

[DOI: 10.20472/IAC.2016.023.092](https://doi.org/10.20472/IAC.2016.023.092)

**ENGİN ÜNGÜREN**

Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat University, Turkey

**SERDAR ARSLAN**

Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat University, Turkey

**YAŞAR YİĞİT KAÇMAZ**

Alanya Municipality, Turkey

## **THE EFFECT OF SELF EFFICACY ON ORGANIZATIONAL ALIENATION: A STUDY ON APART HOTEL EMPLOYEES**

### **Abstract:**

Undoubtedly, one of the most important factors of an organization's success is its employees. Since the study of Hawthorne, it is a known fact that employee behavior and performance are related to many organizational variables. One of the variables that effect an organization's employee performance, productivity and profitability is organizational alienation. When the literature is reviewed, it is seen that organizational alienation has many negative effects on job satisfaction, organizational silence, burn-out, work life quality, organizational commitment, employee turnover and productivity. There are organizational and individual reasons which affecting organizational alienation. The purpose of this study is to reveal the effect of hospitality employees' self efficacy perception on organizational alienation. The research was carried out with employees working in apart hotels in Alanya, one of the most popular tourism destinations in Turkey. The data is collected from a random sample via questionnaire. Structural equation modeling (SEM) was conducted to test the validity of hypotheses. After the analysis it was concluded that self-efficacy has a statistically meaningful yet partial effect on organizational alienation.

### **Keywords:**

Self efficacy, organizational alienation, hospitality management

**JEL Classification:** M19

## 1. Introduction

It is a known fact that human resource is the most important asset for tourism and hospitality organizations for service quality, customer satisfaction and competitive advantage (Kusluvan et. al., 2010, p. 171). Literature supports that employees' job performance is affected both by personal (Brown et. al., 2002; Tett et. al., 1991) and organizational factors (Liao and Chuang, 2004).

Organizational alienation or job alienation which implies an employee's alienation from his/her organization, work, self, personal values and public is one of the most important factors that cause job dissatisfaction and low job performance (Shepard, 1969; Hofstede, 1972). Like job performance, organizational alienation also has many personal and organizational antecedents. This study focuses on one of the personal factors, self-efficacy, and aims to search for the effect of the hospitality employees' self-efficacy perception on organizational alienation.

Self-efficacy is about one's judgment if he or she can perform a certain set of behaviors (Bandura, 1978) whereas alienation examines one's belief about the outcome of his behaviors (Seeman, 1959). Although there is a distinction between the concepts, they are also strongly related. When a person believes in his/her abilities, he/she won't give up when he/she faces a negative outcome. On the other hand, disbelievers tend to decrease their efforts (Bandura, 1978, p. 238). They may start to feel powerless, distract from the path and widely accepted norms and eventually get alienated from what they do.

Even though the literature is rich with self-efficacy and alienation studies, the relationship between these two concepts is rarely discussed. The main objective of this paper is to investigate the effect of self-efficacy on alienation.

## 2. Theoretical Framework

### 2.1. Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy can basically be defined as "one's belief in one's capability to perform a specific task" (Gist, 1987, p. 472). So, if one has a low self-efficacy regarding a certain task; that means one believes that he/she doesn't have the abilities to accomplish it. It is important to underline that self-efficacy is task specific and although related, different from self-esteem in that manner (Gardner and Pierce, 1998).

Although self-efficacy was conceptualized as a situation-specific phenomenon at first, the evidence shows that the belief of accomplishing a targeted task can be effective on other tasks too (Bandura, 1977). So, the concept of generalized self-efficacy expectations which can be measured by certain scales (Sherer and Maddux, 1982) has emerged.

There are three dimensions of self-efficacy; which are "magnitude", "generality" and "strength" (Bandura, 1977, p. 194). Magnitude refers to a person's belief regarding the

level of difficulty of a task that he or she can handle. Some humbly believe that they can handle only the simplest tasks whereas some believe that there are no difficult tasks for them. Generality dimension is about one's belief if his or her capability is competent in any condition. Lastly, strength implies the durability of self-efficacy in time and against negative experiences. People, who have a strong belief in themselves, do not lose their efforts on the way.

