**Mediating Effect of Job Satisfaction in the Relationship between**

**Psychological Empowerment and Job Performance**

**Ferit Ölçer[[1]](#footnote-1)**

**Abstract**

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationships among the four components of psychological empowerment (i.e. meaning, self-determination, competence, and impact), job satisfaction and job performance. This study also tested the mediating effect of job satisfaction on the relationship between the components of psychological empowerment and job performance. A survey questionnaire was used to collect data from a sample of 238 employees in manufacturing industry. SPSS was used to conduct the statistical analysis of all data in this study. Multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine the postulated hypothesis and test the direct and mediated relationships among variables. The findings indicated that meaning, self-determination and impact had positive significant effects on job satisfaction, but competence had no effect on job satisfaction. In addition, competence, self-determination and impact had positive effects on employees’ job performance while meaning did not support the proposed relationship. The results suggested that job satisfaction significantly affected job performance. Furthermore, overall job satisfaction fully mediated the relationship between meaning and job performance. In contrast, job satisfaction partially mediated the relationships between competence and job performance, between self-determination and job performance, and between impact and job performance.
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**1 Introduction**

In recent years there has been a growing consensus that employee Psychological Empowerment (PE) can be a source of competitive advantage for contemporary organizations. PE was a strategy to enhance organizational performance and to develop a flexible organization that was capable of adapting to a changing external environment. Similarly, it was maintained that employee PE was critical to organizational innovativeness and effectiveness. With the right individuals, job characteristics and organizational environment, PE can have a noticeable effect on motivation and performance (Kimolo, 2013). To improve aspects of manufacturing organization’s management, much attention has been given globally to the role that PE plays in improving Job Satisfaction (JS) and Job Performance (JP) (Carless, 2004; Saif and Saleh, 2013). Employee PEhas widely been recognized as an essential contributor to organizational success with many authors observing a direct relationship between the level of employee PE and employee JP, employee JS and employee commitment (Meyerson and Dewettinck, 2012). Further literature in PE revealed that organizations where employees were psychologically empowered shows increase in productivity and JS (Carless, 2004, Patah et al., 2009; Fuller et al., 1999). Within a Western context, PE have been demonstrated to be successful in winning the hearts and minds of employees as well as increasing employee performance (Seibert et al., 2004). PE perceptions can enhance the value of work for individuals, increase JS, and contribute to work productivity and success (Spreitzer, 1995). Studies on empowerment have shown that it has a strong correlation to employee performance in terms of higher productivity, JS and reduction in staff turnover in organizations (Degago, 2014). A growing body of research concluded that the human resource management strategy of PE was a significant factor in improving work situations and employee satisfaction (Cai and Zhou, 2009). Furthermore, there was substantial empirical support for the relationship between PE and positive outcomes such as JS and JP (Spreitzer, 1995; Spreitzer et al., 1997; Liden et al., 2000; Kirkman and Rosen, 1999; Laschinger et al., 2001; Seibert et al., 2004; Wang and Lee, 2009; Thomas and Tymon, 1994). Empowering employees enables organizations to be more flexible and responsive and can lead to improvements in both individual and organizational performance. Empowered employees view themselves as more effective in their work and they are evaluated as more effective by their co-workers (Quinn and Spreitzer, 1997). PE enables them to adopt performance enhancing behavior and contribute to the development of the organization’s competitive strength and success. Moreover, employees PE was seen as a motivational technique if designed and implemented properly in organizations. In general, when employees perceive high levels of PE, they are motivated towards their jobs and are likely to experience positive accompanying consequences (e.g., Spreitzer et al., 1997). Empowering employees may be one of the strategies that enable organizations to balance employees’ JP and JS. Thus, employee PE empowerment will lead to improving productivity, performance and JS (Greasley et al., 2005). Therefore, employee PE programs have been widely adopted in manufacturing companies as a way of to improve employee JS and JP (Degago, 2014).

On the other hand, employees are considered the most vital and valuable resource of any manufacturing organization; their JS and JP play critical role in an organization’s success and effectiveness. JP has been a very much researched area in industrial and organizational psychology due to its importance to an organization. An organization’s success very much depends on the performance of its employees, thus good JP is something organizations try to foster. Focus on performance was an important key factor on employee PE (Kimolo, 2013). Very little was known, however, about the effect of PE on JP. The purposes of this study were to 1) investigate the relationships between perceived PE components (i.e. meaning, competence, self-determination and impact), JS and JP, 2) empirically test the effects of perceived PE components on JS and JP; 3) explore the mediating role of JS in the relationship between perceived PE components and JP in the context of manufacturing sector of Turkey. To address the purposes of this study, the major research questions addressed by this study were: 1) How do PE components affect JS?; 2) How do PE components affect JP?; 3) How do JS affect JP?; and 4) Do JS mediate the relationships between PE components and JP? These four research questions will be used to guide the empirical investigations of the research conceptual model that based on the theoretical framework presented in literature review. This study will contribute to the body of knowledge of employees PE by empirically investigating the relationship between PE components and JP through the mediation mechanism of JS in the manufacturing sector of Turkey. It was hoped that the study findings may assist organizations to develop more efficient ways to enhance their emploees’ JS and JP, which was of importance to academia as well as for practical application in business. Accordingly, the study will make management to view employees PE as an opportunity of maximizing JS and JP. Thus, the study specifically will inspire managers to come up with various interventions on how to increase JS and JP of employees in their organizations by using employees PE programs as one of the strategies.

**2 Literature Review**

In an attempt to better operationalize the construct *“Psychological Empowerment”* Spreitzer (1995a) builds on the theoretical model constructed by Thomas and Velthouse (1990) to develop a four-dimensional scale to measure meaningfulness, impact, competence, and choice. In her highly referenced work, Spreitzer (1995) renames meaningfulness as meaning and choice as self-determination. Spreitzer (1995) defines employees empowerment as intrinsic task motivation manifested in a set of four cognitions (meaning, competence, self determination and impact) reflecting an individual’s orientation to his or her work role. Thuz, PE was a construct that included an employee’s perception of their degree of autonomy, their ability to have influence in the workplace, their sense of self-competence and their ability to find meaning in the work that they do. *Meaning* is the value of work goals or purposes judged by an individual’s perception relative to his or her own personal mission or expectations. *Self-determination* is an individual’s sense of having choice in initiating and regulating actions. *Competence* refers to self-efficacy specific to work; that is, the individual’s capability to perform work activities with necessary skills and knowledge. *Impact* is the degree to which a person can influence strategic, administrative or operating outcomes at work. The dimensional approach was undertaken to pay greater heed to the distinct roles played by different PE dimensions (Spreitzer et al., 1997). By investigating these different dimensions, we seek to explore the rich conceptual domain of PE and its relevance to various outcomes. The other construct of the present study wasJS. The pleasurable emotional state arising from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences was called JS. Spector (1997) described JS as how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs. In this study, JS was used as a mediator. Another variable addressed in the study was JP. Employee performance is about employees achieving the results, goals or standards as per the expectations set by the organization (Degago, 2014). In the current study, we focus on the participants’ perceived performance. It refers to the degree to which an individual perceives to accomplish tasks better than others in the project group in the average. JP was examined as the dependent variable in this study.

