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Abstract

As a result of environmental changes and global competition, the ambition to reveal innovative employees has enhanced the interest and significance of psychological empowerment. This study investigates the mediating role of job satisfaction on the relationship between psychological empowerment and innovative behavior. Data were collected from employees working in 4 and 5 star tourism certificated hotel businesses in Nevşehir, Turkey. The findings of the research showed that there was a significant and positive relationship among psychological empowerment, job satisfaction and innovative behavior. Besides, job satisfaction partially mediated the relationship between psychological empowerment and innovative behavior. Finally, limitations and research recommendations are discussed.
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Introduction

Employees' empowerment in both public and private sector is of great importance within and outside the organization in parallel with the rapid changes in the environmental conditions (Allameh et al., 2012). Empowerment is not only seen as delegation, but also regarded as a psychological aspect (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). Spreitzer et al. (1997) argue that concepts of empowerment are broader and empowerment can be defined as psychological states or cognitive processes based on personel experience. Psychological empowerment is also expressed as a psychological state increasing intrinsic task motivation, influencing employee attitudes and performance (Hill et al., 2014). Psychological empowerment affects a broad range of outcomes in organizational contexts. These outcomes can be listed as intent to leave, organizational citizenship behavior, job performance, organizational learning, employee creativity, job satisfaction and innovative behavior (Koberg et al., 1999; Safari et al., 2011; Chiang & Hsieh, 2012; Sun et al., 2012; Liden et al., 2000; Gazzoli et al., 2010; Pieterse et al., 2010; Singh & Sarkar, 2013).

Innovative behavior, one of the outcomes mentioned above, can be defined as generation, promotion and realization of new ideas to exploit role performance, a group or an organization within work roles, work groups and organizations (Chang & Liu, 2008; Cingöz & Akdoğan, 2011). Innovativeness does not only relate to the characteristic that certain employees working in research and development department have. Therefore, organizations aim at harnessing the creative potential of all employees (Pundt et al., 2010). Employees who have innovative behavior can respond to the needs of customers in a quick and appropriate
manner, and can bring about novel ideas and products (Chang & Liu, 2008). Many studies have shown that empowered employees are inclined to be more motivated, skilled, efficient in their work, more innovative and trying new things, and having high level of job satisfaction (Spreitzer, 1995; Spreitzer et al., 1997; Barton & Barton, 2011).

Job satisfaction can be defined as the difference between the amount of the rewards that employees gained from the work and the amount that they actually believe they should get (Robbins, 1998). If work outcomes fall short of employees' expectations, dissatisfaction will occur. On the other hand, as long as work outcomes with regard to job roles meet employees' expectations, the satisfaction level of employees will increase (Hammer & Avgar, 2005). Liden et al. (2000) stated that if more individuals participate in decisions that affect the organization, they will be more satisfied within the work itself. In a sense, psychologically empowered employees' satisfaction level is bound to mount up and empowered employees are likely to be more willing to carry out the necessities of the work (Meng & Han, 2014).

In this respect, the aim of the study is to investigate the mediating role of job satisfaction on the relationship between psychological empowerment and innovative behavior. Research examining the effect of psychological empowerment on innovative behavior are available in the literature (Lee et al., 2007; Knol & van Linge, 2009; Pieterse et al., 2010; Singh & Sarkar, 2012; Singh & Sarkar, 2013). However, when considered the research variables together in this context, not enough research have been conducted. When considered from this point of view, this study intends to contribute to the literature. Besides, the study will be guiding for business executives who demand to encourage innovative behavior.

Firstly, psychological empowerment and its dimensions, innovative behavior, job satisfaction will be discussed in this study. Then, the relationships between these constructs will be assessed empirically with the research hypotheses through examining the mediating role of job satisfaction on the relationship between psychological empowerment and innovative behavior.

