THE LOYALTY METRIC: HOW EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION & ENGAGEMENT IMPACTS ORGANIZATION LOYALTY

by

MARCIE F. MARKS

Presented to the Faculty of the

The University of Dallas in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF DALLAS

April 2024

Copyright © by Official Student Name: Marcie F. Marks

All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to my loving family for their unwavering support and encouragement throughout this journey. I am grateful for their patience and understanding as I pursued my goals and dreams. Their love has been a constant source of strength for me. I would not have become Dr. Marks if it had not been for you all and your encouraging words. Thank you, Dr. Alaina Desjardin, for being there throughout this process. I am also grateful for the guidance you provided me along the way. I want to acknowledge and thank my chair, Dr. Laura Munoz. Her knowledge and advice were invaluable throughout this process and helped me achieve this milestone. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Tom Brill and Dr. Benjamin L. Dilla, for their patience, insights, and feedback. With all of us working together, this doctoral study was possible.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my children, Marquice, Marquita, Marquell, and Marquez, and my father, Al, who have been my most significant sources of inspiration and motivation throughout this academic journey. Your unwavering support and encouragement have fueled my determination to complete this project and achieve my goals. I am forever grateful for your patience and understanding during the long hours spent studying and writing. Your belief in me has been the driving force behind my success.

ABSTRACT

THE LOYALTY METRIC: HOW EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION & ENGAGEMENT IMPACTS ORGANIZATION LOYALTY

Official Student Name, DBA

The University of Dallas, 2024

Supervising Professor: Dr. Laura Muñoz

Previous research has shown that there are complex dynamics that influence employee loyalty and its outcomes. This study evaluated whether job satisfaction directly influenced employee engagement and whether employee engagement directly influenced the outcomes of employee loyalty, employee net promoter score, and positive word of mouth. The study also examined whether managerial trustworthiness moderates the relationship between job satisfaction and employee engagement. A quantitative approach was used to analyze the data collected from 400 full-time employees working in various industries in the United States. The hypotheses were tested using partial least squares path modeling. The results found a direct relationship between job satisfaction and employee engagement, which was significantly related to the outcomes of employee loyalty, employee net promoter score, and positive word-of-mouth. The results also revealed that the main effect between job satisfaction and employee engagement was significant. The study also found that the managerial trustworthiness moderator did not support the hypothesis; however, the results found that managerial trustworthiness negatively moderated the relationship between job satisfaction and employee engagement. This study enhances the literature on employee loyalty by comprehensively examining knowledge workers' perceptions of the concept. This broader perspective could also enable organizations to implement targeted strategies that foster loyalty. Such insights could assist practitioners in advancing the use of employee net promoter scores by extending their assessment beyond employees who demonstrate loyal behavior.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT v	<i>'</i> i
TABLE OF CONTENTS vii	ii
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS xi	v
LIST OF TABLES x	v
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION1	7
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	5
2.1 Social Exchange Theory	5
2.2 Overview of Loyalty Outcome	7
2.2.1 Employee Loyalty	7
2.2.2 Overview of the Antecedents to Employee Loyalty	0
2.3 Employee Net Promoter Score	4
2.3.1 Measurement of Employee Net Promoter Score	5
2.3.2 Criticisms of Net Promoter Score	7
2.3.3 Benefits of Net Promoter Score	9
2.3.4 Overview of the Antecedents to eNPS	0
2.4 Positive Word of Mouth	4
2.4.1 Overview of the Antecedents to PWOM	6
2.5 Job Satisfaction	9

2.6 Employee Engagement	51
2.7 The Moderating Role of Managerial Trustworthiness	54
2.8 Development Hypotheses	57
2.8.1 Effect of Job Satisfaction on Loyalty Outcomes	57
2.8.2 Effect of Job Satisfaction on eNPS	59
2.8.3 Effect of Job Satisfaction and PWOM	60
2.8.4 Effect of Job Satisfaction on Employee Engagement	61
2.8.5 Effect of Employee Engagement and Employee Loyalty	63
2.8.6 Effect of Employee Engagement and eNPS	65
2.8.7 Effect of Employee Engagement and PWOM	66
2.8.8 Moderating Role of Managerial Trustworthiness between Job Satisfaction an	ıd
Employee Engagement	67
2.9 Summary	69
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY	70
3.1 Research Design	70
3.2 Data Collection	71
3.2.1 Data Sample Source	71
3.2.2 Data Analysis Method Selection	72
3.2.3 Sample Size Requirements	73

	3.3 Survey Design	74
	3.4 Informed Consent and Screening	76
	3.5 BOT Checks, Instructional Manipulation Checks, and Attention Checks	77
	3.6 Measurement Instrumentation	78
	3.6.1 Employee Loyalty	78
	3.6.2 ENPS	79
	3.6.3 PWOM	80
	3.6.4 Job Satisfaction	80
	3.6.5 Employee Engagement	81
	3.6.6 Managerial Trustworthiness	82
	3.7 Control Variables	86
	3.8 Common Method Variance	86
	3.9 Summary	87
C	CHAPTER 4 RESULTS	88
	4.1 Study Participants' Characteristics	89
	4.2 Statistical Assumptions and Assessment of Outliers	91
	4.3 Employee Net Promoter Score (eNPS)	96
	4.4 Measurement Model Assessment	99
	4.4.1 Indicator Reliability	99

	4.4.2 Internal Consistency Reliability for Reflective Constructs	100
	4.4.3 Convergent Validity for Reflective Constructs	101
	4.4.4 Discriminant Validity for Reflective Construct	104
	4.4.5 Assessment of Common Method Bias for Reflective Construct	106
	4.4.6 Construct Validity of Formative Indicators	106
	4.4.7 Statistical Significance and Relevance	107
	4.4.8 Collinearity Assessment	108
4	.5 Structural Model Assessment	109
	4.5.1 Overall Model Predictive Power (R ²)	110
	4.5.2 Effect Size (f ²)	111
	4.5.3 Assessment of Predictive Relevance (Q ²)	112
	4.5.4 Effect size (q ²)	113
	4.5.5 Testing for Out-of-Sample Prediction	114
4	.6 Hypothesis Testing	118
	4.6.1 The Effects of Job Satisfaction on Employee Loyalty, eNPS, PWOM, and	
	Employee Engagement	122
	4.6.2 The Effects of Employee Engagement on Employee Loyalty, eNPS, and	
	PWOM	122
	4.6.3 Moderation Effect of Managerial Trustworthiness	122

4.6.4 Simple Slope Analysis
4.6.5 Post-Hoc Analysis 124
4.6.6 Finite Mixture-PLS 125
4.7 Controls Variable 128
4.7.1 Path Coefficient Multigroup Analysis
4.8 Summary of Results
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION, MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS,
AND CONCLUSION
5.1 Discussion of Results
5.1.1. Job Satisfaction and Employee Engagement and Their Effects on Employee
Loyalty
5.1.2. Job Satisfaction and Employee Engagement and their Effects on Employee
Net Promotor Score (eNPS)142
5.1.3. Job Satisfaction and Employee Engagement and their Effects on Positive
Word of Mouth (PWOM)143
5.1.4. Job Satisfaction Effects on Employee Engagement
5.1.5. Moderating Effects of Managerial Trustworthiness on Job Satisfaction and
Employee Engagement 145
5.1.6. Control Method: Intention to Leave 146
5.1.7. Multigroup Analysis

