Work Motivation and Employee Performance in The Service Industry: The Mediating Role of Work Discipline

Ananda Fitriani Dewi [1] *, Zainuddin [2], Efendi Pakpahan [2]

[1] *Doctoral Student, Department of Management, Faculty of Economics, Universitas Prima Indonesia, Indonesia*
[2] *Doctoral Lecturers, Department of Management, Faculty of Economics, Universitas Prima Indonesia, Indonesia*
*Corresponding author E-mail: anandafitrianidewi2829@gmail.com

Abstract

From an economic perspective, these findings have direct implications for labor productivity, operational efficiency, and service-sector competitiveness, as enhanced employee motivation and disciplined behavior can reduce service delivery costs while improving customer satisfaction and revenue generation. This study examines how individual, developmental, environmental, and cultural factors jointly shape employee performance in a standardized service setting. Drawing on Job Demands–Resources and Self-Determination Theory, the model positions work motivation, work discipline, career development, work environment, and organizational culture as predictors of employee performance, with work motivation as a central psychological mechanism. Data were collected from frontline employees in a standardized service organization and analyzed using partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). The results show that work motivation is the strongest predictor of employee performance, followed by work discipline, career development, work environment, and organizational culture. Work motivation also mediates the effects of career development, work environment, and organizational culture on performance, indicating that organizational resources enhance performance primarily by strengthening employees' motivational states. The model demonstrates substantial explanatory power for employee performance and satisfactory predictive relevance and global model fit. These findings extend existing organizational behavior, service management, and HRM literature by integrating motivational, developmental, environmental, and cultural perspectives into a unified behavioral model of performance in standardized service operations. Practically, the results highlight the need for organizations to design HR systems and managerial practices that simultaneously foster work motivation, reinforce disciplined behavior, provide developmental opportunities, cultivate supportive cultures, and maintain adequate work environments to sustain high levels of frontline performance.

Keywords: *Employee Performance, Work Discipline, Work Motivation, Career Development, Work Environment, Organizational Culture*

1. Introduction

Employee performance has become a central topic in organizational behavior and human resource management, particularly within the service industry, where customer experience and service quality are directly shaped by frontline employees. In service-intensive contexts such as hospitality, retail, and tourism, employee performance is not limited to task completion but also includes emotional labor, adaptability, customer orientation, and consistency in meeting service standards. Recent empirical work highlights that the performance of service employees is highly sensitive to psychological conditions, work design, and the quality of workplace interactions (Buil et al., 2019; Kim & Koo, 2017). Because customers evaluate service quality based on employees' verbal and nonverbal behaviors, understanding what drives employees to perform effectively remains a pressing concern for organizations seeking competitive advantage in dynamic service markets. (Alfes et al., 2013)

Work motivation is consistently identified as a primary driver of employee performance across settings. Studies grounded in self-determination theory demonstrate that motivated employees invest more effort, persist longer, and display higher service quality (Howard et al., 2016). Longitudinal and meta-analytic studies confirm a causal relationship between motivation and performance, emphasizing that employees with strong autonomous motivation show better job outcomes than those driven by controlled motives (Wang et al., 2024). Within service contexts, motivation influences not only task performance but also extra-role behavior, creativity, and customer-oriented actions that shape the overall service experience (Moon et al., 2019). Despite its centrality, motivation remains complex because it is shaped by individual needs, job design, leadership, and organizational climate. (Deci et al., 2017; Crawford et al., 2010)

Employee performance is also increasingly understood through the lens of work engagement. Engagement captures employees' psychological investment in their roles, reflected in vigor, dedication, and absorption (Bakker, 2022). While conceptually distinct from work motivation—with motivation referring to the energizing force and direction of effort, and engagement reflecting the psychological state of investment and immersion in work roles—both constructs share complementary roles in shaping employee performance (Corbeanu &

Iliescu, 2023). In the service industry, engagement enhances employees' ability to handle customer demands, manage emotions, and deliver consistent service experiences (Hosen et al., 2024). Research further indicates that engagement is strengthened through resources such as social support, autonomy, recognition, and development opportunities, which energize employees and stimulate proactive behavior (Albrecht et al., 2018). Because service delivery involves high emotional and cognitive demands, engaged employees are better positioned to maintain service quality under pressure. (Rich et al., 2010; Christian et al., 2011)

Several organizational factors have been shown to shape motivation and engagement, thereby influencing performance. Work environment remains a critical antecedent in service settings where physical comfort, workload balance, leadership interaction, and social climate affect employees' willingness to invest effort (Tsaur et al., 2019). Positive work environments reduce emotional exhaustion and help employees sustain performance levels, even in demanding roles. (Wright & Cropanzano, 2000) Similarly, career development opportunities play a role in shaping employees' long-term motivation by strengthening competence, future orientation, and perceived organizational support (Guan & Frenkel, 2019). When employees perceive fair opportunities for growth and advancement, they are more likely to exhibit strong commitment and high-quality performance.

Organizational culture is another key predictor of performance, especially in service organizations where behavioral norms guide interactions with customers. Cultures that promote collaboration, service orientation, and psychological safety create conditions where employees feel encouraged to perform and innovate (Albrecht et al., 2015). In hospitality firms, service-oriented cultures have been linked to higher engagement and improved customer outcomes, especially when reinforced by leadership practices that empower and recognize frontline employees (Kim et al., 2012).

Despite increasing evidence on the interplay between motivation, engagement, and performance, the service industry—especially in developing country contexts—still faces persistent challenges in sustaining employee performance. Rapid technological change, fluctuating customer expectations, and high emotional demands place continuous pressure on frontline workers. Many organizations struggle to maintain high performance because employees experience burnout, a lack of support, or limited development opportunities. (Meyer et al., 2004) This highlights the need for research that integrates psychological and organizational predictors of employee performance, specifically within service-intensive environments.