**Theoretical Framework**

**Psychological Empowerment**

Psychological empowerment is a widely accepted concept in the management literature. (Wang & Lee, 2009). The term of empowerment is defined either an external or internal process. It can be defined as the actions of empowering others or as the internal motivation of individuals being empowered (Shapira-Lishchinsky & Tsemach, 2014). Psychological empowerment refers to cognitive sets shaped by work environment, making sense of individuals' job roles and active involvement of individuals (Wang & Lee, 2009). Another definition of psychological empowerment means a psychological state that allows individuals to feel a sense of control over their work (Frazier & Fainshmidt, 2012). In addition, psychological empowerment can be seen as a process that increase individuals' self-efficacy beliefs (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). Briefly, psychological empowerment requires intrinsic task motivation, active participation of employees directed job roles and their self-efficacy beliefs.

As a result of environmental changes and global competition, the desire to uncover entrepreneurs and innovative employees has created a growing interest towards empowerment. Also, using the intrinsic and extrinsic techniques of motivation, leaders in the organization exert to benefit from employees' ability and their potential, thereby increasing the importance of the subject (Barton & Barton, 2011; Joo & Lim, 2013). Employees' empowerment is vital for organizations to respond to changes quickly in the surrounding (Jose & Mampilly, 2014). Empowered employees consider themselves as more efficient in their jobs, they are evaluated in an effective manner by their colleagues, they are more likely to change their attitude, cognition and behavior that will lead to positive changes about values, they can delay their own requests, and they are able to build increased self-esteem, self-efficacy and self-awareness (Oladipo, 2009). For instance, Spreitzer (1995), Raub and Robert (2010) manifested that individuals see themselves as valuable assets for
the organization through self-esteem, as having a respectable position, and as active participants towards their work and work units.

Psychological empowerment is not a permanent personality trait, but rather it is a cognitive phenomena characterized by the work environment. For this reason, it reflects individuals' own perceptions regarding the work environment (Spreitzer, 1995; Casey et al., 2010; Safari et al., 2011). When individuals feel empowered, they will perceive the working environment as more liberating. To illustrate, resources in the organization can be distributed in objective reality, but unless employees are informed about the use of resources that are ready for them, access to resources will have little effect on empowerment. Hence, individuals' perception of their working environment forms empowerment (Spreitzer, 1996). Shortly, psychological empowerment is a cognitive fact shaped by individuals' perceptions of organizational practices and working conditions.

Safari et al. (2011) pointed out that efforts to enhance individuals' psychological empowerment is introduced via supporting management practices and emphasis on the psychological aspect of empowerment. Nevertheless, most of the management theorists have discussed empowerment as using management techniques. This situation has neglected the structure and process of the empowerment. Therefore, inadequate explanations have occurred concerning the construct of the empowerment (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). Thomas and Velthouse (1990) also expressed that along with the managerial practices guiding employees' behavior, the dimensions of psychological empowerment also stimulated the intrinsic task motivation of employees. These dimensions are meaning, competence, impact and self-determination (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990; Spreitzer, 1995; Spreitzer, 1996; Spreitzer et al., 1997; Barton & Barton, 2011).

**Meaning** refers to a specific purpose and value of the work and it is associated with ideals and standards of individuals. It creates harmony between beliefs about work roles, values and behavior (Spreitzer, 1995). In other words, it means the individual’s internalisation about the work given. When meaning degree is low, individuals remain indifferent to important events; in contrast, a high degree of meaning can bring about commitment, participation, energy concentration (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). Consequently, as long as the purpose of the work is meaningful for individuals, they will show more value, commitment and involvement to their work.

**Competence** is defined as the necessary skills that individuals should have and as the ability to perform a job. If individuals don't believe in their abilities, they will feel insufficient (Joo & Lim, 2013). This concept has been studied by Bandura (1977) and may be associated with self-efficacy. Individuals with low level of self-efficacy are prone to avoid situations that require skills, but individuals with high level of self-efficacy strive further and they are more persistent in the face of obstacles (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). At this point, competence involves the skills to fulfill a task, reflects self-confidence of individuals.