Self-efficacy is very important for organizations because it reflects a lot about the behaviors and outcomes of those behaviors which are performed by employees. For example, it may help human resources during selection process as a strong predictor of the candidate's performance (Gist, 1987, p. 479). The literature is rich with the studies declaring the positive links between self-efficacy and performance (Manstead and Van Eeekelen, 1998; Stajkovic and Luthans, 1998). Self-efficacy is also a determinant of managerial performance (Wood, Bandura and Trevor, 1990), motivation (Margolis and McCabe, 2003), job satisfaction (Akgündüz, 2013) and newcomer adjustment to organizational environment (Saks, 1995).

Low self-efficacy may cause negative consequences. The most serious consequences are anxiety and depression (Bandura, 1997). It is also argued that self-efficacy plays an intermediary role between job demands and burnout (Salanova et. al., 2005) which can be count as both a personal and organizational negative outcome.

## 2.2. Organizational Alienation

The term "alienation" which originally comes from the Latin word "alienato" has a very long history that it is possible to say "The history of man could very well be written as a history of the alienation of man" (Kahler, 1957, p.43). Its history goes way back to the Old Testament which describes alienation as man's worshipping to an alien object, a false God actually. Man creates an idol which carries the best of him, alienates it and then worships it (Fromm, 1956, p. 118-119).

Hegel would be the first scholar to study alienation out of its religious context. According to Hegel, man is alienated to the nature although nature is a product of man's "spirit" (Ergil, 1978, p. 94). Through work man will be able to shape the nature and become aware of himself (Sayers, 2003, p. 111). Following Hegel, Marx brings a sociological perspective to alienation, undertaking it as a concrete problem of a social class rather than a "metaphysical & humanistic dilemma" (Horowitz, 1966, p. 231).

Alienation was introduced to the arena of empirical studies with the milestone article of M. Seeman (1959). According to Seeman (1959) who has settled the long lasting confusion on the meaning of the term (Dean, 1961, p. 754), alienation should be studied under five independent yet related sub-categories: powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation and self-estrangement. It would be helpful to explain these categories briefly:

- **Powerlessness:** A person's belief that his/her behavior or effort would have no effect on the outcome (Seeman, 1959, p. 784).

- **Meaninglessness:** Occurs when a person cannot predict the possible outcomes of a certain behavior (Seeman, 1959, p. 786).
- **Normlessness:** The belief that certain accomplishments can be achieved only by the means which are not acceptable to the society (Seeman, 1959, p. 788).
- **Isolation:** Attaching little importance to the values and causes of that the society has a high opinion (Seeman, 1959, p. 789).
- **Self-estrangement:** Occurs when a person cannot be satisfied by merely doing his/her work (Seeman, 1959, p. 790).

After it has gained an empirical framework, alienation naturally has found a respectable place in organizational studies. Clark (1959) would be the first scholar who studied alienation with an organizational perspective. Also mentioned as “work alienation”, organizational alienation can be defined as “generalized cognitive (or belief) state of psychological separation from work insofar as work is perceived to lack the potentiality for satisfying one's salient needs and expectations” (Kanungo, 1979, p. 131).

Organizational alienation has many personal and organizational consequences such as low job satisfaction, low commitment, organizational distrust, absenteeism, tendency to quit, low job performance, health problems and even alcohol addiction (Chiaburu et. al., 2014). To avoid these consequences, it is essential for managers to understand the nature of alienation, detect its antecedents and take the necessary precautions. It is an ethical as well as pragmatic responsibility (Kanungo, 1993, p. 414).