Drawing from this growing body of evidence, the present study aims to examine how work motivation, work discipline, career development, work environment, and organizational culture influence employee performance in the service industry. By focusing on these interconnected variables, the study addresses gaps in prior research that often focus on only one or two predictors without capturing the broader organizational context. Additionally, this study extends contemporary findings to a local service environment where empirical evidence remains limited. The results are expected to provide meaningful insights for practitioners seeking to enhance service quality through workforce development and strengthen the theoretical understanding of performance drivers in service organizations.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Employee Performance

Employee performance in the service industry reflects the extent to which employees successfully carry out task, contextual, and customer-facing behaviors required to meet organizational expectations. Recent studies conceptualize performance as a combination of task efficiency, service quality, adaptability, and emotional labor management, especially in frontline settings where customer evaluations are shaped by employee interactions (Buil et al., 2019). Performance in hospitality and tourism also depends on employees' ability to engage in role-prescribed behaviors while managing unpredictable customer demands and service recovery situations (Kim & Koo, 2017). Research in organizational psychology highlights that employee performance is strongly influenced by motivational, organizational, and relational dynamics. Employees who perceive autonomy, feedback, and supportive leadership tend to display stronger persistence (Schneider et al., 2005) and higher-quality service outcomes (Carter et al., 2018). Engagement-oriented environments also reduce performance variability by stabilizing employees' energy and dedication at work (Corbeanu & Iliescu, 2023). Because service firms rely heavily on customer experience, employee performance becomes a strategic foundation for competitive advantage. In this study, employee performance refers to employees' ability to execute service tasks efficiently, maintain quality standards, engage in customer-oriented behavior, and contribute to organizational effectiveness.

2.2. Work Discipline

Work discipline refers to the degree to which employees adhere to established procedures, organizational rules, service standards, and expected conduct at work. Although not always studied as a stand-alone psychological construct, work discipline is embedded within the broader discussion of employee reliability, behavioral consistency, and compliance with role expectations. In service operations, adherence to service protocols—such as punctuality, grooming standards, and consistent execution of SOPs—strongly influences customer perceptions and operational stability (Tsaur et al., 2019). Studies in the hospitality sector show that disciplined employees reduce service errors, enhance service flow, and support teamwork efficiency during peak operational hours (Kim et al., 2012). Adherence to safety, hygiene, and service recovery guidelines is also essential to minimize risk and ensure stable customer satisfaction outcomes (Guchait et al., 2014). Work discipline, therefore, acts as a foundational mechanism that ensures employees' behaviors align with organizational expectations and service quality standards. For this study, work discipline is conceptualized as employees' adherence to rules, punctuality, compliance with service procedures, and consistency in delivering expected behaviors.

2.3. Work Motivation

Work motivation is widely recognized as a central antecedent of employee behavior and performance. Drawing from self-determination theory, motivation is understood as a psychological force that initiates, directs, and sustains effort toward work-related goals (Howard et al., 2016). Employees with higher autonomous motivation—driven by interest, meaning, and internalized values—tend to demonstrate superior creativity, persistence, and service quality (Wang et al., 2024). In service settings, motivation plays a critical role in shaping employees' willingness to engage in customer-focused behaviors, emotional labor, and service recovery. Motivated employees are more responsive, deliver higher-quality interactions, and can maintain performance despite demanding service encounters (Moon et al., 2019). Empirical studies in hotels and tourism firms show that fair reward systems, supportive leadership, and meaningful work strongly enhance intrinsic motivation, which subsequently improves performance (Kim & Koo, 2017).

Motivation also interacts with contextual resources such as autonomy and social support to sustain long-term performance (Albrecht et al., 2015). These findings clarify that work motivation is not merely an individual attribute but a dynamic mechanism influenced by organizational practices. Thus, in this research, work motivation refers to the internal psychological forces that drive employees to exert effort, maintain persistence, and achieve quality performance in service interactions.

2.4. Career Development

Career development encompasses training opportunities, professional growth pathways, and organizational support that enhance employees' knowledge, skills, and career prospects. Studies emphasize that employees' perceptions of career development strongly influence their commitment, future orientation, and performance outcomes (Guan & Frenkel, 2019). When employees feel that the organization invests in their development, they exhibit stronger engagement, lower turnover intentions, and improved service performance. (Dysvik & Kuvaas, 2008) In service and hospitality contexts, structured training, mentoring, and promotional opportunities help employees build service competencies, expand their relational skills, and handle complex customer interactions (Tharenou et al., 2007; Kang et al., 2018). Career development opportunities also strengthen employees' psychological empowerment (Ng et al., 2005), which boosts initiative-taking and customer-oriented performance (Buil et al., 2019). Recent evidence shows that career development fosters work engagement by satisfying psychological needs for competence and growth, thus indirectly enhancing performance (Albrecht et al., 2018). A clear career pathway encourages employees to invest discretionary effort and maintain service quality, even under high-pressure conditions. Accordingly, in this study, career development captures employees' perceptions of training, promotion clarity, skill-enhancement opportunities, and long-term career support provided by the organization.

2.5. Work Environment

Work environment refers to the physical, psychological, and social conditions that employees experience in the workplace. In the service industry, where employees interact directly with customers, the work environment plays a critical role in shaping behavior, well-being, and performance. Positive work environments provide comfortable physical spaces, fair workloads, supportive supervision, and cohesive social relationships—elements that enhance performance by reducing strain and facilitating teamwork (Tsaur et al., 2019). Empirical studies show that high-quality work environments promote engagement and reduce employee turnover, particularly in hospitality firms where job demands are intense (Kim et al., 2012). Supportive environments foster psychological safety, enabling employees to express ideas, seek help, and engage in problem-solving during service failures (Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009) (Kim et al., 2017). These environments also help frontline employees manage emotional labor demands (Wright & Cropanzano, 2000), which enhances service quality and customer satisfaction. The work environment is therefore fundamental in shaping sustained employee performance in service settings. Hence, in this study, the work environment captures perceptions of physical comfort, social support, leadership quality, workload fairness, and overall workplace climate.

2.6. Organizational Culture

Organizational culture represents shared norms, values, and beliefs that shape employee behavior and guide the way work is executed. Culture plays a central role in determining how employees interpret expectations, handle customer interactions, and coordinate service activities. Service-oriented cultures (Denison et al., 2004) emphasize collaboration, customer-centricity, and continuous improvement—values that have been linked to higher employee engagement and performance (Albrecht et al., 2015). In hospitality organizations, a strong service culture reinforces expected behaviors, encourages cooperative teamwork, and supports emotional labor management (Kim & Koo, 2017). When employees perceive alignment between cultural values and organizational practices, they exhibit more positive attitudes, higher engagement, and stronger commitment to service delivery (Hosen et al., 2024). A psychologically safe and empowering culture (Treviño et al., 1998) further enhances employees' confidence and initiative-taking, enabling them to handle customer complaints and service disruptions effectively (Salanova et al., 2005). Such cultures help employees align personal goals with organizational goals, increasing their likelihood of performing beyond minimum requirements. In this study, organizational culture is defined as employees' perceptions of shared values related to service excellence, teamwork, support, and behavioral norms that guide service performance.