**Impact** refers to the extent to which individuals might affect work outcomes. It is also the reverse of learned helplessness. Learned helplessness concerns the lack of perceived effect over work activities. Besides, impact differs from locus of control. Impact is influenced by situations in the job context; on the contrary, locus of control is a general personal trait that is viable for all working conditions (Spreitzer, 1995; Spreitzer, 1996).

**Self-Determination** means employees' freedom to make decisions and regulate their own activities. Self-determination requires participation in work behavior and work processes and maintaining them. Work methods, pace and efforts can be exemplified as an example for self-determination (Spreitzer, 1995). Management strategies that help employees strengthen their autonomy make them feel empowered. Conversely, employees are likely to feel inadequate if management practices that undermine employees' autonomy are conducted (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). Accordingly, employees who have choices and freedom to participate in decision making would feel empowered further.
These four dimensions aforementioned represent individuals’ active orientation toward their work role rather than passive orientation. These dimensions together constitute the concept of empowerment. That is, the absence of any single dimension will reduce the degree of empowerment (Spreitzer, 1995; Spreitzer et al., 1997; Barton & Barton, 2011; Joo & Lim, 2013). As a result, meaning, competence, impact and self-determination should coexist and interact with each other for a full sense of empowerment.

Psychological empowerment is crucial for influencing many outcomes at the organizational level. Organizational commitment, intent to leave, job satisfaction, innovative behavior can be exemplified as important predictors of psychological empowerment (Spreitzer, 1995; Spreitzer et al., 1997; Koberg et al., 1999; Wang & Lee, 2009; Seibert et al., 2011; Singh & Sarkar, 2013; Meng & Han, 2014). For example, four cognitions, meaning, self-determination, competence and impact, may augument individuals' commitment to the organization, besides, individuals are able to express and develop their values, interests and abilities (Chiang & Jang, 2008; Seibert et al., 2011; Frazier & Fainshmidt, 2012; Meng & Han, 2014).

Individuals can show more commitment to the organization provided that they see their jobs as a valuable resource. In consequence, they will be eager to maintain membership in the organization for a long time. The possibility of assessing alternate job resources and intent to leave will reduce further (Seibert et al., 2011). Accordingly, empowered employees will result in greater participation. They should yield to creative and novel ideas and support them. Organizations will be able to realize innovative processes as a means of implementation of these ideas. Additionally, empowered employees will have a stronger positive attitude about their work and feel satisfied in the event that they participate in the decisions relevent to the organization.

Innovative Behavior

Organizations benefit from employees’ innovative capacity to compete with dynamic and competitive environment. Innovative organizations produce better products, services and business processes, improve their performance, and gain competitive advantage through utilising employees’ ability to generate new ideas (Jafri, 2010). For this reason, organizations require employees having knowledge, creativity and innovative contributions. (Pundt et al., 2010). Because, employees are individuals who think of and implement innovative efforts, identify how management affects innovative behaviors to gain a competitive advantage (Pieterse et al., 2010).

Innovative behavior is defined as generation, promotion and realization of new ideas to exploit role performance, a group or an organization within work roles, work groups and organizations (Janssen, 2004; Janssen & Yperen, 2004; Chang & Liu, 2008; Cingöz & Akdoğan, 2011). De Jong and De Hartog (2007) describe innovative behavior as behavior directed towards the initiation and implementation of new ideas, products, processes and procedures within work roles, grups or organizations. Scott and Bruce (1994), on the other hand, argue that innovation comprises of multistage processes and each stage has different activities and individual behaviors. They also point out that innovation is shaped by discontinous activities rather than sequencing ones. Given that definitions aforementioned, the common points of innovation behavior can be labeled as novelty, implementation of new ideas, intentionality of benefit, and innovation processes (West and Altink, 1996).

