological empowerment}$, $\varepsilon = \text{error term}$

From the findings the $t$-test associated with $\beta$-values was significant and the ‘meaning’ psychological empowerment predictor was making a significant contribution to the model. The coefficients results showed that the predicted parameter in relation to the independent factor was significant ($\beta_1 = 0.453, P<0.05$). This implied that the null hypothesis ($H_{01}$), which stated that there was no significant relationship between the ‘meaning’ dimension of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors, was rejected. The results indicated that for each unit increase in the ‘meaning’ psychological empowerment, there was 0.453 units increase in job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. This implied that the more ‘meaning’ the supervisors attached to their jobs the higher the satisfaction.

The findings of this study concurred with Littrel (2010) that of the four-empowerment dimensions, one of the strongest theoretical argument for a positive relation to job
satisfaction has been made for ‘meaning’. In addition, the current study results agreed with Patah et al. (2012) in his study of Kuala Lumpur hotels. The findings of their study revealed that the construct of ‘meaning’ does have a significant and strong influence on the overall job satisfaction.

These results are further cemented by Dickson and Lorenz (2009) and Powpaka (2012) that there exists a positive and significant relationship between the dimension of meaning and job satisfaction for workers. This was also in line with findings generated by Spreitzer (2008) that the meaning cognition was positively related to job satisfaction. The results generated by almost all of the studies reviewed had the same outcome; which was that the meaning cognition had a significant relationship with job satisfaction. This research revealed that when guest house supervisors find the work they perform to be consistent with their beliefs, attitudes and behaviours they tend to be happier and contented with their jobs.

4.5 Influence of ‘Competence’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment on Job Satisfaction of Guest House Supervisors

The second objective of this study was to determine the influence of the ‘competence’ dimension of psychological empowerment on job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County.
4.5.1 Descriptive Statistics of ‘Competence’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment

The ‘competence’ dimension of psychological empowerment statements were computed using descriptive statistics as summarized in Table 4.9. All the respondents (100%) agreed that they were self-assured about their capability to perform their work. A mean of 4.27 and standard deviation of 0.443 was in support of this. Majority of the respondents (n=203, 96.6%) indicated that they were confident about their ability to do their job as supported by a mean score of 4.2 and standard deviation of 0.477, with only 3.3% (n=7) of them disagreeing. Most of the respondents (n=168, 80%) also agreed that they had mastered the skills necessary for their job while 10% were neutral and another 10% disagreed that they had mastered skills of doing their jobs. A mean score of 3.87 and standard deviation of 1.027 was in support of this.

Table 4.9: Descriptive Statistics of ‘Competence’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am confident about my ability to do my job</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am self-assured about my capability to perform my work</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have mastered the skills necessary for my job</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The competence factors indicated that the supervisors were confident about their ability to do their jobs, having mastered the important skills for their work roles and were also self-assured about their performance capabilities. They were certain that their jobs were well within the scope of their abilities. This was consistent with the high mean value of 4.11. This implied that supervisors of guest houses felt that they were competent enough to do their jobs and had confidence that they can perform their work well, despite the fact that majority of them had no formal hospitality training.

The findings from the supervisors’ questionnaire were a contrast to the results of the observations made by the researcher as shown on Table 4.10. It was observed that slightly more than half of the guest houses (N=38, 52.1%) had restaurants which were not properly made. Many procedures were not done correctly, ranging from the arrangement of the furniture, setting of tables, cleanliness and decorations. Further, it was observed that a large number (45.8%) of the guest rooms visited in the guest houses were not professionally made and cleaned. The issues noted ranged from the way the beds had been made and cleanliness of the guest rooms. Observations from the two areas pointed out inadequacy in ‘competency’ psychological empowerment of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County. The implication from these findings was that the cognition of competency was below average as revealed by the inadequacy in supervising for correct procedures in their areas of work.
Table 4.10: Descriptive Statistics of ‘Competence’ from Observation Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has the restaurant been arranged and set properly?</th>
<th>Yes (Average)</th>
<th>No (Average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency %</td>
<td>Frequency %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the guest rooms been cleaned and made properly?</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from the questionnaire revealed that respondents in the current study were self-assured about their capability to perform their work. They had mastered the important skills for their work roles and had confidence about their ability to perform their jobs well. However, the observation checklist findings showed otherwise.

4.5.2 Correlations between ‘Competence’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment and Job Satisfaction

The influence of the ‘competence’ cognition of psychological empowerment on job satisfaction was investigated using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient as shown on Table 4.11. There was found to be a positive influence of ‘competence’ psychological empowerment on job satisfaction (r = .554, p<0.05). This denoted that there was a moderate linear relationship between the cognition of competence and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County. Nevertheless, this implied
that the more the ‘competence’ psychological empowerment was improved the more the job satisfaction of supervisors of guest houses improved.

**Table 4.11: Correlations of ‘Competence’ Psychological Empowerment on Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.554**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

b. Listwise N=210

Generally, the findings indicated that ‘competence’ psychological empowerment positively influenced job satisfaction. This finding concurred with Koen & Maaike van (2011) who indicated that employees who have confidence that they would succeed and feel competent were happier with their jobs and hence more satisfied than employees who feared that they might fail. It further agreed with Ponton (2011) in his study in Australian hotels who posited that the more competent the employees felt, the more satisfied they were in their jobs. It seemed a common trend for employees to see themselves competent enough to tackle their duties whether they were formally trained or not.

In addition, Tsai, Cheng and Chang (2013) in their analysis of the drivers of hospitality industry employees’ job satisfaction in Taiwan observed that employees’ perceived that their competency empowerment was very high. This correlated with the high levels of job
satisfaction reported in these Taiwanese hotels. The results of this study further was in agreement with various studies done in the African continent across various sectors which found a positive relationship between the dimension of competence of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of employees (Nassar, 2017; Buitendach & Hlalele, 2005; Gachunga, et al. (2016) in their study on the influence of psychological empowerment on organizational commitment in Kenyan civil service found that the dimension of competence was positively correlated to job satisfaction, which in turn lead to organizational commitment.

However, it is important to point out that the findings of the current study disagreed with Dehkordi et al. (2011) who argued that the other tenets of psychological empowerment had a relationship with job satisfaction except the dimension of competence. This study actually revealed a positive linear relationship between competence psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County. This could be because of contextual differences between the samples of the two studies.

4.5.3 Linear Regression of ‘Competence’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment

To find out whether there was a significant influence of the ‘competence’ dimension of psychological empowerment on job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County, a linear regression model was used. The ‘competence’ cognition was used to predict job satisfaction of guest house supervisors as summarized in Table 4.12. The $R^2$ represented the measure of variability in job satisfaction of guest house
supervisors that ‘competence’ psychological empowerment accounted for. From the model, \( R^2 = .307 \) showed that the predictor accounted for 30.7% variation in job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. The predictor used in the model captured the variation in the job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. The change statistics was used to test whether the change in adjusted \( R^2 \) was significant using the F-ratio. The model caused adjusted \( R^2 \) to change from zero to .307 and this change gave rise to an F-ratio of 92.07, which was significant at a probability of .05.

### Table 4.12: Model Summary of ‘Competence’ Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted-R Square</th>
<th>Std.Error-of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>Adjusted-R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.-F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.554a</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.35478</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>92.072</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Competence

Further, ANOVA was used to test whether the regression model was significantly fitting in predicting the outcome as shown in Table 4.13. The regression model significantly improved the ability of the dimension of ‘competence’ to predict job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. The F-ratio was 92.07 (P<.05) and thus the model was significant. As such the null hypothesis that there was no significant relationship between the ‘competence’ cognition of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County (\( H_{02} \)) was rejected; and the alternative that there was a significant relationship between the ‘competence’ cognition of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction was adopted.
Table 4.13: ANOVA of ‘Competence’ Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>11.589</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.589</td>
<td>92.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>26.180</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.769</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction
b. Predictors: (Constant), Competence

In addition, the β coefficient for the independent variable ‘competence’ psychological empowerment was generated from the model and subjected to a t-test, in order to test the hypothesis under study. The t-test was used to measure whether the predictor was making a significant contribution to the model. Table 4.14 shows the estimates of β-value and the contribution of ‘competence’ psychological empowerment predictor to the model.

