

The mediating role of hotel employees' job satisfaction and performance in the relationship between authentic leadership and organizational performance

Kaštelan Mrak, Marija; Grudić Kvasić, Sanda

Source / Izvornik: **Management : Journal of Contemporary Management Issues, 2021, 26, 97 - 110**

Journal article, Published version

Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)

<https://doi.org/10.30924/mjcmi.26.1.6>

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:192:979405>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#) / [Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-10-05**



SVEUČILIŠTE U RIJECI
EKONOMSKI FAKULTET

Repository / Repozitorij:

[Repository of the University of Rijeka, Faculty of Economics and Business - FECRI Repository](#)

uniri DIGITALNA
KNJIŽNICA


DIGITALNI AKADEMSKI ARHIVI I REPOZITORIJI

THE MEDIATING ROLE OF HOTEL EMPLOYEES' JOB SATISFACTION AND PERFORMANCE IN THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE*

Marija Kaštelan Mrak**

Sanda Grudić Kvasić***

Received: 24. 9. 2019

Accepted: 13. 1. 2021

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30924/mjcmi.26.1.6>

Preliminary communication

UDC 640.4:005.7

Abstract

Authentic leadership is a positive leadership theory, conceptualized under the influence of positive psychology and positive organizational behaviour movement. Although it has become a recognized leadership theory, it is still somewhat neglected in the hospitality literature. To address this gap, the paper seeks to develop and test a conceptual model linking authentic leadership to organizational performance in the hospitality context. Hypotheses were tested using hierarchical multiple regression analysis on a sample of 226 employees from 24 hotels in Croatia. The research results confirmed the positive impact of authentic leadership on hotels' operational

performance, which was mediated by followers' job satisfaction and performance. There was no empirical support for the hypothesized impact of authentic leadership on hotels' financial performance. The findings suggest that authentic leadership behaviours, together with positive organisational settings, characterized by flexible organizational structure, are more likely to enhance desirable employees' attitudes and behaviours, resulting in improved organizational performance.

Keywords: *authentic leadership, job satisfaction, job performance, organizational performance, hospitality industry*

1. INTRODUCTION

The rapid advances in leadership theory and research over the past two decades have generated new thoughts on the nature and the appropriate mode of studying this multifaceted phenomenon. Namely, while traditional leadership theory has primarily studied the role and the attributes of the

leader, the focus of research has now shifted to followers and contextual factors that influence leadership processes. At the same time, economic and societal changes have energized the need for a new, different form of leadership within organizations. With the advent of terrorism, corporate scandals and management malfeasance at the turn of the

* This paper is based on the doctoral thesis, entitled "The Impact of Leadership on Organisational Performance in the Hospitality Industry" by Sanda Grudić Kvasić (<https://repository.efri.uniri.hr/islandora/object/efri:1228>).

** Marija Kaštelan Mrak, PhD, Full Professor, University of Rijeka, Faculty of Economics and Business, Ivana Filipovića 4, 51000 Rijeka, Croatia, Tel: +385 51 355 163, E-mail: marija.kastelan.mrak@efri.hr, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8247-7467>

*** Sanda Grudić Kvasić, PhD, (corresponding author), Lecturer, PAR University College, Trg Riječke rezolucije 4, 51000 Rijeka, Croatia, Tel.: +385 51 327 322, E-mail: sanda.kvasic@par.hr

century, the need arose for “*bona fide leaders who are honest and good*” (Northouse, 2013: 253).

Authentic leadership (AL) is a positive leadership theory conceptualized under the influence of positive psychology and positive organizational behaviour movement (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Considering the positive effects of AL on desirable employees’ outcomes (see meta-analysis by Hoch et al., 2016) and its follower-centric orientation, it seems prudent to test the impact of authentic leadership behaviours in the hospitality business which is heavily dependent upon satisfied and productive work force.