Innovative behavior is a complicated process consisting of three different phases: idea generation, idea promotion, and idea realization. Individual innovation starts with idea generation. It refers to the emergence of new and useful infromation. Work-related problems, disagreements, discontinuities, emerging trends are components that stimulate the generation of new ideas. Another phase consists of idea promotion. After producing an idea, employees take part in social activities to support idea promotion. The final stage involves idea realization. This stage produces an innovative model to be applied in work roles, groups or organization (Scott & Bruce, 1994; Janssen, 2000; Janssen, 2004). At this stage, employees can significantly contribute to the innovation process by showing application-oriented behavior. For example,
employees with a strong commitment to the idea are able to convince other employees or they are able to endeavor to develop, test and commercialize an idea (de Jong & den Hartog, 2007). In conclusion, innovative behavior includes three phases, namely idea generation, idea promotion, and idea realization. Firstly, the emergence of an idea in the innovation process should be provided. Then, supporting activities should be carried out after the formation of an idea. Finally, the realization of an idea should be implemented in work roles, groups or organizations.

The adoption of innovative behavior intends to contribute to the overall effectiveness and performance of the organization. Innovativeness can also be provided with the changes in organizations. In this respect, organizations achieve these changes by reacting to internal and external changes in the environment or taking measure as regarding the environment beforehand (Damanpour, 1991). Innovative behavior reflects the willingness of employees searching for better options to improve organizational productivity, because developing employees’ innovative capacity is directly associated with the effectiveness and productiveness of organizations (Lee, 2008). If employees are satisfied with the organization, they will show positive behavior towards the organization. As a consequence, the organization's success and long-term survival will be further consolidated with the innovative capacities of employees (Chang et al., 2013).

To sum up, innovative behavior is an important factor for organizations to compete on a global level and to maintain competitive advantage. Besides, innovative behavior relevant to organizational effectiveness and performance provides measures to be taken regarding changes that organizations operate in the environment.

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction can be defined as psychological or affective states that employees demonstrate emotional states towards the work and work-related factors. Job satisfaction is also an outcome of expectations and experiences of individuals gaining from the work; for this reason, it is appraised by a person's perspective (Pan, 2015). In this respect, job satisfaction is viewed as individuals' work values and a positive sense of satisfaction as a result of work values that they have expressed (Yeh, 2013; Kumar et al., 2014). Besides, Igbaria and Guimaraes (1993) describes job satisfaction as an affective reaction that individuals show about their work experiences and job specifications. Consequently, it is possibly to state that job satisfaction stems from individuals' perceptions of their job, their work experiences and work-related factors. If individuals achieve expectations necessary for the work and working conditions, they will indicate a positive attitude to their job. As well as job satisfaction is characterized by the needs and expectations of individuals, it may be associated with many organizational outcomes and may influence them. For instance, where as job satisfaction has a positive relationship with variables such as organizational commitment, work engagement, organizational support, empowerment (Casey et al., 2010; Gazzoli et al., 2010; Yeh, 2013; Buyukgoze-Kavas et al., 2014; Zopatis et al., 2014); it has also a negative relationship with other variables such as turnover, work pressure, and absenteeism (Song et al., 1997; Lopes et al., 2014; Zopatis et al., 2014).

**The Effect of Psychological Empowerment on Innovative Behavior and Job Satisfaction and Hypotheses**

Psychological empowerment is a motivational concept that consists of dimensions such as initiating employees’ activities and regulating them, employees' abilities to perform their jobs better, employees' influencing the surrounding or finding their jobs meaningful. Psychologically empowered individuals consider themselves as more competent, they find their jobs and work environment more meaningful, they exhibit proactive behavior and act independently and as an entrepreneur (Pieterse et al., 2010). Spreitzer (1995) and Lee et al. (2007) purported that empowered employees tend to be autonomous and influential, creative and liberal. In addition to this, they are individuals having self-efficacy, showing innovative behavior at work, pursuing success and also utilising organizational innovativeness for competition and
change. Fernandez and Pitts (2011) stated that empowerment provides organizational members with self-determination in order that they could be more innovative and creative. Likewise, Alge et al. (2006) suggested that psychologically empowered individuals should produce novel ideas and assess them in practice. In the light of these explanations, hypothesis one is as follows:

Hypothesis 1: Psychological empowerment has a positive effect on innovative behavior.