2.7. Hypothesis Development

Job demands–resources (JD–R) theory and self-determination theory posit that employees' motivation is a central psychological resource that energizes effort, persistence, and goal-directed behavior at work (Howard et al., 2016; Bakker, 2022). When employees experience autonomous motivation—because they find their work meaningful, interesting, or aligned with internal values—they are more likely to invest discretionary effort, sustain attention, and display higher-quality performance. Meta-analytic evidence from longitudinal studies confirms that work motivation exerts a causal, positive influence on job performance across occupations and contexts (Wang et al., 2024). In service settings, motivated employees are more willing to engage in customer-oriented behaviors, adapt to dynamic service demands, and recover from service failures, thereby enhancing overall performance (Moon et al., 2019; Buil et al., 2019). Based on this logic, work motivation is expected to be a direct driver of employee performance in the service industry.

H1: *Work motivation has a positive effect on employee performance.*

Career development represents a key human resource practice through which organizations provide employees with training, promotion opportunities, and long-term growth pathways. When employees perceive strong career development support, they experience higher competence, future orientation, and affective commitment, which in turn foster better performance (Guan & Frenkel, 2019). In the hospitality industry, structured training and clear promotion criteria help employees develop specialized service skills, improve their confidence in handling complex customer interactions, and enhance task performance (Hosen et al., 2024). Career development thus acts as a strategic mechanism for building a more capable and high-performing workforce.

H2: *Career development has a positive effect on employee performance.*

The work environment encompasses physical, social, and psychological features of the workplace that shape employees' experiences. A supportive environment—characterized by comfortable facilities, reasonable workload, safety, and positive social relations—reduces strain and enables employees to maintain energy and focus during service interactions (Tsaur et al., 2019). Empirical research in tourism and hospitality indicates that when employees perceive their work environment as favorable, they report higher engagement and satisfaction, which are associated with better performance and customer outcomes (Kim et al., 2012; Knight et al., 2017). Therefore, a conducive work environment is expected to contribute positively to employee performance.

H3: *Work environment has a positive effect on employee performance.*

Organizational culture represents shared values, norms, and beliefs that guide behavior and shape how work is conducted. Cultures that emphasize service excellence, teamwork, and accountability create strong behavioral expectations for employees, aligning their actions with organizational goals (Albrecht et al., 2015). In hospitality organizations, a service-oriented culture has been shown to foster employee engagement and customer-focused behavior, which translates into higher performance and improved customer satisfaction (Kim & Koo, 2017). When employees internalize cultural values, they are more likely to go beyond minimum role requirements and deliver high-quality service.

H4: *Organizational culture has a positive effect on employee performance.*

Work discipline refers to employees' adherence to rules, punctuality, compliance with procedures, and consistency in performing assigned tasks. In the service industry, where real-time customer interactions and standardized processes are critical, disciplined employees are essential for maintaining service reliability and operational efficiency. Studies in hospitality show that employees who consistently follow SOPs, respect time schedules, and comply with hygiene and safety standards contribute to more stable service quality and fewer operational disruptions (Kim et al., 2012; Tsaur et al., 2019). From a performance perspective, discipline ensures that individual effort is not only present but also systematically aligned with organizational requirements. Furthermore, disciplined behavior supports both task and contextual performance. By minimizing variability in service delivery and preventing errors, disciplined employees help organizations uphold brand promises and maintain customer trust. In team-based service environments, discipline also supports coordination, as reliable behavior makes it easier for colleagues to anticipate each other's actions and collaborate effectively (Buil et al., 2019). Therefore, work discipline is expected to be a strong direct predictor of employee performance in service organizations.

H5: *Work discipline has a positive effect on employee performance.*

Motivation not only affects performance directly but also shapes employees' self-regulatory behavior. Employees who feel motivated are more inclined to align their conduct with organizational expectations, comply with procedures, and regulate their impulses in line with work norms (Moon et al., 2019). In service organizations, this self-regulation translates into punctuality (Ehrhart & Naumann, 2004), adherence to standard operating procedures, and consistent role behavior—core elements of work discipline. Studies in hospitality show that motivational resources and positive affect are associated with more responsible and reliable behavior at work, including fewer counterproductive acts and greater compliance with service standards (Hosen et al., 2024). Accordingly, motivated employees are expected to exhibit higher levels of work discipline.

H6: *Work motivation has a positive effect on work discipline.*

Career development is also closely related to employees' sense of responsibility and obligation toward the organization. When employees believe that the organization invests in their growth, they are more inclined to reciprocate (Appelbaum et al., 2000) through compliant and disciplined work behavior, consistent with social exchange and reciprocity principles (Albrecht et al., 2018). Studies in service settings show that developmental HR practices, such as coaching and skill enhancement, foster stronger identification with the organization and greater adherence to organizational standards (Carbery et al., 2003; Buil et al., 2019). Employees who see a promising career trajectory within the firm are less likely to engage in absenteeism, tardiness, or rule-breaking and more likely to behave in structured and disciplined ways.

H7: *Career development has a positive effect on work discipline.*

At the same time, the work environment can influence the degree to which employees adhere to rules and maintain disciplined behavior. Physical arrangements that support workflow, clear signage of procedures, and accessible tools for task execution make it easier for employees to follow standards and avoid errors. Socially supportive environments, where supervisors communicate expectations and coworkers coordinate effectively, also reduce ambiguity and foster disciplined execution of tasks (Albrecht et al., 2018). In service organizations, employees who feel safe and supported are more inclined to comply with protocols and maintain consistent behavior.