### 3. Methodology

Quantitative research approach was adopted so as to test the research model in the light of empirical findings. The research was carried out with employees working in apart hotels in Alanya (Turkey). According to data of Alanya Chamber of Commerce and Industry, 173 apart hotels exist in Alanya (ALTSO, 2015). Research data were obtained from employees working in 46 different apart hotels. The survey instrument utilized for measuring organizational alienation and self-efficacy includes a 5-point Likert-type scale. As a first step, to ensure the reliability of the scales to be used in the questionnaire, a pilot test was conducted on 75 employees. Several edits were done in line with the pilot test results. After revising necessary points, all apart hotels in Alanya were asked for their permission to conduct the study. The permission was taken from 46 apart hotels' general managers. In total, 650 questionnaires were distributed. After the elimination of invalid questionnaires, 491 questionnaires were analyzed. The data were collected from September 2015 to January 2016.

#### 3.1. The measurement instrument

The survey instrument was a self-administered questionnaire with sections of demographic characteristics, organization alienation and self-efficacy inventory. In order to determine self-efficacies of employees, self-efficacy scale developed in

accordance with literature and adapted into Turkish by Yıldırım and İlhan (2010) was used. The scale is composed of 17 items in total. It is indicated Cronbach's alpha of original scale is 0.86; however, it differs between 0.68 and 0.91 in other studies. It was found that reliability, split-half reliability (0.77) and test-retest reliability (Pearson  $r=0,69$ ) of the scale's Turkish version (Cronbach's alpha= 0.80) were similar in studies carried out in different countries.

Organizational alienation scale is composed of 30 items. 7 items for powerlessness dimension, 7 items for meaninglessness dimension, 5 items for normlessness dimension, 7 items for self-alienation dimension and 4 items for social alienation are included in the scale. Items used for Powerlessness, Meaninglessness and Self-Alienation dimensions were chosen from the scale developed by Mottaz (1981) based on 5-dimensional alienation classification model of Seeman (1964) and some items were revised so as to increase their understandability in Turkish. On the other hand, items measuring Normlessness and Social Alienation dimensions were chosen from the scale developed by Tekin (2012) through examining various data collection tools in the literature.

### 3.2. Data Analysis

Data as to demographical characteristics of respondents were analyzed through frequency and percentage distribution. Analyses regarding research model were performed at two stages. At the first stage, findings as to validity and reliability of the measurement were obtained via confirmatory factor analysis. In the second stage research model was tested using structural equation modeling (SEM). SEM requires that certain underlying assumptions be satisfied in order to ensure accurate inferences, such as multivariate normality, completely random missing data, and sufficiently large sample sizes (Lee et al., 2016). So as to determine normal distribution of data, skewness and kurtosis values were used. It was observed skewness and kurtosis values were between  $\pm 1,5$ . These results indicate data as to research variables show normal distribution (Hair et al., 1998). Besides, whether extreme values were included in data set was examined. As a result of examination, it was observed no extreme value exist in data set. Before the two-step approach was adopted, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted to determine the factors.

## 4. Results

### 4.1. Characteristics of respondents

**Table 1: Profile of the respondents**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
Male	322	65,6
Female	160	32,6
Missing	9	1,8
<b>Employment status</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
Temporary	320	65,2
Regular	152	31,0

Missing	17	3,5
<b>Education</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
Elementary school	135	27,5
Senior high school	222	45,2
Vocational college	45	9,2
University	72	14,7
Missing	17	3,5
<b>Age</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
18-25 Age	206	42,0
26-33 Age	178	36,3
34-41 Age	75	15,3
42-48 Age	13	2,6
49 Age and above	8	1,6
Missing	11	2,2
<b>Department</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
Housekeeping	82	16,7
Food and Beverage	147	29,9
Kitchen	67	13,6
Front Office	118	24,0
Accounting and Purchasing	29	5,9
Others	35	7,1
Missing	13	2,6

As seen in Table, 65.6% of respondents are male and 32.6% are female. Temporary employees comprise 65.2% of respondents. Examining educational level of respondents, it is seen most of them have graduated from high school. Primary school graduates with 27.5%, university graduates with 14% and college graduates with 9.2% follow high school graduates. Respondents are mostly composed of employees at 18-25 ages (42%). 36.3% of them at 26-33 ages. Departments of employees show a balanced distribution as housekeeping (%16,7), food and beverage (%29,9), kitchen (%13,6), front office (%24,0), accounting and purchasing (%5,9) and others (%7,1).