Table 4.14: Coefficients of ‘Competence’ Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zero-order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.371</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>5.814</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>9.595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction

The β-value for ‘competence’ psychological empowerment had a positive coefficient, depicting a positive relationship with job satisfaction of guest house supervisors as summarized in the model as:
\[ Y = 1.371 + .559X + \varepsilon \] ………………………………………………………………………………… 2

Where: \( Y = \) job satisfaction, \( X = e^{-'competence'} \) psychological empowerment, \( \varepsilon = \) error term

From these findings the \( t \)-test associated with \( \beta \)-values was significant thus the ‘competence’ cognition of psychological empowerment predictor was making a significant contribution to the model. The coefficient results showed that the predicted parameter in relation to the independent factor was significant (\( \beta_1 = 0.559, P<0.05 \)). Therefore, the study rejected the null hypothesis (\( H_{02} \)) which stated that there was no significant relationship between the ‘competence’ dimension of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. The findings denoted that for each unit increase in the ‘competence’ psychological empowerment, there was 0.559 units increase in job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. This implied that the more competent the supervisors felt the more likely they were satisfied with their jobs.

These findings agreed with Carless (2004) that in the cognitions of empowerment, ‘competence’ was a significant indicator of job satisfaction. The findings were also in line with the findings by Spreitzer (2008) that there was a significant positive relationship between ‘competence’ psychological empowerment and job satisfaction.

However, the findings of the current study were in disagreement with Liden, \textit{et al.} (2009) who argued that the competence cognition had significant negative relationship
with job satisfaction. The findings of the current study further disagreed with Dickson and Lorenz (2009) who indicated that the competence cognition of psychological empowerment did not have any relationship with job satisfaction. The current research revealed that an improved level of competence accordingly appeared to be linked with increased levels of job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County. The differences between the findings of the current study and mentioned studies could be associated with contextual differences as the later study was done in Kenya while the former two studies were done in Western countries.

4.6 Relationship between ‘Choice’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment and Job Satisfaction

The third objective of this study was to determine the influence of the ‘choice’ cognition of psychological empowerment on job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County.

4.6.1 Descriptive Statistics of ‘Choice’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment

The ‘choice’ dimension of psychological empowerment statements were computed using descriptive statistics as summarized in Table 4.15. About 46.7% of the respondents
(n=98) recorded neutral results on whether they had significant autonomy in determining how to do their job and while 6.7% disagreed on autonomy. Only 46.7% of the respondents indicated that they had autonomy in making decisions at the work place. This implied that more than half of respondents (53.4%) felt that they did not have adequate autonomy in decision making in their work roles. A mean of 3.47 and standard deviation of 0.720 was in support of this. Another 43.4% of the respondents (n=94) opined that they decided on their own how to go about doing their work as supported by a mean score of 3.23 and standard deviation of 0.992, with 20% disagreeing and 36.7% undecided. This implied that 56.7% indicated that they did not decide on their own on how to go about their work activities.

A further 43.3% (n=91) were neutral on whether they had considerable opportunity for independence and freedom when doing their jobs, with 40% agreeing and 16.7% disagreed. This implied that 60% of the respondents felt that there was little opportunity for independence and freedom in discharging their duties. A mean score of 3.27 and standard deviation of 1.027 was in support of this. The ‘choice’ psychological empowerment had an average mean score of 3.32. Majority of the respondents disagreed that they had significant autonomy in determining how their job was done, making own decisions, and whether they had considerable opportunity for independence and freedom doing their job.
Table 4.15: Descriptive Statistics of ‘Choice’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My autonomy is significant in determining how I do my job</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I decide on my own how to go about doing my work</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do my job</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The choice cognition of psychological empowerment indicates the autonomy over the initiation and continuation of work behaviour and processes. As such, this aspect regarded guest house supervisors’ choice of how they did their jobs, decisions on how they did it, opportunities for independence and freedom in deciding how they did it. The results of this study indicated that the respondents disagreed that they had autonomy of decision making with a mean value of 3.32 in a scale of 1 to 5. From this it can implied that supervisors of the guest houses had unsatisfactory authority of determining their job, making decisions and using personal initiation in their jobs. This consequently would affect the quality of service delivered to the customers as there would be slower responses in service recovery efforts (Hamborstad & Perry, 2011).
The results of the guest houses supervisors’ questionnaire were supported by findings from the observation checklist. However, the observation check list findings revealed lower levels of ‘choice’ psychological empowerment than the recorded responses from the questionnaire. This was presented in Table 4.16. In order to establish the autonomy of the guest house supervisors in making decisions, the researcher requested them if he could visit their areas of work, that is, the guest rooms, the restaurant and the kitchen. It was observed that in most of the guest houses (N=53, 72.6%) the supervisors had to consult their managers, denoting the low levels of decision making authority. In addition, it was observed that in a large number of the guest houses (N=58, 79.5%) the supervisors were making a lot of consultations with their managers in their work activities.

The two aspects were used by the researcher to gauge the choice cognition, and the results implied low levels of decision making authority of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County. This could perhaps be related to the low levels of formal training in hospitality in guest houses in Mombasa County as revealed by the study. It could also be due to the age of the supervisors as revealed by the study that a large number of guest house supervisors were below the age of 30 years, hence could be having the fear of making wrong decisions.
Table 4.16: Descriptive Statistics of ‘Choice’ Cognition from Observation Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request the supervisor to see certain items. Did he/she consult?</th>
<th>Yes (Average)</th>
<th>No (Average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there a lot of consultations with the manager when handling customers?</td>
<td>58 79.5</td>
<td>15 20.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.2 Correlations between ‘Choice’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment and Job Satisfaction

The relationship between the cognition of ‘choice’ of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction was investigated using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient as shown in Table 4.17. The results indicated a positive influence of ‘choice’ psychological empowerment on job satisfaction ($r = .734, p<0.05$). These results indicated that there existed a strong linear relationship between ‘choice’ psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. This implied that the more the ‘choice’ psychological empowerment was implemented the more the job satisfaction of supervisors of guest houses was improving.
Table 4.17: Correlations of ‘Choice’ Psychological Empowerment and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.734**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

b. Listwise N=210

The findings of this study indicated that the cognition of ‘choice’ strongly influenced job satisfaction. These results were in agreement with Ponton (2011) in his study of the Australian hospitality industry where he posited that the more ‘autonomy’ granted to employees the more they felt satisfied with their jobs. Further, the results of the current study were in line with the findings by Tsai, et al. (2013) who in their study in Taiwanese hotels found low levels of ‘decision making’ empowerment, which in turn had led to low job satisfaction.

In addition, the current study concurred with Sut & Chad (2011) who argued that Chinese hotel managers were using empowerment to grant workers autonomy and authority to solve work problems by themselves. These actions had fostered job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and eventually had ensured low turnover intention among these hospitality employees. Hsiang-Fei, et al. (2014) in their study on empowering
hospitality employees in China also posited that employees who possessed autonomy in performing their duties were more satisfied with their jobs.

Further, the current study concurred with the findings by Buitendach & Hlalele (2005) who found a correlation of a large effect between the cognition of ‘choice’ and job satisfaction among engineers in a petrochemical industry in South Africa. Additionally, it agrees with Mohsen (2014) who found a high correlation between ‘choice’ and job satisfaction among Egyptian employees in the hospitality industry. Locally, the results of the current study were in line with Gachunga, et al. (2016) who posited a positive relationship between the cognition of choice and job satisfaction among civil servants working in public organizations in the education sector. Therefore, this research strongly supported that the choice cognition of psychological empowerment was a significant determinant of guest house supervisors’ job satisfaction in Mombasa County.

4.6.3 Linear Regression of ‘Choice’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment

To explore whether there was significant relationship between the ‘choice’ dimension of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County, a linear regression model was utilized. ‘Choice’ psychological empowerment was used to predict job satisfaction of guest house supervisors as summarized in Table 4.18. From the model, \( R^2 = .538 \) showed that the predictor accounted for 53.8% variation in job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. The predictor used in the model captured the variation in the job satisfaction of guest
house supervisors. The model caused adjusted $R^2$ to change from zero to .538 and this change gave rise to an $F$-ratio of 242.61, which was significant at a probability of .05.

Table 4.18: Model Summary of ‘Choice’ Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted-R Square</th>
<th>Std.Error-of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.734$^a$</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>.28951</td>
<td>.538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Choice

Further, ANOVA was utilized to test whether the regression model was significantly fitting in predicting the outcome as shown in Table 4.19. The regression model significantly improved the ability to predict the job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. The $F$-ratio was 242.61 ($P<.05$) and thus the model was significant. As such the null hypothesis that there was no significant relationship between the ‘choice’ cognition of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County ($H_{O3}$) was rejected; and the alternative that there was a significant relationship between the ‘choice’ cognition of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction was adopted.

Table 4.19: ANOVA of ‘Choice’ Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>20.335</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.335</td>
<td>242.606</td>
<td>.000$^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>17.434</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37.769</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction
b. Predictors: (Constant), Choice
In addition, the $\beta$ coefficient for independent variable ‘choice’ psychological empowerment was generated from the model and subjected to a $t$-test, in order to test the hypothesis under study. The $t$-test was used to measure whether the ‘choice’ psychological empowerment was making a significant contribution to the model. Table 4.20 shows the estimates of $\beta$-value and the contribution of ‘choice’ psychological empowerment as a predictor to the model.