H8: *Work environment has a positive effect on work discipline.*

Culture also plays a critical role in shaping work discipline. A culture that consistently reinforces punctuality, reliability, respect for procedures, and mutual accountability provides a normative backdrop against which disciplined behavior becomes the standard rather than the exception. Research indicates that when employees perceive a strong, coherent culture that signals "how things are done here," they are more likely to align their behavior with these expectations and less likely to engage in deviant or non-compliant behavior (Salanova et al., 2005). In service settings, cultural norms around quality, safety, and professionalism reinforce disciplined execution of tasks.

H9: *Organizational culture has a positive effect on work discipline.*

From a JD–R perspective, work discipline can be viewed as a behavioral mechanism that channels motivational energy into consistent performance outcomes. Motivation provides the psychological drive, while discipline determines whether that drive is translated into

reliable behavior over time. In service contexts, disciplined employees arrive on time, follow service scripts, respect hygiene or safety protocols, and complete tasks according to established procedures—all of which are crucial for maintaining service quality and operational efficiency (Kim et al., 2012). Since motivation strengthens discipline, and discipline enhances performance, it is reasonable to expect an indirect effect whereby motivation improves performance through the cultivation of disciplined work behavior.

H10: *Work discipline mediates the relationship between work motivation and employee performance.*

By strengthening employees' skills and commitment, career development may indirectly enhance performance through work discipline. Development initiatives signal long-term support from the organization and clarify performance expectations, which encourage employees to internalize rules and align their behavior accordingly (Guan & Frenkel, 2019). Discipline then becomes the behavioral channel through which career development initiatives translate into consistent performance improvements in service encounters.

H11: *Work discipline mediates the relationship between career development and employee performance.*

When employees experience a positive environment, they may become more disciplined—using time effectively, respecting schedules, and following SOPs—which in turn enhances performance. From a JD–R lens, the work environment functions as a contextual resource that facilitates disciplined behavior, and disciplined behavior becomes the mechanism through which environmental conditions affect performance (Tsaur et al., 2019). Hence, work discipline is expected to mediate the relationship between work environment and employee performance.

H12: *Work discipline mediates the relationship between work environment and employee performance.*

Given that culture shapes disciplined behavior and discipline, in turn, drives reliable performance, it is reasonable to expect that work discipline mediates the effect of organizational culture on performance. A strong service culture encourages employees to internalize rules and procedures as part of "the way we work," and these internalized norms are reflected in consistent service delivery, timely completion of tasks, and adherence to standards (Albrecht et al., 2015). Thus, discipline may serve as a key mechanism through which cultural values are translated into observable performance outcomes.

H13: *Work discipline mediates the relationship between organizational culture and employee performance.*

3. Methods

3.1. Research design

This research employs a quantitative, explanatory, and cross-sectional design aimed at examining the direct and indirect effects of work motivation, career development, work environment, and organizational culture on employee performance through the mediating role of work discipline. Explanatory designs are commonly used to test theoretically grounded causal relationships among latent variables within organizational settings (Kline, 2016). Given the presence of multiple constructs and a mediation mechanism, the study adopts Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). PLS-SEM is particularly appropriate for predictive research, non-normal survey data, and complex models because it allows simultaneous estimation of structural paths and assessment of measurement quality (Hair et al., 2019; Benitez et al., 2020).

3.2. Population and sampling

The population consists of 300 employees working in Pizza Hut branches in Medan. The unit of analysis is the individual employee, reflecting the study's focus on psychological and organizational determinants of individual performance. Simple random sampling was used to ensure equal selection probability for all members of the population. Referring to standard sampling adequacy guidelines, 165 respondents were obtained, meeting both the minimum requirement from Isaac and Michael's table as well as recommendations for SEM analyses, which generally require samples of 150 or more for models with several latent variables (Kline, 2016). The sample size, therefore, satisfies the methodological criteria for PLS-SEM.

3.3. Measurement of Constructs

All constructs in this study were measured using reflective multi-item scales adopted from validated instruments in organizational behavior and service management research. Responses used a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Work motivation was measured based on items capturing autonomous and intrinsic motives consistent with self-determination theory (Howard et al., 2016; Moon et al., 2019). Career development was measured through indicators referring to promotion clarity, developmental opportunities, and organizational support for career growth, following measurement practices in HRM (Guan & Frenkel, 2019; Hosen et al., 2024). The work environment construct captured physical conditions, psychological comfort, safety, and social interaction quality in the workplace, consistent with conceptualizations in tourism and hospitality studies (Tsaur et al., 2019; Kim et al., 2012). Organizational culture was operationalized as employees' shared perceptions of organizational values, service orientation, and behavioral norms, drawing on established cultural and service-climate frameworks (Albrecht et al., 2018; Salanova et al., 2005). Work discipline was measured through indicators of punctuality, adherence to procedures, reliability, and behavioral consistency, reflecting evidence-based operationalizations in service operations research (Buil et al., 2019; Kim & Koo, 2017). Employee performance was measured using items reflecting task quality, service delivery effectiveness, and contextual performance, consistent with validated measures in prior hospitality studies (Buil et al., 2019). All measurement items were adapted with minor linguistic adjustments to ensure clarity and contextual relevance while preserving their conceptual meaning. Pre-testing confirmed that respondents understood all items clearly.

3.4. Data Collection Procedures

Data collection was conducted using structured self-administered questionnaires distributed to employees during work breaks with managerial approval. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed that their answers would remain anonymous and confidential. To mitigate common method bias, the study applied several procedural remedies recommended in the literature, including the use of psychologically neutral wording, separation of construct sections within the questionnaire, and assurances of anonymity to reduce evaluation apprehension (Podsakoff et al., 2003). All questionnaires were returned fully completed, resulting in 165 usable responses for analysis.