Surprisingly, thus far, the link between AL and job satisfaction has not been investigated in the hospitality context. Also, despite the multilevel conceptualization of authentic leadership, empirical research is predominantly focused on AL’s individual outcomes, with only three studies examining its organizational-level effects (Clapp-Smith et al., 2009; Hsiung, 2012; Musa et al., 2017).

Based on the aforementioned findings, the main aim of this paper is to analyse the relationship between authentic leadership and organizational performance in the hospitality industry, while also taking into account a possible mediating effect of employees’ satisfaction and job performance.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1. Authentic leadership

Authentic leadership is commonly understood as a ‘root construct’, underlying all positive forms of leadership. Namely, the term ‘authentic’ entails the true, genuine elements of positive leadership. Avolio

et al (2004:3) state that authentic leaders are “those individuals who are deeply aware of how they think and behave and are perceived by others as being aware of their own and others’ values/moral perspective, knowledge, and strengths; aware of the context in which they operate and who are confident, hopeful, optimistic, resilient, and high on moral character”. However, it needs to be emphasized that authentic leadership entails more than just authenticity of the leader. More specifically, AL encompasses the authentic leader-follower relationship which can be described as “*open, transparent, trusting and genuine*” (Avolio & Gardner, 2005: 322). with the aim of followers’ personal and professional development and growth.

The following definitions best illustrate the two different approaches to authentic leadership. In their initial conceptual model, Luthans & Avolio (2003: 243) state that AL must be understood as a “*process that draws from both positive psychological capacities and a highly developed organizational context, which results in both greater self-awareness and self-regulated positive behaviours on the part of leaders and associates, fostering positive self-development*”. As it highlights the role of all leadership variables (the leader, the followers and the organizational context), this perspective reflects the integrative nature of authentic leadership.

Later conceptualizations of authentic leadership emphasized its developmental component, which makes it fragile and open to change and development. More specifically, Walumbwa et al. (2008: 94) define AL as “*a pattern of leader behaviour that draws upon and promotes both positive psychological capacities and a positive ethical climate, to foster greater self-awareness, an internalized moral perspective,*

balanced processing of information, and relational transparency on the part of leaders working with followers, fostering positive self-development". The latter conceptualization formed the basis of four AL dimensions: self-awareness, internalized moral perspective, balanced processing and relational transparency. The Walumbwa et al.'s definition (2008) is adopted by most empirical studies on AL.

2.2. Organizational performance

Similar to the concept of authentic leadership, there is no generally accepted definition of organizational performance (Neely, 2005; 2009). In the existing literature, the question of the definition of organizational performance was predominantly related to the conceptualization of the organization itself, that is, to the chosen approach of organizational analysis. Consequently, different models of organizational performance are largely based on the concept of organizational effectiveness (Venkatraman & Ramanujam, 1986). However, according to a more recent conceptualization, organizational performance is one of the many indicators of organizational effectiveness, and encompasses the following three aspects of organizational outcomes: "(1) *financial performance (profits, return on assets, return on investment)*; (2) *product market performance (sales, market share)*; (3) *shareholder return (total shareholder return, economic value added)*" (Richard et al., 2009: 722).

Research on organizational performance predominantly revolves around identifying adequate measures and determinants of organizational success. Up until the early 21st century, or the advent of "*performance measurement revolution*" (Neely, 1999), hotel organizations predominantly used financial performance indicators. Today,

most hotel businesses implement contemporary performance measurement systems consisting of both financial and operational indicators.

From the perspective of strategic leadership, leaders influence organizational performance by making decisions about human resources, competitive strategy, as well as management programs, systems, and structures (Yukl, 2013: 277). The present study explores authentic leadership's relationship to organizational performance through its effect on employees' attitudes and behaviours.

