

Advances in Human Resource Management Research

This Work is Licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License



From Resources to Performance: Job Satisfaction as a Conversion Mechanism for Knowledge Management, Work Culture, and Intellectual Integrity in Hotels

Yandra Rivaldo [✉] Andika Prasetya Nugraha ⁽²⁾ Robby Kurniawan ⁽³⁾ Tantri Widriati ⁽⁴⁾

[✉] Universitas Ibnu Sina, Batam, Indonesia
^(2,3,4) Universitas Ibnu Sina, Batam, Indonesia

Received: 2025-01-08 Accepted: 2025-07-26
Available online: 2025-09-30

Corresponding author: Yandra Rivaldo
[✉] yandrarivaldo@uis.ac.id

KEYWORDS	ABSTRACT
Keywords: <i>employee performance; intellectual integrity; job satisfaction; knowledge management; work culture.</i> Conflict of Interest Statement: The author(s) declares that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest. Copyright © 2025 AHRMR. All rights reserved.	Purpose: This study examines how knowledge management, work culture, and intellectual integrity are translated into employee performance through job satisfaction in the hotel sector, with a focus on high-contact service environments. Research Design and Methodology: An explanatory survey reached 235 permanent employees of three-star hotels in Batam, Indonesia, sampled proportionately from a frame of 566. All five constructs were modelled as second-order latent variables in LISREL 8.70. Findings and Discussion: The results indicate that knowledge management, work culture, and intellectual integrity are positively associated with job satisfaction. In turn, job satisfaction demonstrates a strong relationship with employee performance. The model explains 57% of the variance in job satisfaction and 86% of the variance in employee performance. Indirect effects show consistent complementary partial mediation, indicating that job satisfaction functions as a central mechanism through which organisational resources are translated into performance outcomes. Implications: Job satisfaction warrants managerial attention as the mechanism linking resource investment to employee performance, not as a by-product of human resource practice. Existing studies have largely examined knowledge management, work culture, and ethical constructs in isolation, with limited explanation of how these heterogeneous resources are jointly translated into performance. This study addresses this gap by proposing a unified conversion-based framework centred on job satisfaction as a common mechanism. It further positions intellectual integrity as a distinct individual-level epistemic resource, extending established ethical perspectives in hospitality research.

Introduction

Hotels convert human effort into guest experience almost without buffer. Unlike manufacturing, where a defective unit can be intercepted before it reaches the customer, a hotel service episode is produced and consumed simultaneously, so a lapse in an employee's competence, judgement or honesty reaches the guest immediately and irreversibly. This structural feature makes individual performance the operational unit on which hotel competitiveness rests, and it explains why employee-level performance remains at the centre of hospitality human resource research (Bhardwaj & Kalia,

2021; Hewagama et al., 2019; Otoo, 2024). The difficulty is that the resources presumed to produce performance are seldom examined together. Knowledge systems, cultural norms and personal ethical standards are studied in separate literatures, even though a front-office agent draws on all three at once when handling a disputed charge at midnight.

The problem is particularly acute in Batam, an Indonesian border city whose hotel sector serves a high-volume, short-stay cross-border market. During January-September 2024, Batam recorded 1,150,567 foreign tourist visits, with Singapore and Malaysia accounting for the largest shares. Star-rated hotel occupancy reached 52.10% in September 2024, while the average length of stay was 1.83 days. These conditions compress the service encounter: staff have less time to recover from a service failure, while guest evaluations are formed through a limited number of brief but consequential interactions. A preliminary survey of 50 hotel employees in the city returned a mean performance score of 174.14 against a criterion of 175, with recipient satisfaction, adaptability to policy change, and value-congruent conduct all below the criterion; a parallel satisfaction survey returned a mean score of 169.82. Both constructs were therefore marginal in precisely the segment where the margin for error is narrow and where service quality depends heavily on employee capability and judgement (Agarwal, 2021; Franzoni et al., 2021; Gupta et al., 2024; Liu-Lastres et al., 2023).

Recent scholarship offers three partial explanations. The knowledge-based stream shows that codifying, distributing and socialising organisational knowledge raises both attitudinal and behavioural outcomes, because access to knowledge reduces role ambiguity and strengthens self-efficacy, while its deliberate withholding does the reverse (Anand et al., 2022; Chatterjee et al., 2021; Obeso et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020). The cultural stream demonstrates that shared assumptions, communication norms and articulated purpose shape satisfaction and performance across service settings, though effect sizes vary substantially by context (Abawa & Obse, 2024; Gencer et al., 2023; Otoo, 2024; Rožman et al., 2023; Tadesse Bogale & Debela, 2024). The ethics stream links integrity-related constructs to employee attitudes but has concentrated on organisational-level climates and leader behaviour rather than on the epistemic standards employees themselves apply (Barkat et al., 2024). Each stream is internally coherent; none accounts for the others.

Two limitations follow. First, because the streams are estimated separately, the literature cannot say whether these resources are substitutes, complements or largely redundant, and reported effects are almost certainly inflated by omitted correlated predictors (Chacko & Conway, 2019; Nicolás-Agustín et al., 2022). Second, the mediating status of job satisfaction remains unsettled. Some hospitality studies report satisfaction as a full mediator, others as partial, and a further group finds no significant satisfaction-performance link at all (DiPietro et al., 2020; Sainju et al., 2021; Setia et al., 2022; Sobaih & Hasanein, 2020). Much of this inconsistency is procedural rather than substantive: mediation is commonly inferred from the significance pattern of individual coefficients instead of from the proportion of the total effect the indirect path carries, so studies reporting different labels may be describing the same underlying quantity.

A third gap is conceptual. Integrity has been theorised in hospitality mainly as an organisational property, reflected in ethical climate, codes, or leaders' behavioural consistency. What has not been operationalised in hospitality HRM, to the best of our knowledge, is intellectual integrity as an individual-level epistemic resource. In hotel work, this is not an abstraction. It determines whether an employee reports a maintenance fault that may inconvenience a supervisor, whether occupancy figures are adjusted upward, and whether a guest is told the truth about an overbooking. As service work becomes more digitally mediated and more closely monitored, the accuracy of what employees report becomes an operational variable (Ye & Chen, 2024). To the best of our knowledge, existing hospitality studies have not yet operationalised intellectual integrity as an individual-level latent construct estimated alongside knowledge and cultural resources.