**2.1 The Relationship between PE and JS**

PE work as a main predictor of the employees’ satisfaction with job, the high level of feelings about empowerment reasons to increase JS level whereas on the other hand low level of feelings reason to decrease in JS level (Dhladhla, 2011; Indradevi, 2011). Empowered employees were more satisfied with their jobs, had an increased sense of personal efficacy through participation in decision-making and were encouraged to utilize a wide set of skills and abilities to address different scenarios (Spreitzer, 1997). According to Thomas and Tymon (1994) the task assessments i.e., the facets of PE, generate intrinsic rewards associated with the job, and so they should be positively related to JS. First, there seemed to be strong evidence of a positive association between meaning and JS (Hackman and Oldham, 1980; Spreitzer et al., 1997; Thomas and Tymon, 1994). According to Hackman and Oldham (1980), an important determinant of JS was personal meaning. A sense of meaning was considered necessary for individuals to feel satisfied at work. Having a job that allows fulfillment of ones’ desired work values are likely to increase JS. Liden et al. (2000) argued that individuals who feel that their jobs were significant and worthwhile had higher levels of JS compared to those who felt their jobs had little value. Low levels of meaning have been linked to feelings of apathy and lower work satisfaction (Thomas and Velthouse 1990; Wang and Lee, 2009). Empirical research found a positive association between meaning and JS (Spreitzer et al., 1997; Liden et al., 2000). Accordingly, becausemeaning reflects the fit between the employee and the job, we expect the overall meaning-satisfaction relationship to be positive regardless of the levels of the other components (Wang and Lee, 2009). Second, the literature has yet to establish a consistent link between competence and JS. Carless (2004) reported that competence was negatively related to JS, whereas Spreitzer et al. (1997) reported that competence was positively related to JS among subordinates but not among supervisors. Other research has reported no relationship between these variables (Holdsworth and Cartwright, 2003; Thomas and Tymon, 1994; Wang and Lee, 2009). Third, managerial practices and behavior that promote self-determination, including empowerment practices like granting employees more discretion and providing them with the feedback and skills needed to perform their jobs, may increase JS in different ways (Illardi et al., 1993; Deci et al., 1989). Self-determinationimproves JS as accomplishments can be attributed more to the individual than to other persons (Liden et al., 2000). Self-determination positively influences JS due to its effects on intrinsic motivation. Individuals who have autonomy in determining their actions and behaviors find work more interesting and rewarding, thus creating feelings of satisfaction with their job. Self-determination directly affected JS because people who are gained authority to improve, develop and make decisions on their jobs may utilize work experiences, skills, knowledge and abilities to enhance their productivities on their own ways. As a result, an empowerment was very critical for them primarily to increase autonomy, leading to persons’ JS (Scingduenchai and Prasert, 2005). Researchers have suggested that self-determination-choiceis a psychological need and that meeting this need results in JS (Conger and Kanungo, 1988). Empirical results showed a positive relationship between self-determination and JS (Spreitzer et al., 1997). Studies by Liden et al. (2000) and Thomas and Tymon (1994) show that higher levels of personal control are related to JS. Finally, with regard to the impact-satisfaction relationship, strong and consistent evidence was yet to emerge. When a person’s job has low impact, the employee can feel demotivated because he or she believes that his or her job has no significance to the organization. Liden et al. (2000) argued that when employees feel that their work can influence outcomes that affect their organization, they tend to feel more involved and therefore gain a sense of satisfaction with their job. Theory on the impact component states that individuals should get a sense of JS when they feel that they have been directly involved in outcomes that affect the organization (Ashforth, 1989). Thomas and Tymon (1994) reported a positive relationship between impact and JS, but Spreitzer et al.’s (1997) study did not support the effect of perceived impact on JS.

Previous research findings has consistently showed that PE was the primary predictor of JS and, as a result, an increase in JS was one of the key anticipated outcomes behind the perceived feeling of PE among employees in the workplace, while low levels of PE in the workplace were strongly related to the reduction in JS (Bordin et al., 2007; Holdsworth and Cartwright, 2003; Spreitzer et al., 1997; Spreitzer, 1995; Thomas and Tymon, 1994; Seibert et al., 2004; Dehkordi et al. 2011; Fulford and Enz, 1995; Kirkman and Rosen, 1999; Bowen and Lawler, 1995; Fuller et al., 1999; Carless, 2004; Indradevi, 2012; Kirkman et al., 2004; Choong and Lau, 2011; Harris et al., 2009; Rae, 2013; Chan, 2003; Menon, 1999; Fernandez and Moldogaziev, 2013). Likewise, the empirical research on the studies linking PE and JS found that PE components were significant and positively associated with JS. However, results of the relationship between the four components of PE and JS vary from one study to another (Dickson and Lorenz, 2009; Carless, 2004; Thomas and Tymon, 1994; Spreitzer et al., 1997; Liden et al., 2000). The study by Carless (2004) examined each of the four components of PE and found significant associations between competence, meaning and impact (but not autonomy) components and JS. The research conducted Harris et al. (2009) found that the quality of LMX relationships and the empowerment gives impact on JS and employee performance. Dhladhla (2011) stated that high levels of perceived PE were associated with high levels of JS. Laage (2003) found thatJS as a total correlates practically significant to both of the empowerment questionnaires as well as to impact, self-determination, goal internalization and perceived control. In this study, perceived control was the better predictor of JS than the other sub-scales. Hechanova et al. (2006) found that PE positively correlated both JS and JP. Bowen and Lawler (1995) argued that PE practices improve JS, in part by giving employees a sense of control and making work more meaningful. In another study on the nurses, Laschinger et al. (2001) agreed that the feelings of PE strongly influenced nurses work satisfaction. At the team level, Kirkman and Rosen (1999) found support for the notion that PE was positively related to JS. George (2013) found that there were positive and significant influences between the four components of employee PE and overall JS. Salazar et al. (2006) found that all PE constructs significantly correlated with managers’ JS. However, they stated that only meaningfulness and trust significantly predicted satisfaction levels. Illardi et al. (1993) found that employees who felt strongly that their work allowed them to experience autonomy, competence and relatednessreported higher levels of JS. The findings from Deci et al. (1989) indicated that a managerial orientation that promoted self-determination had a positive effect on general JS among employees. The study conducted by Dickson and Lorenz (2009) concluded that both meaning and impact component had a positive relation with JS of temporary and part-time nonstandard workers. But according to Dickson and Lorenz (2009) competence component did not have any relation and self determination component had a negative relation with JS. Saif and Saleh (2013) found that meaning, self-determination and impact had a significant effect on JS, but competence had no effect on JS. They stated that the highest variation was explained by impact. Rae (2013) found a significant association between the autonomy component of PE and JS. However, no significant association was found between the other PE components: competence, influence, meaningfulness and JS. Malan (2002) indicated a practical significance between JS and perceived control, self-determination and meaning. Spreitzer et al. (1997) concluded that meaning was the strongest predictor of general JS, while impact and self-determination were unrelated to JS whereas Thomas and Tymon (1994) reported that meaning, self-determination and impact were significant predictors of general JS and that competence was unrelated to general JS. In another study by Liden et al. (2000) meaning was an important predictor of JS. But they indicated that competence cognition had a significant negative relationship with JS. According to a study conducted by Fulford and Enz (1995) on the effect of psychological components of empowerment, it was revealed that components of meaningful and influence were the two strongest effects on JS in the hospitality industry. Fock et al. (2011) indicated that influences of PE components on JS were not uniform. Self-determination had the strongest effect on JS followed by impact but no significant results were found with respect to meaning and competence. Dehkordi et al. (2011) stated that meaning, self-determination and competence significantly predicted overall JS. Indradevi (2011) found that autonomy was the most important component that predicted JS followed by meaningful work, competence and impact. Holdsworth and Cartwright (2003) through their research found that three elements of PE, i.e. meaningfulness, self-determination, and impact were in positive and significant relation to JS of the personnel among employees of call centre. Patah et al. (2009)found thatmeaning, competence, and influence (i.e. self-determination and impact) significantly affected respondents’ state of overall JS in five-star hotels in Kuala Lumpur. In their study, Barling and Cooper (2008) found that competence and impact were most strongly related to managerial effectiveness, whereas meaning was the best predictor of JS. In summary, these prior studies described above show that there were mixed findings about the association between the components of PE and JS. Therefore, it appeared appropriate to examine how a employee’s perception of the degree of PE components provided by their workplace may be a key determinant of their sense of JS. Conceivably, if employees can find meaning in their jobs (Spreitzer 1995), congruent with and fulfilling their desired work values, they will be satisfied. Moreover, if employees feel competent(Spreitzer 1995), they are more likely to be confident and satisfied with their job. Furthermore, employees exhibiting high self-determination and impact (Spreitzer 1995) can attribute success to themselves, thereby leading to JS. Consequently, we proposed the following hypothesis:

*H1: PE components (meaning, competence, self-determination and impact) have positive effects on JS.*

**2.2 The Relationship between JS and JP**

The total organizational performance depends on efficient and effective performance of individual employees of the organization. Among employees, JS is often considered as an important motivator and an important influence on employee behaviour and ultimately, organizational effectiveness (Spector, 1997). Employees with higher JS are important since they are more committed to the organization, have higher retention rates and tend to have higher productivity (Bin Hussin, 2011). In order to do that highly satisfied work force is an absolutely necessity for achieving a high level of performance advancement of an organization. Thus every organization tries to create a satisfied work force to operate the well-being of the organization. The study of the relationship between JS and JP is one of the most venerable research traditions in industrial-organizational psychology. Studies have revealed that employees’ attitudes and feelings towards their jobs and/or job experiences have been found to have significant effect on their performance (George, 2013). For example, a highly satisfied employee may work more than the expected number of hours, or attempt to achieve organizational goals more efficiently so the organization can achieve higher profits (Rae, 2013).People who have a sense of belonging and are satisfied in their jobs feel that they are valued and meaningful responsibly to perform them toward their goals potentially (Scingduenchai and Prasert, 2005). JS-JP hypothesis refers to the intuitive belief of management that a happy worker is the cause of a productive worker or that a productive employee causes an employee to be happy. The bulk of the early research focused on the individual within the organization and implied that JS leads to higher JP. Research, however, has not yielded any strong evidence that the relationship exists. In a reexamination of the meta-analytic relationship between JS and JP, Judge et al. (2001)indicated that the mean true correlation between JS and JP was moderate in mag­nitude (.30) and distinguishable from zero. In addition, Judge et al. (2001) recently argued that “the time has come for researchers to reconsider the satisfaction–performance relationship.” As can be seen, this is quite open for debate as much today as in the past. A great deal of previous literature aimed at identifying these conditions has focused on the nature of performance, resulting in some evidence that JS may be more strongly related to some aspects of performance than others (e.g., Rehman and Waheed, 2011; [Scheicler et al.,](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed?term=Schleicher%20DJ%5BAuthor%5D&cauthor=true&cauthor_uid=14769129) 2004). Consequently, the researchers on JS and JP have concluded that the two are only weakly, if even related, while one continues to assume that relatively satisfied workers perform relatively well in their jobs. Based on this discussion, the following hypothesis was proposed.

*H2: JS has significant effect on JP.*

**2.3 The Relationship between PE and JP: Mediating Effect of JS**

In pursuit of better performance, most organizations are putting employee empowerment programs in place which are aimed at creating a link between business objectives and individual objectives (Scingduenchai and Prasert, 2005). PE practices aimed at providing employees with access to job related knowledge and skills and granting them discretion to change work processes increase encouragement to performance. The construct of PE explains how and why an employee’s job can act as a motivator to energize, direct, and sustain the employee behaviors that ultimately are associated with both task and contextual JP and employee turnover intentions (Harris et al., 2009). If an employee is high in empowerment and thus motivated by the job itself, the relationship with a supervisor is of less importance as the job provides the motivation and which is associated with more positive outcomes (Harris et al., 2009). PE generates improved individual and organizational performance to help employees reach certain personal goals by authorizing employees to participate in the decision-making process, inspect their own jobs and find and fix problems (Seibert, 2004). Moreover, PE improves performance because of the opportunities empowerment provides for the employees to do their work more effectively. Empowered employees are typically described as self-motivated and committed individuals who feel responsible to perform at high levels of effort (Thomas and Velthouse, 1990). Thomas and Velthouse (1990) says that empowered employees improve performance by recovering quickly from errors in the service delivery, learning from those recoveries, generating and redesigning processes and products. They may feel that the job has become very meaningful and satisfying. Empowered people will handle their jobs creatively and tend to perform their jobs effectively (Scingduenchai and Prasert, 2005). It was well established that an individual who feels meaningful would perceive that related tasks fulfill his or her desired values, and would therefore formulate a favorable attitude toward such tasks and achieve high performance (Hackman and Oldham, 1980). Accordingly, we contended that the meaningfulness derived from assessing tasks in workplace positively affects individuals’ JP. Bagherzadeh et al. (2014) found that from among the components of PE, only the meaningfulness component has a direct relationship with JP. Given that the positive relationship between competence and performance has gained empirical support from prior studies conducted in traditional organizational contexts (e.g., Liden et al., 2000; Spreitzer et al., 1997). If tasks are self-assignedby the employees rather than through the chain of commands, they have a high degree of control over what tasks to take on and how to perform these tasks by following their own schemata, as opposed to following the orders from superiors. From a cognitive perspective, they generally have more complete knowledge and information about what they can contribute, and therefore are in a better position than others to identify the right tasks to work on. There is consistent support for the positive effects of autonomy on performance in prior research (e.g., Liden et al., 2000). If the employees jointly determine whether individual inputs can be transformed into valuable collective, they may feel strongly that they are making an impact on the task. When experiencing impact, an individual would tend to process information systematically, obtain an understanding of a situation, be aware of unexpected consequences of previous actions, and have information necessary to make accurate adjustments in performing the task (Kirkman and Rosen, 1999). Indeed, it was established that impact has a positive effect on performance (Spreitzer et al., 1997). As a result, being passionate about the jobs (perceiving meaning on the job) and confident of their abilities to perform job (being competent) by working autonomously (perceiving self-determination on the job)to make a difference in the workplace (perceiving impact on the job), psychologically empoweredmanufacturing employees were at avantage position to exhibit high level of JP. In addition, previous research has shown a small but significant, positive relationship between PE and individual JP (e.g., Liden et al., 2000; Spreitzer et al., 1997; Seibert et al., 2004; Scingduenchai and Prasert, 2005; Bordin et al., 2007). Tuuli and Rowlinson (2009) proved that PE had direct and positive effect on JP and also was mediated by intrinsic motivation, opportunity to perform and ability to perform. Kimolo’s (2013)study established that there was relationship between employee PE practice and employee JP. On the other hand, Aryee and Chen (2006) provided empirical evidence that PE leads to higher JS and JP in a Chinese sample of manufacturing workers. Chow et al. (2006) demonstrated the fact that empowerment significantly improves performance. Tsala (2008) found out that there was relationship between employee PE and JP at the city council of Nairobi. A study by Dewettinck et al. (2003) suggested that there was a a differential impact of the distinct PE dimensions on employee JP levels. Fathi et al. (2012) indicated that there was a direct and strong correlation between the components of PE and employee JP. Degago (2014) found that impact was found to be the most important component followed by competence, meaningful work, and self-determination. However, in predicting the JP in software companies, Indradevi (2012) found that meaningful work was found to be the most important component followed by impact, autonomy, and competence. Iqbal et al. (2013) found that positive relationship between meaningful work, competency and employee JP.