3.5. Data analysis

The empirical data were analyzed using SmartPLS 4.0. PLS-SEM analysis followed the two-stage approach recommended by international methodological guidelines. The first stage involved evaluating the measurement model to assess indicator reliability, internal consistency, convergent validity, and discriminant validity. Indicator reliability was examined through outer loading values, which ideally should exceed 0.70. Internal consistency was evaluated through Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability, each expected to exceed 0.70 for adequate reliability. Convergent validity was verified through the Average Variance Extracted (AVE), where values above 0.50 indicate sufficient convergent validity. Discriminant validity was assessed through both the Fornell–Larcker criterion and the HTMT ratio, with HTMT values below 0.85 indicating acceptable discriminant validity (Henseler et al., 2015). The second stage involved evaluating the structural model. Structural paths were assessed for multicollinearity through variance inflation factor (VIF) values, which must remain below 5. Path significance was tested using bootstrapping with 5,000 resamples to generate t-statistics and p-values. Coefficient of determination (R^2) was interpreted using the thresholds provided by Hair et al. (2019), categorizing values of 0.25, 0.50, and 0.75 as weak, moderate, and substantial, respectively. Effect size (f^2) values were analyzed to assess each predictor's contribution to the dependent variable, and predictive relevance (Q^2) was evaluated using the blindfolding procedure to determine whether the model possesses predictive capability. Mediation effects were examined using bootstrapped indirect effects, which provide criteria for full, partial, or non-mediation conclusions (Zhao et al., 2010). The study complied with ethical research principles. All participants provided informed consent, their identities were protected, and the collected information was used solely for academic purposes.

4. Results

4.1. Common Method Bias

Before proceeding to the measurement and structural model assessments, the dataset was examined for potential common method variance using Harman's single-factor test. All measurement items were subjected to an exploratory factor analysis with an unrotated factor solution. Several factors emerged with eigenvalues greater than 1, and the first factor accounted for 33.8% of the total variance, which is below the conservative 50% threshold. This indicates that common method bias is unlikely to pose a serious threat to the validity of the results and that the subsequent PLS-SEM analysis can be conducted with confidence.

4.2. Measurement model assessment

The reflective measurement model was evaluated to ensure that all constructs met the criteria for indicator reliability, internal consistency, and convergent validity. The results show that all retained indicators exhibit loading values above the recommended threshold of 0.70, indicating that each item contributes meaningfully to its corresponding latent construct. Similarly, the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values for all constructs exceed 0.50, demonstrating adequate convergent validity. In addition, the Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability coefficients for all constructs are well above the minimum cutoff value of 0.70, confirming strong internal consistency. The combined results of the loading ranges, AVE, Cronbach's Alpha, and Composite Reliability are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Measurement Model Assessment

Construct	Items	Loading Range	CA	CR	AVE
EP	EP1–EP9	0.777–0.859	0.963	0.967	0.660
WD	WD1–WD9	0.720–0.863	0.963	0.967	0.660
WM	WM1–WM9	0.721–0.873	0.960	0.964	0.642
CD	CD1–CD9	0.725–0.905	0.952	0.958	0.659
WE	WE1–WE21	0.705–0.828	0.965	0.967	0.582
OC	OC1–OC30	0.710–0.838	0.978	0.979	0.609

Notes. EP = Employee Performance; WD = Work Discipline; WM = Work Motivation; CD = Career Development; WE = Work Environment; OC = Organizational Culture; CR = Composite Reliability; AVE = Average Variance Extracted.

All reflective constructs meet the recommended thresholds for indicator reliability, internal consistency, and convergent validity. The loading values exceed 0.70, and the AVE values are above 0.50, demonstrating satisfactory convergent validity. Furthermore, the Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability values for all constructs are above the 0.70 threshold, indicating strong internal consistency. These results confirm that the measurement model is reliable and valid for subsequent structural model evaluation. Discriminant validity was assessed using a combined approach that incorporates both the Fornell–Larcker criterion and the HTMT ratio. The Fornell–Larcker criterion evaluates whether each latent construct shares more variance with its own indicators than with other constructs. Meanwhile, HTMT provides a more stringent assessment by examining construct distinctiveness based on trait-to-trait correlations. The combined matrix presents the square roots of AVE on the diagonal, inter-construct correlations in the lower triangle, and HTMT ratios in the upper triangle. The detailed results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Discriminant Validity Assessment

Construct	OC	WD	EP	WE	WM	CD
OC	**0.780**	0.482	0.516	0.503	0.336	0.429
WD	0.401	**0.812**	0.841	0.522	0.701	0.553
EP	0.463	0.801	**0.812**	0.548	0.692	0.611
WE	0.446	0.440	0.426	**0.763**	0.664	0.507

WM	0.294	0.596	0.589	0.629	**0.801**	0.519
CD	0.371	0.470	0.507	0.427	0.453	**0.812**

Notes. Diagonal (bold) = √AVE (Fornell–Larcker criterion).
Lower triangle (below diagonal) = inter-construct correlations.
Upper triangle (above diagonal) = HTMT ratios.
HTMT values < 0.85 indicate adequate discriminant validity (Henseler et al., 2015).
OC = Organizational Culture; WD = Work Discipline; EP = Employee Performance; WE = Work Environment; WM = Work Motivation; CD = Career Development.

The results in Table 2 demonstrate strong discriminant validity for all constructs. The square roots of AVE are consistently higher than the corresponding inter-construct correlations, satisfying the Fornell–Larcker criterion. In addition, all HTMT values fall below the conservative threshold of 0.85, indicating that each construct is empirically distinct from the others. Together, these criteria confirm that the reflective measurement model exhibits satisfactory discriminant validity, allowing the analysis to proceed to the structural model evaluation.

4.3. Structural model evaluation

The structural model was evaluated by examining the R-square values, the significance of each hypothesized path, and the magnitude of the effect sizes (f^2). Bootstrapping with 5,000 subsamples was conducted to obtain standardized path coefficients, t-values, and p-values for both direct and indirect effects. The complete structural model results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Structural Model Results

Hypothesis	Path	β	t-value	p-value	f^2	Remarks
H1	WD → EP	0.312	5.984	<0.001	0.128	Yes
H2	WM → EP	0.401	7.221	<0.001	0.215	Yes
H3	CD → EP	0.214	3.562	<0.001	0.074	Yes
H4	WE → EP	0.166	2.948	0.003	0.051	Yes
H5	OC → EP	0.109	2.121	0.034	0.028	Yes
H6	WD → WM	0.289	6.003	<0.001	0.097	Yes
H7	CD → WM	0.301	6.552	<0.001	0.112	Yes
H8	WE → WM	0.332	6.883	<0.001	0.128	Yes
H9	OC → WM	0.178	3.221	0.001	0.042	Yes
H10	WD → WM → EP	0.116	4.733	<0.001	—	Yes
H11	CD → WM → EP	0.121	4.889	<0.001	—	Yes
H12	WE → WM → EP	0.133	5.191	<0.001	—	Yes
H13	OC → WM → EP	0.071	2.912	0.004	—	Yes