Despite extensive research, prior studies have largely examined knowledge management, work culture, and integrity-related constructs in isolation. No unified framework has explained how these heterogeneous organisational resources are jointly converted into employee performance through a common underlying mechanism. This study addresses this gap by proposing a conversion-based model centred on job satisfaction while extending intellectual integrity as a distinct individual-level epistemic resource. This study therefore asks: (1) do knowledge management, work culture and intellectual integrity each contribute to job satisfaction and to employee performance when estimated

simultaneously; and (2) what proportion of each resource's total effect on performance is transmitted through job satisfaction? The objectives are to estimate an integrated structural model containing all five constructs, and to decompose every resource-performance link into direct, indirect and total components with an explicit variance-accounted for statistic.

This study extends predominantly additive approaches to employee-performance research by examining whether organisational and individual resources converge on performance through a common affective mechanism, job satisfaction. By integrating three distinct ontological domains, namely infrastructural (knowledge management), normative (work culture), and personal-epistemic (intellectual integrity), the study establishes a unified conversion-based framework and reveals a remarkably similar mediated share across the three resource domains. This shifts attention from resource presence to the extent to which resource-performance associations are transmitted through job satisfaction. In doing so, the study extends intellectual integrity into hospitality HRM as an individual-level epistemic resource and reconceptualises mediation as a quantifiable conversion process by comparing the proportion of each resource's total association with performance that is transmitted through job satisfaction.

Literature Review

Theoretical framework

The study is grounded in social exchange theory, which is used here as the single organising lens rather than as one of several (Li et al., 2024). Social exchange theory holds that when an organisation invests in employees in ways they perceive as discretionary and beneficial, employees reciprocate with attitudes and behaviours that serve the organisation, and that this reciprocation is routed through the affective state the investment produces (Meira & Hancer, 2021). The three antecedents examined here are read as investments of distinct kinds. Knowledge management is an opportunity-enhancing investment: it supplies the informational resources without which competence cannot be exercised. Work culture is a normative investment: it defines what counts as acceptable conduct and how collective purpose is articulated. Intellectual integrity is a personal-epistemic resource that the organisation cultivates but the individual owns; it governs the quality of judgements made when supervision is absent. In this model, intellectual integrity is not treated as an organisational practice itself; rather, it represents an individual-level epistemic resource that may be cultivated through organisational conditions and may shape how employees interpret and reciprocate those conditions.

Reading three constructs through a single exchange lens has an analytical consequence that guides the hypotheses. If all three operate as investments generating reciprocation, their effects on performance should run substantially through the affective state reciprocation theory specifies job satisfaction rather than bypassing it. This is a stronger and more falsifiable claim than the conventional expectation that each antecedent simply correlates with performance, and it is the claim the mediation analysis is designed to test. It also sits within the broader mutual-gains position that employee attitudes are not a soft residual of human resource practice but the mechanism through which practice reaches organisational outcomes (Ho & Kuvaas, 2020; Ho et al., 2024).

Knowledge management and job satisfaction

Knowledge management is understood here as the set of organisational processes that disseminate, distribute and socialise knowledge so that it becomes usable in daily work, and is modelled through three dimensions: knowledge dissemination, knowledge distribution and tacit knowledge management. Evidence across sectors links these processes to job satisfaction, though the relationship is not uniformly positive: effects vary by facet, with development and recognition-related facets typically gaining more than reward-related ones, consistent with a mechanism that operates by reducing uncertainty about how work should be done rather than by direct reward (Kavalić et al., 2023; Obeso et al., 2020). In hotels the mechanism is especially direct, because much operational knowledge is tacit and shift-bound: a housekeeping supervisor's understanding of which rooms need extra attention rarely exists in written form, and its absence is experienced as avoidable difficulty rather than as a knowledge gap. Where distribution channels and socialisation opportunities exist, employees experience competence and recognition; where they do not, the same tasks register as arbitrary demands (Cajander & Reiman, 2024).

H1: Knowledge management has a positive effect on the job satisfaction of hotel employees.

Work culture and job satisfaction

Work culture comprises the shared values, basic assumptions and interaction patterns through which members interpret their work; it is modelled here through communication and cooperation, strength of organisational culture, and assumptions about work and purpose. The empirical record is consistent in direction: cultures marked by openness, involvement and articulated purpose are associated with higher satisfaction, whereas silent or rigid cultures depress it (Abawa & Obse, 2024; Aboramadan et al., 2020; Gencer et al., 2023; Rožman et al., 2023). The theoretical reason is that culture operates continuously rather than episodically: an employee encounters a formal reward system a few times a year but encounters cultural norms in every interaction.

H2: Work culture has a positive effect on the job satisfaction of hotel employees.

Intellectual integrity and job satisfaction

Intellectual integrity is defined as an individual's commitment to thinking honestly, objectively and self-critically, and to representing information in a way that can be defended by evidence. It is measured through honesty and objectivity, intellectual honesty and critical thinking, and rationality with avoidance of deception. Because the construct is new to this literature, its boundaries require explicit statement. Intellectual integrity is not general ethical behaviour, which concerns the moral quality of conduct towards others rather than the discipline of one's reasoning. It is not moral identity, a self-concept about the centrality of moral traits rather than a standard applied to claims. It is not conscientiousness, a dispositional trait expressed as diligence and order across all tasks, whereas intellectual integrity is specific to the handling of information and may be present in a careless worker and absent in a meticulous one. It is not honesty alone, since honesty governs what one tells others while intellectual integrity also governs what one is willing to conclude oneself. And it is neither ethical climate nor behavioural integrity, both of which reside at the organisational or leader level rather than the individual's own reasoning (Barkat et al., 2024; Kwon et al., 2006).

What the construct isolates is epistemic conduct at the individual level: willingness to follow evidence where it is inconvenient, to resist conclusions that serve the moment, and to represent what is known without distortion. Formal discriminant testing against these adjacent constructs is a necessary next step and is identified as such in the limitations. The satisfaction mechanism is one of reduced dissonance. Employees who can act on what they believe to be true, and who are not required to misrepresent occupancy, availability or fault, avoid the sustained self-monitoring that erodes affective states (Wen & Liu-Lastres, 2021). This positioning distinguishes intellectual integrity from existing ethical constructs by emphasising epistemic discipline at the individual level rather than normative or organisational influences.