5.2 Scholarly Implications	
5.3 Practical Implications	150
5.4 Study Limitations and Future Research	
5.5 Conclusion	
REFERENCES	
APPENDIX A	
APPENDIX B	
APPENDIX C	
APPENDIX D	
APPENDIX E	
APPENDIX F	
APPENDIX G	
APPENDIX H	

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure	Page
2.1 Graphic Presentation of the eNPS Method	
2.2 Theoretical Model	65
4.1 Employee Net Promoter Score Graph	94
4.2 Structural Model Results	116
4.3 Simple Slope Analysis of the Interaction Effect of Managerial Trustworthi	ness 119

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
2.1 Select Studies Focused on Employee Loyalty	27
2.2 Select Studies Focused on Employee Net Promoter Score	38
2.3 Select Studies Focused on PWOM	43
3.1 Example of Survey Item Sequencing	72
3.2 Summary of Measurements and Scales	80
4.1 Industry and Sample Characteristics	86
4.2 Descriptive Statistics for Construct Indicators	89
4.3 Bivariate Correlations	91
4.4 Employee Net Promoter Score Summary	93
4.5 Results Summary for Reflective Measurements	98
4.6 Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio	101
4.7 Results Summary for Formative Measurements	105
4.8 Predictive Power of the Model	107
4.9 Effect Size (f^2) of the Predictor Variables	108
4.10 Predictive Relevance of Endogenous Constructs	109
4.11 CVPAT – PLS SEM	112
4.12 Manifest Variable Prediction	113

4.13 Endogenous Constructs Comparison using PLSpredict	114
4.14 Significance Testing Results of the Structural Path Coefficients	116
4.15 Fit Indices for a One to Four-Segment Solution	123
4.16 Segment Size Summary	124
4.17 Control Variable Results of Direct Effect of the Outcomes	126
4.18 Path Coefficient Multigroup Analysis	130

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Companies are losing highly trained employees who choose to switch careers or move to a different company with what they perceive to be superior working conditions (Hamouche, 2021; Legerstee, 2013; Meschke, 2021). As of 2022, nearly 47 million Americans continue to leave their jobs voluntarily, indicating that the Great Resignation is not over (Amanor-Boadu, 2022; Herman, 2023) and according to Herman (2023), employee annual voluntary turnover is predicted to rise by 20% starting in 2022 and continuing into the future. However, according to Serenko (2023), the worker revolution has progressed from the Great Resignation to quiet quitting. Quiet resigning refers to a strategic approach used by workers whereby they selectively limit their work activities, fulfill the basic requirements of their job, and willingly do additional responsibilities to preserve their existing employment status (Lucas, 2022; Serenko, 2023). This approach is characterized by individuals prioritizing their well-being above attaining organizational objectives. Also, M. Baker and Zuech (2022) described that the employee annual voluntary turnover rose by 20% in 2022 and projected it to continue in the coming years. In addition, between 2012 and 2021, Lawson et al. (2022) found that businesses with low employee turnover outperformed those with high turnover in their return on assets and revenue per employee.

Furthermore, when employees voluntarily depart from the company, it leads to a decline in corporate performance because they disrupt existing jobs (Bluedorn, 1982; Kurdi & Alshurideh, 2020) and cause a loss of accumulated experience due to employee voluntary

turnover (Argote et al., 1990; Kurdi & Alshurideh, 2020). Direct expenses of job voluntary departure, such as discharge, recruiting, and training, contribute to poor corporate performance (Darmon, 1990; Palich et al., 1995). Ton and Huckman (2008) examined employee turnover rates for large retail chains in the United States and discovered that, on average, employee turnover is associated with a decline in corporate performance, measured by profit margin and customer service. Therefore, companies can benefit from understanding why employees leave and how they can change these trends, given that losing highly trained people affects their bottom line (Bagis & Adawiyah, 2022; Y. Chen et al., 2021).

Employee loyalty denotes the connection established between an employee and their employer, marked by trust, unwavering dedication, and resolute commitment (Kot-Radojewska & Timenko, 2018; Naus et al., 2007; Sverke & Goslinga, 2003). In instances where employees demonstrate steadfast devotion to their roles, there is an increased propensity for them to surpass anticipated performance benchmarks (Bonaccio et al., 2020). Therefore, loyal employees are an essential asset in organizations as they promote a sense of security and mutual benefit between employees and the company (Guillon & Cezanne, 2014; J. L. Smith, 2015; Wiklund & Jansson, 2019). Also, loyal employees can function as advocates for the company, attracting top talent and elevating the reputation and success of the business (Davenport et al., 2010; Duboff & Heaton, 1999; Logan, 1984; Vecchi et al., 2021). Loyal employees can also help companies increase their productivity, enhance their image, and support revenue (Bagis & Adawiyah, 2022; Y. Chen et al., 2021; e Cunha, 2002; Heskett et al., 1994).

However, the relationship between employee and employer can be imbalanced and unequal (Klotz & Bolino, 2022). Considering the recent trend of quiet resignations, employers ask more of their employees to go above and beyond without sufficiently valuing them in return

(Harvey, 2023; Klotz & Bolino, 2022; Lucas, 2022). While incentives like increased pay or promotions can reward devoted workers, they cannot replace an established relationship with the organization (Gerhart & Fang, 2015; Kulikowski & Sedlak, 2020; Lovejoy et al., 2021).

Employee loyalty and related behavioral outcomes have become a focal point of many human resource models and frameworks, such as those examining employee job satisfaction (Antonova, 2016; Z. Chen, 2001; Dhir et al., 2020; LaGree et al., 2023; Rusbult et al., 1988), employee engagement (LaGree et al., 2023; Syahrizal & Patrisia, 2019), employee commitment (Z. Chen, 2001; LaGree et al., 2023; Rusbult et al., 1988), and workplace environment (Aboobaker et al., 2020; Johnson & Indvik, 2001; Prabhakar, 2016). A recurring theme among these models is the inclusion of employee satisfaction as an outcome resulting from various organizational strategies, along with its positive role as a precursor to loyalty, loyal behaviors, and other favorable outcomes. These findings align with prior research investigating employee job satisfaction (J. A. Chatman & Barsade, 1995; J. Chatman & Caldwell, 1991; Lam & Qiu Zhang, 2003; D. S. Lowry et al., 2002; Martin, 2004; Silva, 2006). However, recent research has prompted a reevaluation of employee job satisfaction due to inconsistent findings in some studies (Kollmann et al., 2020; Mazzola & Disselhorst, 2019; N. P. Podsakoff et al., 2007; Weerasinghe & Batagoda, 2015; Wong et al., 2021).