2.3. Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a well-researched construct in management studies, and is commonly viewed as "*a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job*" (Locke, 1976: 1304). The importance of this job-related attitude arises primarily from its long-assumed role in predicting individual work performance (the 'holy grail' of management research) (Wright, 2006). Numerous studies on the subject have been summarized in several most relevant narrative reviews and meta-analysis (see Grudić Kvasić, 2018: 89). In addition, recent empirical work has also found positive correlations between employee satisfaction and organizational success (Harter et al., 2002).

2.4. Research hypotheses and model

Although the initial AL model posits that authentic leadership develops under "*a highly developed organizational context*" (Luthans & Avolio, 2003: 243), empirical work detailing this notion is still scarce. Leroy et al. (2012) confirmed the positive link between ethical organizational climate and authentic leadership, while Azanza et

al. (2013) find a strong link between flexible organizational culture and authentic leadership. Examining the most frequently studied organizational variables in the hospitality literature, the following organizational characteristics were deemed suitable for exploring the link between organizational context and authentic leadership: hotel's category, ownership status, and organizational structure. Namely, previous empirical studies have demonstrated a correlation between hotel categorization and hotel manager's attributes (Taviteyaman et al., 2014), as well as hotel ownership status and leadership style (Antonakis, 2003; Quintana et al., 2015). Thus, the following hypotheses propose that organizational attributes are significantly related to the perception of authentic leadership:

H1a: Hotel's category is related to authentic leadership.

H1b: Hotel's organizational structure is related to authentic leadership.

H1c: Hotel's ownership status is related to authentic leadership.

Avolio et al. (2004) developed a theoretical model that links authentic leadership to numerous individual outcomes through positive constructs of trust, positive emotions, optimism, hope and identification processes. The work by Gardner et al. (2005) emphasizes the development of authentic followers resulting in veritable and sustainable followers' attitudes and job performance. Confirming these theoretical assumptions, a positive relationship between authentic leadership and employee job satisfaction

has been widely documented (see Grudić Kvasić, 2018: 53). However, the relationship has not been tested in the hospitality settings. Therefore, the following hypothesis is formulated:

H2: Authentic leadership is positively related to employees' job satisfaction.

Organizational performance in the service sector is mostly explored under the umbrella of 'Service-Profit-Chain Framework' (Heskett et al., 1997), which implies that satisfied and productive employees lead to satisfied and loyal customers, resulting in increased growth and profitability of the organization. The link between individual attitudes and behaviours and organizational performance has been examined in different organizational settings: financial sector (Gelade & Young, 2005), manufacturing (Hatane, 2015), service industry (Koys, 2001) and hospitality (Chi & Gursoy, 2009). Thus, based on theory and research, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H3: Employees' job satisfaction is positively related to employees' job performance.

H4a: Employees' job performance is positively related to hotels' financial performance.

H4b: Employees' job performance is positively related to hotels' operational performance.

By adopting the integrative and strategic leadership perspective, the theoretical model (Figure 1) addresses the identified gaps in current leadership research.



Figure 1. Conceptual model

Source: Authors' research

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Sample and procedures

The sample consisted of 226 hotel employees from 24 hotels in Croatia. The respondents were predominately female (59.30 percent) and with secondary education (58.40 percent). On average, the respondents were 36.5 years old with 8.9 years of organizational experience. Comparable to similar research, hotel employees rated their leader's AL and hotel's organizational structure. Job satisfaction and job performance were also measured through employees' self-report. The managers, on the other hand, provided data regarding the hotel category, ownership status and organizational performance.