Job satisfaction refers to employees' attitudes towards their work. Along with covering both cognitive and affective responses, job satisfaction determines consideration between employees' expectations and profits gaining from their work. Job satisfaction also contributes to many attitudes and outcomes since it involves mainly the lives of individuals; thereby affecting life satisfaction (Agarwal & Sharma, 2011). Spreitzer et al. (1997) specified that increasing employee satisfaction, developing intrinsic task motivation and making employees feel satisfied with their work establish the focus of a qualified business life. If individuals are included in a meaningful work, they will be pleased with their jobs, because employees who consider their jobs significant will be more satisfied. Furthermore, autonomy, employees' participation in decisions, controlling over their own issues, employees' involvement in outcomes influencing the organization will result in more satisfaction. As well as raising the value of work in terms of individuals, psychological empowerment will also bring about job satisfaction, work productivity and work performance. Ultimately, it is likely to say that psychological empowerment will increase job satisfaction. (Spreitzer et al., 1997; Koberg et al., 1999; Liden et al., 2000; Dewettinck & van Ameijde, 2011). Based on these ideas, hypothesis two is as follows:

Hypothesis 2: Psychological empowerment has a positive effect on job satisfaction.

Psychological empowerment affects innovative behavior of employees and job satisfaction in a positive manner. The more empowered employees within the organization tend to innovate and generate new ideas, the more satisfied they will become. Besides, one of the antecedents of innovative behavior is job satisfaction (Bysted, 2013). Individuals who are satisfied with their jobs bring innovation to products, services and processes in the organization (Sabir & Kalyar, 2013). Consequently, psychological empowerment will increase job satisfaction, which in turn will result in innovative behavior. Thus, hypothesis three is as follows:

Hypothesis 3: Job satisfaction mediates the relationship between psychological empowerment and innovative behavior.

Research Method

Sample

The sample of the research covers hotel employees operating in 4 and 5 star tourism certificated hotel businesses in Nevsehir, Turkey. The number of the businesses is 21 and approximately 900 employees are estimated to serve in these hotel businesses. Pre-interview was conducted in the businesses and questionnaires were distributed to hotel employees. 230 usable questionnaires were returned. It is emphasized in the literature that the sample size should be around 218 in a mass in which the universe is 900, confidence level 95% and confidence interval 0.05 (Çıngı, 1994). As a result, the sample size is sufficient in terms of data analysis and extrapolation.

230 employees participated in this study, of which 80 were female respondents and 146 of the sample was represented by male respondents. 4 of them did not indicate marital status. Educationally, 160 employees had a bachelor's degree, 53 employees had graduated from high school and 9 employees had a graduate degree. 8 employees did not indicate level of education. The average age of employees was 30.6 (SD=
The average tenure of employees operating in the hotel businesses was 6.7 years (SD= 4.48). The average of tenure of 230 employees in business life was 8.4 years (SD=5.54).

Instruments

A questionnaire form was used as a data collection. Psychological empowerment was measured using Spreitzer (1995) instrument with 12 items in four subdimensions: meaning, competence, self-determination and impact. The Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient was 0.918.

The innovative behavior scale consisted of nine items based on an instrument developed by Scott and Bruce (1994), which draws upon Kanter’s (1988) work. Three items relates to idea generation, three items to idea promotion, and three items to idea realization. (Janssen, 2000). The Crohnbach’s Alpha coefficient was 0.747. Lastly, job satisfaction was measured using Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. The scale comprised of 20 items. (Hirschfeld, 2000). The Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient was 0.928. Responses were rated on a five point Likert scale. The data received were analyzed. In order to test the research variables and the proposed hypotheses, correlation and regression analysis were employed.