## 4.2. Exploratory Factor analysis Results

Primarily, validity and reliabilities of scales were analyzed. Internal consistency (Cronbach's Alpha) method was used so as to show the reliabilities of scales. As a result of reliability analysis, items that lower internal consistencies of scales and those whose item to total correlations and factor loadings were low were removed from the scale. Within this regard, 2 statements from self-efficacy scale and 5 statements from organizational alienation scale were removed. Cronbach's alpha values of both scales are above .70 shows the scales are reliable (Hair et al. 1998). In order to examine structural validity of two scales utilized in the study, EFA (explanatory factor analysis) was performed for each scale. As a result of factor analysis, it was determined organizational efficacy scale had three-dimensional structure whereas organizational alienation scale had five-dimensional structure. Besides, Cronbach's alpha values of all factors were calculated. Cronbach's alpha values of all factors are above .70 shows internal consistencies of scales are high and sub-dimensions of the structures are reliable. In addition, factor loadings, AVE values, KMO and Bartlett's Sphericity test results are provided in Table 2. KMO and Bartlett Sphericity values of scales indicate that sample is sufficient for factor analysis and data are appropriate for factor analysis.

**Table 2: Reliabilities and confirmatory factor analysis**

Scale	Construct and items	Factor Loadings	Eigenvalues	The Ratio of Variance (%)	Cronbach's alpha	
Self-Efficacy Scale	Challenge Potency (CP)					
		CP1	,869			
		CP2	,860			
		CP3	,796			
		CP4	,743	6,505	40,654	,899
		CP5	,717			
		CP6	,701			
		CP7	,642			
		Indecisiveness (IND)				
		IND1	,805			
		IND2	,790			
		IND3	,766	2,473	15,453	,845
		IND4	,717			
		IND5	,681			
	Inadequacy (INA)					
	INA1	,828				
	INA2	,761	1,289	8,058	,848	
	INA3	,718				
	INA4	,707				
	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Value			,859		
	Bartlett's test of sphericity		5791,215 (df: 120),p=0,000			
	The Ratio Of Total Variance			64,165		
	Overall Cronbach's Alpha			,869		
Organization Allineation	Normlessness (NORM)					
		NORM1	,856			
		NORM2	,856			
		NORM3	,749	6,487	25,947	,876
		NORM4	,723			
		NORM5	,711			
		NORM6	,710			
		Powerlessness (POW)				
		POW1	,796			
		POW2	,791			
		POW3	,764	4,548	18,192	,880
		POW4	,747			
		POW5	,747			
		POW6	,731			
		Meaninglessness (MEAN)				
		MEAN1	,749			
		MEAN2	,745			
		MEAN3	,725	2,117	8,470	,801
		MEAN4	,691			
		MEAN5	,659			
		Isolation (ISO)				
		ISO1	,818			
		ISO2	,814	2,006	8,025	,861
		ISO3	,811			
		ISO4	,797			
		Self-estrangement (SEST)				
	SEST1	,749				
	SEST2	,727	1,100	4,400	,820	
	SEST3	,717				
	SEST4	,703				
	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Value	,826				
	Bartlett's test of sphericity	8738,448 (df: 300),p=0,000				
	The Ratio Of Total Variance	65,035				
	Overall Cronbach's Alpha	,877				

### 4.3. Confirmatory Factor Analysis Findings

Following EFA, CFAs (confirmatory factor analysis) were performed. Findings as to confirmatory factor analysis are provided in Table 3. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) carried out via maximum likelihood estimation method was conducted to assess the structure of each measurement model.

**Table 3. CFA results of each measurement model**

Scales	Number of Factors	GFI	AGFI	CFI	NFI	IFI	RMSEA	$\chi^2$ (df)	p
Self-Efficacy	3	.967	.949	.926	.911	.928	.056	223,634 (88)	.000
Organizational Alienation	5	.919	.902	.966	.939	.966	.049	538,783 (246)	.000

As a result of CFA, the value  $\chi^2/df < 3$  was found and this indicates that the scale is statistically significant. RMSEA value being lower than .08 explains that the model regarding the scales is proper. In addition, the goodness-of-fit statistics show a satisfactory fit. (GFI, AGFI, CFI, NFI, IFI > .90). In other words confirmatory measurement models demonstrate the soundness of the measurement properties (Chau 1997).

