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ABSTRACT

Purpose: The objective of this study was to determine the relationship between behavioural empowerment and employee commitment in selected star-rated Hotels in Kisumu City, Kenya. This study was anchored on Social Cognitive Theory.

Methodology: The study adopted explanatory and descriptive research designs. The target population was 1372 non-managerial employees and 130 managerial employees from 34 star rated hotels. A sample size of 310 non-managerial employees and 13 management staff formed the sample for the study. The respondents were selected using stratified and simple random sampling techniques. Questionnaires and interview schedule were used to collect data. The validity of the surveys was established using professional judgment. The dependability of the research tool was assessed using Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. Mean, frequencies, and standard deviation were included in descriptive statistics, whereas linear regression was part of inferential statistics and data presented using tables.

Findings: According to the study's findings, employee commitment and behavioral empowerment were significantly positively correlated in a few star-rated hotels (r=0.751; p<0.05).

Unique Contribution to theory, practice and policy: The study came to the conclusion that, in particular hotels, behavioural empowerment had a substantial impact on employees' engagement. Encourage hotel staff to have confidence in their sense of judgment, values, work roles, and actions related to their jobs.
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Introduction

Employee commitment is regarded one of the main challenges in human resources management, demonstrating the relationship between people and their employers. It evaluates absenteeism, inefficiency, irresponsibility, job discontent, poor performance, chance of leaving, and several other organizational behaviors with an emphasis on how workers behave inside their workplace (Yeshanew & Kaur, 2018). Three forms of employee commitment were identified by Avan et al. (2016) and Yeshanew & Kaur (2018): emotional commitment, continuous commitment, and normative commitment.
Affective commitment, according to Yeshanew and Kaur (2018), is when someone is eager to put in significant effort and inclined to maintain their participation in the organization. Continuous commitment has been characterized as a bad sort of organizational commitment since employees must continue working for the company in order to get their compensation. They therefore remain working there due to the expenses involved in their departure (Joarder et al., 2011). Employees are required to remain with the company, which brings us to the topic of normative commitment.

Employee empowerment is seen as the crucial topic on the practical level and is regarded as the required source of growth of the social exchange theory (Ko&Hur, 2014). Employee conduct on the job and in the workplace is currently being influenced by a movement in the business known as employee empowerment (Francis &Alagas, 2020). Employee empowerment, according to Abuhashesh et al. (2019), is a process that gives firm employees the authority, power, responsibility, resources, and freedom to make decisions and complete tasks. Additionally, it gives employees control and enables the allocation of duties and control at every level.

Being empowered allows employees to work for what they believe to be best and to take initiative without worrying about getting their supervisors' approval (Muguella, Mohd&Mohd, 2013). The process of allowing or authorizing someone to think, conduct, act, and manage work and decision-making in their own way is known as empowerment. Organizations now work in highly competitive business contexts all around the world. Employee empowerment entails taking the initiative to handle issues at work on their own, with the management's encouragement and support (Raub& Robert 2010; Hakan& Jamel, 2012).

Empowerment is a complex idea that can be either structural, psychological, or behavioral. The phrase "behavioral empowerment" refers to largely self-determined actions taken to ensure or enhance organizational work performance. Managers use behavioral empowerment techniques because they think they increase employee ownership. Employees with behavioral empowerment are expected to diligently carry out their duties at work and proactively bring about change in their workplace to improve productivity (Boudrias&Savoie, 2006). Employees should have the necessary freedom, flexibility, and authority to act in a manner that prioritizes the needs of the consumer. According to Lovelock and Wirtz (2010), one of the best strategies for pleasing and serving clients is employee empowerment. Despite their practical relevance, employee actions that show empowerment have not been taken into consideration.

Auh et al. (2014) examined the effect of leadership empowerment on service-oriented civic behavior in a study employing new perspectives. The results show that a large variation in civic activity that is focused on providing services may be explained by the group's level of leadership empowerment. Because empowerment affects organizational performance and competitive advantage in the service sector, it has drawn considerable attention from academics and practitioners (Abu Kassim et al., 2012). Hamborstad and Perry (2011) contend that
empowerment should be focused on enhancing frontline staff members' capacities to meet customers' demands and requirements. When this is done, it is possible to measure consumer happiness and relate it to organizational success.