The results in Table 3 show that all direct paths are statistically significant, indicating that Work Discipline, Work Motivation, Career Development, Work Environment, and Organizational Culture exert meaningful influences on Employee Performance. The indirect effects through Work Motivation are also significant, confirming its mediating role in linking the antecedent constructs to performance outcomes. Combined with the substantial R-square and effect size values, these findings demonstrate that the structural model possesses strong explanatory and predictive capability. To further evaluate the explanatory and predictive ability of the model, the R-square and Q-square values were examined alongside global model-fit indices. The R-square values indicate the proportion of variance explained by the predictors, whereas Q-square values assess the model's predictive relevance using the blindfolding procedure. In addition, overall model fit was assessed using the SRMR and NFI criteria. The combined results are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4: Explanatory Power, Predictive Relevance, and Model Fit

Panel A. R-square and Q-square

Construct	R²	Q²
EP	0.682	0.427
WM	0.544	0.331

Panel B. Model Fit Indices

Fit index	Value	Recommended threshold
SRMR	0.061	< 0.08
NFI	0.912	> 0.90

The results in Table 4 indicate that the structural model demonstrates strong explanatory and predictive capability. The R-square value for Employee Performance is 0.682, meaning that 68.2% of the variation in performance can be explained by the predictors in the model. This level of explanatory power is considered substantial. Meanwhile, the R-square value for Work Motivation is 0.544, indicating that the model explains 54.4% of its variation, which reflects a moderate but meaningful level of influence. The Q-square values of 0.427 for Employee Performance and 0.331 for Work Motivation show that the model has good predictive relevance; these positive values confirm that the model is capable of predicting data that it has not seen before. In terms of model fit, the SRMR value of 0.061 falls below the recommended threshold of 0.08, suggesting that the difference between the observed data and the model's predictions is acceptably small. Additionally, the NFI value of 0.912, which exceeds the recommended minimum of 0.90, indicates that the proposed model fits the data noticeably better than a baseline model.

5. Discussion

The findings of this study provide a coherent explanation of how individual, developmental, environmental, and cultural factors shape employee performance in standardized service settings. The strongest determinant of performance is work motivation, which demonstrates both direct and substantial effects on frontline behavior. This result aligns with prior evidence in service and hospitality contexts showing that intrinsically motivated employees deliver higher-quality service performance, display stronger persistence, and regulate their emotional and behavioral responses more effectively (Liao et al., 2009; Buil et al., 2019; Moon et al., 2019). The present findings reinforce Self-Determination Theory, suggesting that motivational energy remains a powerful driver of performance even in tightly routinized service environments.

Career development also shows a significant influence on employee performance, consistent with research demonstrating that training, mentoring, and career path clarity strengthen competence and service capability (Ng et al., 2005; Tharenou et al., 2007; Hosen et al., 2024; Guan & Frenkel, 2019). The positive effect observed in this study supports the argument that developmental resources not only enhance employees' technical skills but also reinforce their motivational readiness to perform.

Organizational culture exhibits meaningful direct effects on performance, reflecting prior studies that highlight the importance of shared service values and behavioral norms (Albrecht et al., 2015; Kim & Koo, 2017). The findings suggest that culturally rooted expectations—such as teamwork, accountability, and service excellence—help shape consistent performance across frontline roles. Culture appears to strengthen employees' sense of purpose and internal regulation, which contributes to more stable behavioral patterns.

Work discipline also emerges as a significant predictor of performance. This result is aligned with operational research showing that adherence to standard operating procedures reduces service variation and enhances reliability (Kim et al., 2012; Tsaur et al., 2019). In standardized service settings where speed, accuracy, and behavioral consistency are critical, disciplined execution remains a central behavioral requirement for maintaining performance quality. In contrast to some hospitality and tourism studies that emphasize the importance of physical and psychological environmental conditions (Knight et al., 2017), the present findings indicate that the work environment plays a positive but comparatively modest role in shaping performance. This suggests that once basic environmental adequacy is met, psychological and cultural factors—including motivation, development, and shared norms—exert a stronger influence on frontline behavior than environmental conditions alone. The mediating role of work motivation further clarifies the mechanisms through which organizational resources translate into performance outcomes. Prior studies typically highlight engagement, commitment, or job attitudes as key mediators, but the present findings demonstrate that motivational readiness plays a central psychological role in converting resources such as development, environment, and culture into observable performance improvements. This contributes to the JD-R theory by emphasizing that psychological activation is a key pathway through which job resources improve task-related behavior.

From an economic perspective, these results carry important implications for service-sector productivity and labor cost efficiency. Enhanced work motivation translates into measurable productivity gains through faster service delivery, reduced error rates, and higher customer retention. When combined with strong work discipline, motivated employees generate fewer quality-control issues and minimize operational disruptions, thereby reducing costs associated with service recovery, rework, and supervisory oversight. Organizations investing in career development, supportive work environments, and service-oriented cultures may realize substantial returns through improved labor productivity, lower turnover costs, and enhanced competitiveness in markets where service quality drives consumer choice.

5.1. Theoretical Contributions

This study advances existing theoretical perspectives on employee performance through several key contributions. First, the findings reinforce the Job Demands–Resources (JD–R) framework by showing that multiple job resources—including work discipline, motivation, career development, work environment, and organizational culture—collectively predict employee performance. The substantial R-square value (0.682) supports JD–R's proposition that resource availability strengthens employees' capacity to deliver consistent performance in operationally demanding service settings. Second, the results deepen Self-Determination Theory by demonstrating that work motivation acts as a central psychological pathway through which organizational resources shape performance outcomes. The significant mediating effects indicate that motivational energy is the core mechanism that translates developmental, environmental, and cultural support into improved service performance, extending prior research that has primarily focused on engagement or affective states. Third, this study contributes to organizational culture theory by showing that cultural values enhance performance not only through attitudinal alignment but also by fostering motivational readiness among employees. The significant indirect effect through motivation suggests that culture strengthens employees' sense of purpose and internal regulation, which ultimately enhances behavioral consistency and performance. Finally, the integration of career development into the performance model provides an enriched understanding of human capital theory within service operations. The results demonstrate that developmental practices influence performance partly because they enhance employees' motivational states rather than functioning solely through skill acquisition. This expands prior HRM research by clarifying how career-related resources contribute to frontline performance in standardized service environments.

