

DIMENSIONS OF THE TURKISH VERSION OF THE PSYCHOLOGICAL EMPOWERMENT SCALE¹

MURAT HANCER

Adnan Menderes University

Summary.—The purpose of the present study was to examine the dimensions of Spreitzer's Psychological Empowerment Scale for Turkish-speaking people. The scale was tested with a group of undergraduate students in Turkey ($N=214$; M age = 22.6 yr., $SD=1.5$, range = 19–27). Cronbach coefficient alpha was .84. By using maximum likelihood analysis with oblique rotation, three factors emerged and were labeled Influence, Meaning, and Competence.

Psychological empowerment, defined by Conger and Kanungo (1988), is a motivational process whereby an employee's self-efficacy is enhanced, enabling him to accomplish work more effectively and efficiently or achieve his goals successfully. Another study conducted by Thomas and Velthouse (1990) viewed empowerment as not only self-efficacy (competence) but also task meaning, self-determination, and effectiveness. Based on Thomas and Velthouse's study, Spreitzer considered psychological empowerment as a psychological state that is manifest as cognitions which reflect an individual's orientation to his work role and are meaning, competence, self-determination and impact. The Psychological Empowerment Scale (Spreitzer, 1992, 1995), focuses on these four cognitions and measures psychological empowerment based on related cognitions. Since its development, the scale has been employed in a number of studies in the United States (e.g., Kraimer, Seibert, & Liden, 1999; Dee, Henkin, & Duemer, 2003; Hancer & George, 2003) and in other countries (e.g., Mok & Au-Yeung, 2002; Hu & Leung, 2003).

Measuring psychological empowerment across diverse cultures is important for understanding the universal aspects of empowerment. Given various benefits of the Psychological Empowerment Scale and its appropriateness for employees working in organizations, it was essential to have translation that maintained the original factors for empowerment states and provided a base for cross-cultural studies of empowerment. Therefore, we translated the Psychological Empowerment Scale into Turkish and evaluated this version's factors for Turkish-speaking people with the kind permission of Dr. G. M. Spreitzer (1992).

¹Please address correspondence to Murat Hancer, Assistant Professor, School of Tourism & Hotel Management, Adnan Menderes University, Kusadasi, 09400, Turkey or e-mail (hancerm@yahoo.com).

METHOD

Participants and Procedure

The participants of the study were 214 undergraduate students at the Adnan Menderes University School of Hospitality and Tourism in Turkey. The sample included 128 male and 86 female students. The mean age of the sample was 22.6 yr. ($SD=1.5$, range=19–27). While over half of the students (56%) were seniors, 35% of the students were juniors, and 8.4% of the students were sophomores.

The scale was administered to students during regular class sessions in their classrooms in groups of approximately 30 students. The scale included questions about age, sex, and class rank of the respondents. Students were assured about anonymity and confidentiality by the lecturers who administered the scale in the class.

Scale

Spreitzer's 12-item Psychological Empowerment Scale (1992, 1995) has three items assessing each dimension of empowerment. The scale provided responses on a 7-point scale with anchors of 1: Strongly Disagree and 7: Strongly Agree. The first dimension of empowerment, Meaning, involves a fit between the requirements of a work role and beliefs, values, and behaviors (Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Brief & Nord, 1990). The second dimension, Competence or Self-efficacy, is an individual's belief in his capability to perform activities with skill (Gist, 1987). The third dimension, Self-determination, focuses on an individual's sense of having a choice in initiating and regulating actions (Deci, Connell, & Ryan, 1989). The last dimension, Impact, is how much an individual can influence strategy, administrative, or operating outcomes at work (Ashforth, 1989). In sum, psychological empowerment is defined as a motivational construct manifested in four cognitions: Meaning, Competence, Self-determination, and Impact.

Translation Procedure

Bradley's model (1994) was used to guide the development and evaluation of the Turkish version of the Psychological Empowerment Scale adapted in this study. Three translators independently translated the original version of the Psychological Empowerment Scale (Spreitzer, 1992) to Turkish then back to English (back translation). A two-member back-translation committee, consisting of one translator and the author, was then formed to examine discrepancies between the original English version, the initial Turkish version, and the back-translated English version. The committee's responsibility was to decide on the most appropriate translation of each item and to develop a Turkish version that was linguistically and conceptually equivalent (Bradley, 1994; Chang, Chau, & Holroyd, 1999). Given the cultural differ-

ences between the two languages, some adaptations were made to increase translation accuracy. Differences between translations were discussed and a modified Turkish version was developed after a series of meetings.