Organizations are under pressure from the changing environment of today to maintain their management strategies up to date with the problems facing them. Employees who sense a good alignment between their beliefs, values, and behaviors in the workplace gradually come to understand the importance of their work to both the business and to themselves, and they begin to pay attention to it. Ombachi (2011) discovered that hotels implemented training, information exchange, and participatory decision-making while examining the link between employee empowerment and the performance of hotels in Mombasa County. This study therefore sought attempt to fill this gap by examining the relationship between behavioural empowerment and employee commitment in selected hotels in Kisumu City, Kenya.

**Literature Review**

**Concept of Employee Commitment**

Creating organizational commitment (OC) among employees is one of the crucial components to ensuring organizational efficiency, according to Selvi and Maheswari (2020). Consequently, dedicated employees contribute to improved organizational performance (Mahmoud et al., 2020). According to Loan (2020), organizational commitment is a sentiment shared by employees or a strength of a company that binds employees together to encourage retention. Typically, there are three components to organizational commitment: emotional commitment, continuation commitment, and normative commitment (Brooks et al., 2020). Employees that are emotionally dedicated are thought to continue working diligently on their own, and ongoing commitment assures that they stay involved with the business (Sohail&Ilyas, 2018).

People may be forced to continue working for a certain company for a variety of reasons, including incentives, promotions, favorable working circumstances, reasonable discipline practices, and social pressure, regardless of how satisfied they are with the company or how positively they feel about it. Because of this, workers with high levels of normative commitment are motivated to please their employers (Yeshanew& Kaur, 2018). As a result, compared to the other two categories of organizational commitment, affective commitment requires a higher level of dedication. Finally, the level of each type of organizational commitment varies from one organization to the next depending on the nature, size, and working circumstances of the company. Employees that are more committed to the company are seen as being more responsible, more productive, more empathetic, more devoted to their jobs, and more content with their work (Karim &Rehman, 2012).

Additionally, workers who are highly committed to their organizations are more likely to form emotional bonds with them, feel content, and have higher desires to contribute meaningfully.
Sahoo, Behera, and Tripathy (2010) provided evidence that a worker who is dedicated to their work and profession has less intention to take time off or resign, tends to be content in their position, and has stronger intrinsic drive. Various firms make substantial sacrifices in the present and changing business conditions to assure organizational loyalty and work happiness among their personnel in order to retain them and improving their productivity. It is commonly acknowledged that organizational commitment benefits both the business and its people since it may strengthen sentiments of belonging, job stability, career advancement, increased remuneration, and higher intrinsic rewards (Azeem & Akhtar, 2014).

Overall, it has been discovered that organizational commitment is very advantageous to organizations since it results in productive behavioral and attitude outcomes at work. Organizational commitment has been linked to improved performance, initiative taking, work efforts, lower turnover, and absenteeism in terms of behavioral work outcomes (Srivastava & Dhar, 2016). Employees that are committed to their occupations are more efficient and productive at work and are less likely to miss work or quit their positions. Organizational commitment is associated with increased job satisfaction and self-directedness in the context of attitudinal work outcomes, and motivation (Buch, 2015) as well as lower turnover intentions (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

**Relationship between behavioural empowerment and employee commitment**

Managers use behavioral empowerment techniques because they think they increase employee ownership. The manifestation of behavioral empowerment might thus occur through both "in-role" and "citizenship" performance. Employees with behavioral empowerment are expected to diligently carry out their duties at work and proactively bring about change in their workplace to improve productivity (Boudrias & Savoie, 2006; Tremblay & Wils, 2006).

According to Boudrias and Savoie (2006), a thorough evaluation of behavioural empowerment should look at how conscientiously employees perform their job duties, demonstrate efforts to improve their jobs on the job, collaborate well with coworkers, demonstrate efforts to improve within the work group, and become involved in the organization to maintain and increase efficiency. When these behaviors are evaluated in workers, it may be possible to determine how empowered they are on a behavioral level, which might then be used as a criteria variable to assess how well supervisor empowerment initiatives are working.

Customers must be happy and pleased with the service in order for a business to have a competitive and dynamic position in the market. Service providers and organizations should collaborate to increase client loyalty and happiness in order to achieve that outcome. Having the correct group of workers, educating them, and giving them influence over their work are the most effective ways to do this in this respect (Lovelock and Wirtz, 2010). Employees should have the necessary freedom, flexibility, and authority to act in a manner that prioritizes the needs
of the consumer. One of the most important behaviors for employees that interact with consumers directly is customer-centered conduct.