Social exchange theory (SET) is one of the most prominent theoretical frameworks related to workplace behavior (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Loi et al., 2015). SET involves interactions between two parties that involve reciprocal interdependence (Blau, 1964; Eisenberger et al., 1986; Meira & Hancer, 2021; Y. C. Yang, 2012). According to Gerstner and Day (1997), researchers use SET to investigate the interpersonal interactions between employees and managers as a reciprocal relationship between managers and employees. Employees feel

respected and included in the leader's core group if they believe managerial behavior is trustworthy (Blau, 1964). This trust is built when managers consistently communicate openly and honestly with their employees, ensuring transparency in decision-making processes (Chanana & Sangeeta, 2021; Gillespie et al., 2020; Krosgaard et al., 2002). Additionally, leaders who actively listen to their employees' concerns and feedback further reinforce this sense of trust and inclusion within the core group (Gillespie et al., 2020; Hendriks et al., 2020; Korsgaard et al., 2015; Krosgaard et al., 2002). People who are trusting expect others to act similarly (Korsgaard et al., 2015).

Organizations begin the social exchange process by valuing their employees' contributions and caring for their well-being. According to the SET, employees will be more loyal to an employer if they believe they have gained something positive in return from the organization (S. Chen et al., 2022; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Homans, 1958; Wiklund & Jansson, 2019). Furthermore, employee loyalty is critical because it is part of the SET. The theory's tenets include that employees who feel valued, supported, and rewarded by their organization are more likely to reciprocate with increased commitment and loyalty (Shore et al., 2001, 2009; Wayne et al., 1997).

Another variable worth considering is the employee Net Promoter Score (eNPS), which is used to measure how employees feel about their company. The eNPS comprises a straightforward question: "How likely are you to recommend us as a place to work for your family and friends?" Organizations can use the eNPS to decide the likelihood of an employee referring potential employees to the organization and recommending the company's products and services (Legerstee, 2013; Lynch, 2022). The eNPS is a vital measurement tool for employee engagement and experience within the organizational context (Al Fannah et al., 2021). Rao and

Rajasekaran (2019) claimed that eNPS promotes employee loyalty, considers employee feedback, produces closed learning and improvement loops, and aids the organization in deciding its needs. ENPS is used to help companies measure employee loyalty within their organization and is a critical organizational priority (Legerstee, 2013; Lynch, 2022; Pollack & Alexandrov, 2013; Rao & Rajasekaran, 2019). Using eNPS surveys, employees respond regarding whether they might recommend their employer to friends and family. Studies have linked employee satisfaction and various antecedents with NPS or eNPS metrics; for example, Legerstee (2013) evaluated the eNPS to measure whether employees are affectively committed to the organization. The results showed a significant positive correlation between person-organization fit and a negative correlation with intentions to leave.

While there is a substantial body of research linking high eNPS to favorable loyaltyrelated outcomes, such as customer satisfaction, there exists a scarcity of studies specifically delving into the correlation between employee satisfaction and firm outcomes as measured by eNPS, in comparison to the volume of research on those other constructs. Limited in number are investigations into eNPS relationships with different antecedents and outcomes (Legerstee, 2013; Lynch, 2022). Furthermore, the extent of understanding surrounding its associations with various factors remains modest. An additional metric developed to assist employers in gauging employee loyalty is Positive Word-of-Mouth (PWOM: S. Gupta & Zeithaml, 2006; Pollack & Alexandrov, 2013). Through an exploration of both PWOM and eNPS, researchers can gain enhanced insights into the factors that shape employee loyalty outcomes.

PWOM is a measure that captures the extent to which employees speak positively about their organization to others (Mittal et al., 2022). This scale shows employee loyalty because employees who engage in PWOM are likely to have a high sense of commitment and satisfaction toward their organization (Wang & Binti Omar, 2023). Organizations like Apple, Intuit, and Philips have made eNPS the centerpiece of their management strategies (Barhorst et al., 2020; Forbes, 2011; F. F. Reichheld & Markey, 2011; Sweeney et al., 2020). The eNPS has become even more appealing as positive word-of-mouth communications have gained significance (Pollack & Alexandrov, 2013). Increasing employee job satisfaction will foster strong employee loyalty and, as a result, increase PWOM about the company (Rogers et al., 2014).

Due to the limited findings in the aforementioned studies, researchers are now studying additional constructs and measures that can capture the development of employee loyalty, such as eNPS and PWOM. Other constructs include employee engagement, managerial trustworthiness, and job satisfaction. Evidence has shown that employee satisfaction and engagement relate to how employees perceive their interactions with their organizations and leaders (Y. J. Cho & Perry, 2012; Colquitt & Rodell, 2011; Simons & Roberson, 2003). Researchers in management have found that job satisfaction and work engagement play significant roles in retaining staff, and these relationships have garnered significant attention. For example, research has found that job satisfaction predicts absenteeism, burnout, turnover, and turnover intention (M. Gupta & Shaheen, 2017; Shields & Ward, 2001). Studies have shown that when employees are satisfied, they are engaged in the organization and their performance and tend toward higher retention (J. K. Harter et al., 2002; Lu et al., 2016; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). In addition, employee trust in managers is crucial for establishing a solid working relationship between employees and their managers (Korsgaard et al., 2015).

This study will examine if job satisfaction directly influences employee engagement and whether employee engagement directly influences employee loyalty, eNPS, and PWOM. Also, it will examine if managerial trustworthiness moderates the relationship between job satisfaction

and engagement. This research will explore these factors to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the complex dynamics influencing employee loyalty and its outcomes. Furthermore, this broader perspective could enable organizations to implement targeted strategies that foster loyalty.

Several empirical studies have focused on the role of NPS in customer loyalty and the outcomes of customer satisfaction and organizational sales growth (Baehre et al., 2022). However, few studies focus on eNPS in employee loyalty and job satisfaction that measure employee experience within the organizational context. Based on these explanations as the theoretical and practical basis, this research study will address the question, "What is the likelihood that a loyal employee will promote their company to others if they are satisfied and engaged?"