RESULTS

The mean Psychological Empowerment total score for the sample of 214 students was 5.8 ($SD=.7$). A maximum likelihood analysis with oblique rotation was used to identify whether there was an empirically derived set of subscales. The suitability of the data was examined before utilizing the factor analysis. The correlation matrix, Bartlett's test of sphericity, measures of sampling adequacy (MSA) for the matrix and for individual variables, and initial estimate of communality for each variable in the observed variable set were taken into consideration while conducting the analysis. Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant, indicating these data do not produce an identity matrix; therefore, they were acceptable for factor analysis. To look at whether the distribution of the values in the set was adequate for conducting factor analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure was used, whose values range from 0 to 1. In the current study, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure was .77 for the sample, so these data were acceptable for factor analysis (Kaiser, 1974). Communalities ranging from .37 to .69 for 12 items indicated the strength of the association among measures. The mean scores for each item replaced the missing scores. All the analyses were computed by using the SPSS 12.0 statistical program.

While the Psychological Empowerment Scale as a multidimensional measure was supported by previous studies (e.g., Spreitzer, 1992, 1995; Hancer & George, 2003), it was important to identify whether the application of the Turkish Psychological Empowerment Scale yielded similar dimensions (Boyle, 1990; Cronbach, 1990; Nunnally, 1994; Streiner & Norman, 1995). A visual inspection of the scree plot suggested that three factors might represent the factor structure of the Psychological Empowerment Scale accurately. In addition, the factor structure was rotated using the Oblique simple structure method. An iterative process of factor analyses and item analyses was used to identify the smallest number of psychologically coherent and meaningful factors (Boyle, 1990; Cronbach, 1990; Nunnally, 1994; Streiner & Norman, 1995). After rotation, the first factor accounted for 40.0%, the second for 14.9%, and the third for 10.0%. Factor 1 consisted of six items all of which loaded above .50. For Factor 1, Items 7 to 9 and Items 10 to 12 were combined into a single factor and named Influence. Factor 1 closely resembles those of Fulford and Enz's (1995) and Hancer and George's (2003) studies. Factor 2 consisted of Items 2 and 3 and was named Meaning. Item 1, however, did not load on any of the factors and was deleted. Factor 3 consisted of Items 4, 5, and 6 and was named Competence (Table 1).

TABLE 1
DIMENSIONS OF TURKISH PSYCHOLOGICAL EMPOWERMENT SCALE

Psychological Empowerment Scale	Factor*		
	1	2	3
Meaning			
2. My job activities are personally meaningful to me. (Meaning 2)	.92		
3. The work I do is meaningful to me. (Meaning 3)	.53		
Influence			
12. I have significant influence over what happens in my department. (Impact 3)		.83	
11. I have a great deal of control over what happens in my department. (Impact 2)		.74	
9. I have considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do my job. (Self-determination 3)		.64	
7. I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job. (Self-determination 1)		.60	
8. I can decide on my own to go about doing my work. (Self-determination 2)		.58	
10. My impact on what happens in my department is large. (Impact 1)		.57	
Competence			
5. I am self-assured about my capabilities to perform my work activities. (Competence 2)			.90
6. I have mastered the skills necessary for my job. (Competence 3)			.76
4. I am confident about my ability to do my job. (Competence 1)			.52
1. The work I do is very important to me. (Meaning 1)†	.33	.13	.10
Eigenvalues	4.31	1.63	1.10
% of variance accounted for	40.0	14.9	10.0
Cumulative	40.0	54.9	64.9

Note.—Factor names in the parentheses indicate Spreitzer's (1992) dimensions of Psychological Empowerment Scale. *Factors 1=Influence; 2=Meaning; 3=Competence. †Deleted item.

DISCUSSION

It is difficult to assure that the psychometric properties of a questionnaire will remain the same after translation (van Kuyk-Minis & Liu, 1998). Therefore, it is necessary to re-estimate reliability and validity using the new version of the questionnaire and using a sample of the target population for which the new questionnaire is intended (van Kuyk-Minis & Liu, 1998). On the other hand, the results of the preliminary psychometric study support the use of the Turkish version of the Psychological Empowerment Scale. Commonalities between the studies examining factor structure of the Psychological Empowerment Scale and this study suggest a probability of both multidimensionality and stability of the Psychological Empowerment Scale. Continuing this cross-cultural adaptation will permit international comparisons and multinational research studies to examine the psychological empowerment of employees in all sectors.