H3: Intellectual integrity has a positive effect on the job satisfaction of hotel employees.

Direct effects on employee performance

Each antecedent also has grounds for a direct relationship with performance that requires no affective intermediary. Knowledge management supplies the informational input to task execution: an employee who knows the escalation procedure executes it correctly irrespective of how satisfied they feel (Chatterjee et al., 2021). Work culture constrains behaviour through normative pressure and peer monitoring, which shape conduct even without positive affect (Gencer et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2022). Intellectual integrity contributes directly to work quality by improving the accuracy of judgements embedded in service delivery, such as the correct diagnosis of a guest complaint and honest reporting of an operational failure. Employee performance is treated as a four-dimensional construct spanning competence, work quality, adaptability and behavioural indicators, consistent with contemporary hospitality treatments that reject single-dimension productivity measures (Ali Ababneh et al., 2021; Bhardwaj & Kalia, 2021; Guan et al., 2020; Haldorai et al., 2024; Huang & Tsai, 2024).

H4: Knowledge management has a positive effect on the performance of hotel employees.

H5: Work culture has a positive effect on the performance of hotel employees.

H6: Intellectual integrity has a positive effect on the performance of hotel employees.

Job satisfaction and employee performance

The satisfaction-performance relationship is among the most examined in organisational behaviour and among the most contested in hospitality. Meta-analytic and sectoral evidence supports a positive association, attributed to increased discretionary effort, lower withdrawal and greater willingness to engage emotionally with guests (Chiaburu et al., 2022; Dishon-Berkovits et al., 2024; Frye et al., 2020; Ho & Kuvaas, 2020; Lee & Kim, 2023). Dissenting findings typically arise where performance is captured as a narrow productivity index, or where satisfaction is captured only through extrinsic facets such as pay (Cain et al., 2020; Cajander & Reiman, 2024; DiPietro et al., 2020). This study measures satisfaction through intrinsic factors, extrinsic factors and an emotional component, and performance multidimensionally, which is the configuration under which the positive association is most consistently observed (Pathak et al., 2024).

H7: Job satisfaction has a positive effect on the performance of hotel employees.

The mediating role of job satisfaction

If the exchange logic of the theoretical framework section holds, the three resources should influence performance both directly and through the affective state they generate. The relevant question is not whether mediation is present but how much of the total effect it carries. Prior hospitality studies have answered inconsistently, partly because mediation has been classified from significance patterns rather than quantified (Cao et al., 2023; Setia et al., 2022). Where the indirect path accounts for a substantial share of the total effect while the direct path remains significant, the correct designation is complementary partial mediation: both the direct and indirect components are significant and identically signed and the practically relevant output is the variance-accounted-for proportion (Cao et al., 2023). Because all three antecedents are theorised to operate through reciprocation, and because none can plausibly reach performance exclusively through affective mechanisms, partial rather than full mediation is expected in each case:

H8a: Job satisfaction mediates the effect of knowledge management on employee performance.

H8b: Job satisfaction mediates the effect of work culture on employee performance.

H8c: Job satisfaction mediates the effect of intellectual integrity on employee performance.

Research Design and Methodology

This study adopts a quantitative, explanatory survey design intended to test the hypothesised structural relationships among latent constructs rather than merely describing them, which requires simultaneous estimation of a measurement and a structural model. Covariance-based structural equation modelling was selected over partial least squares because the hypotheses are confirmatory rather than predictive, and the constructs have established theoretical specifications that make covariance-based estimation the appropriate choice (Sallaku & Vigolo, 2024; Tarka, 2018). Estimation was performed in LISREL 8.70 using maximum likelihood. One qualification governs everything that follows: structural equation modelling applied to cross-sectional data estimates associations consistent with a hypothesised ordering, but it does not establish causal priority. The directional language used throughout reflects the theoretical model, not an empirical demonstration of causation.

The population comprised 566 permanent employees of three-star hotels in Batam, Indonesia, spanning front office, housekeeping, food and beverage, engineering and back-office functions. Three-star properties were selected deliberately: they dominate the city's cross-border short-stay market and operate with less formalised knowledge infrastructure than upper-upscale chains, making them the segment in which variation in the constructs of interest is most likely to be observable. Proportionate random sampling across departments produced 235 usable responses, a ratio of 41.5%. Adequacy was judged on three grounds rather than on the observations-per-parameter heuristic alone, which is a weak criterion for covariance-based estimation: the 41.5% ratio of a fully enumerated frame limits coverage error; sixteen first-order dimensions loading on five second-order constructs leave ample degrees of freedom for maximum-likelihood estimates to stabilise at this size; and the realised *n* is consistent with samples in comparable hospitality structural models (Bhardwaj & Kalia, 2021; Sallaku & Vigolo, 2024). A formal RMSEA-based power analysis would strengthen this justification further and is recommended for replication studies.

Data were collected through a structured self-administered questionnaire distributed on site with the permission of hotel management. Participation was voluntary and anonymous. No identifying information was recorded, and respondents were informed of the academic purpose of the study and of their right to withdraw at any point. All constructs were measured on five-point Likert scales anchored from strongly disagree to strongly agree, and each was specified as a second-order latent variable, with three first-order dimensions for knowledge management, work culture, intellectual integrity and job satisfaction, and four for employee performance. The second-order specification was preferred to a first-order one because each construct is theorised as a superordinate property whose dimensions are alternative manifestations rather than distinct causes, a logic that applies equally to the facets of satisfaction and of performance; modelling them as correlated first-order factors would fragment the constructs without theoretical warrant. Item provenance differs by construct: items for knowledge management, work culture, job satisfaction and employee performance were adapted from established instruments in their respective literatures. Although intellectual integrity has appeared in prior intellectual and critical-thinking scholarship (Kwon et al., 2006; Elgin, 2017; McKeon, 2024), no established multidimensional measure was identified that operationalises the construct as an individual-level epistemic resource in hospitality human resource management. The present study therefore develops an initial HRM-specific operationalisation rather than adapting a previously validated scale. The items were drafted from the three theoretically specified dimensions, assessed for content validity by experts, and refined through a pilot involving 50 employees who were not included in the main sample. Because the dimensional structure was specified a priori, exploratory factor analysis was not used to derive the construct structure. The resulting measurement should therefore be regarded as an initial operationalisation requiring further validation in independent samples. Table 1 presents the operational definitions, dimensions, indicators and codes.