This study makes two theoretical contributions. The first contribution is knowledge about employee loyalty that can benefit organizations, managers, and employees directly. For example, when employees intend to stay with a company, they often demonstrate high performance and promote the company positively (Meschke, 2021). Therefore, loyal employees benefit managers and businesses. Second, this study could help practitioners drive eNPS by going beyond whether employees have shown loyalty behaviors and considering their willingness to recommend the company as a great workplace. Employees with a high eNPS score are highly engaged and satisfied with their workplace, while employees with a low score have room for improvement (Legerstee, 2013; Lynch, 2022; Meschke, 2021). Companies can use eNPS data to identify areas for improvement, increase employee retention, and attract top talent. These contributions can be valuable insights for practitioners and researchers seeking to initiate more research.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Chapter 2 analyses the background literature, including discussions of managerial trustworthiness, job satisfaction, and employee engagement as the antecedents of employee loyalty, PWOM, and eNPS. The chapter also discusses SET as the theoretical framework. Chapter 3 discusses the methods, data collection, and variables used in this study. Chapter 4 includes the data analysis and findings concerning managerial trustworthiness, job satisfaction, and employee, employee loyalty, eNPS, and PWOM. Finally, Chapter 5 discusses the managerial implications, limitations, and potential future research directions.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review presents the theoretical foundations for the hypotheses proposed in this study. First, SET is the foundation for employee loyalty. Following the discussion of SET, this review focuses on defining employee loyalty by reviewing the important works related to this construct and more recent studies that expand its definition. After defining employee loyalty, this review examines the various antecedents of employee loyalty in the existing literature. As part of discussing antecedents, the literature review includes outcomes from studies on employee loyalty in an organizational context; examining these outcomes is crucial because the current study concerns loyalty in organizations. Also, this discussion included eNPS and PWOM as additional outcomes being researched in this study. Finally, after reviewing the relevant literature, this chapter concludes with the conceptual model and all corresponding hypotheses.

2.1 Social Exchange Theory

The central theoretical framework guiding this research study was SET (Blau, 1964) to analyze the direct relationships between employees and the organization. Social exchanges encompass the interaction of two parties driven by the results they hope to achieve (Blau, 1964; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). The SET was primarily to evaluate human behavior but later was adapted to assess organizational behavior (Wiklund & Jansson, 2019). Homans (1958) and Blau (1964) pioneered the exchange-based perspective on social behavior within the realm of psychology, while Thibault and Kelley (1959, 2017) extended and mirrored this theory within the field of sociology. Essential to the current study, Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005) expanded

this theory for management in organizations. Researchers often use the SET theory to explain how people behave when making decisions (Karatepe et al., 2018). According to Wiklund and Jansson (2019) the theory, people decide based on the anticipated results and the work needed to achieve those results. Also, according to Shiau and Luo (2012), the theory is primarily utilized to explain organizational behavior and the impact of social norms. When an employee abides by the social norms of the organization, they typically expect to receive reciprocal valuable exchanges, such as financial rewards in salaries, promotions, and bonuses. Furthermore, Blau (1964) defined social exchange as "voluntary actions of individuals that are motivated by the returns they are expected to bring and typically do in fact bring from others" (p. 91).

Moreover, employees may expect exchanges between themselves and their employers, including loyalty, trust, and faithfulness (Tyler, 2001). Like other workplace behaviors, social behavior depends on the context and the situation (Meschke, 2021). According to SET, interactions between two parties often involve reciprocal interdependence (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Blau, 1964; Kidder, 2005). Thus, social exchanges have predicted fundamental social exchange-related behaviors. (Meschke, 2021). As a result, employees reciprocate, show positive behaviors, and are more committed to their work (Blau, 1964). Additionally, researchers have used SET to understand the importance of trust and fairness in workplace relationships. Employees who feel respected and valued are more likely to reciprocate positively, while those feeling undervalued or mistreated may act negatively or leave the company (Meschke, 2021; Organ, 1990). Organizations start the social exchange process by appreciating their employees' contributions and taking an interest in their welfare (Meira & Hancer, 2021). Organizations can start these connections better through mutual commitment, loyalty, and trust (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). According to Eisenberger et al. (1986), employees become loyal to their

company because they understand how the organization values them and how employees feel obligated to conduct their company's strategic goals (Gouldner, 1960; Jaiswal & Dhar, 2016; Kurtessis et al., 2017).

SET is one of the most well-known theories regarding workplace behavior (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005), and its practice has significantly impacted employee loyalty. According to Blau (1964) and Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005), employee loyalty develops over time, and the employer should reciprocate with loyalty to the employee. Strong relationships between the employees, supervisors, and the organization lead to mutually perceived obligations, which end in loyalty (Meschke, 2021; Suliman & Al Kathairi, 2013). Furthermore, through the process of social exchange, employee loyalty is associated with an ethical work climate, high service quality, reciprocal protections of the partners, and power for the supervisor (Meschke, 2021).

2.2 Overview of Loyalty Outcome

This study analyzed some key antecedents that influence employee loyalty while also encompassing two supplementary outcome variables, namely, eNPS and PWOM, to further assess and provide insight into employee loyalty. Also, this study leveraged the eNPS metric to investigate employees' intentions to recommend the company to acquaintances and the level of loyalty of employees. In contrast, PWOM examined whether employees spread positive messages about their company. The following discussion reviews the literature regarding each of these loyalty outcomes.

2.2.1 Employee Loyalty

Employee loyalty is important because it is part of the SET (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Meschke, 2021; Scholl, 1981). Using SET supports understanding organizational interactions and why employees are loyal to their employers (Hollebeek & Haar, 2012; Meschke, 2021).

Employees exchange their labor for anticipated benefits and show loyalty to the company in exchange for these benefits (Hollebeek & Haar, 2012; Meschke, 2021). In the latter decades of the 20th century, loyalty was accepted as integral to business (Rosanas & Velilla, 2003). The 1980s have been described as "the decade of greed" (E. W. Anderson, 1998, p. 25). More recently, self-interest has been the driving force behind economic interests (Bessen & Connell, 2022; Jensen, 1994; Kenton, 2023). However, during the last 20 years of the century, networks, alliances, and other forms of cooperation proliferated, emphasizing the need for at least an enlightened self-interest. Moreover, some have promoted altruism as a corporate objective. For example, Kanungo and Conger (1993) argued that loyalty is a genuine need. F. F. Reichheld (1996) and F. Reichheld (2011) asserted that loyalty is the cornerstone of growth and profitability for organizations.

Researchers have presented diverse interpretations of employee loyalty (Allen & Grisaffe, 2001; Guillon & Cezanne, 2014; Powers, 2000; Turkyilmaz et al., 2011). These conceptualizations encompass elements such as commitment to the organization, personal fulfillment, the work environment, social recognition, and financial incentives. (Allen & Grisaffe, 2001; Guillon & Cezanne, 2014; Powers, 2000; Turkyilmaz et al., 2011). These conceptualizations encompass elements such as commitment to the organization, personal fulfillment, the work environment, social recognition, and financial incentives. Turkyilmaz et al. (2011) defined employee loyalty as the degree to which individuals seek to remain working for their company. According to Powers (2000), an employee loyal to the company will put in extra effort to finish tasks, work harder for the organization, help coworkers reach their objectives, follow instructions, and not take advantage of the business. Also, F. F. Reichheld (2003) defined loyalty as an employee's willingness to voluntarily contribute to or make sacrifices on behalf of

the company and the intention to engage with the organization in the long term, which plays a positive role in the retention of employees in the organization. This definition underscores the significance of employees' dedication to their organization and their inclination to exceed their job obligations. Powers' (2000) definition was utilized in this study as described as "based on unwritten policies or norms of the organizational culture, e.g., staying late to complete a project, participating in extracurricular activities, contributing to company charities, offering suggestions, and remaining with the organization" (p. 6).

