JOB RESOURCES, WORK ENGAGEMENT, AND HOTEL EMPLOYEE OUTCOMES: A TIME-LAGGED ANALYSIS
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This study develops and tests a research model that investigates work engagement as a mediator of the effects of coworker and supervisor support on career satisfaction, service recovery performance, job performance, and creative performance. Data were obtained from frontline hotel employees with a time lag of one month and their immediate supervisors in Cameroon. The relationships were tested using LISREL 8.30 through structural equation modeling. The results demonstrated a better fit for the fully mediated model when compared to the partially mediated model.

The results further revealed that work engagement fully mediated the effects of coworker and supervisor support on the previously mentioned outcomes. Implications of the results and their future research directions are offered.
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I. INTRODUCTION

In today's competitive market environment, astute hotel managers recognize that delivery of service quality is a must for organizational success and survival. Employees having intense face-to-face or voice-to-voice interactions with customers play the most critical role in this process (Cheng et al., 2008; Weber and Sparks, 2010; Yavas et al., 2010). Such employees are also among the main actors who can return disgruntled customers to a state of satisfaction after a service failure (Yavas et al., 2010). In addition, according to the resource-based view, inimitable human resources (e.g., highly qualified frontline employees) are pivotal in service delivery process (Jerman and Završnik, 2006; Karatepe and Aleshinloye, 2009). Under these circumstances, hotel managers are in need of frontline employees who can deliver quality services to customers and deal with customer problems effectively (cf. Awang et al., 2010; Ivanković et al., 2010; Yavas et al., 2010).

Work engagement (WE), which refers to "a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption" (Schaufeli et al., 2002, p. 74), leads to positive employee outcomes (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008). In Schaufeli et al.'s (2002) study, vigor is defined as "high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, the willingness to invest efforts in one's work, and persistence even in the face of difficulties", while dedication refers to "a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge" (p. 74). Absorption, which is another dimension of WE, is defined as "being fully concentrated and deeply engrossed in one's work, whereby time passes quickly and one has difficulties with detaching oneself from work" (p. 75). Engaged employees have elevated levels of energy while working and are dedicated. In addition, these employees are fully engrossed in their work. It has been shown that the availability of job resources such as coworker support (CS) and supervisor support (SS) enhances WE, which in turn results in positive employee outcomes (Bakker et al., 2004; Bakker and Demerouti, 2008).

Against this background, this study develops and tests a research model (see Figure 1) that examines WE as a mediator of the impacts of CS and SS on employee outcomes based on the precepts of the motivational process of the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model. The model contends that CS and SS increase WE. WE in turn leads to career satisfaction (CSAT), service recovery performance (SRP), job performance (JP), and creative performance (CRP). Consequently, WE fully mediates the effects of CS and SS on the aforementioned outcomes. These relationships are tested using data collected from frontline employees with a time lag of one month and their immediate supervisors in the four- and five-star hotels in Cameroon in the sub-Saharan Africa.

Investigating such relationships is relevant and significant. First, WE is an important signal of occupational well-being for employees and organizations (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008). Despite this realization, empirical research regarding the impact of WE on hotel employees' behavioral outcomes in the workplace is scanty (Karatepe, 2011; Slätten and Mehmetoglu, 2011). This is also valid for the antecedents of WE in frontline service jobs in the hotel industry (Karatepe and Olugbade, 2009). This is surprising, because management of the hotels has to retain a pool of engaged frontline employees who are satisfied with their career in terms of goals for income, advancement, and development of new skills, display high quality JP, effectively recover from service failures, and produce new ideas and display novel behaviors.

Second, there are a number of empirical studies about WE based on data derived from the developed Western countries such as the Netherlands (e.g., Bakker and Bal, 2010; Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004), Finland (e.g., Bakker et al., 2007; Hakanen et al., 2006), Canada (e.g., Saks, 2006), and Spain (e.g., Salanova et al., 2005). However, there is a dearth of empirical research regarding WE
using data collected from the developing non-Western countries (Chung and Angeline, 2010; Karatepe et al., 2010), especially in the African continent (Karatepe and Olugbade, 2009; Karatepe, 2011). Research indeed reveals that there is an under-representation of the African research data in the services marketing literature (Svensson et al., 2008).