When employees feel that they are powerful and can influence others ultimately they become confident and perform better as well as their JS level increases. Given that the extant literature primarily focused on the understanding of direct effects of PE on JP, we conducted further data analysis to test the mediating effect of JS, because JS may bring JP. Such a test was important as its results would support the necessity of including JS in a research model on the relationship between PE components and behavior outcomes. First, it was well established that performance was a function of JS, and JS may be affected by perceptions and psychological states and other factors such as available time or energy. According to motivation theory, a motivational construct, such as empowerment, affects individual intention to act, but may not lead to behavior outcomes directly. Thus, empowerment would translate into accomplished work by means of the JS. Second, empirical findings on the direct effects of PE have been mixed and even controversial. For example, Thomas and Tymon (1994) found no relationship between competence, one of the critical components of PE, and performance, while Locke and Shaw (1984) found that competence was positively related to performance. The mixed findings indicated that an examination of possible mediating effects may extend our understanding of PE’s effects on performance, resolving the inconsistencies in the extant literature. In a recent study Chiang and Hsieh (2012) found that PE of the employees and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) positively influenced JP and that OCB also had partial mediation on the relationship between PE and JP. Moreover, Scingduenchai and Prasert (2005) found that PE affected JP indirectly JS. Ke and Zhang (2012) demonstrated that competence and impact have a positive influence on OSS participants’ performance, while autonomy and meaningfulness have a slightly negative influence on performance. In addition, they stated that empowerment’s effects on performance can be mediated by effort expended. Many more studies showed employee PE to increase JS, and various others find JS to be a key antecedent of JP. Thus, we propose that the effect of employee PE on JP was indirect and mediated by JS. Based upon the theoretical framework discussed above, this study developed following hypotheses.

*H3: PE components (meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact) have positive effects on JP.*

*H4: JS will be mediated the positive effects of PE components on JP.*

**3. Research Methodology**

**3.1 Population and Sample**

The target population of this research was employees working in a large private textilemanufacturing company in Turkey. The list of the employees was obtained from the Human Resources Office of the company which had 462 full time employees. The primary sample consisted of 300 employees who were chosen through simple random sampling method from the list of employees. Participation in the study was voluntary, participants’ identities were anony­mous and confidentiality of responses was assured. A total of 300 self-administered surveys were distributed by the researchers to employee who agreed to participate in the study and only 238 usable ones were retrieved, resulting in response rate of 79.33%. This rate was considered satisfactory for survey research type. Among the manufacturing employees, a predominant 77.7% were male and 22.3% were female. The average age of employees was 30.74±7.368 in this research. Approximately 46% ofthem had bachelor’s degree, with an average organizational tenure of 4.47±3.719 years. Regarding the marital status of the employees, it was specified that 78 persons (32.8%) were single and 160 persons (67.2%) were married.

**3.2 Data Collection: Survey Instrument**

The research design adopted for this study was cross-sectional survey method. Self-administered questionnaires were used in data collection. A Turkish version of the instrument was developed using the back-translation method. All the measures were translated into Turkish language and back translated in English for accuracy. Demographic items were included to allow for descriptive statistics to be performed for an understanding of the sample. In addition, the questionnaire was comprised of three individual, pre-existing reliable and valid multi-item scales. The independent variable, employee’s perceived PE, was measured by a 12-item Psychological Empowerment Scale (PES) developed and validated by Spreitzer (1995). It consisted of four subscales and self-reported items that measure four components of PE: meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact. Each scale consisted of three items that were rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), with high scores indicating high levels of perceptions of PE. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability estimate for overall PE was 0.863. The Cronbach’s alphas for the four components were 0.825 (meaning), 0.802 (competence), 0.834 (self-determination), and 0.891 (impact). JS was measured using the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) developed by Hackman and Oldham (1975). The JDS included a 14-item scale to measure five specific satisfactions; pay, job security, social, supervisory, and growth satisfaction. The format for the items was a 5-point scale ranging from (1) “extremely dissatisfied” to (5) “extremely satisfied.” For this study the overall or global measure of JS was assessed, because a global approach can provide a more complete picture of an individual’s JS than a facet approach. Responses were summed across the 14 items to obtain the overall JDS score. This was done because theory predicted that JS (overall) would be related to JP (see Judge et al., 2001), and to achieve construct correspondence with overall performance, a measure of overall satisfaction was most appropriate.High scores indicated that the employees had high levels of JS. In this study, Coefficient alpha for this scale was 0.925. Self-perceived JP was measured using a 4-item instrument adapted from Sigler and Pearson’s (2000) JP scale which revised from Kirkman and Rosen (1999). The response was 5-point Likert scale with 1 representing strongly disagree and 5 strongly agree. High scores indicated that the employees had high levels of JP. The dependent variable of JP had a high reliability coefficient of 0.851.