According to Lovelock and Wirtz (2010), one of the best strategies for pleasing and serving clients is employee empowerment. To put it another way, empowerment develops to provide subordinates greater authority over work-related circumstances and decisions, allowing them to be more adaptable and responsible in relation to a range of client demands. Despite their practical relevance, employee actions that show empowerment have not been taken into consideration. It is conceivable that behavioural empowerment is used to promote (pro)active actions that may have an influence on organizational results in addition to changing employee cognitions.

As a result of providers and frontline staff members engaging in positive and beneficial behaviors, a number of terminology and ideas have been generated in the literature. Customer orientation, organizational citizenship conduct, and customer-oriented behavior are some of these (Gazzoli et al., 2013). To put it more precisely, customer-oriented conduct is the capacity to recognize, assess, comprehend, and satisfy the wants of customers (Reychav and Weisberg, 2009). In order to increase customer satisfaction with the service, Mechinda and Patterson (2011) describe it as certain actions that frontline personnel demonstrated during service interaction points.

According to Pimpakorn and Patterson (2010), customer-oriented conduct is the willingness of subordinates to act favorably and provide consumers with high-quality services. Employees with pleasant and polite personalities, according to Taheri and Gharakhani (2012), are more likely to be customer-oriented. If nice, polite service is required, friendly, polite individuals must be engaged. Although it is feasible to provide employees the technical know-how necessary for the job, it is challenging to teach them interpersonal skills (Taheri and Gharakhani, 2012).

Effective human capital management gives businesses a significant competitive edge. Leaders must oversee their organization's human capital strategy with increased consideration and care (Ashford and Dieck, 2012; Bakker and Schaufeli, 2008). The potential advantages of positive psychology in the workplace are now being maximized by researchers and practitioners to improve both business performance and people' work experiences (Mills et al., 2013).

In a time where change is the only constant, leaders must not only help their teams adapt to change (De Poel et al., 2012), but they also play a growingly important role in creating a talented workforce that is essential to the success of their organizations. Because it is intimately related to organizational results like improved employee attitudes, higher performance, and motivation, successful and effective leadership is crucial (Kelloway et al., 2012). It's important to strike a balance between the traditionally dominant leadership styles and those that emphasize employee empowerment (Dewettinck and Van Ameijde, 2011).
Leadership empowerment behavior (LEB), described as a leader's ability to share authority, encourage responsibility and self-directed decision-making, develop followers' abilities, and coach followers, is viewed as an enabling rather than a delegating process (Hakimi et al., 2010). Leadership involves emphasizing positive human cognitions, attitudes, and expectancies, similar to how positive psychology emphasizes human weaknesses (Hannah, et al., 2009). According to Cameron's (2008) definition of "positive," which emphasizes performance (accountability for results), supportive (information sharing and growth), and what people usually consider to be good (empowerment), LEB may be classified as a positive approach to people management.

In a Jordanian study, Odeh (2008) investigated the relationship between frontline staff empowerment and service quality in the restaurant industry. The study's findings revealed that work happiness, organizational commitment, and customer-oriented behavior strongly influenced the relationship between psychological empowerment and service quality. In other words, psychological empowerment increased staff dedication to servicing clients.

Auh et al. (2014) assessed the impact of leadership empowerment on civic behavior. They implemented two levels of leadership empowerment at the individual and group levels using a range of data sources (i.e., frontline employees and supervisors). The results showed that a large variation in citizenship behavior that was focused on providing services could be explained by the group's level of leadership empowerment. Given the conversation that has just occurred, it is evident that academics have looked at employee behavior that is customer-oriented and empowered from many viewpoints and across various sectors. Despite the significance of this idea generally and in the service industry specifically, no prior study has combined the two types of empowerment to examine their effects on customer-focused behavior.

Kuruuzum, Etin, and Irmak (2009) investigate the relationship between work participation, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction in the Turkish hospitality industry. A quantitative investigation has been conducted. According to the conclusions of the study, strong organizational commitment has a profoundly good influence on employees' job satisfaction, and as a result, motivated and delighted personnel will be critical to the success of the Turkish hospitality sector. It is recommended that more research be conducted on other components such as best customer service efforts, worker empowerment and autonomy, and task identification that explains the level of devotion and satisfaction at various levels.