5.2. Managerial Implications

The findings provide clear guidance for managers seeking to improve employee performance in standardized service settings. The strong effect of work motivation on performance indicates that organizations must move beyond transactional incentives and focus on building meaningful, autonomy-supportive, and feedback-rich work environments. Motivational practices should be embedded in daily operations to ensure sustained performance consistency. Work discipline also plays a significant role, highlighting the importance of clear expectations, consistent enforcement of procedures, and structured behavioral monitoring. Managers should ensure that standard operating procedures are not only documented but also actively reinforced through coaching, feedback, and role modeling. Career development emerges as a strategic lever for performance improvement. Structured training pathways, mentoring programs, and transparent advancement criteria strengthen employees' motivational states and enhance their contribution to service quality. Managers should recognize that developmental initiatives are not merely HR tools but mechanisms for strengthening employee reliability and performance stability. The positive effect of the work environment suggests that physical, social, and operational conditions continue to matter. Improving workflow smoothness, teamwork quality, safety, and ergonomic support can strengthen motivational readiness and performance outcomes. Organizational culture should be reinforced through leadership behaviors, communication of service values, and symbols that embody accountability, cooperation, and excellence. A strong culture enhances employees' internal drive, which in turn improves performance quality.

5.3. Limitations and future research directions

It is important to note that this study was conducted within a single service organization (Pizza Hut branches in Medan, Indonesia), which limits the generalizability of findings to other organizational contexts, industry sectors, or cultural settings. The standardized operational procedures, organizational culture, and workforce characteristics specific to this context may influence the strength and direction of relationships observed in the model. Replication studies in diverse service environments—including luxury hospitality, healthcare, retail banking, and professional services—would help establish the external validity of these findings and identify context-specific boundary conditions.

Although this study offers meaningful contributions to the literature on employee performance in service operations, several limitations merit consideration and present opportunities for future research. First, the cross-sectional design restricts the ability to conclude long-term causal dynamics. Future studies should employ longitudinal or multi-wave designs to capture how motivation, discipline, and performance evolve over time and whether fluctuations in motivational states influence behavioral consistency or sustained performance. Second, the study was conducted within a single service organization in Indonesia, which may limit the generalizability of the findings. While the operational characteristics reflect those of many standardized service chains, contextual factors specific to local managerial practices may have shaped employee perceptions and behaviors. Comparative studies across different cultural, industry, or organizational contexts—such as hospitality, healthcare, or logistics—would provide a more comprehensive understanding of whether the observed effects are universal or context-dependent. Third, the use of self-reported measures raises the potential for common method variance, despite the implementation of procedural and statistical remedies. Future research may incorporate multi-source data, such as supervisor ratings, objective performance metrics, or behavioral observations, to reduce perceptual bias and strengthen causal inferences. Fourth, the measurement of the work environment may not have fully captured the complexity of environmental demands in service operations. Future studies should refine this construct by including dimensions such as emotional climate, sensory load, crowding, shift patterns, or interpersonal dynamics. Such expansions may reveal nuanced environmental mechanisms that were not detectable in the present measurement framework. Finally, this study focused primarily on motivation as the mediator linking organizational resources to performance. Future research could examine alternative or complementary pathways, including job engagement, psychological empowerment, organizational commitment, or emotional exhaustion. Moderated mediation models may also yield valuable insights, particularly regarding whether leadership style, team climate, or cultural alignment strengthens or weakens the resource–performance relationships. Mixed-method approaches that combine quantitative modeling with qualitative interviews or field observations could further enrich understanding of why certain mechanisms—such as motivation and discipline—exert a dominant influence in standardized service settings.

6. Conclusion

This study examined how individual, developmental, environmental, and cultural factors jointly shape employee performance in a standardized service setting. The results show that work motivation, work discipline, career development, work environment, and organizational culture all have significant and meaningful effects on employee performance. Among these predictors, work motivation emerges as the strongest driver, highlighting the central role of psychological energy and internal drive in sustaining high levels of performance in routine-based service roles. The findings further demonstrate that organizational resources do not operate in isolation but are translated into performance largely through motivational processes. Career development opportunities, supportive work environments, and a strong organizational culture enhance employees' motivational states, which in turn improve their behavioral consistency and performance outcomes. Work discipline also contributes directly to performance, indicating that clear expectations, procedural adherence, and reliable conduct remain essential in standardized service operations, even when motivation is high. These mechanisms are particularly relevant for economic outcomes, as they directly influence service efficiency, labor productivity, and organizational cost structures, making them critical considerations for managers seeking to enhance both service quality and operational profitability. The significant effect of the work environment suggests that physical, social, and operational conditions continue to matter in shaping employees' capacity to deliver stable performance. However, the relative strength of motivation, career development, and culture indicates that psychological and organizational dynamics are more critical than environmental features alone in explaining why some employees perform better than others in highly structured service contexts. Overall, this study contributes to organizational behavior, service management, and HRM literature by integrating motivational, developmental, environmental, and cultural perspectives into a unified behavioral model of performance.

References

[1] Albrecht, S. L., Bakker, A. B., Gruman, J. A., Macey, W. H., & Saks, A. M. (2015). Employee engagement, human resource management practices, and competitive advantage: An integrated approach. Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance, 2(1), 7-35.

[2] Albrecht, S., Breidahl, E., & Marty, A. (2018). Organizational resources, organizational engagement climate, and employee engagement. Career Development International, 23(1), 67-85.

[3] Alfes, K., Shantz, A. D., Truss, C., & Soane, E. C. (2013). The link between perceived human resource management practices, engagement and employee behaviour: a moderated mediation model. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 24(2), 330-351.

[4] Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., Berg, P., & Kalleberg, A. L. (2000). Manufacturing advantage: Why high-performance work systems pay off. Cornell University Press.

[5] Bakker, A. B. (2022). The social psychology of work engagement: state of the field. Career Development International, 27(1), 36-53.

[6] Benitez, J., Henseler, J., Castillo, A., & Schuberth, F. (2020). How to perform and report an impactful analysis using partial least squares: Guidelines for confirmatory and explanatory IS research. Information & Management, 57(2), 103168.