Table 4.20: Coefficients of ‘Choice’ Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.919</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td></td>
<td>.734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction

The $\beta$-value for ‘choice’ psychological empowerment had positive coefficient, depicting a positive relationship with job satisfaction of guest house supervisors as summarized in the model as:

$$Y = 1.919 + .503X + \varepsilon$$

Where: $Y =$ job satisfaction, $X =$ ‘choice’ psychological empowerment, $\varepsilon =$ error term
From the findings the $t$-test associated with $\beta$-values was significant and the ‘choice’ psychological empowerment predictor was making a significant contribution to the model. The coefficient results showed that the predicted parameter in relation to the independent factor was significant ($\beta_1 = 0.503, P<0.05$). This meant that the study rejected the null hypothesis ($H_0$). The findings indicated that for each unit increase in the ‘choice’ psychological empowerment, there was 0.503 units increase in job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. This implied that the more autonomy and authority in making decisions granted to guest house supervisors the more they felt satisfied with their jobs.

These findings agreed with Fiksembaun (2010) who indicated that when ‘choice’ was not present, individuals felt helpless and dissatisfied with their jobs because they had no discretion of taking job-related decisions that they deemed appropriate. This seriously affected customer service delivery and consequently decreasing customer satisfaction (Clinton & Wong, 2012).

The current study findings also concurred with Karthik, Priyanko & Puiwa (2014) who did a survey of 365 frontline employees in 40 units of a chain restaurant in the USA about leader empowering behaviors and employee psychological empowerment. They posited that the major methods that psychological empowerment could be realized were through trusting and allowing workers to make decisions concerning their work activities. They further indicated that this had a significant influence on employees feeling satisfied with their work roles. Therefore, the current study supported that it was
of utmost importance for management of guest houses to grant their employees autonomy of making work related decisions which not only would improve their job satisfaction but also enhance customer service delivery.

4.7 Influence of ‘Impact’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment on Job Satisfaction of Guest House Supervisors

The fourth objective of this study was to establish the influence of the ‘impact’ cognition of psychological empowerment on job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County.

4.7.1 Descriptive Statistics of ‘Impact’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment

The ‘impact’ psychological empowerment statements were computed using descriptive statistics as summarized in Table 4.21. Majority of the respondents (n=182, 86.7%) opined that they had some influence on what happened in their departments, with 6.7% being neutral and 6.7% disagreeing. A mean of 3.9 and standard deviation of 0.652 was in support of this. Another 70% of the respondents (n=147) indicated that they had a great deal of control over what happened in their departments as supported by a mean score of 3.77 and standard deviation of 0.669, with 26.7% recording neutral and 3.3% indicating that they had no control.
A further 73.3% of the respondents (n=154) said that they had significant influence over what happened in their departments with 23.3% being neutral and 3.3% disagreeing. A mean score of 3.77 and standard deviation of 0.763 was in support of this. The overall ‘impact’ psychological empowerment had a high mean score of 3.81. The implication of these results was that majority of the respondents felt that their ideas and opinions (impact) were put into consideration by the management of the guest houses, despite the fact that they had limited decision making power.

Table 4.21: Descriptive Statistics of ‘Impact’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have large impact on what is happening in my organization/department</td>
<td>14 6.7</td>
<td>14 6.7</td>
<td>161 76.7</td>
<td>21 10.0</td>
<td>3.90 .652</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My control is big over what happens in my organization/department</td>
<td>7 3.3</td>
<td>56 26.7</td>
<td>126 60.0</td>
<td>21 10.0</td>
<td>3.77 .669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My influence is significant over what happens in my organization/department</td>
<td>7 3.3</td>
<td>49 23.3</td>
<td>133 63.3</td>
<td>21 10.0</td>
<td>3.77 .763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.81 .620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ‘impact’ cognition includes the feeling that employees have control over their job activities to some extent, and that they got some impact over the departmental and company’s decisions. This consists of staff influence on what happens in their departments, their extent of control on their departments and their participation in making of decisions. The findings of this study indicated that most of the respondents were positive on their responses. The mean value of 3.81 generally showed that the impact of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County on their jobs, responsibilities and departmental issues was moderately above average.

The questionnaire findings were strongly supported by findings from the observation check list as shown in Table 4.22. The researcher requested the supervisors if he could see the duty rotas they had made for the staff in their sections. In 55 guest houses (72.6%) the supervisors availed the rotas and stated that they made them in consultation with their managers. In 18 guest houses, the supervisors alluded that they did not have them because they were made by their managers. In addition, the researcher was keen to observe whether the supervisors held staff briefings in their sections. It was observed that in 50 guest houses (68.5%), staff briefings were held. This pointed to the extent that the supervisors were involved in the decisions of running their sections. The two aspects were used by the researcher to gauge the level of ‘impact’ psychological empowerment of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County. The findings from the observation check list were pointing to the direction that the supervisors were involved in the running of their sections and had opportunities to make contributions.
Table 4.2: Descriptive Statistics of ‘Impact’ from Observation Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes (Average)</th>
<th>No (Average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask to see the contributions of the supervisors have made.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are they available? Are there departmental staff briefings?</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7.2 Correlations between ‘Impact’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment and Job Satisfaction

The influence of ‘impact’ psychological empowerment on job satisfaction was investigated using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient as shown on Table 4.23. There was found to be a positive influence of ‘impact’ psychological empowerment on job satisfaction ($r=0.868$, $p<0.05$). This indicated that there was a strong linear relationship between ‘impact’ psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. This implied that the more ‘impact’ psychological empowerment was adopted the more the job satisfaction of supervisors of guest houses improved.
Table 4.23: Correlations of ‘Impact’ Psychological Empowerment and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.868**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

b. Listwise N=210

These findings indicated that the dimension of ‘impact’ of psychological empowerment positively influenced guest house supervisors’ job satisfaction. These results concurred with the findings by Sut & Chad (2011) in their research in the Chinese hotel industry. They argued that managers should encourage employees to contribute their ideas and opinions as this enhanced job satisfaction. Employees also felt that their seniors were listening to their voices; and their ideas impacted on their organization’s performance. They established that this had a direct influence on the employees’ commitment in their jobs. The current study further agreed with the Hsiang-Fei, et al. (2014) who indicated that power and impact are conducive to displaying a higher degree of job satisfaction among hospitality employees.

Moreover, the results of this study were in line with the Turkish hospitality industry study done by Elbeyi, et al. (2011) concerning empowerment and job satisfaction. Majority of the respondents in the Turkish study indicated that when they influenced decisions in
their organizations they felt a great sense of satisfaction; and felt that they were valuable members of the whole team. This made employees feel that their contribution indeed counted. In addition, the findings of the current study was in concurrence with Buitendach & Hlalele (2005) who found a correlation of a large effect between the dimension of ‘impact’ and job satisfaction among engineers in a petrochemical industry in South Africa. It further agreed with Gachunga, et al. (2016) who posited a positive correlation between ‘impact’ and job satisfaction among civil servants in four public organizations in the education sector in Kenya.

4.7.3 Linear Regression of ‘Impact’ Cognition of Psychological Empowerment

To find out whether there was significant influence of the ‘impact’ dimension of psychological empowerment on job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County, a linear regression model was used. ‘Impact’ psychological empowerment was used to predict job satisfaction of guest house supervisors as summarized in Table 4.24. From the model, \( R^2 = .753 \) showed that the predictor accounted for 75.3% variation in job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. The predictor used in the model captured the variation in the job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. The change statistics was used to test whether the change in adjusted \( R^2 \) was significant using the F-ratio. The model caused adjusted \( R^2 \) to change from zero to .753 and this change gave rise to an F-ratio of 634.233, which was significant at a probability of .05.
Table 4.24: Model Summary of ‘Impact’ Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted-R Square</th>
<th>Std.Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.-F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.868*</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.21176</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>634.233</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Impact

Additionally, ANOVA was used to test whether the regression model was significantly fitting in predicting the outcome as shown in Table 4.25. The regression model significantly improved the ability to predict the job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. The F- ratio was 634.23 (P<.05) and thus the model was significant. As such, the null hypothesis that there was no significant relationship between the ‘impact’ cognition of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County (H_{04}) was rejected; and the alternative that there was a significant relationship between the ‘impact’ cognition of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction was adopted.