Humborstad and Perry (2011) discovered a connection between organizational commitment, job happiness, and employee empowerment in China. 290 people provided the data for this study. The factors that are examined in this research are employee empowerment, job happiness, workplace dedication, service power, and desire to leave the company. The conclusion is that empowerment results in lower employee turnover rates in the organization and that empowered personnel demonstrated great organizational loyalty and favorable job satisfaction.
Similar to this, Gunlu, Aksarayli, & Perçin (2010) conducted research in Turkey to determine the relationship between workplace commitment and job happiness by defining various organizational commitments and their unique impact on job satisfaction. The factors employed in this study include organizational commitment, income level, age, and education extrinsic work satisfaction, and intrinsic job satisfaction (normative, continuous, and affective). 123 hotel industry managers made up the sample size. Questionnaires were used to carry out the quantitative approach. The research's conclusions demonstrated that while work satisfaction has a little impact on continuous commitment, it has a notable impact on normative and emotional organizational commitment.

Rahman, Raja, Shaari, Panatik, Shah, and Hamid (2012) investigated the impacts of employees' views of workplace culture commitment, organizational identification, and job satisfaction. The characteristics considered in this study were organizational identity, job satisfaction, and workplace commitment. The sample size was 578 workers. In this study, regression analysis was used to assess the relevance of the variables. The outcomes of the study show that organizational commitment has a considerable influence on work satisfaction, whereas identification has a negative impact on job satisfaction. This shows that high levels of commitment and identification are linked to pleasant workplace feelings.

**Theoretical Framework**

In the 1960s, Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory (SLT) developed into Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) (Bandura 1986). In 1986, the SCT was developed from the premise that learning occurs in a social setting with a dynamic and reciprocal interplay of the person, environment, and behavior. What distinguishes SCT is its emphasis on social effect and both external and internal social reinforcement. SCT considers how people learn and keep specific behaviors, as well as the social environment in which they participate in such activities (LaMorte, 2016).

Behavior, cognitions, personal factors, and the environment are the three reciprocal effects that make up the Social Cognitive Theory (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). According to Gist & Mitchell (1992), the motivation to use cognitive resources and to take the required steps to fulfill environmental demands comes from one's conviction in one's ability. Social cognitive theory was shown by Billek-Sawbney and Reicherter (2004) as a triangle with behavior, cognition, personal variables, and the environment making up each corner. The environment may impact personal and cognitive elements as well as behavior, and vice versa. Behavior can influence cognition and the environment, and the environment can influence personal and cognitive aspects as well as behavior.

The idea takes a person's prior experiences into account when predicting whether certain behavioral actions will be taken. Prior experiences determine reinforcements, expectations, and expectancies, all of which influence whether or not someone will participate in a certain activity.
as well as the motives behind that behavior. The Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) states that a person's environment, behavior, and psychological and cognitive traits all impact one another.

Human functioning, according to this theory, can be explained in terms of a number of fundamental abilities, such as the capacity for symbolizing, forethought, vicarious learning (the ability to learn by observing, imitating, or modeling the behaviors and attitudes of others), self-regulatory functioning, and self-reflective functioning. SCT's basic ideas are divided into five categories: (1) psychological determinants of behavior (outcome expectations, self-efficacy, and collective efficacy), (2) observational learning, (3) environmental determinants of behavior (incentive motivation, facilitation), (4) self-regulation, and (5) social cognitive theory and (5) moral disengagement. SCT's objective is to clarify how people regulate and reinforce their behavior in order to develop goal-directed behavior that can be sustained over time. Although the self-efficacy component was included after the theory evolved into SCT, the first five components were developed as part of the SLT.

Self-efficacy is the degree to which a person believes in his or her own ability to do a task successfully. Although this component has since been added to other theories, notably the Theory of Planned Behavior, self-efficacy is unique to SCT. The distinctive features and other personal elements of a person, as well as the contextual conditions (barriers and facilitators), all influence their level of self-efficacy (LaMorte, 2016). Social cognitive theory considers several levels of the social ecology model when discussing how an individual's behavior changes. Because of the emphasis on the individual and the environment, SCT is often used in promotion.

The Social Cognitive Theory considers a person's previous behavior, cognitions, social context, and physical environment when anticipating future behavior. Behavior change is initiated and sustained when people feel they can carry out the intended action (i.e., when they have self-efficacy) and have a reasonable hope that the behavior will achieve the desired consequence (i.e., outcome expectations).

**Research Methodology**

This study is based on pragmatic research paradigm. According to Creswell (2013), pragmatism enables one to operate within the positivist and interpretivist paradigms, hence enabling the use of a variety of approaches to address the relevant research problems. This study used explanatory and descriptive research techniques to test hypotheses and measure the correlations between variables in an effort to understand the phenomenon under investigation. Studies that establish causal links between variables employ explanatory design, according to Saunders et al. (2011). The study's primary goal was to quantify a link or compare groups on purpose to find a cause-and-effect relationship, hence the research design was appropriate.