**3.3 Data Analysis**

All data were analyzed with SPSS version 16.0 software and descriptive-inferential method. First of all, Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for each of the scales used in this research were computed using reliability analysis to assess the internal consistency of the measuring instruments. Descriptive statistics such as mean scores and standard deviations were computed according to the variables. Pearson product-moment correlation analysis applied in order to check the nature of relationship between the variables and also to identify the level of autocorrelations in variables and multicolliniarity. The primary data analysis technique employed to test the research hypotheses was a series of regression analyses. A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was also conducted to test possible mediating effect of overall JS on the relationship between PE and JP. Standardized beta were used for all of regression analyses. Statistical significance was considered for p values less than 0.05.

**4. Results and Discussion**

**4.1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Analysis**

Table 1 showed the results of the descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation analysis with the Cronbach’s alpha for each scale shown in bold and on the diagonal. To determine to what extent Turkish employees were psychologically empowered, according to Spreitzer’s (1995) model, means and standard deviations were calculated for the four components (meaning, competence, self-determination and impact) and overall PE. The results revealed that overall PE reached a mean of 3.9 (SD=0.649), indicating that the employees perceived themselves as highly empowered, confirming that few restrictions in the work environment exist to prevent workers from resolving matters affecting their daily work and that the management of organization provides a relatively high level of PE. Moreover, each component was rated with mean value of greater than 3. Of the four components of PE, meaning had the highest mean (M=4.42, SD=0.667). This result could indicate that employees in current organization felt very proud of and happy with their work and believed that their work environment enabled them to perform their jobs in meaningful ways. The competence component ranked second and its mean was 4.32 (SD=0.666), indicating that employees believed that they had adequate skills to accomplish their daily jobs. Self-determination came third (M=3.57, SD=1.056). This finding lead us to believe that the state or condition of having independence and being able to function alone without management intervention in the work environment was close to average. Impact ranked fourth (M=3.30, SD=1.116), which showed that the employees believed that they had some influence on what occurs in their organizations and that they had an impact on the activities surrounding them. Additionally, the results in Table 1 showed that overall JS reached a mean of 3.12 (SD=0.811), indicating a moderate level of JS. However, JP reached a mean of 4.16 (SD=0.719), showing that the employees perceived that they had relatively high JP. The Cronbach’s alphas which reported earlier confirmed the reliability of all measurement scales used for this study.

Table 1: Descriptives and Correlations among Studied Variables

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variables | Mean | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 1. Meaning | 4.42 | 0.667 | (0.825) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Competence | 4.32 | 0.666 | 0.531\*\* | (0.802) |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Self-Determination | 3.57 | 1.056 | 0.282\*\* | 0.386\*\* | (0.834) |  |  |  |
| 4. Impact | 3.30 | 1.116 | 0.348\*\* | 0.389\*\* | 0.417\*\* | (0.891) |  |  |
| 5. JS | 3.12 | 0.811 | 0.303\*\* | 0.224\*\* | 0.316\*\* | 0.303\*\* | (0.925) |  |
| 6. JP | 4.16 | 0.719 | 0.395\*\* | 0.497\*\* | 0.417\*\* | 0.390\*\* | 0.310\*\* | (0.851) |

 \*\* Correlation was significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Examination of the correlations between the variables showed that they were highly significant. The results concluded that the four components of employee PE were significantly correlated with each other and were moving in the same direction as one variable or construct. This relationship provided added empirical support for the four componental conceptualization of PE. Moreover, the results indicated that all components of PE were statistically significantly related to JS. Self-determination showed the highest correlation with JS (r=0.316). Meaning and impact were also practically significantly related to JS (both medium effects, r=0.303). Finally, competence had a weak positive correlation to the measures of JS (r=0.224). These relationships could be interpreted that the more Turkish employees had empowerment, the more they were satisfied with their jobs. Thus, individuals who experienced a sense of purpose in their work, who strongly felt competent in their jobs, who believed that they could influence the system in which they were embedded, and who had self-endorsed goals were more satisfied with their work. In addition, the result indicated that there were fairly significant, moderate and positive correlations between PE components, namely meaning (r=0.395), competence (r=0.497), self-determination (r=0.417), and impact (r=0.390), and JP. This meant that higher levels of PE perceptions led to higher levels of JP. The correlation results also revealed that overall JS was significantly and positively correlated with JP (r=0.310), thus indicating that the employees who had a high level of JS were likely had high level of JP. All of the bivariate correlations among the six measures were moderate, less than 0.90 and statistically significant (p<0.01), indicating that the data was not affected by serious collinearity problem and providing confidence that the measures were functioning properly. Moreover, the correlations among the study variables provided initial support for our hypotheses.

**4.2 The Effects of PE Components on JS**

The effects of the four components of employee PE on overall JS were explored and examined by using multiple regression analysis. In order to confirm the H1 of this study, JS was regressed on the components of PE.

The regression results revealed that the overall model for Equation 1 was significant with an F value of 11.741; p<0.001. It was proved that there were positive and significant relationships between PE components and JS. As indicated by the results of the regression test in Table 2, from the four components of PE, meaning, self-determination and impact significantly and directly affected employees’ state of overall JS and they were the predictors of JS. The results also indicated that 16.8% of the variance in employee JS was explained by PE components (R²=0.168). The Beta calculations showed that the highest variation was explained by meaning (β=0.203), the next highest was explained by self-determination (β=0.202), and the lowest was explained by impact (β=0.157). However, the competence component had no significant direct effect on JS (β=-0.023, p>0.05) and did not contribute significantly to the model. Therefore, H1 was only partially supported.

Table 2: The Effects of PE Components on JS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Independent Variables(PE Components) | Dependent Variable (JS) |
| Beta (β) | t-value | Sig. |
| Meaning CompetenceSelf-DeterminationImpact | 0.203-0.0230.2020.157 | 2.961-0.3032.8302.264 | 0.003\*\*0.7620.005\*\*0.024\* |
| R2Adjusted R2F | 0.1680.15311.741\*\*\* |

 Note: \* p<0.05; \*\* p<0.01; \*\*\* p<0.001; Standardized regression coefficients (β) are reported.

The results revealed that meaning had positive effect on JS, indicating that the employees who perceived that their job assigned by their superior to be meaningful experienced a higher degree of JS. This is because, if an employee engages himself in a job which is meaningful to him he can derive satisfaction from his work (Spreitzer et al., 1997). This finding was consistent with the previous studies (Yim, 2008; Malan, 2002; Saif and Saleh, 2013; Dickson and Lorenz, 2009; Stander and Rothmann, 2010; Patah et al., 2009; Hackman and Oldham, 1980; Thomas and Tymon, 1994; Salazar, 2000; Fulford and Enz, 1995; Salazar et al., 2006; Hancer and George, 2003; Bowen and Lawler, 1995; Carless, 2004; Liden et al., 2000; Wang and Lee, 2009; Spreitzer et al., 1997; Holdsworth and Cartwright, 2003). This finding indicated that when opportunities were created to experience meaning in work, employees’ attachment to work was stimulated, thus resulting in JS. Thus, if the employees’ found that the works they perform were consistent with their beliefs, attitudes and behaviours, this would result in higher JS and they would be happy to perform their work. Although Rae (2013) stated that no significant association was found between meaning and JS, this study also revealed that meaning was the better predictor of JS than the other components. This result was aligned with the findings made by Spreitzer (1996) and Barling and Cooper (2008) who also found that the meaning was the strongest contributor to overall JS.