Table 4.25: ANOVA of ‘Impact’ Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.442</td>
<td>634.233</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37.769</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction
b. Predictors: (Constant), Impact

Further, the β coefficient for independent variable ‘impact’ psychological empowerment was generated from the model and subjected to a t-test, in order to test the hypothesis under study (H_{04}). The t-test was used to measure whether the predictor was making a
significant contribution to the model. Table 4.26 shows the estimates of β-value and the contribution of ‘impact’ psychological empowerment predictor to the model.

Table 4.26: Coefficients of ‘Impact’ Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Zero-order</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>1.370</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>15.121</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>25.184</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>.868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction

The β-value for ‘impact’ psychological empowerment had positive coefficient, depicting a positive relationship with job satisfaction of guest house supervisors as summarized in the model as:

\[ Y = 1.370 + .595X + \varepsilon \]

Where: \( Y \) = job satisfaction, \( X \) = ‘impact’ psychological empowerment, \( \varepsilon \) = error term

From these results the \( t \)-test associated with β-values was significant and ‘impact’ psychological empowerment predictor made a significant contribution to the model. The coefficients results showed that the predicted parameter in relation to the independent factor was significant (\( \beta_1 = 0.595, P<0.05 \)). Therefore, this implied that the study rejected the null hypothesis (\( H_{04} \)); which stated that there was no
significant relationship between the ‘impact’ dimension of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. The results indicated that for each unit increase in the ‘impact’ psychological empowerment, there was 0.595 units increase in job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. The findings showed that the more guest house supervisors felt that they had impact on departmental and organizational matters, the higher their job satisfaction.

This finding of the study agreed with Carless, (2004) that impact was a significant predictor of job satisfaction. For the impact dimension, individuals derive a sense of job satisfaction when they feel they have been directly involved in decision-making; the more satisfied they should be with the work itself. The results were also in concurrence with Dickson and Lorenz (2009) who found that the impact cognition of psychological empowerment had a significant positive relationship with job satisfaction. However, the current study findings were in sharp disagreement with Liden, et al. (2009) who stated that there was no positive relationship between ‘impact’ and job satisfaction. This study’s results also differed with Spreitzer (2008) who indicated that no relationship existed between the two variables. This difference could be associated with contextual differences as the current study was done in Kenya while the former two studies were done in Western countries.
4.8 Relationship between Overall Psychological Empowerment and Job Satisfaction

The fifth objective of this study was to examine the relationship between the overall psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County.

4.8.1 Descriptive Statistics of Overall Psychological Empowerment

The overall psychological empowerment was computed by use of descriptive statistics of the four cognitions as summarized in Table 4.27. The overall psychological empowerment mean was found to be 3.70 with a standard deviation of 0.710 in a scale of 1 to 5. This implied that a lot of efforts were needed in guest houses Mombasa County in order to achieve total psychological empowerment among their supervisors.

Table 4.27 Descriptive Statistics of Overall Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8.2 Multiple Regression Analysis of Overall Psychological Empowerment and Job Satisfaction

Regression analysis was done to establish how much the independent sub-variables (meaning, competence, choice and impact) explained the dependent variable (job satisfaction). It was also used to understand by how much each independent sub-variable explained the dependent variable. The researcher analyzed the conceptual framework of psychological empowerment by entering them into the multiple regression equation: competence, meaning, impact and choice. The model summary in Table 4.28 presents how much of the variance in the dependent variable (job satisfaction) was explained by the model. The multiple coefficient of determination denoted as R square was 0.857.

**Table 4.28: Model Summary of Overall Psychological Empowerment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted-R Square</th>
<th>Std.Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.-F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>.16248</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>306.431</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Impact, Competence, Choice, Meaning

The value of the R square indicated that 85.7 percent of variance in the variable supervisors’ job satisfaction was explained by the model. To check overestimation of the model the adjusted R Square should be considered. The adjusted R square was 0.854 and it indicated only a slight overestimation of the model. The regression model was statistically significant since the probability level was 0.000. The F-ratio was 306.43 and significant (P<.05). The model significantly improved the ability to predict the job
satisfaction. Thus the model was significant and as such the null hypothesis ($H_0$) which stated that there was no significant relationship between the overall psychological empowerment and job satisfaction was rejected; and the alternative that there was a significant relationship between overall psychological empowerment and job satisfaction was adopted.

4.8.3 Coefficients of Psychological Empowerment

From the study the $\beta$ coefficients for independent variables were generated from the model and used to test the hypothesis under study. The $t$-test was used as a measure to identify whether the predictors were making a significant contribution to the model. Table 4.29 shows the estimates of $\beta$ values and gave the contribution of the predictor to the model. The $\beta$ values explained the relationship between job satisfaction and the predictor psychological empowerment.

Table 4.29: Coefficients of Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>6.710</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.765 .412 .171 .469</td>
<td>2.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>6.482</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.554 .314 .125 .764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>4.730</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.535 .314 .125 .764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>7.808</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.734 .479 .206 .584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>10.075</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.868 .575 .266 .355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction
The positive β values indicated the positive relationship that existed between the predictor and the outcome. The β value for psychological empowerment had a positive coefficient thus there existed a positive relationship with job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. In predicting job satisfaction in guest houses, it was found that ‘impact’ was the most critical component (β 0.307, \(t=10.07\)) followed by ‘choice’ (β = 0.185, \(t=7.808\)), then ‘competence’ (β = 0.144, \(t=4.73\)) and finally ‘meaning’ (β = 0.142, \(t=6.382\)) as summarized in the model below;

\[ Y = 0.743 + 0.307Z_1 + 0.185Z_2 + 0.144Z_3 + 0.142Z_4 + \varepsilon \]

**Where:** Y = job satisfaction and \(\varepsilon = \) error term

\(Z_1 = \) impact, \(Z_2 = \) choice, \(Z_3 = \) competence, \(Z_4 = \) meaning

From the significance value (p<0.05) in Table 4.27 it was possible to interpret whether the particular independent variable had a significant relationship with the dependent variable. The results showed there existed a significant correlation for meaning, impact, competence and choice with job satisfaction, relative to each other. This implied that these variables were significant predictors of the dependent variable, that is, supervisors’ job satisfaction. The multiple regression results in Table 4.29 indicated that psychological empowerment dimensions meaning (β= 0.250, p< 0.05); impact (β= 0.447, p< 0.05); competence (β= 0.143, p< 0.05) and choice (β= 0.270, p< 0.05) had positive and significant influence on employees’ job satisfaction. Therefore, the conclusion was that
all the psychological empowerment dimensions had positive and significant influence (at p< 0.05) on job satisfaction.

The results of this study strongly concurred with Osman and Georgiana (2015) in their study in Romania about psychological empowerment and how it fostered job satisfaction of hotel frontline staff which posited that employees high in psychological empowerment were more satisfied with their jobs. Their results further reported that psychological empowerment enhanced work engagement that in turn led to low labour turnover. Similarly, the current study agreed with Buitendach & Hlalele (2005) who found a positive relationship between overall psychological empowerment and job satisfaction among South African petrochemical industry engineers.

The current study also aimed to identify which of the cognitions of psychological empowerment contributed highly to prediction of the dependent variable (job satisfaction). This information was investigated via Standardized coefficient Beta as shown in Table 4.29. The highest Beta value was 0.447 for ‘impact’, second was 0.270 for ‘choice’, thirdly was 0.250 for ‘meaning’ and finally 0.143 for ‘competence’. The findings implied that the variables impact, choice and meaning made the strongest contribution in explaining the dependent variable supervisor’s job satisfaction. Competence was found to contribute the least to job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County. Nevertheless, all these independent variables were significantly related to the dependent variable and were good predictors.
These findings enabled to deduce that the model explained 85.7 percent of the variance in job satisfaction. The variables represented good predictors of the dependent variable. This finding agreed with Jun and Lee (2009) in their study of South Korean hotels who found that the four psychological empowerment cognitions additively significantly predicted job satisfaction. It further concurred with Osman & Georgiana (2015) in their study on hotel frontline employees’ psychological capital and job satisfaction in Romania. They posited that employees high in the four tenets of psychological capital are more satisfied with their jobs. Addition, Geralis & Terziovski (2003) on their study revealed that empowerment practices, when implemented simultaneously, were linked to higher job satisfaction of Australian bank employees. The regression analysis showed that all of the four dimensions of psychological empowerment significantly predicted job satisfaction. This implied that employees who had higher degree of psychological empowerment also had higher level of job satisfaction.