#### 4.4. Structural Equation Modeling

Structural equation modeling SEM was conducted to test the validity of the hypotheses. Table 4 shows the standardized path coefficients for all relationships in the structural model. Goodness-of-fit indices proved that the structural model reasonably fit the data ( $\chi^2 = 2673,863$ ;  $df=752$ ,  $\chi^2/df=3.556$ ,  $p=0.000$ , RMSEA-0.062, GFI-0.980, CFI-0.977, IFI-0.977, NFI-0.937, IFI-0.977, AGFI-0.948) (Byrne, 1998).

**Table 4. Results Related to Structural Equation Modeling**

Independent Variables (Paths)	Dependent Variables	$\beta$	t-Value	P	Results
Challenge potency →	Normlessness	,094	1,837	0,066	Not Supported
Challenge potency →	Powerlessness	-,172	-3,309	***	<b>Supported</b>
Challenge potency →	Meaninglessness	-,418	-8,989	***	<b>Supported</b>
Challenge potency →	Isolation	-,293	-5,408	***	<b>Supported</b>
Challenge potency →	Self-estrangement	-,472	-9,988	***	<b>Supported</b>
Inadequacy →	Normlessness	-,134	-1,847	0,065	Not Supported
Inadequacy →	Powerlessness	,052	0,728	0,467	Not Supported
Inadequacy →	Meaninglessness	,405	6,143	***	<b>Supported</b>
Inadequacy →	Isolation	-,022	-0,308	0,758	Not Supported
Inadequacy →	Self-estrangement	,310	4,726	***	<b>Supported</b>
Indecisiveness →	Normlessness	,222	3,35	***	<b>Supported</b>
Indecisiveness →	Powerlessness	,280	4,117	***	<b>Supported</b>
Indecisiveness →	Meaninglessness	-,007	-0,123	0,902	Not Supported
Indecisiveness →	Isolation	,188	2,881	***	<b>Supported</b>
Indecisiveness →	Self-estrangement	,105	1,848	0,065	Not Supported
		$\chi^2$	2673,863	GFI	0.980
		df	752	CFI	0.977
Goodness-of-fit statistics		$\chi^2/df$	3.556	NFI	0.937
		p	0.000	IFI	0.977
		RMSEA	0.062	AGFI	0.948

According to findings in Table 4, challenge potency dimension of self-efficacy creates a statistically significant effect on four dimensions of organizational alienation. Challenge potency dimension of self-efficacy creates this powerful effect on self-alienation ( $\beta=-,472$ ;  $t= -9,988$ ) and meaninglessness ( $\beta=-,418$ ;  $t= -8,989$ ) dimensions. In addition, challenge potency is statistically effective on isolation ( $\beta=-,293$ ;  $t= -5,408$ ) and powerlessness ( $\beta=-,172$ ;  $t= -3,309$ ) dimensions of organizational alienation.

Examining standardized path coefficient, it is seen that as challenge potency of employees increases, self-alienation, meaninglessness, social alienation and powerlessness dimensions decrease significantly. It is also observed that normlessness dimension increases in parallel with challenge potency of employees; however, this increase is not statistically significant.

It is observed inadequacy dimension of self-efficacy creates a statistically significant effect on meaninglessness ( $\beta=,405$ ;  $t= 6,143$ ) and self-alienation ( $\beta=,310$ ;  $t= 4,726$ ) dimensions of alienation. Accordingly, as employees' inadequacy perceptions increase, meaninglessness and self-alienation dimensions significantly increase. It is seen inadequacy does not have a statistically significant effect on alienation, normlessness, powerlessness and social alienation dimensions.