Findings

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics and correlation analysis based on the research variables.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and correlation analysis results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Psychological empowerment</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Innovative Behavior</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>.519**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.431**</td>
<td>.455**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Meaning</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>.714**</td>
<td>.390**</td>
<td>.291**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Competence</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.436</td>
<td>.683**</td>
<td>.277**</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.454**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-determination</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>.769**</td>
<td>.462**</td>
<td>.466**</td>
<td>.472**</td>
<td>.336**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Impact</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.597</td>
<td>.743**</td>
<td>.406**</td>
<td>.411**</td>
<td>.326**</td>
<td>.162**</td>
<td>.540**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p< .01

According to the correlation analysis results in Table 1, there was a positive and significant relationship between psychological empowerment and innovative behavior (r= 0.519, p< 0.01). In this respect, employees indicated higher innovative behavior when they perceived higher psychological empowerment. Self-determination, one of psychological empowerment dimensions, correlated highly with innovative behavior (r=0.462, p< 0.01). Besides, there was a positive and significant relationship between psychological empowerment and job satisfaction (r=0.431, p< 0.01). Similarly, self-determination correlated highly with job satisfaction (r=0.466, p< 0.01). At this point, as the level of self-determination increased, innovative behavior and job satisfaction would also increase. Lastly, there was a positive and significant relationship between innovative behavior and job satisfaction. The correlation coefficient was 0.455 (p< 0.01). This result exhibited that employees showed higher innovative behavior at work when they perceived higher job satisfaction.

Table 2 illustrates the results of the multi regression analysis to test the first research hypothesis.
In accordance with the results of the regression analysis in Table 2, the model as a whole which attempts to explain the effect of psychological empowerment on innovative behavior is significant ($R^2 = 0.285$; $F(4, 225) = 22.454$; $p<0.05$). The value of $R^2$ was 0.285 ($F(4, 225) = 22.454$). This result exhibited that 28.5% of the variance in the innovative behavior was explained by the dimensions of psychological empowerment. Hypothesis 1 was supported. Among these four dimensions, self-determination had the highest level to account for the change in the innovative behavior. The Beta value of self-determination was higher and significant compared to the other dimensions ($\beta=0.207$; $p<0.05$) and was followed by impact ($\beta=0.106$; $p<0.05$), respectively. But nonetheless, considering the research sample, competence had no significant effect on the innovative behavior.

Table 3. Regression analysis results showing the effect of psychological empowerment on job satisfaction

The regression analysis results presented in Table 3 demonstrate that the model tested as a whole is significant ($R^2 = 0.262$; $F(4, 225) = 19.945$; $p<0.05$). The value of $R^2$ was 0.262 ($F(4, 225) = 19.945$). That is, 26.2% of the variance in job satisfaction was explained by the dimensions of psychological empowerment. Hypothesis 2 was supported. Out of four dimensions, self-determination had the highest level to account for the change in job satisfaction ($\beta=0.272$; $p<0.05$). Impact, on the other hand, had a significant effect on job satisfaction ($\beta=0.106$; $p<0.05$). Besides, meaning and competence had no significant effect on dependent variable.
Table 4. Regression Analysis Results Demonstrating the Mediating Effect of Job Satisfaction on The Relationship Between Psychological Empowerment and Innovative Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>Model 1 (β) Psychological Empowerment-Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Model 2 (β) Psychological Empowerment-Innovative Behavior</th>
<th>Model 3 (β) Job Satisfaction-Innovative Behavior</th>
<th>Model 4 (β) Psychological Empowerment/Job Satisfaction-Innovative Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment</td>
<td>0.385**</td>
<td>0.479**</td>
<td>0.366**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.471**</td>
<td>0.294**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² Change</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Change</td>
<td>51.980</td>
<td>83.937</td>
<td>59.679</td>
<td>57.216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<0.01; Dependent Variable: Innovative Behavior