3.2. Measures

The Authentic Leadership Inventory (Neider & Schriesheim, 2011), consisting of 16 items, measured hotel employees' perception of their manager's *authentic leadership behaviour (ALB)*. A sample ALB item is: "My leader shows consistency between his/her beliefs and actions". The Job Diagnostic Scale (Hackman & Oldham, 1980), consisting of three items, measured employees' job *satisfaction*. A sample of general satisfaction item is: "I

often think of quitting this job" (reversed). Job performance is assessed using a 6-item scale (Befort & Hattrup, 2003). A sample item of measured task performance is: "I proficiently complete all duties central to the job". Organizational performance was measured using one operational and one financial performance indicator: occupancy and net profit rate. The organizational characteristics are operationalized in the following way: hotels are *categorized* into 4 groups (2-5 stars); the *ownership status* distinguishes between independent and chain hotels, while formalization, as a key dimension of *organizational structure* (the degree to which decision making and work behaviour are determined by rules, policies, and procedures), is measured with a 3-item instrument (Olson et al., 2005). A sample item is: "There is little action taken unless the decision fits standard operating procedures." Respondents (where applicable) used a 5-point Likert scale of agreement.

3.3. Data analysis

In addition to descriptive statistics, reliability and correlation analysis, the hypotheses were tested using hierarchical multiple regression analysis in conjunction with the standard mediation testing procedures (Baron & Kenny, 1986). The level of analysis is the individual employee.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Descriptive statistics

The descriptive results for main study variables (Table 1) revealed a relatively high level of perceived authentic leadership ($M = 3.84$), job satisfaction ($M = 3.82$) and job performance ($M = 4.06$). The average hotel occupancy rate is 49.85%, while the average net profit rate is 12.14%. Using Cohen's (1988) effect size criterion, small correlations were found between: job satisfaction and profit ($r = .203$, $p < .01$), job satisfaction and occupancy rate ($r = .213$, $p < .01$) and job performance and occupancy rate ($r = .274$, $p < .01$); while medium

correlations were established between: mechanistic organizational structure and job satisfaction ($r = -.319$, $p < .01$), mechanistic organizational structure and authentic leadership ($r = -.335$, $p < .01$) and job satisfaction and performance ($r = .409$, $p < .01$). Large effect size was only observed in the relationship between authentic leadership and employee job satisfaction ($r = .516$, $p < .01$). Cronbach alphas for AL, job satisfaction and job performance measures were above the benchmark of .70 (Nunnally, 1978). Although the organizational structure scale (.631) did not reach the generally acceptable level of internal consistency, it can still be considered as a marginally acceptable reliability (Hair et al., 2010).

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and correlations

Variables	M (SD)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Category	3.35(.73)								
2. Ownership	0.75(.43)	-.256**							
3. OS	3.14 (.87)	.078	-.004	.631					
4. Net profit	12.14 (6.29)	-.093	-.061	-.035					
5. Occupancy	49.85 (4.66)	.146*	.022	-.047	.136*				
6. AL	3.82 (.52)	.057	.052	-.335**	.069	.102	.992		
7. JS	3.84 (.50)	.044	.010	-.319**	.203**	.213**	.516**	.896	
8. JP	4.06 (.45)	.108	-.028	-.147*	.081	.274**	.234**	.409**	.756

Note: OS = organizational structure, AL = authentic leadership, JS = job satisfaction, JP = job performance. Scale reliabilities appear in bold.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

4.2. Hypotheses testing

Direct effects. The first three hypotheses, predicting a direct impact of organizational characteristics on perceived authentic leadership, were tested using hierarchical multiple regression analysis where the covariates of employees' gender, age, tenure and education were entered into Step 1 and the following organizational characteristics into Step 2: hotel category, ownership status and organizational structure. As evidenced in Table 2, entering organizational characteristics

in Step 2 predicted significant variance beyond the covariates. More specifically, the R^2 change associated with mechanistic organizational structure is significant ($\beta = -.333$, $p < .01$), showing support for Hypothesis 1b, which predicts that organizational structure is related to authentic leadership. In contrast, Hypothesis 1a, which presumes a positive relationship between hotel category and perceived authentic leadership, as well as the Hypothesis 1c, which posits that hotel ownership status is positively related to authentic leadership, were not supported.