Researchers in Africa have also found the overall psychological empowerment to be related to job satisfaction. These include Nicolaides (2012) in his analysis of the South African hospitality industry, Esther & Allen (2012) in their study on staffing issues among hotels in the Volta Region in Ghana and Osman (2012) in his study on the perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, and performance outcomes in Cameroon. They posited that psychological empowerment strongly influenced employee job satisfaction in their respective studies.
However, the findings of this study disagreed with Robert, *et al.* (2000) as quoted by Sut & Chad (2011) in their study about employee empowerment, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In their study, the psychological empowerment - job satisfaction relationship was revealed to be negative in an Indian hotel sample. The findings of the current study also disagreed with the research by Bhatnagar (2007) and Chen & Chen (2008) who found that some of the sub-dimensions of psychological empowerment were negatively or not correlated with job satisfaction in India and Taiwan respectively. This difference could be because of contextual differences of the study samples.

The current study revealed that all four tenets of psychological empowerment were positively correlated to job satisfaction. Therefore, increasing psychological empowerment of guest house supervisors would lead to increased feeling of satisfaction with their jobs. This was consistent with the research findings by Kazlauskaite, *et al.* (2012) in Lithuania hotels who found that overall psychological empowerment was positively related to job satisfaction and organizational loyalty. Similarly, Chiang and Hsieh (2012) found that psychological empowerment of employees positively influenced job satisfaction and performance in hotels in Taiwan. However, it is important to note that the results of the relationship between the four cognitions of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction have been found to be varied from study to study (Dickson & Lorenz, 2009; Carless, 2004; Liden, *et al.* 2009).
4.9 Influence of Demographics on Job Satisfaction

The sixth objective of this study was to find out the relationship between guest house supervisors’ demographics and their job satisfaction in the County of Mombasa.

4.9.1 Correlation on the Influence of Demographic Factors on Job Satisfaction

Pearson product moment correlation was used to establish the influence of demographic factors on job satisfaction as shown in Table 4.30. There was found to be a positive influence of age (r = .117) on job satisfaction. This implied that as age increased, job satisfaction also increased. Additionally, it was found that there was a negative influence of guest house supervisors’ gender (r = -.144), education (r = -.115) and number of years worked (r = -.132) on job satisfaction. This implied that as the gender of the supervisors, their level of education and the number of years they had worked increased, there was a decline in job satisfaction. This could possibly be explained by the fact that as the supervisors gained age and experience, they became dissatisfied with the intrinsic and extrinsic motivations of their jobs, such as, inadequate levels of autonomy and low salaries.
**Table 4.30: Correlation on the Influence of Demographic Factors on Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Years worked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.144*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.144*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>-.221**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.397**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years worked</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>-.162**</td>
<td>.275**</td>
<td>-.255**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

4.9.2 Linear Regression of Influence of Demographic Factors on Job Satisfaction

A linear regression model was used to explore the relationship between demographic factors and job satisfaction as summarized in Table 4.31. From the model, \( R^2 = .077 \) showed that the predictors accounted for 7.7% variation in job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. The predictors used in the model captured the variation in the job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. The model caused adjusted \( R^2 \) to change from zero to .077 and this change gave rise to an F-ratio of 4.264, which was significant at a probability of 0.05.
Table 4.31: Model Summary of Demographic Factors and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted-R Square</th>
<th>Std.Error-of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.41242</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>4.264</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Gender, Education, Age, Years worked

The regression model significantly improved the ability to predict the job satisfaction of guest house supervisors as shown in Table 4.32. The F-ratio was 4.264 (P<.05) and thus the model was significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there was no significant relationship between demographic characteristics and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County (H0_6) was rejected; and the alternative that there was a significant relationship between demographic characteristics and job satisfaction was adopted.

Table 4.32: ANOVA of Demographic Factors and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2.901</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>4.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>34.868</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37.769</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction
b. Predictors: (Constant), Gender, Education, Age, Years worked

In addition, the β coefficients for the independent variable (demographic factors) were generated in order to test the hypothesis under study. The t-test was used as to measure whether the predictor was making a significant contribution to the model. Table 4.33 shows the estimates of β-value and the contribution of demographic factors predictor to the model. The β-value for age had a positive coefficient, depicting a positive
relationship with job satisfaction of guest house supervisors; while gender, education and number of years worked had a negative relationship as summarized in the model as:

\[ Y = 4.269 + .054(\text{age}) - 151(\text{gender}) - 0.063(\text{education}) - 140(\text{years worked}) + \varepsilon \]

Table 4.33: Coefficients of Demographic Factors and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.269</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>16.535</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>-.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>-.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years worked</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.216</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings the \( t \)-test associated with \( \beta \)-values for demographic factors were significant predictors and were making significant contribution to the model. The multiple regression results indicated that demographic factors dimensions: gender (\( \beta = -0.151, p<0.05 \)); education (\( \beta = -0.063, p>0.05 \)) and number of years worked (\( \beta = -0.140, p<0.05 \)) had negative relationship with employees’ job satisfaction. This implied that as the level of education and number of years/experience increased, job satisfaction decreased. Only age (\( \beta = 0.054, p>0.05 \)) was found to have a positive relationship with job satisfaction; implying that as supervisors’ age increased, their job satisfaction also increased. However, the \( \beta \)-value indicated that it was a weak linear relationship between
the two variables. This could possibly be explained by the fact that as the supervisors’ age increased, their personal responsibilities also increased. Hence, they had to value their jobs as the source of meeting their responsibilities and their livelihood. Similarly, Ruta (2011) opined that older employees demonstrated higher job satisfaction in hotels in Lithuania, establishing that the two variables were positively related. Similarly, the findings of the current study revealed that there was a positive relationship between age and job satisfaction, although it was a very weak relationship. This implied that as supervisors’ age increased, their level of job satisfaction increased too. This could possibly be explained by the increased responsibilities of a person as they get older and the need to settle down.

The findings of this study indicated that the number of years worked (experience) had a negative linear relationship with job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County. This implied that as the supervisors’ experience increased their job satisfaction decreased. These findings agreed with some older findings by Clark & Oswald (1996) who stated that longer experience may sometimes result in low levels of job satisfaction. This was revealed by the negative relationship between the number of years worked and job satisfaction. Interestingly, this was a sharp contrast of the findings by Dickson & Lorenz, (2009) which indicated that there was a positive linear relationship between job experience and job satisfaction. This disparity could be explained by some of the extrinsic factors mentioned by the respondents in the open ended questions, such as, low salaries and poor working conditions.
Moreover, the findings of this study were in agreement with the findings by Chan, Ng & Casmir (2010) who argued that demographic characteristics of employees in the hospitality industry such as gender affected job satisfaction. It further concurred with Kim, Lee, Murrmann & George (2012) who suggested that gender of employees had a large impact on their job satisfaction. It additionally agreed with Nadiri & Tanova (2010) in their investigation on the role of justice in turnover intentions, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour in the hospitality industry in Turkey who argued that male and female employees tend to think, feel, value and act differently from each other in the workplace and therefore affecting their job satisfaction. The current study also strongly supported the findings by Ng & Pine (2010) who noted that gender affected job satisfaction of hotel managers, in their study about men and women hotel managers in Hong Kong hospitality industry.

It is of importance to note that Derya, et al. (2012) in his study designed to address gender differences and employee job satisfaction of hotels staff in Turkey indicated that there existed a wide range of conflicting results in literature concerning demographics and job satisfaction.

4.10 Extrinsic Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction

The seventh objective of this study was to find out the extrinsic factors which affect job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County. Information for this
objective was collected using open ended questions where respondents had the freedom of giving their opinions on what their managers should do to enhance their feeling of job satisfaction. Majority of the respondents (n=119, 56.7%) indicated that their managers should consider increasing salaries to enhance their satisfaction and ability to perform their duties as supervisors as shown on Table 4.34. This finding was in tandem with the findings by George (2013) who suggested that salary is a significant predictor in determining job satisfaction and ability of employees to perform their duties effectively.

Table 4.34: Actions to Enhance the General Feeling of Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of service (permanent basis)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee welfare (e.g. medical cover)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work facilities and conditions</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>210</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elbeyi, et al. (2011) in their study that aimed at determining the effect of employee empowerment on job satisfaction of employees in hotels in Turkey, established that majority of the employees were not satisfied with the salaries they received. They reported that this in turn affected their job satisfaction in general. Moreover, Derya, et al. (2012) in their study in five-star hotels in Ankara, argued that how much income an employee got paid played a significant role towards job satisfaction. Additionally, Tsai, et al. (2013) in their study about the drivers of hospitality industry employees’ job satisfaction in Taiwan discovered that employees’ job satisfaction was low due to low wages and salaries. From these studies done in other parts of the world, there was a clear
indication that job satisfaction was closely related to employee salaries and the current study strongly agreed with them. Infact, salaries were found to be the strongest extrinsic element affecting job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County.