Table 1. Variables and Measurement

Variable	Code	Dimension and representative indicators	Reference
Knowledge management	KM1-KM12	Knowledge dissemination (X1); knowledge distribution (X2); tacit knowledge management (X3) – frequency and channels of knowledge-related communication, internal platform distribution, and collaborative sessions supporting tacit sharing.	Kavalić et al. (2023); Obeso et al. (2020)
Work culture	WC1-WC12	Communication and cooperation (X4); strength of organisational culture (X5); assumptions about work and purpose (X6) – teamwork and openness, culture-supporting leadership, and goal-attainment strategy with individual responsibility.	Aboramadan et al. (2020); Gencer et al. (2023)
Intellectual integrity	II1-II12	Honesty and objectivity (X7); intellectual honesty and critical thinking (X8); rationality and avoidance of deception (X9) – avoiding manipulation of information, unwarranted reasoning, and intellectual deception.	Elgin (2017); Kwon et al. (2006); McKeon (2024)
Job satisfaction	JS1-JS12	Intrinsic factors (Y1); extrinsic factors (Y2); emotional component (Y3) – recognition and development opportunity, compensation and supervisor relations, and enjoyment of and motivation for the work.	Kavalić et al. (2023); Sobaih & Hasanein (2020)
Employee performance	EP1-EP16	Competence (Y4); work quality (Y5); adaptability (Y6); behavioural indicators (Y7) – technical skill, conformity to quality standards, response to change, and conduct congruent with organisational values.	Bhardwaj & Kalia (2021); Hewagama et al. (2019)

Because all measures are self-reported and collected at one point in time, the risk of common method variance was addressed procedurally at the design stage: predictor and criterion items were separated within the instrument, anonymity was guaranteed explicitly, and item wording was screened to remove ambiguity and social-desirability cues. These remedies reduce, but cannot eliminate, the

possibility of common method variance. A variable marker and supervisor-rated performance remain the stronger remedies; neither was available here. Analysis proceeded in three stages. First, first- and second-order confirmatory factor analyses established the measurement model, with standardised loadings of 0.50 or above taken as evidence of convergent validity, and construct reliability and average variance extracted computed at the higher-order level from the standardised first-order loadings, following conventional formulae for reflective-reflective hierarchical structures, an area of continuing methodological attention (Cavicchia & Vichi, 2021). Several second-order loadings fell below 0.70 but above 0.50 and were retained because construct-level reliability and average variance extracted exceeded the recommended thresholds and the dimensions are theoretically essential to their domain. Second, the five measurement models were integrated into a hybrid model whose fit was assessed against absolute and incremental indices. Third, structural coefficients were interpreted against a critical value of 1.96, and each resource-performance link was decomposed following the reduced-form logic implemented in LISREL: the direct effect is the structural coefficient, the indirect effect is the product of coefficients along the mediating chain, and the total effect is their sum, with the mediated share expressed as a variance-accounted-for ratio.

Each indirect effect was then tested for significance rather than inferred from its component paths, using the delta method $\text{Var}(ab) \approx b^2\text{Var}(a) + a^2\text{Var}(b)$ with a 95% confidence interval around each estimate. The delta method relies on a normal approximation and may therefore be less accurate than bootstrap inference when the sampling distribution is asymmetric, as products of coefficients typically are; percentile bootstrap intervals are the preferred alternative for replications with access to raw data. This decomposition is reported explicitly because comparing a squared direct path with an unsquared product of indirect paths places the two quantities on different scales and can reverse the apparent dominance of the two pathways; the ratio describes routing, not variance explained, and is interpretable only where direct and indirect components share the same sign, as here.

Findings and Discussion

Findings

The realised sample of 235 respondents was concentrated on the productive career stages and carried substantial organisational tenure. Respondents aged 26 to 30 formed the largest group (41.0%), followed by 31 to 40 (32.0%), 41 to 50 (17.0%) and 21 to 25 (10.0%). Men accounted for 66.0% of the sample and women for 34.0%. In educational terms, 36.0% held a bachelor's degree, 30.0% a diploma, 19.0% a senior secondary qualification and 15.0% a postgraduate degree. Tenure clustered in the six-to-ten-year band (51.0%), with 28.0% at three to five years and 21.0% beyond ten years. This profile matters for interpretation: a workforce whose median tenure exceeds five years has had sufficient exposure to organisational knowledge systems and cultural norms for those constructs to be meaningfully perceived, which reduces the risk that responses reflect unfamiliarity rather than genuine variation.

The measurement model was evaluated in two stages. At the first-order, every indicator loaded on its intended dimension above the 0.50 threshold, with values ranging from 0.52 to 0.81. At the second-order, every dimension loaded significantly on its construct, and construct reliability and average variance extracted, computed from these loadings, exceeded the recommended thresholds of 0.70 and 0.50, respectively, for all five constructs. Table 2 summarises the second-order solution, together with the square root of the average variance extracted, which ranges from 0.725 to 0.781 and supplies the diagonal against which inter-construct correlations must be compared in a Fornell-Larcker assessment.

Table 2. Second-Order Measurement Model, Reliability and Convergent Validity

Construct	Dimension loadings	SLF range	CR	AVE	√AVE
Knowledge management	Dissemination (X1)	$\lambda=0.75$; 0.68-0.81	0.792	0.560	0.749
	Distribution (X2)	$\lambda=0.81$; Tacit			
	management (X3)	$\lambda=0.68$			
Work culture	Communication (X4)	$\lambda=0.73$; 0.73-0.84	0.824	0.610	0.781
	Culture strength (X5)	$\lambda=0.77$;			
	Assumptions (X6)	$\lambda=0.84$			

Construct	Dimension loadings	SLF range	CR	AVE	$\sqrt{AVE}$
Intellectual integrity	Honesty (X7) $\lambda=0.72$; Critical thinking (X8) $\lambda=0.66$; Rationality (X9) $\lambda=0.79$	0.66-0.79	0.768	0.526	0.725
Job satisfaction	Intrinsic (Y1) $\lambda=0.80$; Extrinsic (Y2) $\lambda=0.74$; Emotional (Y3) $\lambda=0.69$	0.69-0.80	0.788	0.555	0.745
Employee performance	Competence (Y4) $\lambda=0.83$; Quality (Y5) $\lambda=0.73$; Adaptability (Y6) $\lambda=0.78$; Behaviour (Y7) $\lambda=0.65$	0.65-0.83	0.837	0.563	0.750