The results revealed that self-determination had positive effect on JS. Carless (2004) found that self-determination (autonomy) was not relationship with JS. Nevertheless, this result was consistent with those from large meta-analyses and the previous studies showing that empowerment practices aimed at providing feedback and granting autonomy were positively related to JS (Yim, 2008; Malan, 2002; Saif and Saleh, 2013; Laschinger et al., 2003; Salazar et al., 2006; Spreitzer et al., 1997; Holdsworth and Cartwright, 2003; Hancer and George, 2003; Scingduenchai and Prasert, 2005; Liden et al., 2000; Thomas and Tymon, 1994; Illardi et al., 1993; Deci et al., 1989; Patah et al., 2009; Rae, 2013). This findings revelaed that if the employees felt that had the right choice, he/she motivated in terms of behavior and this intrinsic motivation was caused to increase JS. Thus, this study indicated that it was important for the employees to be given a considerable degree of autonomy in their work roles so that they could feel a sense of JS in the workplace. In other words, when the employees felt they possessed freedom of action and the requisite independence for initiation and consistency of behavior and processes, decisiveness in regard to the manner of performing their career duties and finally the personal ingenuity while performing their responsibilities, they were likely to be more satisfied with their jobs.

The results revealed that impact had also positive effect on JS, indicating that the more the employees perceive a high level of impact, the more they are satisfied with their job. This means that the employees those who were influential in the workplace and who felt that they could influence strategic, administrative or operating outcomes would be most likely to experience a higher level of JS. Spreitzer et al.’s (1997) and Rae’s (2013) study did not support the effect of perceived impact on JS. However, the result of this study was consistent with the previous studies (Patah et al., 2009; Laschinger et al., 2003; Salazar et al., 2006; Hancer and George, 2003; Stander and Rothmann, 2010; Malan, 2002; Dickson and Lorenz, 2009; Holdsworth and Cartwright, 2003; Fulford and Enz, 1995; Bowen and Lawler, 1995; Carless, 2004; Thomas and Tymon, 1994). The finding that impact was positively related with JS, provides support that the perception of impact over one’s work can be important in the workplace, even for the employees who may not have high expectations for their opportunities to impact their workplace. It was likely that they perceived impact primarily over local, operational outcomes. Accordingly, they were more satisfied with their current job position, current employer and the type of job that they were doing if they were allowed more opportunities to participate actively in the work-group decision making process in company. Contrary to our expectations, the results indicated that compentencehad not direct effect on JS. This finding was quite surprising in light of the previously mentioned research. For example, Illardi et al. (1993) and Spreitzer et al. (1997) reported that competence was positively related to JS among subordinates, but several previous studies found that competence was negatively related to JS (Liden et al., 2000; Barling and Cooper, 2008; Carless, 2004; Stander and Rothmann, 2010; Salazar et al., 2006; Hancer and George, 2003). However, there were other studies that also failed to find a significant positive link. Thus, the result of this study was consistent with the findings of Dickson and Lorenz (2009); Yim (2008); Holdsworth and Cartwright (2003); Thomas and Tymon (1994); Rae (2013); and Spreitzer et al. (1997) who also found that the relationship between the competence component of PE and JS was not practically significant. Therefore, it seemed that it did not suffice to simply increase self-efficacy or competence perceptions of employees to increase their JS; rather, additional career opportunities and work redesign may be deemed necessary. There are at least two plausible explanations for this unexpected result. First, it was likely that highly competent employees found it especially difficult to derive a significant amount of satisfaction from their jobs, because they could achieve good results with relative ease. As a result, their jobs may be perceived as less challenging, thwarting perceptions of JS, in line with research on job design. Second, according to self-regulating theories of motivation*,* individuals possessing highhighly competentare more likely to accept or self-set difficult goals, which enhances their levels of motivation. Higher goals demand that individuals push their perceived level of performance to higher levels to be satisfied. But, the failure of achievement of these higher self-set goals may oftentimes give rise to job dissatisfaction. As a result, the findings in this study revealed the need to seek the potential of the sub-component of competence thoroughly in determining JS in the manufacturing industry.

**4.3 The Effect of JS on JP**

In order to test H2, a simple regression analysis was conducted and JP regressed on JS. The result indicated that the model for predicting JP based on JSwas significant (F=25.130, p<0.001). The R2 value was 0.096, which meant that JS was interpreted 9.6 % of the variance of JP. The result also revealed that JS had a positive significant effect on JP (β=0.310, p<0.001), indicating that JS was a significant predictor of JP. Thus support was found for Hypothesis 2. According to this result, satisfied worker leads to extend more effort to JP, then works harder and better. When an employee feels a satisfaction about the job, he/she is motivated to do grater effort to the JP. This result of the present study was in line with past studies (Bin Hussin, 2011; Judge et al., 2001; Scheicler et al., 2004; Rehman and Waheed, 2011; Pushpakumari, 2008) who found positive relation between JS and JP. Satisfied employees have positive attitudes regarding their jobs. The positive attitudes will increase the quality and quantity of employees’ JP. Moreover, satisfied employees are tend to attend to work on time, more concern about the given targets, work speedily, work free of errors and omissions, loyalty and commitment to the job, less dependability, suggest new ideas, tend to improve knowledge, willing to accept more responsibility, obedience of rules and regulations, less absenteeism and effort to retain in the present job.

Table 3: Regression Analysis Results of the Effect of JS on JP

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Independent Variable | Dependent Variable (JP) |
| Beta (β) | t-value | Sig. |
| JS | 0.310 | 5.013 | 0.000\*\*\* |
| R2Adjusted R2F | 0.0960.09225.130\*\*\* |

 Note: \* p<0.05; \*\* p<0.01; \*\*\* p<0.001; Standardized regression coefficients (β) are reported.