Another 33.3% of the respondents indicated that managers of guest houses should provide better working facilities and conditions. This finding was in tandem with the findings by Connolly & Myers (2011) who argued that the employees’ work setting and conditions might be linked to increasing job satisfaction. The specific issues pointed out included items such as proper lighting, temperatures, ventilation, working hours, rest rooms and noise levels. Similarly, Esther & Allen (2012) in their study on staffing issues in Ghanian hotels revealed that among the issues which needed to be handled by managers concerning employees’ job satisfaction were working conditions and working hours. This was in concurrence with the findings revealed by the current study. Other studies which have been done in the past have also indicated that workers have preference for work settings that are comfortable, clean and safe (Robbins, 2012). Therefore, working conditions were indicated by guest house supervisors in Mombasa County as another major action area by managers in enhancing their job satisfaction and performance.

In addition, another 6.7% of the respondents stated that the managers should improve their terms of employment, that is, employ them on contract or permanent basis and promote them accordingly. Many of the guest house supervisors indicated that they did not even have appointment letters and were engaged on casual basis. This was indicated
by the respondents as another major area which needed improvement from the side of the management of guest houses in Mombasa County. This finding concurred strongly with George (2013) who suggested that those employees who perceived that they were not properly employed and promotion decisions were not made fairly were most likely to experience low job satisfaction. It also agreed with Tatsapaugh (1994) who revealed that if there were no opportunities for advancement (promotion) on the job and poor terms of service were factors which affected job satisfaction negatively, hence tempting employees to quit their jobs. Additionally, George (2013) alluded that better terms of service and opportunities for advancement were some of the top priorities that employees desired in their jobs.

A smaller percentage (3.3%) indicated that through provision of proper employee welfare (for instance, bonuses, staff transport and medical cover) they would be facilitated to perform their work activities and therefore enhancing their job satisfaction. This finding agreed with Esther & Allen (2012) who argued that fringe benefits such a medical cover and financial rewards could be used by hotel managers to enhance employee job satisfaction and performance. Similarly, this finding was in tandem with Tsai, Cheng & Chang (2013) who found that employees’ welfare contributed to job satisfaction and performance in the hotel industry in Taiwan.

These findings revealed that the major extrinsic factor towards job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County was ‘salaries’ which respondents indicated that they should be raised to enhance the general feeling of ability to perform their duties as
supervisors. The second element which respondents indicated managers should work on was the provision of better work conditions and freedom of decision making. The third item for managers to work on as indicated by the respondents was the terms of employment. The last issue indicated by the respondents was the employment welfare. It was also important to point out that all the respondents (N=210, 100%) indicated that they thought there was a direct relationship between the feeling of empowerment and job satisfaction.

This study went further to find out about the factors that the guest house supervisors were satisfied with in their job. Half of the respondents (N=105, 50%) indicated that they were satisfied with teamwork and cooperation among co-workers as shown on Table 4.35. Another 43.3% (N=91) stated that they were satisfied with the flexibility of shifts while 6.7% indicated that their employer paid them on time. These findings showed that despite the shortfalls the respondents had pointed out about their jobs, the guest houses were showing efforts in encouraging teamwork spirit, introducing flexible shifts and payment of salaries on time to achieve total employee satisfaction. In conclusion, all the respondents indicated that they felt that there was a relationship between being empowered and being satisfied with their jobs.

### Table 4.35: Actions by Managers that Made Supervisors Satisfied with their Jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexible shifts</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment on time</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>210</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the study findings, draws conclusions, makes recommendations and finally gives suggestions for further research.

5.2 Summary of Findings

The first objective of the study was to establish the effect of the ‘meaning’ dimension of psychological empowerment on job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County. The findings indicated that ‘meaning’ psychological empowerment was rated highly by the respondents. This implied that employees of guest houses believed that their work was significant to them and to the organization. The ‘meaning’ cognition of psychological empowerment was found to positively influence job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. There was a strong linear relationship between ‘meaning’ psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors \[ r = .765, n = 210, p<.05 \]. The \( \beta \)-value for the meaning cognition had a positive coefficient \( (\beta_1 = 0.453, P<0.05) \), depicting positive relationship with job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. The higher the supervisors found the work they performed to be consistent with their beliefs, the higher they tended to be satisfied with their jobs. The ‘meaning’
psychological empowerment made a significant contribution to the model. The null hypothesis that there was no significant relationship between the ‘meaning’ dimension of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County ($H_{01}$) was rejected; and the alternative that there was a significant relationship between the ‘meaning’ dimension of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction was adopted.

The second objective of the study was to establish the influence of the ‘competence’ dimension of psychological empowerment on job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County. The competence dimension indicated that the supervisors were confident about their ability to do their jobs and had mastered the skills necessary for the jobs. This was despite the fact that majority of them had no formal hospitality training. There was a positive influence of ‘competence’ cognition of psychological empowerment on job satisfaction. The ‘competence’ tenet of psychological empowerment had a moderate linear relationship with job satisfaction ($r = .554$, $p<0.05$). The job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in relation to the competence cognition was significant ($\beta_2 = 0.559$, $P<0.05$). This implied that the null hypothesis ($H_{02}$); that there was no significant relationship between the ‘competence’ dimension of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County was rejected; and the alternative that there was a significant relationship between the ‘competence’ dimension of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction was adopted.
The third objective of the study was to establish the relationship between the ‘choice’ dimension of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County. Majority of the respondents were neutral on whether they had significant autonomy in determining how to do their job and whether they decided on their own how to go about doing their work. The choice dimension was found to positively influence job satisfaction. There was found to be a strong linear relationship between ‘choice’ psychological empowerment and job satisfaction ($r = .734, p<0.05$).

The $\beta$-values ($\beta_3 = 0.503, P<0.05$) was significant and the ‘choice’ psychological empowerment predictor was making a significant contribution to the model. Hence, the null hypothesis ($H_{03}$) stating that there was no significant relationship between the ‘choice’ dimension of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County was rejected; and the alternative that there was a significant relationship between the ‘choice’ dimension of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction was adopted.

The fourth objective of the study was to establish the influence of the ‘impact’ dimension of psychological empowerment on job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County. The impact cognition positively influenced supervisors’ job satisfaction. There was found to be a strong linear relationship between ‘impact’ psychological empowerment on job satisfaction ($r = .868, p<0.05$). The $\beta$-value for ‘impact’ psychological empowerment ($\beta_4 = 0.595, P<0.05$) had positive coefficient, depicting positive relationship with job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. The null
hypothesis that there was no significant relationship between the ‘impact’ cognition of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County (H_{04}) was rejected; and the alternative that there was a significant relationship between the ‘impact’ dimension of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction was adopted.

The fifth objective was to examine the relationship between overall psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County. Multiple regression analysis was used to establish to what extent each independent variable (meaning, competence, choice and impact) explained the dependent variable (job satisfaction). The multiple regression results indicated that psychological empowerment dimensions: meaning (β= 0.250, p< 0.05); impact (β= 0.447, p< 0.05); competence (β= 0.143, p< 0.05) and choice (β= 0.270, p< 0.05) had positive and significant influence on guest house supervisors’ job satisfaction. Therefore all the psychological empowerment dimensions had positive and significant (at p< 0.05) influence on supervisors’ job satisfaction. In addition, overall psychological empowerment was found to be positively related to job satisfaction. Multiple regression indicated that 85.4% of variance of job satisfaction was explained by the dimensions of psychological empowerment. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there was no significant relationship between the overall psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County (H_{05}) was rejected; and the alternative that there was a significant
relationship between the overall psychological empowerment and job satisfaction was adopted.

The sixth objective was to determine the influence of demographic factors on job satisfaction among guest house supervisors in Mombasa County. Majority of the respondents (n=154, 73%) were male compared to and 27% (n=56) female, denoting a big gender disparity. A large number of the respondents were below 39 years (86.7%). This implied that most of them were youthful. In addition, most of the respondents (70%) had the highest level of education as secondary school and below. This implied that very high levels of respondents had no formal hospitality training. Most of the respondents also had working experience of less than 4 years (86.6%) indicating a high staff turnover. The findings also revealed a positive influence of age on job satisfaction, although it was a weak relationship (r = .117). This implied that as age increased, job satisfaction increased too. It was also found that there was a negative influence of guest house supervisors’ gender (r = -.144), education (r = -.115) and number of years worked (r = -.132) on job satisfaction. This implied that as the gender of the supervisors, their level of education and their experience increased, there was a decline in job satisfaction. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there was no significant relationship between demographic factors and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County (H₀₆) was rejected; and the alternative that there was a significant relationship between demographic factors and job satisfaction was adopted.
The seventh and final objective of this study was to establish the major extrinsic factors which influence job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County. The study revealed that these were salaries, working conditions, terms of employment and employee welfare in that order. The study also established that teamwork, flexible shifts and prompt payment of salaries were the issues that guest house supervisors were most satisfied with.