According to Syahrizal and Patrisia (2019), Jun et al. (2006), and Longo and Mura (2011), satisfied workers are likely to remain with the organization. Employee loyalty may be evaluated in various ways, such as through employee satisfaction surveys, analyzing turnover rates, and measuring employee engagement levels (Dhir et al., 2020; Gorgenyi-Hegyes et al., 2021; Tran Thi & Tran, 2020). Among these are a desire to exceed expectations and demonstrate exceptional performance on what is expected of them for organizational success, an interest in making the company a career, a concern for the organization, and intentions to remain employed by the organization. Aristana et al. (2022) stated that loyalty implies an action-oriented stance because it affects employee behavior. Allen and Grisaffe (2001) and Aristana et al. (2022) described loyalty as a psychological state that affects how an organization and its employees interact and whether individuals decide to stay with a company.

Employee involvement and relationships help them develop stronger loyalty to the company (L. Book et al., 2019; Masakure, 2016). Therefore, employees' voluntary commitment and involvement are integral to an organization (Bhat & Darzi, 2018). Employees with high loyalty were fully committed to the organization's objectives, worked to achieve them, and wanted to stay with the company for an extended time. Rao and Rajasekaran (2019) found

employee loyalty to be a high priority in organizations and frequently measured using the eNPS. Rao and Rajasekaran's (2019) research indicated that eNPS includes employees' understanding of the company's economic goals, which create opportunities for profitable growth, and their awareness of how effectively the company upholds its core values.

2.2.2 Overview of the Antecedents to Employee Loyalty

Understanding the origins and definitions of employee loyalty constructs supports investigations into what organizations can do to drive their employees' loyalty. Several researchers examining employee loyalty found it is an outcome of several antecedents, moderators, and mediators. These antecedents were reviewed to draw linkages between the potential results of this study and the existing literature. The focus was on studies examining the antecedents of employee loyalty in an organizational context. Table 2.1 summarizes selected studies that focused on employee loyalty and are included in this review; the table contains the research context, antecedents, and outcomes assessed in each study.

Table 2.1

Authors	Research context	Antecedent variables	Consequents variables	Key Findings
Khuong and Tien (2013)	Banking industry	Supervisor support Teamwork Working Environment	Employee loyalty	The results showed that higher satisfaction levels, supervisor support, fringe benefits, teamwork, working environment, and training were positively associated with higher organizational loyalty.
Hwang and Wang (2013)	Telecommunicati ons industry	Job satisfaction Human Resources Management Systems	Organizational loyalty	Findings showed that job satisfaction plays a significant role in organizational loyalty, which relates to organizational employee perceptions of ethical business dilemmas.
Hussain (2012)	Hotel industries	Teamwork and cooperation Recognition and rewards Working conditions Relationship with Supervisors	Employee loyalty Customer loyalty Employee satisfaction	The finding showed a positive and significant relationship between employee loyalty, teamwork and cooperation recognition and rewards, working conditions, and relationship with the supervisor. The main objective of loyalty was employee and customer satisfaction, which found a positive relationship.

Select Studies Focused on Employee Loyalty, Its Research Context, and Its Antecedents and Outcomes

Authors	Research context	Antecedent variables	Consequents variables	Key Findings
Turkyilmaz. et al. (2011)	General	Job satisfaction Empowerment and participation Working conditions Reward and recognition Teamwork Training & development	Employee loyalty	The results showed a strong relationship between employee satisfaction and loyalty. It was also found that training and personal development were the most influential factors in customer satisfaction. The results also found a positive relationship between working conditions and satisfaction.
Sihombing and Berlianto (2018)	College level of Educational	Work values International marketing Job satisfaction	Employee loyalty	The study identified a positive relationship between work values and job satisfaction and a positive relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty. However, the study did not find a positive relationship between internal marketing and job satisfaction because internal marketing treats employees as internal customers.
Khuong and Linh (2020)	Vietnam hospitality industry	Job-related stressors Individual related stressors Employee motivation Job satisfaction	Employee loyalty	The results showed that individual-related stressors positively and directly affect employee motivation, job satisfaction, and loyalty. In contrast, job-related stressors positively affect employee motivation but indirectly affect job satisfaction and loyalty.
Abror et al. (2020)	Higher education institution - university	Satisfaction OCB Employee Engagement Self-efficacy Remuneration	Employee loyalty	The finding showed that employee engagement, self-efficacy, remuneration, satisfaction, and OCB are significantly related to employee loyalty.

Authors	Research context	Antecedent variables	Consequents variables	Key Findings
Lynch (2022)	General	Workplace friendship	Employee Loyalty Affective Commitment Normative commitment	The findings showed that workplace friendship was related to employee loyalty and affective and normative commitment. An additional finding suggests that employee loyalty may be too similar to organizational commitment to be considered a separate construct.
Yao et al. (2019)	Hotel	Employee trust Employee satisfaction Affective commitment Normative commitment Continuance commitment	Attitudinal loyalty Behavioral loyalty	Employee trust moderated employee satisfaction and was the dominant direct antecedent of affective, normative, and continuance commitment. Employee satisfaction has a moderate to significant effect on these commitments, while affective commitment significantly influences attitudinal and behavioral loyalty. An alternative model was developed to eliminate the path between satisfaction and normative commitment, and behavioral loyalty.

Note. OCB - Organizational Citizenship Behavior

2.3 Employee Net Promoter Score

This study examined the effectiveness of the eNPS as a measure of employee loyalty to an organization. The eNPS measures the likelihood of employees referring others to the company where they work and recommending their workplace (Birkinshaw, 2013). F. F. Reichheld (2003) created the NPS to measure customer loyalty by asking customers a single question about the likelihood they would recommend a product to friends and family. For example, Philips, a technological company selling various products, such as electric toothbrushes, home goods, and automotive electronics, has used the NPS since 2006 to align with its customers (Kahn, 2011). Kahn (2011) indicated that Philips had integrated NPS into their company to track customer satisfaction and make product changes. They launched a web mining project to capture cyberspace chatter and understand social media's impact on NPS. Studies show that 78% of purchase decisions are based on peer-to-peer recommendations, highlighting the importance of customer feedback.

ENPS is a loyalty measurement method used in many different organizations. ENPS can measure employee loyalty and job satisfaction and help organizations find loyal employees (Srirahayu et al., 2021). F. F. Reichheld's (2003) original question has been modified slightly for employee respondents, "How likely are you to recommend this company as a great place to work?" (Owen & Brooks, 2008, p. 2). By using these metrics, companies can gain valuable insights into their customers' and employees' experiences and improve as needed. Akingbola et al. (2022) argued that when companies ask customers whether they recommend a company or ask employees if they would recommend others work for their company, people put their reputations on the line when they promote a company or employer. Therefore, the percentage of customers or employees willing to take this risk provides helpful insight into how loyal a

customer is to a particular brand or an employee's belief that their company is a great workplace (Akingbola et al., 2022).