Third, the preponderance of empirical research pertaining to WE has focused on data obtained at one point in time and/or self-report data (Halbesleben and Wheeler, 2008). In Halbesleben and Wheeler’s (2008) study, it is also stated that much of empirical research about performance variables has been operationalized using a single source. Consistent with the suggestions made by Podsakoff et al. (2003), this study uses a temporal separation between the measurement of the independent and dependent variables. The current study also tests frontline employees’ performance outcomes as assessed by their supervisors.

By testing WE as a full mediator of the effects of CS and SS on attitudinal and behavioral outcomes through data collected from frontline hotel employees with a one-month time lag and their immediate supervisors in Cameroon, this study fills in the abovementioned voids and serves as a frame of reference for future research.

The next section of the article presents the study hypotheses. This is followed by discussions of the method and results of the study. The article concludes with implications of the results and avenues for future research.

II. RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

The JD-R model proposes that work characteristics can be classified into two general categories that are job demands and job resources, although every occupation may have its own specific characteristics associated with the work domain (Bakker et al., 2004; Demerouti et al., 2001). The JD-R model assumes two processes: the health-impairment process and the motivational process. The health-impairment process posits that the presence of high job demands (e.g., workload, role stress) in the workplace may exhaust employees’ physical and mental resources and result in energy depletion and health problems (Xanthopoulou et al., 2007). Research shows that job demands positively influence exhaustion/burnout, which in turn leads to negative outcomes such as impaired JP (Bakker et al., 2004) and ill health (Hakanen et al., 2006). The motivational process contends that job resources (e.g., SS, CS, performance feedback) foster WE resulting in positive outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and JP (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008). Specifically, job resources, due to their intrinsic and extrinsic motivational roles, mitigate job demands, stimulate employees’ growth, learning and development, and foster goal accomplishment (Bakker and Demerouti, 2007; Xanthopoulou et al., 2007). Under these circumstances, such employees have high levels of WE, and therefore, display positive outcomes (Bakker and Demerouti, 2007; Hakanen et al., 2006).
FIGURE 1 – RESEARCH MODEL

SOURCE: Author
As depicted in Figure 1, CS and SS are linked to WE. Employees who are able to obtain sufficient support from their coworkers and supervisors are engaged in their work. In empirical terms, Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) found that job resources (i.e., supervisory coaching, colleague support, performance feedback) positively influenced WE among the Dutch employees in three different samples. Bakker et al. (2007) also showed that SS increased WE among Finnish teachers. Therefore, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H1(a): CS is positively related to WE.

H1(b): SS is positively related to WE.

Engaged employees display high levels of energy while working, are involved and feel happily absorbed in their work. Such engaged employees have desirable job outcomes for themselves and their organization (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008; Bakker et al., 2008). In this study CSAT, SRP, JP, and CRP are considered as the four important outcomes for employees and the organization. CSAT, which refers to “... personal satisfaction with various aspects of career progress and success ...” (Parasuraman et al., 1996, p. 283), is a critical career outcome (Greenhaus et al., 1990).

SRP and JP are the two organizationally valued performance outcomes (Ashill et al., 2008; Yavas et al., 2010). SRP refers to frontline employees’ abilities and actions to resolve a service failure to the satisfaction of the customer (Babakus et al., 2003). JP is defined as “the level of productivity of an individual employee, relative to his or her peers, on several job-related behaviors and outcomes” (Babin and Boles, 1998, p. 82). CRP refers to the amount of new ideas generated and novel behaviors displayed by employees in carrying out job-related tasks (Wang and Netemeyer, 2004). CRP that has not received much empirical attention in the relevant literature is also a critical performance outcome (Karatepe et al., 2008).