Table 2. The direct effects of organizational characteristics on authentic leadership

	Authentic leadership	
	Step 1	Step 2
	β	β
Gender	-,004	,031
Age	-,029	-,022
Tenure	-,099	-,060
High school vs. Bachelor	,053	,051
High school vs. Master	,049	,018
Ownership status		,056
Organizational structure		-,333**
3* vs. 2*		-,091
3* vs. 4*		,066
3* vs. 5*		,019
R²	,016	,150
ΔR^2	,016	,134
ΔF	,700	4,770**

Note: Standardized coefficients reported: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Mediating effects. The next four hypotheses, which indicate an indirect impact of authentic leadership on organizational performance through employees' job satisfaction and performance, were tested using Baron and Kenny's (1986) procedure for determining mediating effect: "(1) the independent variable relates to the mediating

variable, (2) the independent variable is related to the dependent variable, (3) the mediating variable relates to the dependent variable, (4) the relationship of the independent with the dependent variable is weaker (partial mediation) or non-significant (full mediation) when the mediator is added to the model" (see Jiang et al., 2017).

Table 3. The mediating effect of job satisfaction in the relationship between authentic leadership and job performance

	Job satisfaction		Job performance		
	Model 1		Model 2		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
	β	β	β	β	β
Gender	-.020	-.014	-.054	-.051	-.046
Age	-.072	-.064	-.084	-.081	-.056
Tenure	-.076	-.025	-.055	-.032	-.023
High school vs. Bachelor	.061	.034	.019	.007	-.006
High school vs. Master	.068	.036	.054	.039	.026
Authentic leadership		.507**		.224**	.030
Job satisfaction					.384**
R²	.020	.274	.019	.068	.175
ΔR^2	.020	.253	.019	.050	.107
ΔF	.920	76.362**	.847	11.639**	28.300**

Note: Standardized coefficients reported: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

As all four conditions have been met, we found support for a full mediation of job satisfaction and, consequently, for Hypothesis 2 which predicted a positive relationship between authentic leadership and employees' job satisfaction ($\beta = .507$, $p < .01$).

The results of the second mediation analysis are mixed (Table 4). Namely, when organizational performance was measured by occupancy rate, all 4 mediation preconditions have been met (Model 1 and Model 3), thus lending support for Hypothesis 3, which defined a positive link between job satisfaction and job performance ($\beta = .399$, $p < .01$), as well as Hypothesis 4b which posited that employees' job performance is positively related to hotel's operational

performance ($\beta = .222$, $p < .01$). In fact, since the relationship of job satisfaction with operational performance is non-significant when the variable of job performance is added (Model 3) job performance was found to fully mediate the said relationship (Step 3).

In contrast, when organizational performance was measured by net profit margin (Model 2), the third precondition of mediation has not been met (Step 3). Consequently, there was no empirical proof to support the Hypothesis 4a, which predicted a positive relationship between hotel employees' job performance and organization's financial performance ($\beta = -.002$, $p = .977$).

Table 4. The mediating effect of job performance in the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational performance

	Job performance		Net profit			Occupancy		
	Model 1		Model 2			Model 3		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β
Gender	-.054	-.046						
Age	-.084	-.056						
Tenure	-.055	-.024						
High school vs. Bachelor	.019	-.005						
High school vs. Master	.054	.026						
Location 1 vs. 2			.004	.011	.011	-.147	-.140	-.124
Location 1 vs. 3			-.038	-.030	-.030	-.015	-.008	.007
Job satisfaction		.399**		.203**	.203**		.211**	.121
Job performance					-.002			.222**
R ²	.019	.175	.002	.043	.043	.019	.063	.104
ΔR^2	.019	.156	.002	.041	.000	.019	.045	.041
ΔF	.847	41.378**	.191	9.464**	.001	2.115	10.569**	10.100**

Note: Standardized coefficients reported: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The results of multiple regression analysis have partly given evidence to the hypothesized indirect impact of authentic leadership on organizational performance. Namely, job satisfaction and performance were found to fully mediate the relationship between authentic leadership and hotels' operational performance. In contrast, there was no empirical proof in defense of the hypothesized mediating effect of employees' job satisfaction and performance in the relationship between authentic leadership and hotels' financial performance. Research has also demonstrated that, among the observed organizational characteristics (category, organizational structure and ownership status), only the organic organizational

structure is positively linked to authentic leadership behaviour.