Researchers have demonstrated the reliability and validity of NPS, and its practical use across industries has rapidly gained popularity (Colvin, 2020). In the United States, companies across six industries have shown that improvements in NPS were correlated with firm growth and profitability (F. F. Reichheld, 2003). Similar findings were found in a study of U.K.-based businesses, which found that those with positive NPS increased four times more quickly than those with negative NPS (Marsden et al., 2005). Pollack and Alexandrov (2013) examined the nomological network of NPS and found that it influences repurchase intention. More recently, Raassens and Haans (2017) found a positive relationship between NPS and customers' online word-of-mouth (PWOM) behaviors. Therefore, based on extensive empirical findings in support of NPS, this study uses eNPS. ENPS can measure the loyalty behaviors of individual employees to the organization, including managers at all hierarchical levels, workgroups, units, and entire organizations (Aguinis & Burgi-Tian, 2021).

2.3.1 Measurement of Employee Net Promoter Score

The eNPS has received little attention in the literature (Sedlak, 2020). The eNPS measures the likelihood that employees will recommend their company as an employer (Kaufman et al., 2013). ENPS is a metric employers use to evaluate employee loyalty (Aguinis & Burgi-Tian, 2021; Srirahayu et al., 2021; White, 2008). The eNPS is a vital metric linked to employee engagement and experience or service within the organizational context. F. Reichheld (2006b) introduced a quantitative question utilizing an 11-point scale, a departure from the more conventional 7-point scale. This metric is centered around a solitary inquiry, wherein respondents are prompted to assess their likelihood of recommending the company's product or

their organization to friends and family. The scale ranges from 0 (indicative of "not at all likely") to 10 (reflecting "extremely likely"; Figure 2.1: Legerstee, 2013; Owen, 2019; F. F. Reichheld, 2003; Sedlak, 2020). Owen and Brooks (2008), as well as White (2008), underscored that consultants at Satmetrix (2007) endorsed F. Reichheld's (2006b) rationale for adopting the 0-10 scale, citing respondents' familiarity with this scale due to its widespread usage in non-academic contexts such as sports, entertainment, and music rankings. This configuration ensures participants recognize the connotations of numbers, differentiating between affirmative and adverse responses along the spectrum from 0 to 10. The inclusion of zero as an anchor serves to prevent confusion with positive scores. Respondents are intuitively guided to comprehend that a score of 10 signifies high loyalty, while 0 signifies low loyalty (see Figure 2.1).

Following the employees' responses to the ultimate question, employees fall into one of 3 categories to establish a score: detractors, promoters, and passives. The eNPS has traditionally been calculated by subtracting the percentage of supporters of the organization from the percentage of detractors (Aguinis & Burgi-Tian, 2021; Owen & Brooks, 2008; F. Reichheld, 2006b; F. F. Reichheld & Markey, 2011). Detractors exert a more substantial influence compared to promoters, driven by entirely distinct factors. Typically disengaged from their tasks, they harbor a pessimistic outlook toward their organization. This negativity translates into their propensity to vocalize unfavorable opinions about their employers and eventually seek alternative positions that align better with their preferences (Aguinis & Burgi-Tian, 2021; Kahn, 2011; Owen, 2019; Owen & Brooks, 2008; F. Reichheld, 2006a, 2006b, 2011; Sedlak, 2020). Although they might not want to work for the company, they may continue for convenience, lack of better options, and other reasons. They tend to rate their employers from 0 to 6 on the eNPS (Sedlak, 2020).

In contrast, a promoter makes an extra effort to complete their work and help colleagues. Promoters are very committed to the organization and encourage their friends and family to follow suit (Kahn, 2011; Owen, 2019; Sedlak, 2020). Promoters tend to score 9s or 10s on the eNPS (Kahn, 2011; Sedlak, 2020) and can influence the company's recruiting, and they typically have lower absenteeism rates (Kahn, 2011; Lynch, 2022). Passively satisfied people have scores of 7 or 8. Even though they are typically content, passive employees are satisfied but not devoted (Kahn, 2011; Sedlak, 2020). These passive employees do not often talk highly of their businesses; if these employees do, they describe it unenthusiastically and as suitable. These employees will defect if they receive a better offer.

Figure 2.1



Graphic Presentation of the eNPS Method

% Promoters - % Detractors = Net Promoter Score

Note. Calculating the Net Promoter Score. Adapted from *Answering the ultimate question: How Net Promoter can transform your business*? (p. 2), by Owen, R., & Brooks, L. L., 2008, John Wiley & Sons.

2.3.2 Criticisms of Net Promoter Score

Researchers have raised concerns about the validity of the NPS and whether it captures the construct of interest (Keiningham et al., 2007, 2008). The model has been criticized as overly simplistic, and some have further described it as invalid. According to Keiningham et al. (2007),
the NPS model has limited value as a company's revenue forecast compared to several other models. However, that research did not address a fundamental concept of the net promoter Score, namely that the net promoter score itself is less important than the measures management takes to ensure that the net promoter score momentum is increasing rather than stagnating or declining (Kahn, 2011; White, 2008). Despite the criticisms of the NPS model and subsequent instruments, prior studies by Cocheo (2006), De Paula (2005), F. F. Reichheld (2003), F. Reichheld (2006a, 2006b), Samson (2006), and Willmott (2005), provided the foundation for face and content validity related to the quantitative survey instrument and the qualitative interview questions. F. F. Reichheld's (2003) depiction of the direct impact of NPS on organizational growth lacked specificity. Similarly, Sedlak (2020) did not substantiate the rationale behind adopting an 11point scale, expressed reservations about result reproducibility, and acknowledged existing doubts regarding the metric's precision in forecasting customer loyalty and satisfaction.

Despite the popularity of eNPS as a metric for measuring employee satisfaction and loyalty, some experts have criticized how eNPS relies on a single question to gauge overall sentiment, which may not capture the nuances of how employees feel about their workplace (Lynch, 2022; Sedlak, 2020). Using one question to measure employees' loyalty has been a point of contention and caution for researchers (Akingbola et al., 2022). According to Akingbola et al. (2022) and Zaki et al. (2016), eNPS provides employers with the what but not directly the why of employee loyalty; the score does not provide employers with the root cause or causes of a low score but rather the effect of that cause. Leaders in an organization might look to the eNPS as a starting point for evaluating employee engagement (Kahn, 2011). However, more evidence is needed to assess the organization's climate and performance potential (Akingbola et al., 2022).

Although these criticisms, many organizations use eNPS to assess employee satisfaction and make tactical choices regarding workforce management (Aguinis & Burgi-Tian, 2021). However, companies should consider the limitations of this metric and supplement it with other forms of feedback and analysis to understand their employees' experiences (Pollack & Alexandrov, 2013). Although debate and conflicting views, consumer research often employs the eNPS. This instrument has also found application in diverse domains, including surveys evaluating employee loyalty (Legerstee, 2013; Sedlak, 2020).