[7] Buil, I., Martínez, E., & Matute, J. (2019). Transformational leadership and employee performance: The role of identification, engagement and proactive personality. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 77, 64–75.

[8] Carbery, R., Garavan, T. N., O'Brien, F., & McDonnell, J. (2003). Predicting hotel managers' turnover cognitions. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 18(7), 649-679.

[9] Carter, W. R., Nesbit, P. L., Badham, R. J., Parker, S. K., & Sung, L. K. (2018). The effects of employee engagement and self-efficacy on job performance: a longitudinal field study. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 29(17), 2483-2502.

[10] Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. Personnel Psychology, 64(1), 89-136.

[11] Corbeanu, A., & Iliescu, D. (2023). The link between work engagement and job performance: A meta-analysis. Journal of Personnel Psychology, 22(3), 111–122.

[12] Crawford, E. R., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2010). Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: A theoretical extension and meta-analytic test. Journal of Applied Psychology, 95(5), 834-848.

[13] Deci, E. L., Olafsen, A. H., & Ryan, R. M. (2017). Self-determination theory in work organizations: The state of a science. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 4, 19-43.

[14] Denison, D. R., Haaland, S., & Goelzer, P. (2004). Corporate culture and organizational effectiveness: Is Asia different from the rest of the world? Organizational Dynamics, 33(1), 98-109.

[15] Dysvik, A., & Kuvaas, B. (2008). The relationship between perceived training opportunities, work motivation and employee outcomes. International Journal of Training and Development, 12(3), 138-157.

[16] Ehrhart, M. G., & Naumann, S. E. (2004). Organizational citizenship behavior in work groups: A group norms approach. Journal of Applied Psychology, 89(6), 960-974.

[17] Guan, X., & Frenkel, S. (2019). How perceptions of training impact employee performance: Evidence from two Chinese manufacturing firms. Personnel Review, 48(1), 163-183.

[18] Guchait, P., Paşamehmetoğlu, A., & Dawson, M. (2014). Perceived supervisor and co-worker support for error management: Impact on perceived psychological safety and service recovery performance. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 41, 28-37.

[19] Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. European Business Review, 31(1), 2–24.

[20] Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 43(1), 115–135.

[21] Hosen, S., Hamzah, S. R. A., Ismail, I. A., Alias, S. N., Abd Aziz, M. F., & Rahman, M. M. (2024). Training & development, career development, and organizational commitment as the predictor of work performance. Heliyon, 10(1).

[22] Howard, J., Gagné, M., Morin, A. J., & Van den Broeck, A. (2016). Motivation profiles at work: A self-determination theory approach. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 95, 74-89.

[23] Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1981). Handbook in research and evaluation (2nd ed.). EdITS.

[24] Kim, M. S., & Koo, D. W. (2017). Linking LMX, engagement, innovative behavior, and job performance in hotel employees. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 29(12), 3044-3062.

[25] Kim, T. T., Paek, S., Choi, C. H., & Lee, G. (2012). Frontline service employees' customer-related social stressors, emotional exhaustion, and service recovery performance: customer orientation as a moderator. Service Business, 6(4), 503-526.

[26] Kline, R. B. (2016). Principles and practice of structural equation modeling (4th ed.). Guilford Press.

[27] Knight, C., Patterson, M., & Dawson, J. (2017). Building work engagement: A systematic review and meta-analysis investigating the effectiveness of work engagement interventions. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 38(6), 792-812.

[28] Kuenzi, M., & Schminke, M. (2009). Assembling fragments into a lens: A review, critique, and proposed research agenda for the organizational work climate literature. Journal of Management, 35(3), 634-717.

[29] Liao, H., Toya, K., Lepak, D. P., & Hong, Y. (2009). Do they see eye to eye? Management and employee perspectives of high-performance work systems and influence processes on service quality. Journal of Applied Psychology, 94(2), 371-391.

[30] Linnenluecke, M. K., & Griffiths, A. (2010). Corporate sustainability and organizational culture. Journal of World Business, 45(4), 357-366.

[31] Meyer, J. P., Becker, T. E., & Vandenberghe, C. (2004). Employee commitment and motivation: A conceptual analysis and integrative model. Journal of Applied Psychology, 89(6), 991-1007.

[32] Moon, T. W., Hur, W. M., & Hyun, S. S. (2019). How service employees' work motivations lead to job performance: The role of service employees' job creativity and customer orientation. Current Psychology, 38(2), 517-532.

[33] Ng, T. W., Eby, L. T., Sorensen, K. L., & Feldman, D. C. (2005). Predictors of objective and subjective career success: A meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 58(2), 367-408.

[34] Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88(5), 879–903.

[35] Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. Academy of Management Journal, 53(3), 617-635.

[36] Salanova, M., Agut, S., & Peiró, J. M. (2005). Linking organizational resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty: the mediation of service climate. Journal of Applied Psychology, 90(6), 1217.

[37] Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., Mayer, D. M., Saltz, J. L., & Niles-Jolly, K. (2005). Understanding organization-customer links in service settings. Academy of Management Journal, 48(6), 1017-1032.

[38] Tharenou, P., Saks, A. M., & Moore, C. (2007). A review and critique of research on training and organizational-level outcomes. Human Resource Management Review, 17(3), 251-273.

[39] Treviño, L. K., Butterfield, K. D., & McCabe, D. L. (1998). The ethical context in organizations: Influences on employee attitudes and behaviors. Business Ethics Quarterly, 8(3), 447-476.

[40] Tsaur, S. H., Hsu, F. S., & Lin, H. (2019). Workplace fun and work engagement in tourism and hospitality: The role of psychological capital. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 81, 131-140.

[41] Wang, N., Luan, Y., & Ma, R. (2024). Detecting causal relationships between work motivation and job performance: a meta-analytic review of cross-lagged studies. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 11(1), 1-10.

[42] Wright, T. A., & Cropanzano, R. (2000). Psychological well-being and job satisfaction as predictors of job performance. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5(1), 84-94.

[43] Zhao, X., Lynch, J. G., & Chen, Q. (2010). Reconsidering Baron and Kenny: Myths and truths about mediation analysis. Journal of Consumer Research, 37(2), 197–206.