Engaged employees are likely to be satisfied with their career concerning goals for income, advancement, and development of new skills, can provide quality services to customers, and display effective service recovery. In addition, they can create new ideas for service delivery process and display novel behaviors for the effective resolution of customer problems. Therefore, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H2: WE is positively related to (a) CSAT, (b) SRP, (c) JP, and (d) CRP.

As mentioned before, the motivational process of the JD-R model is used to develop hypotheses regarding the full mediating role of WE. That is, CS and SS foster employees’ WE leading to CSAT, SRP, JP, and CRP. There is empirical evidence supporting similar relationships. For example, WE fully mediates the effects of job resources on organizational commitment (Hakanen et al., 2006), in-role and extra-role performances (Chung and Angeline, 2010), and turnover intentions (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004).

In light of the precepts of the motivational process of the JD-R model and empirical evidence in the relevant literature, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H3: WE fully mediates the effect of CS on (a) CSAT, (b) SRP, (c) JP, and (d) CRP.

H4: WE fully mediates the effect of SS on (a) CSAT, (b) SRP, (c) JP, and (d) CRP.
III. METHOD

A. Sample and procedure

Data were gathered from a sample of full-time frontline employees (e.g., front desk agents, food servers, bartenders, door attendants, bell attendants) with a one-month time lag and their immediate supervisors in the four- and five-star hotels in Yaoundé and Douala in Cameroon. There were 3 four-star hotels and only one five-star hotel in Yaoundé and 2 four-star hotels in Douala at the time of this study. These hotels were licensed by the National Tourism Council under the Ministry of Tourism in Cameroon. Permission for data collection was obtained from management of the five-star hotel and two four-star hotels in Yaoundé and only one four-star hotel in Douala. The self-administered questionnaires that had information about the assurance and confidentiality of the study were distributed directly to frontline employees with the help of their immediate supervisors. The Time I questionnaire included the CS, SS, and WE measures and items regarding respondents’ profile (i.e., age, gender, education, organizational tenure). The Time II questionnaire was composed of the CSAT measure. Finally, the supervisor questionnaire consisted of the SRP, JP, and CRP measures.

338 questionnaires were distributed to frontline employees at Time I. By the cut-off date for data collection at Time I, 269 questionnaires were retrieved, yielding a response rate of 79.6%. 269 questionnaires were then distributed to the same frontline hotel employees at Time II. By the cut-off date for data collection, 212 questionnaires were received for a response rate of 78.8% of the original sample and 62.7% of the entire population. 212 questionnaires that were matched with the Time I and Time II questionnaires were obtained from the supervisors.

16% of the respondents were between the ages of 18-27, while 47% were aged between 28 and 37 years. 30% of the respondents were between the ages of 38-47 and the rest were older than 47. 52% of the respondents were male. 14% of the respondents had primary school education and 36% secondary and high school education. 36% of the respondents had two-year college degrees and the rest had four-year college degrees. 4% of the respondents had tenure of below one year, 34% between one and five years, and 41% between six and ten years. The rest of the respondents had tenures more than ten years.

B. Measures

All perceptual variables in this study were operationalized using multiple items from different sources in the relevant literature. Broadly speaking, CS was measured through five items from Hammer et al. (2004). SS was measured using five items from Karasek et al. (1982). The shortened version of the Utrecht WE Scale (nine items) was used to measure WE (Schaufeli et al., 2006). CSAT was operationalized via five items from Greenhaus et al. (1990). Five items from Boshoff and Allen (2000) were used to measure SRP. Five items adapted from Babin and Boles (1998) were used to operationalize JP. Finally, six items adapted from Wang and Netemeyer (2004) were used to measure CRP.

Responses to items in CS, SS, CSAT, SRP, and JP were recorded on five-point scales ranging from 5 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree). Response options for items in WE ranged from 6 (always) to 0 (never). Responses to items in CRP were elicited on a five-point scale ranging from 5 (almost always) and 1 (never).