The study was conducted in Kenya, among selected star-rated hotels in Kisumu City. The ratings of the hotels are according to Tourism Regulatory Board (TRB) of Kenya. The choice of
the study area is based on the fact that this region has many of the classified hotels in the Western Tourist Circuit of Kenya. Kisumu, is the principle port city of Western Kenya in Kisumu County, the immediate former capital of Nyanza province, and the headquarters of Kisumu County, covering 2,085.9KM² with a population of 968,879 (KNBS 2019).

The target population in this study consisted of employees drawn from the selected hotels. The target population was 1372 non-managerial employees and 130 management employees from 34 star rated hotels. Using Yamane’s (1973) sample size formula at 95% confidence level, P = 0.05, the sample size of 310 respondents was computed. With regard to the managerial employees, out of a target of 130, a sample size 13 was used. This was 10% of the population, derived using a formula from Mugenda and Mugenda (2008).

Kisumu City was picked via the use of purposeful sampling. Hotels in Kisumu City with all-star ratings were chosen using the census. Following this, a stratified sample approach was used to split the hotels into strata based on their star ratings. It was suitable to use stratified random sampling since it allowed the researcher to accurately represent both the population as a whole and important subgroup within it. The primary hotel departments were used to further stratify the workforce. Front desk, housekeeping, food manufacturing, and food and beverage service were the specialized departments. The 310 employees who took part in the research were chosen using simple random selection. Employers were chosen using a basic random sampling procedure to guarantee that each had an equal probability of being included in the sample.13 managers who were purposefully chosen from the sampled hotels made up the managerial staff. Given that the study’s instrument was qualitative in nature, this strategy was suited for the task at hand.

Both primary and secondary data were employed in the investigation. Primary data was gathered from hotel staff members using standardized questionnaires and from managers and supervisors using an interview schedule. The workers came from several departments. Self-administered structured questionnaires were employed in the study. The hotel staff answered the inquiries when it was convenient for them. Additionally, it offered the greatest feeling of anonymity and the least risk of prejudice. All of the scales were used in its current form or were changed to match the needs of the study. They had previously been created in the literature. Unless otherwise specified, all factors were measured on a 5-point Likert scale, with 1 representing strongly disagree/very unhappy and 5 representing strongly agree/very satisfied. The questionnaire was created to address the specified goals.

An interview guide guaranteed that responses were consistently gathered and enabled for comparisons. In terms of suitable tactics for obtaining replies, the interviewer was more proficient at interviewing in general. To acquire information from supervisors and managers, a systematic interview schedule was adopted.
In this study, all variables were measured using a five-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree). Employee commitment was assessed on three levels: emotional, continuous, and normative (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Using the Boudrais and Savoie (2006) measuring instrument, behavioral was assessed as a one-dimensional construct with (25 items): efficacy in performing job tasks (5 items), improvement efforts in job tasks (5 items), effective collaboration (5 items), effort for improvement in work group (5 items), and involvement at the organizational level (5 items).

Prior to the actual data collection exercise, the researcher conducted a preliminary survey in other hotels that did not participate in the study to become acquainted with the study area. The tools were tested using respondents from hotels in Eldoret town that had comparable features with the research region. The pilot study was designed to allow the researcher to determine the reliability and validity of the instruments, as well as to become acquainted with the administration of the questionnaires.

According to Mugenda & Mugenda (2008), instrument dependability is the degree to which a research instrument produces consistent outcomes or data after repeated trials. Using the SPSS V. 23 application, Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha was utilized to measure the reliability of the research instrument. A reliability coefficient of 0.7 or above was thought to represent the instruments' internal dependability (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000). The full questionnaire was declared credible after various typographical mistakes and omissions discovered in the instrument were fixed, demonstrating that it was adequate for use in the main research.

The amount to which a construct measures what it is designed to measure is referred to as its validity (Zikmund et al., 2010). The study made use of content and construct validity. Discussions with specialists were done during the questionnaire development stage to ensure that the measures comprise a sufficient and representative selection of items that tap the content. The researcher used expert judgment to establish the instrument's content validity. Validity was determined by reviewing the instrument's items with supervisors, department lecturers, and coworkers.