2.3.3 Benefits of Net Promoter Score

Some researchers use NPS, eNPS, Net Performance Promoter Score, or Performance Promoter Score (PPS) interchangeably to measure customer and employee loyalty and satisfaction (Biesok & Wyrod-Wrobel, 2021). For example, M. I. Brown (2020) used NPS to measure employee and customer loyalty, while others used the NPS method integrated into the enterprise performance measurement and management systems (Aguinis & Burgi-Tian, 2021). General Electric (GE) was an early proponent of the NPS. The senior management at GE saw NPS as a natural extension of Six Sigma and invested significant internal resources in its implementation (Owen & Brooks, 2008; F. Reichheld & Markey, 2006). GE emphasized their senior management's commitment to NPS when they implemented bonus calculations, including an NPS component as part of the process. Aguinis and Burgi-Tian's (2021) research extends the NPS literature by introducing the PPS to overcome the difficulties associated with gauging performance during a crisis.

According to Kaplan (2016), more than two-thirds of Fortune 1000 companies across several industries implement NPS as a predictor of rising sales and a gauge of customer mindset. Historically, practitioners used NPS as a transactional metric to gauge customer loyalty, but it

has since developed into a metric for tracking overall brand health, which now takes responses from non-customers into account as well (Baehre et al., 2022; Megaladevi, 2023). Many businesses still use NPS, raising the possibility that these businesses have discovered the circumstances in which NPS is valuable in predicting future sales growth. For example, Megaladevi's 2023 study on U.S. sportswear firms found that the brand health measure of NPS accurately predicts future sales growth using a sample of potential customers. Markey (2014) and Qualtrics®^{XM} (2020) stated while NPS was first developed as a transaction-based customer loyalty metric, many companies, including GE (S. Gupta & Zeithaml, 2006), Best Buy, Delta Airlines (Safdar & Pacheco, 2019), and Apple (Denning, 2011), are now using it to guide decisions, determine employee compensation, and share earnings reports with investors (Safdar & Pacheco, 2019). NPS is a transactional customer loyalty metric and a measure of overall brand health used for competitive benchmarking and goal setting.

Although little research exists regarding eNPS, evidence supports that a high eNPS positively correlates with job satisfaction (Sedlak, 2020). This correlation suggests that eNPS could be used as a "single-item work satisfaction measure" (Sedlak, 2020, p. 8), even though there are numerous valid measures of job satisfaction (Hancer & George, 2003; Kinicki et al., 2002; Rentsch & Steel, 1992). The scale's simplicity is another advantage of eNPS (Sedlak, 2020). Organizations use eNPS to lower costs by reducing employee turnover and increasing loyalty. Also, businesses widely use the eNPS, demonstrating the significance of PWOM as a substitute for loyalty and a significant value driver (Beckers et al., 2014; V. Kumar et al., 2013).

2.3.4 Overview of the Antecedents to eNPS

Understanding the origins and definitions of eNPS constructs supports further investigations of what organizations can do to drive their employees to recommend the company

to their friends and family (Biesok & Wyrod-Wrobel, 2021). Several researchers have examined eNPS and found it is an outcome of several antecedents, moderators, and mediators (Al Fannah et al., 2021; Lynch, 2022; Sedlak, 2020). These antecedents were reviewed to draw linkages between the potential results of this study and the existing literature. The focus was on studies examining the antecedents of eNPS in an organizational context. For reference, Table 2.2 summarizes selected studies that focused on eNPS and are included in this review; the table contains the research context, antecedents, and outcomes tested in this study.

Table 2.2

Authors	Research context	Antecedent variables	Consequents variables	Key Findings
Legerstee (2013)	General	Affective commitment Person organization fit Job satisfaction Normative commitment Intention to leave	Employee Promoter Score (EPS)	The EPS correlated significantly with five variables. The EPS showed a highly correlated measure of affective commitment, suggesting a more subjective state of loyalty to an organization. The person-organization fit was also closely related to the EPS, indicating that employees' values align with the organizations. Additionally, the score was highly correlated with the intention to leave, suggesting that employees with higher scores are less likely to quit.
Lynch (2022)	General	Workplace friendship	eNPS Employee Loyalty Affective Commitment Normative commitment	Findings showed that eNPS was positively correlated with workplace friendship, employee loyalty, and normative commitment. An additional finding found that eNPS was significantly and strongly correlated with the validated measure of employee loyalty, which supports the use of the eNPS as a measure of loyalty.

Select Studies Focused on Employee Net Promoter Score, Its Research Context, and Its Antecedents and Outcomes

Authors	Research context	Antecedent variables	Consequents variables	Key Findings
Pollack and Alexandrov (2013) *	Phone industry	Customer Satisfaction (SAT)	NPS PWOM Repurchase intention (RPI)	The results showed significant positive relationships between customer satisfaction and traditional PWOM measures across the three service industries. The results confirmed significant and positive relationships between traditional PWOM measures and RPI intentions. Also revealed were similar patterns between the NPS question and RPI intentions across the three service industries. The results were almost identical, with the phone industry showing similar effects of SAT on PWOM, NPS, and RPI. Also, the outcomes demonstrated that the nomological validity of the NPS question and the conventional word-of-mouth measure performed at least as well.
Sedlak (2020)	General	Employee Satisfaction	eNPS	The results showed significant positive relationships between employee satisfaction and eNPS measures across the three different companies.

Note. * Studies focused on customers' behaviors, not employees' behaviors.

2.4 Positive Word of Mouth

Employee PWOM is a construct linked to SET; that is, employees with a positive attitude toward their jobs are more likely to engage in communication and display work-related behaviors (Bone, 1995; Cable & Turban, 2001; R. E. Smith & Vogt, 1995; Van Hoye, 2013). WOM is an outside information source that is not directly under the organization's control (Van Hoye, 2013). WOM among employees can spread information across a spectrum: positive, neutral, or negative (E. W. Anderson, 1998). Negative word-of-mouth (NWOM), encompassing complaints, product or service disparagement, and sharing unfavorable experiences, often arises after a negative encounter (E. W. Anderson, 1998; Zeithaml et al., 1996). Similarly, PWOM occurs when consumers or employees engage in behaviors after they have a pleasing, unique, or lively experience with a product or service (E. W. Anderson, 1998; Swan & Oliver, 1989). This study used PWOM as one of the outcome variables.

PWOM is the informal exchange of information between parties assessing the quality of service (Engel et al., 1969; Singh, 1988; Westbrook, 1987) and aiming to inform or persuade others (E. W. Anderson, 1998). PWOM has been identified as a resource that may make an organization more attractive (J. F. Uen et al., 2015). From the organizational psychology perspective, numerous studies have examined the beneficial effects of employee PWOM on attracting potential job candidates (Cable & Turban, 2006; Collins & Stevens, 2002; Van Hoye, 2013; Van Hoye & Lievens, 2005, 2007b). PWOM is the interpersonal discussion of a company as a potential employer or about particular jobs (Van Hoye & Lievens, 2005). Examples include discussions with friends and suggestions from impartial experts. Bone (1995) defined employee PWOM recruitment as an experiential source because it informally occurs between people and has a specific informational social influence. Marketing research has focused on the notion that

PWOM communication influences consumers' attitudes and behaviors and is significantly more effective than advertising and personal selling at convincing customers to switch brands and changing negative or neutral attitudes into positive ones (A. M. Baker et al., 2016; Day, 1971; Jiang, 2019). Specifically, PWOM refers to "the dissemination of information and viewpoints about the organization by current and former staff members, extending to both their immediate and broader social circles" (Keeling et al., 2013, p. 89). In addition, Wangenheim and Bayon (2007) studied PWOM's impact on customer lifetime value. The authors discovered that PWOM increases the longevity of the customer relationship and attracts new clients. In contrast, negative NWOM significantly reduces a customer's lifetime value. Negative word-of-mouth (NWOM) is when customers spread unfavorable information to others about a product or service (Hennig-Thurau et al., 2004).