All items in the three questionnaires were originally prepared in English and then translated into French using the back-translation method (Parameswaran and Yaprak, 1987), because data were collected from frontline hotel employees and their immediate supervisors in two-French speaking regions of Cameroon. The Time I and Time II questionnaires were tested with two different pilot samples of 10 employees. The supervisor questionnaire was also tested with a pilot sample of 10
supervisors. No changes were made in the questionnaires, because frontline employees and their supervisors did not have any difficulty in understanding items.

C. Data analysis

This study employed a series of confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for providing evidence of convergent and discriminant validity and used structural equation modeling (SEM) for assessing the hypothesized relationships through LISREL 8.30 (Joreskog and Sorbom, 1996). Specifically, in the present study a two-step approach including CFA and SEM was used (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988). The first step consisted of the measurement quality of scale items in terms of convergent and discriminant validity. The second step was related to a comparison of two models based on the χ² difference test. The overall χ² measure, GFI [Goodness of fit index], CFI [Comparative fit index], IFI [Incremental fit index], RMSEA [Root mean square error of approximation], and SRMR [Standardized root mean square residual] were used to assess model fit. In addition, the internal consistency reliability was evaluated on the basis of the 0.70 benchmark.

The following conditions were used for the mediation analysis (Baron and Kenny, 1986): (1) there are significant relationships between the predictor variables (CS and SS) and the mediator (WE), (2) there are significant relationships between the predictor variables (CS and SS) and the criterion variables (CSAT, SRP, JP, and CRP), (3) there are significant relationships between the mediator (WE) and the criterion variables (CSAT, SRP, JP, and CRP), and (4) full mediation will hold if the predictor variables (CS and SS) have no significant relationships with the criterion variables (CSAT, SRP, JP, and CRP) when the mediator (WE) is controlled. The last condition was evaluated by comparing the fully and partially mediated models using the χ² difference test (cf. Chen et al., 2005).

IV. RESULTS

A. Measurement results

One item from the SRP measure and two items from the WE measure were dropped due to low standardized loading estimates during CFA. The results also revealed that several items loaded on more than one factor. Therefore, one item each from the CS, SS, and WE measures as well as two items each from the CSAT and JP measures and three items from the CRP measure were deleted during CFA. The final results of CFA demonstrated a good fit of the seven-factor model to the data based on a number of fit statistics (χ² = 455.41, df = 303; χ² / df = 1.50; GFI = 0.86; CFI = 0.93; IFI = 0.93; RMSEA = 0.049; SRMR = 0.047). The magnitudes of the standardized loading estimates ranged from 0.51 to 0.86 and their t-values were significant. Seventeen out of 27 estimates were greater than 0.70. Overall, the results provided support for convergent validity (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988).
TABLE 1. SCALE RELIABILITIES, MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND CORRELATIONS OF STUDY VARIABLES (n = 212)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Coworker support</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supervisor support</td>
<td>0.284&quot;</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work engagement</td>
<td>0.274&quot;</td>
<td>0.335&quot;</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Career satisfaction</td>
<td>0.213&quot;</td>
<td>0.337&quot;</td>
<td>0.381&quot;</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Service recovery performance</td>
<td>0.171&quot;</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.241&quot;</td>
<td>0.273&quot;</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Job performance</td>
<td>0.244&quot;</td>
<td>0.185&quot;</td>
<td>0.342&quot;</td>
<td>0.360&quot;</td>
<td>0.677&quot;</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Creative performance</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.224&quot;</td>
<td>0.669&quot;</td>
<td>0.689&quot;</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Composite scores for each measure were obtained by averaging scores across items representing that measure. Higher scores indicated higher levels of each variable (e.g., coworker support, creative performance). *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, one-tailed test.

SOURCE: Research Results

Discriminant validity was evaluated based on a series of χ² difference tests (p < 0.01) using measures of each pair of constructs. Specifically, a two-dimensional model for each pair of constructs was first fit, and then items representing each construct were forced into a single-factor solution. The χ² difference test produced a significant result for each pair of measures. Consequently, there was evidence of discriminant validity (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988).

Table 1 presents means, standard deviations, and correlations of study variables. Coefficient alphas for CS, SS, WE, CSAT, SRP, JP, and CRP are also reported in Table 1.