After collecting all of the data, the researcher performed data cleaning, which involves identifying missing or erroneous replies and correcting them to improve the quality of the responses. The data was coded, classified, and placed into a computer for analysis using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Thematic analysis was used to examine the data from the interview schedule, which supplemented the questionnaires. Questionnaire data were examined using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. Mean and standard deviation were descriptive statistics. Linear regression analysis was used for inferential statistics. Regression analysis was performed on the data using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS V23). Tables were used to present data. To test the hypothesis, linear regression analysis was utilized using the model as follows:
Y = β₀ + β₁X₁ + e ....................................................Model 1

Where:

Y: Employee commitment
X₁: Behavioural empowerment
β₀: Constant
β₁: Regression coefficients
e: Error term

**Results**

The regression model summary displayed in table 1 revealed that behavioural empowerment influenced up to 49% (R²=0.490) of the variance in employee. However, it actually explained up to 48.8% (Adjusted R² square=0.488) of the variance in employee commitment. Therefore, the behavioural empowerment predictor used in the model captured the variation in the employee commitment.

**Table 1: Model Summary on Behavioural empowerment and employee commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.700a</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.48730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Commitment
b. Predictors: (Constant), Behavioural

**Analysis of Variance on Behavioural empowerment and employee commitment**

The analysis of variance was done to see if the model accurately predicted the outcome. F(1,266)=255.640, p =0.000) for the regression model incorporating behavioral empowerment as a predictor (Table 2). This demonstrates that behavioral empowerment and staff engagement have a major impact. The ANOVA findings show the statistical validity of the proposed regression model for behavioral empowerment and employee commitment. This demonstrates that behavioral empowerment and staff engagement have a major impact.
In order to assess the hypotheses under consideration, the model created the $\beta$ coefficient for behavioral empowerment as an independent variable. The t-test was performed to determine if behavioral empowerment as a predictor contributes significantly to the model. Table 3 displays the $\beta$-value estimates and the predictor's contribution to the model.

**Table 3: Behavioural empowerment and employee commitment Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>3.118</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings the t-test associated with $\beta$-values was significant and the behavioural empowerment as the predictor was making a significant contribution to the model. The $\beta$-value for behavioural empowerment had a positive coefficient, depicting positive relationship with employee commitment as summarized in the model as:

$$Y = 0.567 + 0.751x + \varepsilon \quad \text{.......................................................... Equation 1}$$

Where: $Y = \text{Employee commitment}$, $X = \text{Behavioural empowerment}$, $\varepsilon = \text{error term}$
According to the study's hypothesis, there is no significant association between behavioral empowerment and employee commitment. According to the study findings, there is a positive significant association between behavioral empowerment and employee commitment ($\beta_1=0.751$ and $p=0.05$). As a result, a rise in behavioral empowerment at the unit level resulted in an increase in employee commitment. The null hypothesis ($H_{o1}$) was rejected since the p value was less than 0.05. As a result, we may conclude that behavioral empowerment influenced employee commitment significantly. This means that for every rise in behavioral empowerment, there was an increase in employee commitment.

Employee commitment is strongly related to behavioral empowerment. The empowerment behavior provides a clear framework for developing empowering leaders by concentrating on their strengths first and then coaching them to maximize those capabilities. Cameron (2013) highlighted four ways for producing exceptional performance in organizations: creating a good atmosphere; positive connections; positive communication; and positive purpose. This is possible if leaders are trained to transfer responsibility, hold individuals accountable for results, allow for self-directed decision making, and inform and develop them.

The findings suggested that leadership empowerment behavior has a significant impact on employees' perceptions of and experiences in the workplace. Employees will feel more competent and in control when their leaders empower them, and they will find meaning in their work. Employee empowerment brings decision-makers and employees closer together, reducing task time. Empowered individuals played a more active role in the company, taking up ideas and participating in the organization's operations.

**Conclusion**

The study revealed that behavioral empowerment had a substantial impact on staff engagement in selected Kisumu City hotels. Employees were self-sufficient in arranging their work and adhering to the norms and procedures. Employees believed that management cared about their well-being and was prepared to assist their colleagues when necessary. Employee empowerment activities will help the hotel's competitive edge and financial performance, as well as boost workers' skills and job happiness, efficiency, and devotion to the business.

**Recommendation**

Employees in the organization should be encouraged to trust their judgment, values, job role, and actions related to their work. Employees should have the flexibility or autonomy to execute their own job and have the ability to impact organizational strategy, administrative or operational outcomes at work. This resulted in psychological empowerment among employees, which has a substantial impact on organizational commitment. Hotels must take initiatives to empower their staff. Apart from empowering measures, hotels can strive to tackle the behavioral, psychological, and structural elements that make employees feel vulnerable.
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