The mediating variable analysis method proposed by Baron and Kenny (1986) has been used so as to determine the mediating effect of job satisfaction on the relationship between psychological empowerment and innovative behavior. This method expressed that the effect of independent variable (psychological empowerment) and mediating variable (job satisfaction) on dependent variable (innovative behavior) should be treated separately. In addition to this, there should be a relationship between the independent variable and mediating variable (Yüürür and Keser, 2011). In this context, Model 1 showed the effect of psychological empowerment (independent variable) on job satisfaction (mediating variable). Model 2 examined the effect of psychological empowerment (independent variable) on innovative behavior (dependent variable). Model 3 demonstrated the effect of job satisfaction (mediating variable) on innovative behavior. The results of these three models indicated that research variables had a significant and direct effect on each other. After these conditions being met, Model 4 displayed the mediating role of job satisfaction on the relationship between psychological empowerment and innovative behavior. Table 4 presents the analysis results.

Considering the values given in Table 4, beta coefficients and R² changes were significant. Psychological empowerment had a positive effect on job satisfaction and innovative behavior. Likewise, job satisfaction had also a positive effect on innovative behavior. In addition, job satisfaction had a positive effect on innovative behavior even as psychological empowerment was available in the model. This significant relationship between variables supported the existence of the mediating effect. That is, the mediating effect of job satisfaction on the relationship between psychological empowerment and innovative behavior was determined. However, this model displayed that job satisfaction took place as a partial mediating variable in that the effect on psychological empowerment on innovative behavior was significant and beta coefficient decreased.

Lastly, Sobel tests were administered to evaluate the significance of the indirect effects in order to validate the mediational hypothesis (Sobel, 1982). As well as its accompanying standard error, Sobel tests figure up the magnitude of the unstandardized indirect effect. In order to establish the statistical importance of the indirect effect, the ratio of the indirect effect over its standard error is compared to a z-distribution. As a consequence, Sobel test results pointed out that the indirect effect of job satisfaction on the relationship between psychological empowerment and innovative behavior (z= 3.87 for 95% confidence level) was in the anticipated direction and statistically significant. Thus, Hypothesis 3 was supported.
Discussion and Conclusion

This study was to analyze the mediating role of job satisfaction on the relationship between psychological empowerment and innovative behavior in the sample of hotel employees working in Nevsehir. The results of the study showed that psychological empowerment had a positive effect on innovative behavior. This finding was similar with the studies of Knol and van Linge (2009), Seibert et al. (2011), Singh and Sarkar (2013). In this respect, psychologically empowered employees demonstrated more innovative behavior. On the other hand, psychological empowerment had also a positive effect on job satisfaction. This finding was consistent with the studies of Koberg et al. (1999), Liden et al. (2000), Gazzoli et al. (2010), Dewettinck and van Ameijde (2011). Similarly, employees indicated higher job satisfaction when they perceived higher psychological empowerment. Another result of the study was that job satisfaction partially mediated the relationship between psychological empowerment and innovative behavior. Finally, it should be considered to increase the level of employees' job satisfaction by increasing their innovative behavior along with psychological empowerment.

Hotel businesses, compared to manufacturing enterprises, indicate a labour intensive feature and depend on largely labour force. This case has increased the significance of psychological factors such as morale, satisfaction commitment through labour power that provide with service production, service delivery and building relationship with customers. Tourism industry is a dynamic sector. It involves constantly being in relation with customers and intensive work pace, thereby increasing the turnover of employees and resulting in stress and dissatisfaction among employees (Çakıcı et al., 2002). Moreover, the desire to innovate and to make extra contributions of employees to organizations also begins to decrease. Therefore, psychological empowerment becomes crucial to increase the level of job satisfaction of employees, to motivate them and to benefit from their innovative capacity. In this respect, the hotel businesses should provide employees with autonomy and encourage the participation of employees in decisions and make them perceive their jobs meaningfully.

This study has some limitations. Data were collected from hotel businesses in Nevsehir and the sample of the study is restricted to hotel employees. Therefore, the study needs to be replicated in different sectors of tourism and different cultures to be able to generalize the findings. Future research should examine different variables and their relationship with each other as regards the research model.
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