B. Structural model results

A close examination of the results in Table 1 reveals that all direct linkages are significant and the first three conditions for a mediation analysis are met. Specifically, both CS (r = 0.274) and SS (r = 0.335) are positively correlated with WE. According to the results in Table 1, CS is positively correlated with CSAT (r = 0.213), SRP (r = 0.171), JP (r = 0.244), and CRP (r = 0.126). SS has a positive correlation with each of the employee outcomes (CSAT, r = 0.337; SRP, r = 0.120; JP, r = 0.185; and CRP, r = 0.123). The results in Table 1 also demonstrate that WE is positively correlated with CSAT (r = 0.381), SRP (r = 0.241), JP (r = 0.342), and CRP (r = 0.135).

The fully mediated or hypothesized model (χ² = 477.83, df = 312) is compared to the partially mediated model (χ² = 460.90, df = 304) using the χ² difference test (p < 0.01) to meet the last condition for a mediation analysis. That is, the result pertaining to the χ² difference test suggested a non-significant difference in fit (Δχ² = 16.93, Δdf = 8, non-significant). Accordingly, the fully mediated model appeared to have a better fit than the partially mediated model.
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TABLE - 2 STRUCTURAL MODEL RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Standardized path estimate</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1(a): CS → WE (γ₁₁)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1(b): SS → WE (γ₁₂)</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2(a): WE → CSAT (β₁₁)</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2(b): WE → SRP (β₁₂)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2(c): WE → JP (β₁₃)</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2(d): WE → CRP (β₁₄)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3(a): CS → WE → CSAT</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3(b): CS → WE → SRP</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3(c): CS → WE → JP</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3(d): CS → WE → CRP</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4(a): SS → WE → CSAT</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4(b): SS → WE → SRP</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4(c): SS → WE → JP</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4(d): SS → WE → CRP</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² for: WE = 0.21; CSAT = 0.26; SRP = 0.09; JP = 0.17; CRP = 0.03

Model fit statistics:
\(\chi^2 = 477.83, df = 312; \chi^2/df = 1.53; \text{GFI} = 0.86; \text{CFI} = 0.92; \text{IFI} = 0.93; \text{RMSEA} = 0.050; \text{SRMR} = 0.062\)

Notes: CS = Coworker support; SS = Supervisor support; WE = Work engagement; CSAT = Career satisfaction; SRP = Service recovery performance; JP = Job performance; CRP = Creative performance. All standardized path estimates are significant (p < 0.05 or p < 0.01). T-values: one-tailed test t > 1.3, p < 0.10; t > 1.65, p < 0.05; and t > 2.33, p < 0.01.

SOURCE: Research Results

The hypothesized model fit the data reasonably well based on the following model fit statistics: \(\chi^2 = 477.83, df = 312; \chi^2/df = 1.53; \text{GFI} = 0.86; \text{CFI} = 0.92; \text{IFI} = 0.93; \text{RMSEA} = 0.050; \text{SRMR} = 0.062\). The results for the hypothesized model are given in Table 2. The results of SEM in Table 2 showed that CS \((\gamma_{11} = 0.22, t = 2.63)\) and SS \((\gamma_{12} = 0.33, t = 3.91)\) depicted significant positive relationships with WE. Therefore, hypotheses 1(a) and 1(b) were supported. The results of SEM also revealed that WE exerted significant positive effects on CSAT \((\beta_{31} = 0.51, t = 4.93)\), SRP \((\beta_{32} = 0.31, t = 3.80)\), JP \((\beta_{33} = 0.41, t = 5.10)\), and CRP \((\beta_{34} = 0.18, t = 2.20)\). Therefore, hypotheses 2(a), 2(b), 2(c), and 2(d) were supported.