**4.4 The Relationship between PE and JP: Mediating Effect of JS**

Hiercachical regression analysis was undertaken to test the extent of effects of PE components on JP and the mediating effect of JS. We applied Baron and Kenny’s (1986) strategy for testing mediating effect of JS with multiple regression. According to them, four conditions must be met to confirm the presence of mediation effect. Firstly, the predictor variable (PE components) must have a significant effect on the mediator variable (JS). Secondly, the mediator variable (JS) must have a significant effect on the dependent variable (JP). Thirdly, the predictor variable (PE components) must have a significant effect on the dependent variable (JP). Finally, the effect of the predictor (PE components) should not be significant (in case of full mediation) or should be reduced in strength (in case of partial mediation) after it was controlled for the mediator variable (JS). The above results fulfilled the first two conditions of testing mediation. Thus, with regard to the first and second conditions, we have shown that perceptions of PE components had significant effect on JS, except for competence and JS had a significant effect on JP (Tables 2 and 3). In the final step of the analysis, we needed to establish whether perceived PE components had significant effects on JP, and whether these effects were reduced or eliminated after the effect of JS had been taken into account. As shown in Table 4, when JS was not in the model (Step 1), all the four PE components had significant effects on JP. Thus the result indicated that PE components (meaning, competence, self-determination and impact) account for 33.9% significant variance in JP (R2=0.339) and this regression model was significant (F=29.928, p<0.001). It was observed that among PE factors, competence and meaning represent the highest and the lowest amount of JP variance respectively. According to the result, standardized coefficient beta values between meaning (β=0.132, p<0.05), competence (β=0.294, p<0.001), self-determination (β=0.207, p<0.01), impact (β=0.145 p<0.05) and JP were significant. This result indicated that there were direct positive effects of all PE components on JP. These relationships could be interpreted all PE components were significant predictors of JP, providing support for the third condition and so, H3 was fully accepted. In the second step, JS was introduced into the overall model of meaning, competence, self-determination, impact and JP. When all of PE components and JP were entered together, they accounted for 35% of the total variance in JP (R2=0.350; F=25.034; p<0.001) in the final model. Moreover, when JS was introduced as a mediator (step 2 in Table 4), the relationships between competence and JP (β=0.291, p<0.001), between self-determination and JP (β=0.183, p<0.01), and between impact and JP (β=0.126, p<0.05) remained significant. Yet, the relationship between meaning and JP became insignificant (β=0.109, p˃0.05). These results indicated that JS partially mediated the relationships between competence, self-determination, impact and JP, but fully mediated the relationship between meaning and JP. Thus, H4 was accepted as the data support the notion that JS mediated the relationships between PE components and JP.

Table 4: Regression Analysis Results of the Effects of PE Components on JP: Mediating Effect of JS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Independent Variables(Predictors) | Dependent Variable (JP) |
| Beta (β) | t-value | Sig. | Beta (β) | t-value | Sig. |
| *Step 1: PE Components*Meaning CompetenceSelf-DeterminationImpact*Step 2: Mediating Variable*JS | 0.1320.2940.2070.145 | 2.0684.4303.3972.344 | 0.040\*0.000\*\*\*0.001\*\*0.020\* | 0.1090.2910.1830.1260.115 | 1.6844.3642.9772.0421.986 | 0.0940.000\*\*\*0.003\*\*0.042\*0.048\* |
| R2Adjusted R2FR2 ChangeF Change | 0.3390.32829.928\*\*\* | 0.3500.33625.034\*\*\*0.011\*3.944\* |

 Note: \* p<0.05; \*\* p<0.01; \*\*\* p<0.001; Standardized regression coefficients (β) are reported.

The findings indicated that all of PE components were positively and significantly affected the level of employees’ JP and they simultaneously predicted it, which was also suggested in previous studies (Indradevi, 2012; Barrutia et al., 2009; Tuuli and Rowlinson, 2009; Degago, 2014; Meyerson and Dewettinck, 2012). By considering the results, competence as one of PE components had the most effect on improvement of employees’ JP. Thus, feeling competent at work contributed to JP. This was consistent with the findings of prior researches (Iqbal et al., 2013; Ke and Zhang, 2010; Liden et al., 2000; Spreitzer et al., 1997). Accordingly, as employees become more empowered, their self-efficacy (competence) expectations will be enhanced, thereby increasing the amount of effort and time they dedicate to performing a task (Conger and Kanungo, 1988). In other words, empowered employees have a higher expectancy in their ability to perform a task successful; they exert greater effort and persist in those efforts when faced with adversity. The findings also revealed that meaning had a direct positive effect on JP. This was consistent with previous studies (Iqbal et al., 2013; Patah et al., 2009; Indradevi, 2012; Bagherzadeh et al., 2014). Thus, when employees found a fit between their values and the organization’s goals and delivering meaningfuljobs, they were more likely to be loyal, service oriented, concerned with others, and high performers. Moreover, the results indicated that self-determination had a direct positive effect on JP, which was consistent with previous studies (e.g., Liden et al., 2000). Indeed, a sense of autonomy at work, along with feeling of having control over the outcome, increases effort and in addition to exerting greater effort or working harder, empowered employees also seem to perform better by working smarter by seeking out new and better ways of doing things (Conger and Kanungo, 1988). The employees feel they possess freedom of action and the requisite independence for initiation and consistency of behavior and processes, decisiveness in regard to the manner of performing their career duties and finally the personal ingenuity while performing their responsibilities. The findings indicated that impact had a direct positive effect on JP. Likewise, Ke and Zhang (2010), Spreitzer et al. (1997); Kirkman and Rosen (1999) also found that impact had positive relationship with JP. According to this result, when the employees thought that they have enough power to penetrate in the executive, official and strategic outcomes of their work and also have a great control over whatever takes place in the area of their work, they exhibited high level of JP. So, management should involve and consult employees in decision making process of their organizations. Finally, the results of the mediating regression showed that employee PE components had a positive and substantively significant effects on JS, which in turn, had a negative and substantively significant effect on JP. Thus, the relationships between PE components and JP were positive and mediated by JS. This findings revealed that there were also indirect effects of PE components on JP through the intervening variable of JS. This meant that if manufacturing employees perceived high meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact, this may lead to higher JS, which in turn, could lead to higher levels of JP.

**Conclusions**

This study focused specifically on the relationships between PE components and JP, as well as examining whether JS had any effect on the relationship between these variables among manufacturing employees. The following conclusions were drawn based on the findings of this study. The empowerment scores for each construct indicated that most of the employees agreed that: (1) their jobs retained personal meaning; (2) they felt very competent in performing their jobs; (3) they could practice self-determining behaviors; (4) their work and values had impact on the organization. Thus, this study implied that the employees in the manufacturing organization perceived themselves as highly empowered. Thus, it was established that the management of Turkish organizations provided a comparatively acceptable level of PE. Moreover, the study displayed that the most employees were satisfied with their jobs and perceived high JP. On the basis of results, the present study implied that the higher the level of PE, the greater the level of JS and JP in Turkish employees. The effect of employees’ PE on their level of JS proved to be valid and significant in this study. Thus, the findings of this study provided additional empirical support for Spreitzer’s (1995) theoretical suggestion and for the prior studies that emphasized the importance of employees PE as one of the factors influencing JS (Liden et al., 2000; Spreitzer et al., 1997, Carless, 2004; Saif and Saleh, 2013). However, the study did not find that competence component of PE was a predictor for JS in Turkish employees. This finding implied that the employees whose job had a higher level of meaning, those who had self-determination and those who were influential in the workplace would be most likely to experience a higher level of JS. Accordingly, the employees felt higher level of JS when their work goals aligned with their own ideals and standards and the employees considered their career goals valuable and had a noticeable inner motivation about their works. In addition, the employees perceiving themselves as having influenceover others was also a critical factor in shaping JS as liking the work and being able to influence what happens at work are critical (Fulford and Enz, 1995). Moreover, the findings suggested that when the employees had more autonomy (self-determination), they would be highly satisfied with their jobs. From the findings in this study, it could be concluded that enhancing employees’ PE perceptions by giving them autonomy, independence, feeling of meaning and enhancing their impact would also reason to increase the employees’ JS and ultimately the respective organizational overall productivity will increase. However, the study found that the relationship was stronger in meaning followed by self-determination and impact. Therefore, the managers could especially concentrate on the meaning and impact cognitions if they want employees to feel more JS through the process of PE. One way to increase meaning would be to set clear goals that do not contradict the employees’ values. Another way would be to make sure employees know how they fit into the big picture of the organization. Showing employees how their jobs fit into the organization and how the tasks they complete affect the outcomes of the company may increase their perception of meaning. Moreover, impact could be increased by giving workers processes by which they can suggest operational changes in their work environment. The employees’ PE level can be increased by providing opportunities of participation in decision making, nurturing good environment as well as matching the vales of employees with their work ultimately reasons to increase the employees JS. One of the major findings in the current study was the role of JS as a possible driving force behind the development of JP. This study had identified a strong positive relationship between employee JS and JP. Employees who are extremely satisfied with their jobs will engage in their work with greater and more intense interest and will provide quality care. Moreover, if organizations can be more concerned about the JS of employees, better performances can be expected. This aspect should be given more consideration by the managers in order to improve performance. For this, in macro level managers can be educated the importance of the concept of JS (Pushpakumari, 2008). In addition, future research should investigate whether or not all four aspects of JS would cause high JP.