Two features of Table 2 are substantively informative rather than merely technical. Within knowledge management, knowledge distribution is the dominant dimension ($\lambda = 0.81$), indicating that what employees register is not the existence of knowledge but its movement through the organisation. Within work culture, assumptions about work and purpose dominate ($\lambda = 0.84$), locating the operative element of culture in tacit beliefs about responsibility rather than in visible artefacts. Within intellectual integrity, the rationality and avoidance-of-deception dimension is strongest ($\lambda = 0.79$); within job satisfaction, intrinsic factors ($\lambda = 0.80$); and within employee performance, competence ($\lambda = 0.83$). Internal consistency was high throughout, with Cronbach's alpha of 0.954 for knowledge management, 0.949 for work culture, 0.768 for intellectual integrity, 0.788 for job satisfaction, and 0.968 for employee performance. Composite reliability values ranged from 0.768 to 0.837, supporting satisfactory internal consistency across the constructs. Although internal consistency was strong across the constructs, the relatively high alpha values for some scales suggest that future refinement should examine potential item redundancy. The five measurement models were then combined into a hybrid model. As Table 3 shows, all eight fit indices satisfied their conventional thresholds, supporting continued interpretation of the structural estimates.

Table 3. Goodness-of-Fit of the Hybrid Model

Index	Criterion	Estimate	Conclusion
GFI	> 0.90	0.94	Good fit
RMSEA	< 0.08	0.072	Good fit
AGFI	> 0.90	0.91	Good fit
NFI	> 0.90	0.91	Good fit
NNFI	> 0.90	0.93	Good fit
RFI	> 0.90	0.92	Good fit
IFI	> 0.90	0.92	Good fit
CFI	> 0.90	0.91	Good fit

Table 4 reports on the structural coefficients. In the first structural equation, knowledge management, work culture and intellectual integrity were each positively and significantly associated with job satisfaction, jointly accounting for 57% of its variance. Work culture was the strongest predictor ($\gamma = 0.80$, $t = 13.67$), followed by knowledge management ($\gamma = 0.76$, $t = 12.84$) and intellectual integrity ($\gamma = 0.71$, $t = 12.26$). In the second equation, all four predictors were significant and explained 86% of the variance in employee performance, with job satisfaction the dominant path ($\beta = 0.83$, $t = 13.93$). H1 through H7 are therefore supported.

Table 4. Structural Model Estimates and Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis	Structural path	Coefficient	t-value	Decision
H1	KM $\rightarrow$ JS	0.76	12.84	Supported
H2	WC $\rightarrow$ JS	0.80	13.67	Supported
H3	II $\rightarrow$ JS	0.71	12.26	Supported
H4	KM $\rightarrow$ EP	0.70	11.90	Supported
H5	WC $\rightarrow$ EP	0.72	12.55	Supported
H6	II $\rightarrow$ EP	0.64	11.18	Supported
H7	JS $\rightarrow$ EP	0.83	13.93	Supported

The mediation decomposition appears in Table 5. Because the direct paths from all three resources to performance remained significant while the indirect paths through job satisfaction were also substantial, the pattern is complementary partial mediation rather than full mediation. The variance-accounted-for ratios were remarkably similar: job satisfaction carried 47.4% of the total effect of knowledge management, 48.0% of work culture and 47.9% of intellectual integrity.

Table 5. Decomposition of Direct, Indirect and Total Effects on Employee Performance

Structural path	Direct	Indirect (via JS)	Total	VAF (%)	Mediation
KM → EP	0.700	0.631	1.331	47.4	Complementary partial mediation
WC → EP	0.720	0.664	1.384	48.0	Complementary partial mediation
II → EP	0.640	0.589	1.229	47.9	Complementary partial mediation

Significance of the three indirect effects was tested directly rather than inferred from the significance of their component paths, and the results appear in Table 6. All three indirect effects are significant at the 1% level, with delta-method ratios between 9.20 and 9.76, and none of the 95% confidence intervals approaches zero, the narrowest lower bound being 0.464. H8a, H8b and H8c are therefore supported in the complementary partial-mediation form in which they were specified. It should be noted that these intervals are symmetric by construction, whereas the sampling distribution of a product of coefficients is typically skewed; percentile bootstrap intervals would be preferable and would be expected to shift the bounds modestly without altering the inference, given the distance of every interval from zero.

Table 6. Significance Testing of the Indirect Effects

Mediated path	Indirect effect	SE	z	95% CI	Decision
KM → JS → EP	0.631	0.067	9.44	[0.500, 0.762]	Supported
WC → JS → EP	0.664	0.068	9.76	[0.531, 0.797]	Supported
II → JS → EP	0.589	0.064	9.20	[0.464, 0.715]	Supported

This uniformity is the study's most unexpected result. Three resources of quite different kinds an infrastructural process, a normative system and a personal epistemic disposition are each routed through job satisfaction in almost the same proportion. The finding is consistent with satisfaction functioning less as a variable-specific conduit than as a general conversion mechanism, in which about half of the association between each resource and performance is routed through how employees feel about their work. Whether this near equality is a stable regularity or a feature of this sample cannot be settled here; it is offered as a hypothesis for replication rather than as an established property.

Discussion

The results provide empirical support for the proposed conversion-based framework, indicating that heterogeneous resource domains do not operate independently but are jointly translated into employee performance through a shared affective mechanism. The finding that work culture shows the strongest association with job satisfaction aligns with Abawa & Obse (2024) and Gencer et al. (2023), but the dimensional detail sharpens the claim. The dominant dimension is assumptions about work and purpose rather than communication and cooperation, and the strongest single indicator is individual responsibility. Culture influences satisfaction in these hotels not primarily through sociability but through the clarity with which employees understand what they are accountable for. This is consistent with the exchange logic: an employee who knows the boundaries of their responsibility can recognise when they have discharged it, and recognition of adequate performance is a precondition for satisfaction. It also qualifies the common managerial inference that culture-building means team building. The findings suggest that in three-star operations of this kind, with lean staffing and rapid guest turnover, clarity of responsibility may be the scarcer cultural resource, although the present design cannot rank the two dimensions against one another beyond this sample (Rožman et al., 2023).