A summary of the relationships between the study variables as per the research findings is presented in Figure 5.1.
Fig. 5.1: Modified Conceptual Framework

*Source: Author’s own construct (2019)*
5.3 Conclusion

Based on the results of this study and the discussion thereof of the seven research objectives that provided the framework for this research, the following conclusions were drawn. First, this study was set out to establish the influence of the ‘meaning’ cognition of psychological empowerment on job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County, Kenya. There was found to exist a positive correlation between ‘meaning’ cognition of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction. It was found that the two variables had a strong linear relationship. The implication of this finding was that the more guest houses adopted ‘meaning’ the more their supervisors were satisfied with their jobs. This is because the more guest house supervisors find that there is a fit between their work roles and their values, attitudes and beliefs, the more they get motivated and satisfied with their jobs. However, it was found that the variable of ‘meaning’ had the lowest contribution towards the job satisfaction.

Secondly, this research sought to determine the relationship between the ‘competence’ dimension of psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. It was revealed that ‘competence’ psychological empowerment had a positive influence towards guest house supervisors’ job satisfaction. The two variables had moderate linear relationship. This finding had the implication that the more guest houses adopted ‘competence’ the more their supervisors were satisfied with their jobs. This is because the more guest house supervisors perceive that they have the necessary knowledge and skills of discharging their duties and that they are competent, the more
they feel satisfaction with their work roles. The variable of ‘competence’ was found to have the second lowest contribution towards job satisfaction.

Thirdly, the study sought to establish the relationship between ‘choice’ psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. The study findings revealed that ‘choice’ psychological empowerment had a positive influence on guest house supervisors’ job satisfaction. The two variables had a strong linear relationship. This implied that the more guest houses adopted ‘choice’ the more their supervisors’ satisfaction was enhanced. This is due to the importance of autonomy of supervisors in their work. The more they perceive that they have the authority to make decisions the more they will be satisfied with their work roles. This tenet was found to be the second largest contributor towards the overall job satisfaction.

Fourth, the study sought to find out the relationship between ‘impact’ psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. It revealed a positive influence of ‘impact’ psychological empowerment on job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. The two variables were found to have a strong linear relationship. This meant that the more guest houses implemented ‘impact’, the more job satisfaction of their supervisors increased. This is because the more guest house supervisors feel that their suggestions and opinion are taken into consideration in making organizational and departmental decisions, the more they feel satisfied with their jobs. This variable was found to be the highest contributor towards overall supervisors’ job satisfaction.
The study also established that there was a relationship between the overall psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. The study found that the two variables were positively related. Psychological empowerment predicted 85.7% of supervisors’ job satisfaction with the remaining 14.3% being influenced by other factors not included in the study. The four cognitions of psychological empowerment were found to positively influence job satisfaction of guest house supervisors relative to each other. They were found to be good predictors of job satisfaction, and their relationship ranged from moderate to strong. However, the four cognitions of psychological empowerment were found to have different levels of contribution to the ultimate job satisfaction. The cognition of impact was indicated to have the highest contribution (0.447), followed by choice (0.270), meaning (0.250) and competence (0.143) respectively.

The sixth objective of this study sought to find out the relationship between demographic characteristics of supervisors and their job satisfaction. The study found that supervisors’ gender, education and experience had a negative significant influence on job satisfaction of the supervisors. As these demographics increased job satisfaction decreased. However, age had a positive influence on job satisfaction. As age increased, job satisfaction also increased.

The last objective of the study sought to determine the major extrinsic factors which have impact on job satisfaction of supervisors. The major extrinsic factors identified to affect job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa were salaries, working conditions, terms of employment and employee welfare. This finding is of particular
importance to managers and entrepreneurs in the guest house sectors in provision of knowledge of the most critical extrinsic factors.

5.4 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, a number of recommendations were made. These included recommendations for practice, policy and further research.

5.4.1 Recommendations for Practice/Policy

From the findings and discussions of this study, the following recommendations were put forward:

Practice

1. The study recommends that guest houses should encourage their supervisors when it comes to idea contribution and innovative ways of tackling their duties. The might include enhancing the structures of listening and obtaining ideas from employees such as listening posts, suggestion boxes and customer advocates. The management also needs to give the necessary support to their supervisors. The good ideas generated from the supervisors should be incorporated in the ultimate final organizational decisions. This would make employees feel part and parcel of the whole organization and therefore enhance their perception of having ‘impact’ empowerment and subsequently
boost job satisfaction. This would in turn assist in taming the run-away levels of labour turnover in the hospitality industry.

2. In addition, guest house supervisors should be given enough freedom and authority to make decisions concerning their day to day work roles. This would enhance their perception of autonomy in decision making concerning their work activities. This would go a great length in enhancing ‘choice’ psychological empowerment and ultimately job satisfaction. This would be helpful in improving time management, self-esteem among supervisors and service recovery in cases of service failure.

3. Further, the study recommends adoption of activities that would enhance guest house supervisors’ perception of the fit between their jobs and their values, attitudes and believes. This would include items such as enhancing training, presentation and proper communication. Guest house supervisors need to understand the philosophies, missions, visions and values of their respective organizations. This would in turn improve their feeling of ‘meaning’ and subsequently job satisfaction.

4. It is also recommended that guest houses management should consider improving the major extrinsic factors influencing job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. This would help in enhancing the supervisors’ general
feeling of ability to perform their duties. Improving the salaries, working conditions, employee welfare and better terms of service is also recommended as they were the other extrinsic factors which were found to have impact on guest house supervisors’ job satisfaction. Such aspects as provision of rest rooms, staff transport, medical cover, good staff meals, and reliable employment contracts are recommended.

**Policy**

1. This study revealed clearly the critical role played by psychological empowerment towards job satisfaction. It therefore recommends that guest house managers and entrepreneurs should formulate policies which favour participation of their employees in the day to day running of the institutions.

2. In addition, the study recommends that the various organizations under the Ministry of Tourism such as KTB, KAHCC and PERAK should come up with policies and guidelines on how employee empowerment in their sectors could be implemented. They should hold seminars and workshops for managers and sensitize their memberships on the critical role played by psychological empowerment towards job satisfaction.
5.4.2 Recommendations for Further Research

This study focused on the influence of psychological empowerment and extrinsic factors on job satisfaction of guest house supervisors in Mombasa County. It opened up possible gaps for further research. These include:

1. This study utilized questionnaires and observation as the methods of data collection. Questionnaires have major limitations of dishonest responses and the difference of understanding and interpretation of what is required. In addition this method of collecting data is prone to respondents skipping some questions which might be critical to the study. Observation as a method of data collection is prone to biasness. Therefore, this study recommends future research utilizing other data collection methods such as focus groups and interviews. This might be useful in obtaining detailed information about personal and group feelings, opinions and perceptions. Items of particular importance to the study might be able to be clarified and therefore get the required information in full. This might allow more concrete conclusions on this study area.

2. The focus of this study was mainly psychological empowerment and how it is related to job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. It mainly dwelt on the psychological empowerment at an individual level and its influence on job satisfaction. Future research is recommended to include the other strand of
empowerment, that is, structural empowerment. This would bring out a clearer picture of empowerment from the management’s point of view.

5.5 Contributions of the Current Study

This study made key contributions to the body of knowledge, theory and practice in the areas of employees’ psychological empowerment and job satisfaction in guest house operations and the field of work psychology as well.

i) This study demonstrated clearly the existence of correlation between the dimensions of psychological empowerment (meaning, competence, impact and choice) and job satisfaction of guest house supervisors. Through multiple regression, it further revealed that the strongest predictor to job satisfaction of guest house supervisors among the four tenets was impact, meaning, choice and competence in that order.

ii) The study further revealed that the extrinsic factors affecting job satisfaction and which mattered most to guest house supervisors were salaries, working conditions, employee welfare and employment terms. These were the issues which guest house managers could use to strengthen job satisfaction and curb high labour turnover in the guest house sector and in extension the whole hospitality industry.

iii) A significant contribution in terms of knowledge was also provided to other stakeholders of the hospitality industry. The findings of this study could be
useful to classified hospitality establishments, independent restaurants and entertainments facilities in using employee psychological empowerment to enhance their job satisfaction. This would be useful to the organizations in meeting their organizational goals of employee loyalty, improved performance and customer satisfaction. The government through Ministry of Labour and other organization such as, Federation of Kenya Employers would also benefit a lot from the knowledge generated from this study and hence could use it as a basis to urge other sectors of the economy for a similar study.
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APPENDICES

Appendix I: Transmittal Letter from Graduate School
Appendix II: Guest House Supervisors’ Questionnaire

Code No:  

Dear Sir/ Madam,

You are requested to assist in completing the attached questionnaire by circling the appropriate responses or filling the blank spaces. By completing it, you will contribute to a study being undertaken regarding psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of supervisors in guest houses in Mombasa County. Your participation in this survey is voluntary, but very important. Your answers will be completely confidential and will be released only as a summary in which no individual’s answers can be identified. If you have any questions or comments about this study, I would be happy to talk with you. Thank you in advance for your feedback.