REFERENCES

- ASHFORTH, B. E. (1989) The experience of powerlessness in organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 43, 207-242.
- BOYLE, G. J. (1990) Does item homogeneity indicate internal consistency or item redundancy in psychometric scales? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12, 291-294.
- BRADLEY, C. (1994) Translation of questionnaires for use in different languages and cultures. In C. Bradley (Ed.), *Handbook of psychology: a guide to psychological measurement in diabetes research and management*. Singapore: Harwood Academic. Pp. 43-56.
- BRIEF, A. P., & NORD, W. R. (1990) *Meanings of occupational work*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- CHANG, A., CHAU, J. P. C., & HOLROYD, E. (1999) Translation of questionnaires and issues of equivalence. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 29, 316-322.
- CONGER, J. A., & KANUNGO, R. N. (1988) The empowerment process: integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 471-482.
- CRONBACH, L. J. (1990) *Essentials of psychological testing*. (5th ed.) New York: Harper & Row.
- DECI, E. L., CONNELL, J. P., & RYAN, R. M. (1989) Self-determination in a work organization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 580-590.
- DEE, J. R., HENKIN, A. B., & DUEMER, L. (2003) Structural antecedents and psychological correlates of teacher empowerment. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41, 257-277.
- FULFORD, M. D., & ENZ, C. A. (1995) The impact of empowerment on service employees. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 7, 161-175.
- GIST, M. E. (1987) Self efficacy: implications for organizational behavior and human resource management. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 472-485.
- HACKMAN, J. R., & OLDFHAM, G. R. (1980) *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- HANCER, M., & GEORGE, R. T. (2003) Psychological empowerment of non-supervisory employees working in full-service restaurants. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 22, 3-16.
- HU, S. L. Y., & LEUNG, L. (2003) Effects of expectancy-value, attitudes, and use of the Internet on psychological empowerment experienced by Chinese women at the workplace. *Tele-matics and Informatics*, 20, 365-382.
- KAISER, H. F. (1974) An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39, 31-36.
- KRAIMER, M. L., SEIBERT, S. E., & LIDEN, R. C. (1999) Psychological empowerment as a multidimensional construct: a test of construct validity. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 59, 127-142.
- MOK, E., & AU-YEUNG, B. (2002) Relationship between organizational climate and empowerment of nurses in Hong Kong. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 10, 129-137.

- NUNNALLY, J. C. (1994) *Psychometric theory*. (3rd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill.
- SPREITZER, G. M. (1992) When organizations dare: the dynamics of psychological empowerment in the workplace. Unpublished dissertation, The Univer. of Michigan.
- SPREITZER, G. M. (1995) Individual empowerment in the workplace: dimensions, measurement, validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 1442-1465.
- STREINER, D. L., & NORMAN, G. R. (1995) *Health management scales: a practical guide to their development and use*. (2nd ed.) Oxford, UK: Oxford Univer. Press.
- THOMAS, K. W., & VELTHOUSE, B. A. (1990) Cognitive elements of empowerment: an interpretive model of intrinsic task motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 15, 666-681.
- VAN KUYK-MINIS, M. H., & LIU, L. (1998) Issues related to the translation of measurement scales: a comparison of versions of the arthritis impact measurement scale. *The Occupational Therapy Journal of Research*, 18, 143-156.

Accepted September 12, 2005.

APPENDIX

THE TURKISH FORM OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EMPOWERMENT SCALE

-
1. Yaptığım iş benim için çok önemlidir.
 2. İşimde yaptıklarım benim için kişisel olarak anlamlıdır.
 3. Yaptığım iş benim için anlamlıdır.
 4. İşimi yapma yeteneğim konusunda kendimden eminim.
 5. İşteki faaliyetleri yerine getirecek kapasitede olduğuma inanıyorum.
 6. İşimi yapmak için gereken becerileri edindim.
 7. İşimi nasıl yapacağıma karar verirken önemli ölçüde yetkim var.
 8. İşimi nasıl yapacağıma dair kendi başıma karar verebilirim.
 9. İşimi nasıl yapacağıma dair önemli ölçüde bağımsızlık ve özgürlük olanağım var.
 10. Çalıştığım bölümde olanlara etkim büyüktür.
 11. Çalıştığım bölümde olanları büyük ölçüde ben kontrol ederim.
 12. Çalıştığım bölümde olanlar üzerinde önemli ölçüde hükmüm geçmektedir.
-