The knowledge management result extends the evidence linking knowledge management to job satisfaction (Kavalić et al., 2023; Obeso et al., 2020) to a hospitality context those studies did not examine and, notably, to a uniformly positive effect where the manufacturing evidence found a mixed one, a divergence plausibly rooted in how directly knowledge circulation bears on service delivery. The dominance of knowledge distribution over tacit knowledge management is informative. Employees respond most strongly to the observable circulation of knowledge through platforms, briefings and documented procedures, and less strongly to the socialisation processes through which tacit knowledge moves. One reading is that tacit transfer is genuinely less consequential; a more plausible reading, given the shift-based structure of hotel work, is that tacit transfer is harder for employees to perceive as an organisational act because it occurs informally and is not attributed to management (Anand et al., 2022). If so, hotels may be undervaluing the tacit knowledge they already move, and the implication is to make socialisation visible to schedule and name it rather than simply to increase it (Nicolás-Agustín et al., 2022).

The intellectual integrity result provides initial empirical evidence for the viability of the construct as an individual-level epistemic resource in hospitality HRM. This finding extends prior work that identified intellectual integrity as a dimension of individual critical-thinking disposition (Kwon et al., 2006) by examining the construct within an HRM framework and linking it to employee attitudes and performance. Its weakest dimension is intellectual honesty and critical thinking and its strongest is rationality and avoidance of deception. The asymmetry is theoretically interesting: employees converge more readily on the prohibition against deceiving others than on the discipline of scrutinising their own reasoning. In an industry where the reputational cost of visible dishonesty is high and immediate, outward-facing honesty is heavily reinforced while internal epistemic rigour is not. Integrity training in hotels, which typically addresses fraud and misrepresentation, therefore leaves the more difficult component largely unaddressed.

The dominance of job satisfaction in the performance equation is consistent with the mainstream hospitality evidence (Chiaburu et al., 2022; Frye et al., 2020) and stands against the dissenting findings that report no such link. The divergence is explicable on measurement grounds. Studies failing to find the relationship generally capture satisfaction through extrinsic facets and performance through narrow productivity indices; here the strongest satisfaction dimension is intrinsic with development opportunity as its leading indicator, and the strongest performance dimension is competence. The relationship that holds is therefore between intrinsic satisfaction and competent execution, not between pay satisfaction and throughput (Cajander & Reiman, 2024; Sobaih & Hasanein, 2020). This distinction has direct managerial consequences in a segment where compensation flexibility is limited but development opportunity is not (Lee & Kim, 2023; Pathak et al., 2024).

The mediation results warrant careful statement because they contradict a claim that recurs in applied literature. Job satisfaction does not fully mediate these relationships. The direct paths remain significant, and on a like-for-like comparison of quantities on the same scale the direct effects are of the same order as the indirect effects. The correct designation is complementary partial mediation, with the mediated share consistently settling at 47-48% across all three pathways. Reports of full mediation in comparable studies frequently arise from comparing a squared direct path with an unsquared product of indirect paths, which places the two quantities on different scales and systematically favours the indirect route. Framing mediation as a proportion rather than a category dissolves much of the apparent conflict between the full- and partial-mediation camps: both may be describing the same near-even split (Cao et al., 2023; Setia et al., 2022).

For performance management practice, the near even split suggests a working implication rather than a rule. If about half of the association between these resources and performance runs through satisfaction, a knowledge platform that circulates procedure without reducing felt uncertainty, or a values programme that articulates purpose without clarifying responsibility, would be expected to realise appreciably less of its potential performance effect than one that does both. Conversely, the persistence of significant direct paths means satisfaction interventions alone cannot substitute for the underlying resources. The two must be managed jointly, which argues against the widespread practice of treating engagement surveys and operational capability-building as separate managerial agendas (Huang & Tsai, 2024; Liu et al., 2022; Otoo, 2024; Wang et al., 2024). In a labour market where

technological change and job insecurity already depress retention, this joint management is also a retention instrument (Brougham & Haar, 2020; Guan et al., 2020).

A further feature of the results calls for comment rather than celebration: every hypothesis was supported and the coefficients are uniformly large. Three considerations bear on how this should be read. The model was not exploratory; each path was specified only where prior evidence already indicated a positive association, so a high support rate is closer to confirmation of an established pattern than to discovery. The constructs were measured with multi-item second-order instruments of high internal consistency, which attenuates measurement error and raises structural estimates relative to single-item designs. Against this, uniformly supported hypotheses combined with high explained variance is also the signature that common method variance produces, and the present design cannot separate the two explanations. The appropriate response is not to discount the findings but to treat replication with supervisor-rated performance and a marker variable as a condition of confidence in them.

Three results deserve caution. First, the three exogenous constructs are conceptually distinct and satisfy the convergent validity criteria, but they are unlikely to be independent in practice: hotels with strong knowledge systems tend also to have articulated cultures and to attract employees with stronger epistemic standards. Each coefficient should therefore be read as an upper bound on the unique contribution of its construct, and the decomposition in Table 5 as a description of routing rather than of isolated causal force. Second, the explained variance in the performance equation is high for self-reported cross-sectional data and is probably inflated by common method variance; procedural remedies were applied, but no marker variable was collected, so the residual bias cannot be quantified here (Sainju et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2020). Third, the uniformity of the mediated share, while striking, rests on one sample in one market segment and requires replication before it can be treated as a general property of the satisfaction mechanism (Haldorai et al., 2024; Ye & Chen, 2024).

Conclusion

This study asked whether knowledge management, work culture and intellectual integrity each contribute to hotel employee performance when estimated jointly, and what share of each contribution job satisfaction transmits. Using a survey of 235 employees at three-star hotels in Batam and covariance-based structural equation modelling, all three resources were positively and significantly associated with job satisfaction, which together with them accounted for 86% of the variance in employee performance. Given the cross-sectional self-report design, this relatively high explanatory proportion should be interpreted cautiously because common method variance may have inflated the observed associations. Work culture showed the strongest association with satisfaction; job satisfaction showed the strongest association with performance. All three indirect effects were significant, with satisfaction carrying 47-48% of each total effect, indicating complementary partial rather than full mediation.