Yours faithfully,

Alex Kivuva.
SECTION I (General Information)

Directions: Kindly respond to the following items by ticking one response in the appropriate box.

1. Gender:
   Male ☐ Female ☐

2. Age:
   20-29 ☐
   30-39 ☐
   40-49 ☐
   50 and above ☐

3. Highest level of education attained:
   Degree (Hospitality) ☐
   Higher diploma (Hospitality) ☐
   Diploma (Hospitality) ☐
   Certificate (Hospitality) ☐
   Others (specify) ________________________________

4. Department of work: ________________________________

5. How many years have you worked in the hospitality industry?
   0-2 ☐ 2-4 ☐ 4-6 ☐ 6-8 ☐ 8-10 ☐ 10 and above ☐

6. Terms of service: Casual ☐ Contract ☐ Permanent ☐
SECTION II (Psychological Empowerment Scale)

(Adopted from Spreitzer’s Psychological Empowerment Scale)

Directions: The following statements deal with your feelings with respect to your work roles. Please read each statement carefully and circle one response that best represents your opinion with respect to your work role. You are kindly requested to be honest.

Strongly Disagree  -1  Agree  -4
Disagree  -2  Strongly Agree  -5
Neither  -3

Meaning

1. The work I do is meaningful. 1 2 3 4 5
2. The work I do is very important to me. 1 2 3 4 5
3. My job activities are personally meaningful to me. 1 2 3 4 5

Competence

4. I am confident about my ability to do my job. 1 2 3 4 5
5. I am self-assured about my capability to perform my work. 1 2 3 4 5
6. I have mastered the skills necessary for my job. 1 2 3 4 5

Choice

7. I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job. 1 2 3 4 5
8. I can decide on my own how to go about doing my work. 1 2 3 4 5
9. I have considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do my job. 1 2 3 4 5
Impact

10. My impact on what happens in my department is large. 1 2 3 4 5
11. I have a great deal of control over what happens in my department. 1 2 3 4 5
12. I have significant influence over what happens in my department. 1 2 3 4 5

SECTION III (Job Satisfaction Scale)

(Adopted from Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Scale)

Directions: The statements listed below measure your level of satiety with various aspects of your job. Using the scale provided below, please indicate by circling the extent to which you believe you are satisfied or dissatisfied with each item with respect to your job.

Very Dissatisfied -1 Satisfied -4
Dissatisfied -2 Very Satisfied -5
Neutral -3

A. My job enables me:

1. to keep busy all the time 1 2 3 4 5
2. to work alone on the job with minimum supervision 1 2 3 4 5
3. to do different things from time to time 1 2 3 4 5
4. to get praised for doing a good job. 1 2 3 4 5
5. to do things that don’t go against my conscience. 1 2 3 4 5
6. to have a steady employment. 1 2 3 4 5
7. to do things for other people. 1 2 3 4 5
8. to tell people what to do. 1 2 3 4 5
9. to do things that makes use of my abilities. 1 2 3 4 5
10. to have a chance for advancement on the job. 1 2 3 4 5
11. to use my own judgment in decision making. 1 2 3 4 5
12. to try my own methods of doing my duties. 1 2 3 4 5

B. What is your satisfaction level concerning the following aspects in your job?
13. The working conditions. 1 2 3 4 5
14. The way my co-workers get along with each other. 1 2 3 4 5
15. The way my boss handles his/her workers. 1 2 3 4 5
16. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions. 1 2 3 4 5
17. The way company policies are put into practice. 1 2 3 4 5
18. My pay and the amount of work I do. 1 2 3 4 5

C. My job enables me:
19. to be “some-body” in the community. 1 2 3 4 5
20. to have a feeling of accomplishment. 1 2 3 4 5

SECTION IV
1. Among the items listed under SECTION III- B, which is the most important thing that your manager should do to enhance your job satisfaction as a supervisor?
2. What aspects are you most satisfied with in your job?

3. Do you think there is a relationship between the “feeling of being empowered and job satisfaction”?
Appendix III: Observation Checklist

CODE NO.: [ ]

Meaning

1. Do the supervisors look genuinely interested in their jobs?
   i. Well groomed and presentable Yes/No
   ii. Communication (inferred message) Yes/No

2. Are the supervisors handling employees and customers in a human way?
   i. Handling customers requests Yes/No
   ii. Giving instructions to staff Yes/No

Competence

1. Has the restaurant been properly arranged and set?
   i. Furniture well arranged Yes/No
   ii. Cutlery well set Yes/No
   iii. Table cloths are clean and pressed Yes/No

2. Have the guest rooms been cleaned and made properly?
   i. The corners and top of the door are clean Yes/No
   ii. The floor and under bed are clean Yes/No
   iii. The bed is well made with mitred corners Yes/No
   iv. The toilet is sparkling clean Yes/No

Choice

1. Request the supervisors the following. Did he/she consult to seek permission?
   i. Ask to see a file in the reception Yes/No
ii. Ask to see the food costs Yes/No

2. Are there a lot of consultations when handling customers?
   i. Handling customer requests and complaints Yes/No
   ii. During check ins and check outs Yes/No

Impact

1. Request to see the contributions of the supervisors to their departments. Are they available?
   i. Duty rotas made by supervisors Yes/No
   ii. Menu cards made by supervisors Yes/No
   iii. Recipes made by supervisors Yes/No

2. Are there any staff briefings observed during data collection period?
   i. Briefings before food service Yes/No
   ii. Briefings headed by supervisors Yes/No
Appendix IV: List of Guesthouses in Mombasa County

**GUEST HOUSE LIST (MOMBASA COUNTY)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREMISE NAME</th>
<th>SUB-COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. DODOMA GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>MVITA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. KALOLEN GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>CHANGAMWE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ROMUNYA GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>CHANGAMWE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. WHITE CASTEL ROYAL GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>CHANGAMWE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CHANIA GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>CHANGAMWE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. LEADWAY GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>KISAUNI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. COAST GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>NYALI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CALIFORNIA GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>LIKONI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. VOLAN'S GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>KISAUNI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. TUJUANE GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>LIKONI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. YWCA GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>LIKONI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. KISIMANI GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>NYALI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. TUMAA GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>KISAUNI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SHILO GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>LIKONI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. SAMARA GUEST INN</td>
<td>KISAUNI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. GOLDEN PALACE GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>MVITA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. IRENE GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>LIKONI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. LAS VEGAS GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>NYALI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. GLORY INN TUDOR GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>MVITA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. CAMPUS PLACE GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>MVITA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. SILVERTONIC GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>JOMVU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. ARIZONA PALACE GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>MVITA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. SILENCE GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>JOMVU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. SAMTECH GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>JOMVU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. PWEZA ADAMS VILLE GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>KISAUNI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. ALDAAR GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>MVITA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. AIRPORT GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>CHANGAMWE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. MIAMI GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>CHANGAMWE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. STAR GARDEN GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>KISAUNI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. KNIGHT DREAM GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>CHANGAMWE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. SACA GUEST HOUSE</td>
<td>CHANGAMWE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>SWEET CORNER GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>SEA VIEW GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>MOMBASA GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>IMARA GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>SHAFI GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>FALCON GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>BAMBURI GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>EVENING GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>THE FOLKS GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>NEW JERSEY GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>AIRPORT GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>MOONLIGHT GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>JUMBO GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>VUVUZEL A GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>BEMANYO GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>DAN GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>MUNAWAR GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>ALI HIDAYA GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>HIGHWAY GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>MPYA VILLAGE GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>MUKALIO GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>ARUSHA GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>SUMMIT GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>MIGADINI GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>MELODY GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>ZIPRA GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>STRIDES GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>BAHATI GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>JEMO'S PUB GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>TANA GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>MEGA GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>DRIVING INN GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>THE COAST GATE HOTEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>HOTEL SEAVIEW AND GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>COOL BREEZE GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>HOTEL DORSE AND GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>SINAI STAR GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>MAMBA VILLAGE GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>HORIZON VIEW GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>PONTOON GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>BIG TREE GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>SHAPERS GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>MIDVIEW GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>DALLAS GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>COMFORT INN GUEST HOUSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix V: Map of Mombasa County
Appendix VI: Research Authorization Letter from Mombasa County Commissioner
Appendix VII: Research Permit