Lastly, indecisiveness dimension of self-efficacy creates a statistically significant effect on normlessness ( $\beta=,222$ ;  $t= 3,350$ ), powerlessness ( $\beta=,280$ ;  $t= 4,117$ ) and social alienation ( $\beta=,188$ ;  $t= 2,881$ ) dimensions of alienation. Accordingly, as indecisiveness of employees increase, normlessness, powerlessness and social alienation dimensions significantly increase, as well. On the other hand, it is observed indecisiveness dimension does not have any statistically significant effect on normlessness and self-alienation dimensions.

## Conclusion

It is supported by the literature that self-efficacy and alienation are among most essential organizational behavior topics affecting employee performance, productivity and profitability. In this study, these two topics which comprise the perception of employees regarding the self-competence to conduct a certain behavior and the result of that behavior are hypothesized to be related. Specifically, the hypothesis is that self-efficacy has a direct effect on organizational alienation.

In the light of the data analysis outcomes, it can be concluded that self-efficacy has a meaningful yet partial effect on alienation. This effect is investigated between the three dimensions of self-efficacy and five dimensions of alienation which came through as the result of factor analysis. According to the results of structural equation modeling, the effect of self-efficacy dimensions on alienation is mostly supported. These effects seem to be positive for "Inadequacy" and "Indecisiveness" but negative for "Challenge Potency".

As a distinguished outcome, the only positive effect of "Challenge potency" is on normlessness dimension of alienation which is not supported statistically though. This diverse effect can be explained by the perception of an employee with a high "challenge potency" that the socially accepted norms are prohibitive to his/her distinctive effort. This particular outcome may be a topic of future research.

## Reference

- Akgündüz Y., "Analysis of Relationship Between Job Satisfaction, Life Satisfaction, And Self-Efficacy in Hospitality Business (Konaklama İşletmelerinde İş Doyumu, Yaşam Doyumu ve Öz Yeterlilik Arasındaki İlişkinin Analizi)", *CBÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Vol. 11, No. 1, (2013), 180-204.
- ALTISO (2015). 2014 Alanya Ekonomik Rapor, Alanya Ticaret ve Sanayi Odası, Günizi Tasarım Basım Tanıtım Ltd. Şti., Alanya.
- Bandura A., "Self-Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change", *Psychological Review*, Vol. 84, No. 2, (1977), 191-215.
- Bandura A., "Reflections on Self-Efficacy", *Advances in Behaviour Research and Therapy*, Vol. 1, (1978), 237-269.
- Bandura A., "Insights. Self-efficacy", *Harvard Mental Health Letter*, Vol. 13, No. 9, (1997), 4-6.
- Brown T. J., Mowen J. C., Donovan D. T. & Licata J. W., "The Customer Orientation of Service Workers: Personality Trait Effects on Self and Supervisor Performance Ratings", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. XXXIX, (2002), 110-119.
- Byrne, B. M., *Structural equation modeling with LISREL, PRELIS, and SIMPLIS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming*, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Manwah, 1998.
- Chau, P. Y. K., "Reexamining a Model for Evaluating Information Center Success Using a Structural Equation Modeling Approach", *Decision Sciences*, Vol. 28, No. 2, (1997), 309–334.
- Chiaburu D. S., Thundiyil T. and Wang J., "Alienation and Its Correlates: A meta-analysis", *European Management Journal*, Vol. 32, (2014), 24-36.
- Clark J. P., "Measuring Alienation Within A Social System", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 24, No. 6, (1959), 849-852.
- Dean D. G., "Alienation: It's Meaning and Measurement", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 26, No. 5, (1961), 753-758.
- Ergil D., "Yabancılaşma Kuramına İlk Katkılar", *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, Vol. 33, (1978), 93-108.
- Fromm E., *The Sane Society*, Routledge, Londra, 1956.
- Gardner D. G. and Pierce J. L., "Self-esteem and Self-efficacy Within the Organizational Context: An Empirical Examination", *Group & Organization Management*, Vol. 23, No. 1, (1998), 48-77.
- Gist M. E., "Self-Efficacy: Implications for Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Management", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 12, No. 3, (1987), 472-485.
- Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L. and Black, W.C., *Multivariate Data Analysis (Fifth Edition)*. Prentice-Hall Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ., 1998.
- Hofstede G., "Alienation at the Top", *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 4, No. 3, (1976), 44-60.
- Horowitz I. L., "On Alienation and Social Order", *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, Vol. 27, No. 2, (1966), 230-237.
- Kahler E., *The Tower and The Abyss*, George Braziller Inc., Newyork, 1957.