As for the results of SEM regarding the mediating effects in Table 2, all hypotheses were supported. Specifically, the results showed that the indirect impact of CS on CSAT (standardized indirect effect = 0.11, t = 2.40), SRP (standardized indirect effect = 0.07, t = 2.23), JP (standardized indirect effect = 0.09, t = 2.42), and CRP (standardized indirect effect = 0.04, t = 1.72) via WE was significant and positive. The results collectively illustrated that WE fully mediated the effect of CS on CSAT, SRP, JP, and CRP. Therefore, hypotheses 3(a), 3(b), 3(c), and 3(d) were supported.

According to the results in Table 2, WE also functioned as a full mediator of the impact of SS on CSAT, SRP, JP, and CRP. The indirect effect of SS on CSAT (standardized indirect effect = 0.17, t = 3.26), SRP (standardized indirect effect = 0.10, t = 2.86), JP (standardized indirect effect = 0.14, t = 2.20), and CRP (standardized indirect effect = 0.09, t = 2.42) were supported.
3.31), and CRP (standardized indirect effect = 0.06, t = 1.96) through WE was significant and positive. Therefore, there was empirical support for hypotheses 4(a), 4(b), 4(c), and 4(d). The results accounted for 21% of the variance in WE, 26% in CSAT, 9% in SRP, 17% in JP, and 3% in CRP.

V. DISCUSSION

A. Summary of findings

The results reveal that the fully mediated model provides a better fit to the data when compared to the partially mediated model. The results further indicate that all hypothesized relationships in the fully mediated model are supported. Specifically, frontline employees receiving adequate support from their coworkers and supervisors are engaged in their work. Such employees in turn are satisfied with their career, solve customer problems appropriately, deliver quality services to customers, and display CRP.

More importantly, the results reported in this study provide support for the motivational process of the JD-R model. In short, the results suggest that CS and SS enhance WE, which in turn results in CSAT, SRP, JP, and CRP.

B. Strengths of the study

Several strengths of this study are of note. First, the current study lends empirical support to WE as a full mediator of the effects of CS and SS on four important job outcomes in frontline service jobs in the hotel industry, which are CSAT, SRP, JP, and CRP. It also provides empirical support for the motivational process of the JD-R model.

Second, this study extends the research stream on the antecedents and consequences of WE to Cameroon in the sub-Saharan Africa. Finally, the present study minimizes the possibility of common method bias by testing the relationships through data collected from frontline employees with a one-month time lag and their immediate supervisors.

C. Limitations and future research directions

Although this study contributes to the existing knowledge base, viable prospects for future research remain. First, incorporating other types of job resources (e.g., training, empowerment, rewards) into the research model that may also be equally important in frontline service jobs would enhance the understanding of their effects on CSAT, SRP, JP, and CRP via WE. Second, frontline male and female employees may have different reactions to SS, WE, SRP, JP, or CRP. With this realization, in future studies testing gender as a moderator of the strength of relationships among the variables used in the present study would be illuminating.

In addition, replication studies among other frontline employees in different service settings (e.g., banks, airlines) in Cameroon are needed for cross-validating the results and broadening the database for further generalizations.

D. Management implications

The results of this study provide various implications from a managerial perspective. Specifically, it is important for hotel managers to establish and maintain a work environment where frontline employees and their supervisors pay utmost attention to the critical roles of CS and SS. Since CS and SS trigger WE, managers need to make sure that coworkers and supervisors provide support whenever needed. Managers can also benefit from hiring individuals who really fit well with the demands of frontline service jobs. This is a must for managers, because long work hours, irregular and inflexible work schedules, and excessive job demands are among the problems in frontline
service jobs. If managers hire individuals whose expectations are not met, such individuals are likely to leave the organization or management of the hotels is likely to have layoff decisions for these individuals. Therefore, managers should use objective and scenario-based tests for hiring the most suitable individuals. By doing so, management of the hotels may plan to retain a pool of engaged employees who may display satisfaction with their career and have high quality performance outcomes.

In closing, managers can arrange various workshops in order to receive feedback from frontline employees for an effective customer complaint management and obtain new and creative ideas for a better service delivery process. When such employees feel that they are considered as strategic partners of the organization, they are likely to have high quality performance outcomes such SRP, JP, and CRP.
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