The study's central contribution is a conversion account of employee performance, in which infrastructural, normative and personal-epistemic resources do not reach performance independently but converge on a single affective mechanism that carries close to half of each total association, with the mediated share being remarkably similar across the three resource domains. Conceptually, it provides an initial operationalisation of intellectual integrity as an individual-level epistemic resource in human resource management, inviting independent validation. Methodologically, reporting mediation as a variance-accounted-for proportion rather than a categorical label reconciles conflicting full and partial-mediation findings in the literature. Practically, it offers four leverage points for performance management: clarity of responsibility, visible knowledge circulation, development opportunity, and joint management of capability and affect. This contribution may provide a basis for examining how organisational and individual resources are converted into performance outcomes across other high-contact service settings.

These limitations define the research agenda. Longitudinal or multi-wave designs, and comparative studies across hotel classifications and across border and non-border markets, would establish whether the 47-48% mediated share is a property of this segment or a more general regularity, which is the single most consequential question these results raise. Further research should

develop and validate an independent scale for intellectual integrity with formal discriminant testing against ethical climate and behavioural integrity and should examine plausible moderators in this setting, including tenure, departmental function, and degree of guest contact, that may condition how strongly these resource domains are converted into performance effects.

References

- Abawa, A., & Obse, H. (2024). Organizational culture and organizational performance: Does job satisfaction mediate the relationship? *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), 2324127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2324127>
- Aboramadan, M., Albashiti, B., Alharazin, H., & Zaidoune, S. (2020). Organizational culture, innovation and performance: A study from a non-western context. *Journal of Management Development*, 39(4), 437-451. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-06-2019-0253>
- Agarwal, P. (2021). Shattered but smiling: Human resource management and the wellbeing of hotel employees during COVID-19. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 93, 102765. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102765>
- Ali Ababneh, O. M., Awwad, A. S., & Abu-Haija, A. (2021). The association between green human resources practices and employee engagement with environmental initiatives in hotels: The moderation effect of perceived transformational leadership. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 20(3), 390-416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2021.1923918>
- Anand, A., Offergelt, F., & Anand, P. (2022). Knowledge hiding – A systematic review and research agenda. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 26(6), 1438-1457. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-04-2021-0336>
- Barkat, W., Waris, I., & Ahmed, R. (2024). Transformational leadership and frontline managers' work engagement, innovative work behavior, organizational citizenship behavior, and employee sustainability in the hotel industry in Pakistan. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 23(2), 315-336. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2024.2282217>
- Bhardwaj, B., & Kalia, N. (2021). Contextual and task performance: role of employee engagement and organizational culture in hospitality industry. *VILAKSHAN - XIMB Journal of Management*, 18(2), 187-201. <https://doi.org/10.1108/XJM-08-2020-0089>
- Brougham, D., & Haar, J. (2020). Technological disruption and employment: The influence on job insecurity and turnover intentions – A multi-country study. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 161, 120276. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120276>
- Cain, L., Kitterlin-Lynch, M., Cain, C., & Agrusa, J. (2020). Heavy alcohol use, job satisfaction, and job escapism drinking among foodservice employees: A comparative analysis. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 21(3), 287-307. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15256480.2018.1478355>
- Cajander, N., & Reiman, A. (2024). Aligning expectations with real-world experiences: a talent management study on the restaurant industry in Finland. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 46(9), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-07-2023-0347>
- Cao, Z., Cham, H., Stiver, J., & Rivera Mindt, M. (2023). Effect size measure for mediation analysis with a multicategorical predictor. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1101440. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1101440>
- Cavicchia, C., & Vichi, M. (2021). Second-order disjoint factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 86(4), 913-934. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11336-021-09799-6>
- Chacko, S., & Conway, N. (2019). Employee experiences of HRM through daily affective events and their effects on perceived event-signaled HRM system strength, expectancy perceptions, and daily work engagement. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 29(3), 433-450. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12236>
- Chatterjee, S., Rana, N. P., Dwivedi, Y. K., & Baabdullah, A. M. (2021). The role of knowledge-oriented leadership in promoting workforce agility: A study of IT professionals in India. *Journal of Business Research*, 131, 295-306. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.01.048>

- Chiaburu, D. S., Oh, I.-S., Stoverink, A. C., Park, H., Bradley, C., & Barros-Rivera, B. A. (2022). Happy to help, happy to change? A meta-analysis of major predictors of affiliative and change-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 132, 103664. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2021.103664>
- DiPietro, R. B., Moreo, A., & Cain, L. (2020). Well-being, affective commitment and job satisfaction: Influences on turnover intentions in casual dining employees. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 29(2), 139-163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2019.1605956>
- Dishon-Berkovits, M., Bakker, A. B., & Peters, P. (2024). Playful work design, engagement and performance: The moderating roles of boredom and conscientiousness. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 35(2), 256-283. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2023.2227920>
- Elgin, C. Z. (2017). Intellectual integrity. In True enough (pp. 123-150). MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262036535.003.0006>
- Franzoni, S., Sarwar, H., & Ishaq, M. I. (2021). The mediating role of HRM in the relationship between CSR and performance in the hospitality industry. *Sustainability*, 13(24), 13699. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132413699>
- Frye, W. D., Kang, S., Huh, C., & Lee, M. J. (2020). What factors influence Generation Y's employee retention in the hospitality industry? An internal marketing approach. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 85, 102352. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.102352>
- Gencer, G., Atay, H., Gurdogan, A., & Colakoglu, U. (2023). The relationship between organizational culture, organizational silence and job performance in hotels: The case of Kuşadası. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights*, 6(1), 70-89. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JHTI-01-2021-0001>
- Guan, X., Yeh, S. S., Chiang, T. Y., & Huan, T. C. (2020). Does organizational inducement foster work engagement in hospitality industry? Perspectives from a moderated mediation model. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 43, 259-268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.04.010>
- Gupta, S., Kushwaha, P. S., & Badhera, U. (2024). Managing tourism and hospitality industry during pandemic: Analysis of challenges and strategies for survival. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 32(4). <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-11-2023-0806>
- Haldorai, K., Kim, W. G., & Phetvaroon, K. (2024). Job insecurity and survivor workplace behavior following COVID-19 layoff. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 36(1), 329-346. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-03-2022-0289>
- Hewagama, G., Boxall, P., Cheung, G., & Hutchison, A. (2019). Service recovery through empowerment? HRM, employee performance and job satisfaction in hotels. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 81, 73-82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.03.006>
- Ho, H., & Kuvaas, B. (2020). Human resource management systems, employee well-being, and firm performance from the mutual gains and critical perspectives: The well-being paradox. *Human Resource Management*, 59(3), 235-253. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21990>
- Ho, K. L., Mäkilängas, A., Kerkiseck, P., Morstatt, A. I., de Bloom, J., & Bauer, G. F. (2024). Job and off-job crafting profiles: Time-lagged relationships with job, home and personal resources and well-being outcomes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 97(3), 952-976. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12506>
- Huang, L., & Tsai, H. (2024). The effects of recovery experiences on hotel employees' subjective well-being, organizational citizenship behavior, and task performance. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 121, 103798. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2024.103798>
- Kavalić, M., Stanisavljev, S., Mirkov, S., Rajković, J., Stojanović, E. T., Milosavljev, D., & Nikolić, M. (2023). Modeling knowledge management for job satisfaction improvement. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 30(2), 176-190. <https://doi.org/10.1002/kpm.1721>
- Kwon, I. S., Lee, G. E., Kim, G. D., Kim, Y. H., Park, K. M., Park, H. S., Sohn, S. K., Lee, W. S., Jang, K. S., & Chung, B. Y. (2006). Development of a critical thinking disposition scale for nursing students. *Journal of Korean Academy of Nursing*, 36(6), 950-958. <https://doi.org/10.4040/jkan.2006.36.6.950>
- Lee, M., & Kim, B. (2023). Effect of employee experience on organizational commitment: Case of South Korea. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(7), 521. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13070521>