- Kanungo R. N., "The Concepts of Alienation and Involvement Revisited", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 86, No. 1, (1979), 119-138.
- Kanungo R. N., "Alienation and Empowerment: Some Ethical Imperatives in Business", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 11, (1992), 413-422.
- Kursuvan S., Kursuvan Z., Ilhan I. & Buyruk L., "The Human Dimension A Review of Human Resources Management Issues in the Tourism and Hospitality Industry", *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, Vol. 51, No. 2, (2010), 171-214.
- Lee, K.H., Choo, S.W. and Hyunc, S.S., "Effects of recovery experiences on hotel employees' subjectivewell-being", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 52, (2016), 1-12.
- Liao H. & Chuang A., "A Multilevel Investigation of Factors Influencing Employee Service Performance and Customer Outcomes", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 47, No. 1, (2004), 41-58.
- Manstead A. S. R. and Vab Eekelen S. A. M., "Distinguishing Between Perceived Behavioral Control and Self-Efficacy in the Domain of Academic Achievement Intentions and Behaviors", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 28, No. 15, (1998), 1375-1392.
- Margolis H. & McCabe P., "Self Efficacy: A Key to Improving the Motivation of Struggling Learners", *Preventing School Failure*, Vol. 47, No. 4, (2003), 162-169.
- Mottaz C. J., "Some Determinants of Work Alienation", *The Sociological Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No. 4, (1981), 515-529.
- Saks A. M., "Longitudinal Field Inverstigation of the Moderating and Mediating Effects of Self-Efficacy on the Relationship Between Training and Newcomer Adjustment", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 80, No. 2, (1995), 211-225.
- Salanova M., Llorens S., Garcia M., Burriel R., Bresó E., & Schaufeli W. B., "Towards a four dimensional model of burnout: A multigroup factor-analytic study including depersonalization and cynicism", *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 65, (2005), 901-913.
- Sayers S., "Creative Activity and Alienation in Hegel and Marx", *Historical Materialism*, Vol. 11, No. 1, (2003), 107-128.
- Seeman M., "On The Meaning of Alienation", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 24, No. 6, (1959), 783-791.
- Shepard J. M., "Functional Specialization and Work Attitudes", *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 8, No. 2, (1969), 185-194.
- Sherer M. & Maddux J. E., "The Self-efficacy Scale: Construction and Validation", *Psychological Reports*, Vol. 51, (1982), 663-671.
- Stajkovic A. D. & Luthans F., "Self-Efficacy and Work-Related Performance: A Meta-Analysis", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 124, No. 2, (1998), 240-261.
- Tekin Ö. A., "The relationships between five factors personality traits and alienation: An examination on five star hotel employees in Kemer, Antalya (Yabancılaşma ve Beş Faktör Kişilik Özellikleri Arasındaki İlişkiler: Antalya Kemer'deki Beş Yıldızlı Otel İşletmeleri Çalışanları Üzerinde Bir Uygulama)", *Doctoral Dissertation, Akdeniz University, Antalya, 2012.*
- Tett R. P., Jackson D. N. & Rothstein M., "Personality Measures as Predictors of Job Performance: A Meta-Analytical Review", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 44, No. 4, (1991), 703-742.

Wood R., Bandura A. & Bailey T., "Mechanisms Governing Organizational Performance in Complex Decision-Making Environments", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 46, (1990), 181-201.

Yıldırım, F. and İlhan, I.O., "The Validity and Reliability of the General Self-Efficacy Scale-Turkish Form", *Turkish Journal of Psychiatry*, Vol. 21, No. 4, (2010), 301-308.