The findings of this study recognized a solid relationship among employee PE and JPof the employees. Our data analysis results revealed that meaning, competence, self-determination and impact had positive effects on JP, thus employee performance was anticipated by all determinants of PE. JP was predicted by PE and among the four components of PE, in manufacturing company competence was found to be the most important component predicting JP followed by self-determination, impact, and meaning. Thus the employees would be likely to show a higher level of JP when they found their work meaningful, when they had enough skills to perform their job well, when they had freedom to make decisions about their work, and when they felt that they could have an impact on organizational outcomes. Supervisors and managers play an important role in engaging work environments and increasing JP of employees. Interventions should focus on meaningful work, competence, self-determination and impact. In this study, competence was established to be very essential determinant forecasting the performance of employee. These findings support Spreitzer’s PE theory because they both influence the feelings of the employees and these results in an increase in their abilities to get things done. Thus, these results provide encouraging support for the managers to create and maintain an environment which provides good opportunities, ample resources, support, useful information, autonomy, and great support for all employees. Employees who work in these environment will have the capacity to achieve their goals and they will get more power if they feel that they are able to manage their jobs. So, the managers should build the competence of the employees. Furthermore, they could create autonomy-supportive work climates by taking employees’ perspectives into account, providing greater choice, and encouraging self-initiation. They must create work environments in which people experience their work as meaningful and where they feel that they can influence events. Influence (self-determination and impact) was stimulated when managers and supervisors provide a meaningful rationale for performing an uninteresting task, acknowledge the perspective and feelings of employees about tasks, and structure work to allow interdependence among employees (Stander and Rothmann, 2010). On the other hand, according to self-determination theory (Ryan and Deci, 2001), feeling competent and confident with respect to valued goals was associated with enhanced intrinsic motivation. It was suggested to organization’s manager that: Employees were allowed to get involved in cession of activities, so that they played a role in choosing job and condition of its implementation. Because in this case, it was more possibility that they accepted their delegated tasks eagerly, performed the jobs with competence and experience getting empowered. In delegation of every task, holding a justification meeting was useful and essential. Individuals mustn’t be responsible for indefinite tasks; expected result of each task must be expressed clearly. Clearness of whatever must be done the reason for its importance was a prerequisite for delegation of authority and consequently performance improvement. Control and supervision should focus on results instead of methods of performance of the job. When tasks and authorities were obligated, excessive control on performance methods, destroys morale of confidence. The present study implied that, in addition to direct effects, components of PE indirectly influence JP through JS, confirming that JS mediated the relationships between PE components and JP. Thus, the notion of JS was successfully applied within the empowerment management models of the organization under study. This meant that when the employees of the manufacturing sector were psychologically empowered they feel that their work contributions were meaningful and felt powerful in their abilities to shape the organization, thus leading to more JS and resulting in increased JP of the employees.

The findings of this study supported and broadened PE research literature mainly published in Western and Eastern organizational settings. Accordingly, the more the employees perceived a high level of PE, the more they were satisfied with their job, and the more they had high level of JP. Therefore, special emphasis should be placed on meaningful work and on each of the components of PE. The findings of the study directly benefited the manufacturing industry since the management would initiate employee PE programs which would ultimately result in enhancing employee JP in terms of delivery of effective and efficiency services to the huge client in their areas of jurisdiction. Utilization of the findings contributed to overcome the problems of employee PE in manufacturing sector and given a fair idea that employee JS and JP could be achieved through empowerment. The management should maintain and reinforce the current levels of PE implementation and should do more to enhance PE, as it could lead to work effectiveness and satisfaction without the expenditure of financial resources. Moreover, the managers must fully understand the importance of PE and must be trained in the best method of applying PE in their organizations. Organizations should empower people through participation, supporting resources, information and rewards, freedom in handling tasks and opportunities to make decisions. Organization should create a supportive work environment and job characteristics to empower person to work effectively such as job enrichment and promotion. However, employees PE was strongly criticized in increasing the work load of employees. Therefore, management should ensure that employee PE was seen as an opportunity rather a strategy to increase the work load of other employees. Similarly management should put in place internal controls to check the misuse of power and authority in their organizations. Thus employees PE without adequate training of employees would be a major treat to employee relation in organization. Managers should note that PE will not happen naturally in organization, but must be initiated and is an ongoing process. On the other hand, management should be aware that JS has both a vital and a valuable impact on the manufacturing environment and performance. So, managers certainly needed to ensure that employees were satisfied and enjoy what they do at work. More focus should be on developing creativity and rooms for employees to exercise empowerment in order to enhance their JS level and performance thus providing quality service to customers. As a result, in today’s global competiveness there is a great desire on the part of the employees to play an active role in organization activities and as such every effort should be made to accommodate employees views. Therefore the study recommended that employee PE practices should be supported by both top and middle level management in the regional development authorities as this will improve employees JP tremendously. This study had various limitations. The study used a cross-sectional research design,which does not allow for assessment of impact or cause and effect. The study used self-report measures, therefore the present findings may be partly affected by common method variance. Future studies should employ longitudinal research design to strengthen conclusions about the causal direction between PE, JS and JP. Data were collected from one organization in the manufacturing industry and therefore the generalizability of the findings to other types of organizations was questionable. The researcher worked with a sample of employees. Future research should seek to replicate and clarify the relationships with larger and more varied samples. The theoretical model proposed in the current study had the potential to be expanded through the inclusion of further variables that were likely to influence JP among employees. Therefore, future research needs to explore the mediating effects of variables that were not measured in this study such as self-esteem, leadership, organization’ structure, climate, and culture.
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