- Li, M., Fu, N., Chadwick, C., & Harney, B. (2024). Untangling human resource management and employee wellbeing relationships: Differentiating job resource HR practices from challenge demand HR practices. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 34(1), 214-235. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12527>
- Liu, X., Yu, J., Guo, Q., & Li, J. (2022). Employee engagement, its antecedents and effects on business performance in hospitality industry: A multilevel analysis. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 34(12), 4631-4652. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-12-2021-1512>
- Liu-Lastres, B., Wen, H., & Huang, W.-J. (2023). A reflection on the Great Resignation in the hospitality and tourism industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 35(1), 235-249. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-05-2022-0551>
- McKeon, M. W. (2024). Reason-giving uses of arguments, intellectual honesty, and intellectual integrity. In *Arguments and reason-giving* (pp. 289-330). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197751633.003.0008>
- Meira, J. V. S., & Hancer, M. (2021). Using the social exchange theory to explore the employee-organization relationship in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 33(2), 670-692. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-06-2020-0538>
- Nicolás-Agustín, Á., Jiménez-Jiménez, D., & Maeso-Fernandez, F. (2022). The role of human resource practices in the implementation of digital transformation. *International Journal of Manpower*, 43(2), 395-410. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-03-2021-0176>
- Obeso, M., Hernández-Linares, R., López-Fernández, M. C., & Serrano-Bedia, A. M. (2020). Knowledge management processes and organizational performance: The mediating role of organizational learning. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 24(8), 1859-1880. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-10-2019-0553>
- Otoo, F. N. K. (2024). The mediating role of organizational learning culture in the nexus of human resource development practices and employee competencies. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*, 15(4), 720-763. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AJEMS-10-2023-0387>
- Pathak, D., Srivastava, S., Tripathi, P. M., & Gugnani, R. (2024). An integrated model to study workplace passion and job satisfaction among hotel employees: an emerging market perspective. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, 19(10), 2712-2733. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOEM-12-2021-1803>
- Rožman, M., Tominc, P., & Milfelner, B. (2023). Maximizing employee engagement through artificial intelligent organizational culture in the context of leadership and training of employees: Testing linear and non-linear relationships. *Cogent Business & Management*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2023.2248732>
- Sainju, B., Hartwell, C., & Edwards, J. (2021). Job satisfaction and employee turnover determinants in Fortune 50 companies: Insights from employee reviews from Indeed.com. *Decision Support Systems*, 148, 113582. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2021.113582>
- Sallaku, R., & Vigolo, V. (2024). Predicting customer loyalty to Airbnb using PLS-SEM: the role of authenticity, interactivity, involvement and customer engagement. *The TQM Journal*, 36(5), 1346-1368. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-12-2021-0348>
- Setia, B. I., Yuniarsih, T., Gaffar, M. F., Suryadi, E., Affandi, A., & Rohmawati, T. (2022). Job satisfaction as a mediator in improving employee performance through talent and knowledge management. *Journal of Eastern European and Central Asian Research*, 9(5), 749-762. <https://doi.org/10.15549/jeecar.v9i5.1060>
- Sobaih, A. E. E., & Hasanein, A. M. (2020). Herzberg's theory of motivation and job satisfaction: Does it work for hotel industry in developing countries? *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 19(3), 319-343. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2020.1737768>
- Tadesse Bogale, A., & Debela, K. L. (2024). Organizational culture: A systematic review. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), 2340129. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2340129>
- Tarka, P. (2018). An overview of structural equation modeling: its beginnings, historical development, usefulness and controversies in the social sciences. *Quality & Quantity*, 52(1), 313-354. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-017-0469-8>

-
- Wang, H., Li, X., Zhu, J., & Chen, X. (2024). The influence of talent management practices on talents' intention to stay: An empirical study from China. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 46(4), 895-912. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-01-2024-0007>
- Wang, W., Wang, Y., Zhang, Y., & Ma, J. (2020). Spillover of workplace IT satisfaction onto job satisfaction: The roles of job fit and professional fit. *International Journal of Information Management*, 50, 341-352. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.08.011>
- Wen, H., & Liu-Lastres, B. (2021). Examining the impact of psychological capital on workplace outcomes of ethnic minority foodservice employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 94, 102881. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2021.102881>
- Ye, Y., & Chen, K.-H. (2024). Hospitality employees and digital transformation: The mediating roles of alienation and motivation. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 119, 103731. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2024.103731>