The findings of this study point to two key *practical implications* for managers. Firstly, since authentic leadership is a behaviour that can be developed through the education and training of positive leadership, the organizations cannot only benefit by more efficient leaders, but also by more satisfied and productive employees, who, in turn, results in improved organizational performance. Secondly, by implementing an organic organizational structure that promotes flexible structures, decentralization, empowerment, and provides open access to information and resources, organization sustains authentic leadership development, and thus contributes to desirable work attitudes and behaviours.

The paper has several methodological *limitations* that need to be addressed. As expected and due to the cross-sectional design of the empirical research, no causal conclusions can be drawn. A second limitation concerns the ‘common-source bias’ (Podsakoff et al., 2003) as all data regarding authentic leadership, organizational structure, followers’ job satisfaction and performance were obtained from the same source (employees). The final limitation is related to the sample size and generalizability of the findings.

The study contributes to the existing knowledge in several ways. First, the study replicates previous research by confirming the positive influence of authentic leadership on employees’ individual outcomes. Secondly, the study expands research on authentic leadership by proposing and testing a model that examines the organizational-level outcome of authentic leadership. Finally, the study enables a better understanding of the organizational factors that influence authentic leadership development in the hospitality industry context.

REFERENCES

1. Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(3), 261-295.
2. Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F., & May, D. R. (2004). Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(6), 801-823.
3. Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 315-338.
4. Azanza, G., Moriano, J. A., & Molero, F. (2013). Authentic leadership and organizational culture as drivers of employees’ job satisfaction. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 29(2), 45-50.
5. Banks, G. C., McCauley, K. D., Gardner, W. L., & Guler, C. E. (2016). A meta-analytic review of authentic and transformational leadership: A test for redundancy. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(4), 634-652.
6. Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 51(6), 1173.
7. Befort, N., & Hattrup, K. (2003). Valuing task and contextual performance: Experience, job roles, and ratings of the importance of job behaviors. *Applied HRM Research*, 8(1), 17-32.
8. Brayfield, A. H., & Crockett, W. H. (1955). Employee attitudes and employee performance. *Psychological bulletin*, 52(5), 396.
9. Chi, C. G., & Gursoy, D. (2009). Employee satisfaction, customer satisfaction, and financial performance: An empirical examination. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(2), 245-253.
10. Choi, H. G., & Ahn, S. H. (2016). Influence of nurse managers’ authentic leadership on nurses’ organizational commitment and job satisfaction: focused on the mediating effects of empowerment. *Journal of Korean Academy of Nursing*, 46(1), 100-108.

11. Clapp-Smith, R., Vogelgesang, G. R., & Avey, J. B. (2009). Authentic leadership and positive psychological capital: The mediating role of trust at the group level of analysis. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 15(3), 227-240.
12. Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
13. Černe, M., Dimovski, V., Marič, M., Penger, S., & Škerlavaj, M. (2014). Congruence of leader self-perceptions and follower perceptions of authentic leadership: Understanding what authentic leadership is and how it enhances employees' job satisfaction. *Australian Journal of Management*, 39(3), 453-471.
14. Fallatah, F., & Laschinger, H. K. (2016). The influence of authentic leadership and supportive professional practice environments on new graduate nurses' job satisfaction. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 21(2), 125-136.
15. Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., May, D. R., & Walumbwa, F. (2005). "Can you see the real me?" A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 343-372.
16. Gelade, G. A., & Young, S. (2005). Test of a service profit chain model in the retail banking sector. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78(1), 1-22.
17. Giallonardo, L. M., Wong, C. A., & Iwasiw, C. L. (2010). Authentic leadership of preceptors: predictor of new graduate nurses' work engagement and job satisfaction. *Journal of NursingM*, 18(8), 993-1003.
18. Gill, C., & Caza, A. (2018). An investigation of authentic leadership's individual and group influences on follower responses. *Journal of Management*, 44(2), 530-554.
19. Grudić Kvasić, S. (2018). *Utjecaj vodstva na organizacijsku uspješnost u hotelijerstvu* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Rijeka. Faculty of Economics.).
20. Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
21. Hair, J. F. J., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis*, Seventh Edition, Prentice Hall.
22. Harter, S. (2002). Authenticity. U C. R. Snyder, & S. Lopez (Ur.), *Handbook of positive psychology*, (pp. 382-394). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
23. Hatane, S. E. (2015). Employee satisfaction and performance as intervening variables of learning organization on financial performance. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 211, 619-628.
24. Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R. O., & Capwell, D. F. (1957). *Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion*. Pittsburgh, PA: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh.
25. Heskett, J. L., Sasser, W. E., Jr, & Schlesinger, L. A. (1997). *The service profit chain*. New York: Free Press.
26. Hoch, J. E., Bommer, W. H., Dulebohn, J. H., & Wu, D. (2018). Do ethical, authentic, and servant leadership explain variance above and beyond transformational leadership? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, 44(2), 501-529.
27. Hsiung, H. H. (2012). Authentic leadership and employee voice behavior: A multi-level psychological process. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107(3), 349-361.

28. Iaffaldano, M. T., & Muchinsky, P. M. (1985). Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 97(2), 251.
29. Jiang, Z., Hu, X., Wang, Z., & Jiang, X. (2017). Career decision self-efficacy and life satisfaction in China: An empirical analysis. *Social Indicators Research*, 132(1), 137-154.
30. Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction job performance relationship: a qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 376-407.
31. Koys, D. J. (2001). The effects of employee satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover on organizational effectiveness: A unit-level, longitudinal study. *Personnel Psychology*, 54(1), 101-114.
32. Larson, M., Luthans, F. (2006), Potential added value of psychological capital in predicting work attitudes, *Journal of Leadership and Organization Studies*, 13, 45-62.
33. Laschinger, H. K. S. (2012). Job and career satisfaction and turnover intentions of newly graduated nurses. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 20(4), 472-484.
34. Leroy, H., Palanski, M. E., & Simons, T. (2012). Authentic leadership and behavioral integrity as drivers of follower commitment and performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107(3), 255-264.
35. Locke, E. A. (1970). Job satisfaction and job performance: A theoretical analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 5(5), 484-500.
36. Locke, E. A., & Dunnette, M. D. (1976). Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. *The nature and causes of job satisfaction*, 1297-1349.
37. Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. J. 2003. Authentic leadership development. U K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship*: 241-258. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
38. Musa, S., Soetjpto, B. W., Gardner, W. L., & Rachmawati, R. (2017). Authentic Leadership, Strategic Orientation, Strategy Execution and Firm Performance. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 2017, No. 1, p. 13330). Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510: Academy of Management.
39. Neely, A. (1999). The performance measurement revolution: why now and what next?. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 19(2), 205-228.
40. Neider, L. L., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2011). The authentic leadership inventory (ALI): Development and empirical tests. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(6), 1146-1164.
41. Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Sage publications.
42. Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
43. Olaniyan, O. S., & Hystad, S. W. (2016). Employees' psychological capital, job satisfaction, insecurity, and intentions to quit: The direct and indirect effects of authentic leadership. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 32(3), 163-171.
44. Olson, E. M., Slater, S. F., & Hult, G. T. M. (2005). The performance implications of fit among business strategy, marketing organization structure, and strategic behavior. *Journal of Marketing*, 69(3), 49-65.
45. Penger, S., & Černe, M. (2014). Authentic leadership, employees' job satisfaction, and work engagement:

- A hierarchical linear modelling approach. *Economic research-Ekonomska istraživanja*, 27(1), 508-526.
46. Petty, M. M., McGee, G. W., & Cavender, J. W. (1984). A meta-analysis of the relationships between individual job satisfaction and individual performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(4), 712-721.
 47. 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.
 48. Quintana, T. A., Park, S., & Cabrera, Y. A. (2015). Assessing the effects of leadership styles on employees' outcomes in international luxury hotels. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 129(2), 469-489.
 49. Richard, P. J., Devinney, T. M., Yip, G. S., & Johnson, G. (2009). Measuring organizational performance: Towards methodological best practice. *Journal of Management*, 35(3), 718-804.
 50. Schwab, D. P., & Cummings, L. L. (1970). Theories of performance and satisfaction: A review. *Industrial Relations: A journal of economy and society*, 9(4), 408-430.
 51. Tavitiyaman, P., Weerakit, N., & Ryan, B. (2014). Leadership competencies for hotel general managers: The differences in age, education, and hotel characteristics. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 15(2), 191-216.
 52. Venkatraman, N., & Ramanujam, V. (1986). Measurement of business performance in strategy research: A comparison of approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(4), 801-814.
 53. Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*, 34, str. 89-126.
 54. Wang, H., Sui, Y., Luthans, F., Wang, D., Wu, Y. (2014). Impact of authentic leadership on performance: Role of followers' positive psychological capital and relational processes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(1), str. 5-21.
 55. Wong, C. A., & Laschinger, H. K. (2013). Authentic leadership, performance, and job satisfaction: the mediating role of empowerment. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 69(4), 947-959.
 56. Wright, T. A. (2006). The emergence of job satisfaction in organizational behavior: A historical overview of the dawn of job attitude research. *Journal of Management History*, 12(3), 262-277.
 57. Yukl, G. A. (2013). *Leadership in organizations*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Prentice Hall.

**MEDIJACIJSKA ULOGA ZADOVOLJSTVA POSLOM
I PERFORMANSI HOTELSKIH ZAPOSLENIKA U
ODNOSU IZMEĐU AUTENTIČNOG LIDERSTVA I
ORGANIZACIJSKIH PERFORMANSI**

Sažetak

Autentično liderstvo je pozitivna teorija liderstva, konceptualizirana pod utjecajem pozitivne psihologije i pokreta pozitivnog organizacijskog ponašanja. Iako je prepoznata kao relevantna teorija vođenja, ona je još uvijek donekle zanemarena u literaturi iz područja ugostiteljstva. Kako bi se umanjio ovaj nedostatak, u radu se razvija i testira konceptualni model, koji povezuje autentično liderstvo i organizacijske performanse u kontekstu ugostiteljstva. Hipoteze su testirane korištenjem hijerarhijske multiple regresije, na uzorku 226 zaposlenih u 24 hrvatska hotela. Rezultati istraživanja su potvrdili pozitivan utjecaj autentičnog liderstva na operacijske performanse hotela, pri čemu su zadovoljstvo

poslom i performanse sljedbenika imali medijacijsku ulogu. Hipoteza o utjecaju autentičnog liderstva na financijske performanse hotela nije empirijski dokazana. Rezultati ukazuju na doprinos ponašanja unutar autentičnog liderstva, zajedno s pozitivnim organizacijskim okruženjem, kojeg karakterizira fleksibilna organizacijska struktura, poboljšanje stavova i ponašanja zaposlenika, a što sve rezultira unapređenjem organizacijskih performansi.

Ključne riječi: *autentično liderstvo, zadovoljstvo poslom, performanse zaposlenika, organizacijske performanse, hotelijerska i ugostiteljska industrija*