PWOM has received attention recently as a supportive approach to improving organizational attractiveness (Van Hoye & Lievens, 2007a, 2007b). PWOM leads to positive impacts on antecedents that are linked to several constructs, such as employee satisfaction (Keeling et al., 2013; Mohammed, 2023; Zhang et al., 2022), employee loyalty (Mittal et al., 2022; Wang & Binti Omar, 2023), commitment and trust (Mittal et al., 2022). East et al. (2008) argued that PWOM and NWOM embed similar behaviors, except for their opposed effects on brand purchase.

While preceding research demonstrates the effectiveness of PWOM communication in shaping marketing strategies and consumer actions (De Matos & Rossi, 2008), as well as its impact on recruitment practices (Van Hoye & Lievens, 2007b), this specific concept still retains a realm of uncharted potential. Given employees' significant role as conveyors of organizational information, further investigation is warranted into the organizational protocols and

psychological factors that shape staff members' recommendations through PWOM (J. F. Uen et al., 2015; Van Hoye, 2013). The subsequent section delves into the precursors of PWOM.

2.4.1 Overview of the Antecedents to PWOM

Understanding the origins and definitions of PWOM constructs supports further investigations of what organizations can do to drive employees to spread the word about the company. Several researchers examining PWOM found it is an outcome of several antecedents, moderators, and mediators. These antecedents were reviewed to draw linkages between the potential results of this study and the existing literature. The focus was on studies examining the antecedents of PWOM in an organizational context. For reference, Table 2.3 summarizes selected studies that focused on PWOM and are included in this review; the table contains the research context, antecedents, and outcomes test in this study.

Table 2.3

Authors	Research context	Antecedent variables	Consequents variables	Key Findings
Abror et al., (2021) *	Tourists	Customer engagement Customer satisfaction Religiosity Muslim friendly tourism	PWOM	This study examines the direct impact of religiosity on PWOM and its relationship with Muslim- friendly tourism, tourist satisfaction, and customer engagement. It finds that higher religiosity leads to better perceptions of Muslim-friendly tourism attributes and is significantly related to customer engagement. Additionally, the study highlights that Muslim-friendly tourism, customer engagement, and satisfaction significantly mediated the relationship between religiosity and PWOM.
Dechawatanapaisal (2020)	General	Perceived external prestige Organizational identification Person-organization fit	Intention to stay Positive word-of- out (PWOM) referrals	The results supported the influence of person- organization fit on intention to stay and PWOM referrals, partially transmitted by organizational identification. A strong sense of compatibility between individual values and organizational practices was successful at stimulating employees' sense of identification, which indirectly impacts workforce retention and induces PWOM referrals. Perceived external prestige also helps explain the relationship between organizational identification and word-of-mouth referrals, with highly identified employees positively communicating and sharing good things about their workplace. The results did not support perceived external prestige as a moderator between organizational identification and employee intention to stay.

Select Studies Focused on PWOM, Its Research Context, and Its Antecedents and Outcomes

Authors	Research context	Antecedent variables	Consequents variables	Key Findings
Zhang et al. (2022)	General	Job-related motivations Social related motivations Online interaction propensity Persuasion self-efficacy Job satisfaction Social relationship tie strength	Employees' PWOM Behavior	The results showed that job-related motivations positively impact employees' PWOM behavior on social networking sites, with task performance and impression management positively impacting PWOM behavior. Branding benefits did not show a significant relationship. The study reveals a positive correlation between social-related motivations and employees' PWOM shared behaviors, with social benefits and helping others being critical predictors.
Pollack and Alexandrov (2013) *	General	Customer satisfaction	NPS PWOM RPI	These results are similar to Table 2.2
Wang and Binti Omar (2023)	The tourism sector, including hotels and transport and traveling agencies	Employee brand love Employee loyalty Affective commitment	PWOM	The findings demonstrated that employee brand love is crucial in determining employees' loyalty to their employers and PWOM. Findings showed that not only does employee loyalty directly predict PWOM, but it also serves as a mediator in the relationship between brand love and PWOM.

Note. * Studies focused on customers' behaviors, not employees' behaviors.

2.5 Job Satisfaction

An organization's success depends significantly on employee job satisfaction. Even though there is no universal definition of job satisfaction that covers all dimensions of the construct, most definitions emphasize job satisfaction as the degree to which individuals enjoy their jobs (Cranny et al., 1992; P. C. Smith et al., 1969; Weiss, 2002). Job satisfaction is a perspective on jobs and can be defined as a collection of positive interests and feelings employees have regarding their jobs and employment with the company (Hamidi et al., 2014; J. Islam et al., 2011; Syeyen & Van Wyk, 1999). Aziri (2011) stated that most definitions of job satisfaction paint a complicated, multifaceted picture. According to Hoppock (1935), job satisfaction is a combination of cognitive, physiological, and environmental factors determining whether a person is satisfied with their work.

Employees' emotions toward their jobs reflect their level of job satisfaction (Spector, 1997). Similarly, Vroom (1964) also argued that employee job satisfaction concerns employees' emotional orientation about their work. Employee satisfaction is closely intertwined with their attitude toward work, as stated by Armstrong (2006). Conversely, when employees find contentment in their roles, a positive disposition follows. Another angle to consider is the correlation between an employee's expectations and the outcomes they experience in their work, a connection highlighted by research by Mason and Griffin (2002) and Wright and Staw (1999). In this study, Vroom's (1964) comprehensive definition of job satisfaction served as the foundation for investigation.

According to Aziri (2011), job satisfaction reflects how employees feel their work meets their needs on a physical and psychological level. Employees have a higher level of satisfaction at work if their high expectations are met, but it is also predicted that they will be more likely to

leave their jobs if they are not satisfied (Irving & Montes, 2009). Studies have examined employee job satisfaction and its significance in the workplace and discovered that it is a crucial determinant of an organization's growth, service, and quality (T. J. Lee, 2017).

Studies have confirmed that satisfied employees perform better and contribute to the organization's overall success (Adnan Bataineh, 2019; Ali & Anwar, 2021; Cranny et al., 1992; Dziuba et al., 2020; Weiss, 2002). However, unsatisfied employees perform poorly and hinder success (Clack, 2021; Ficarra et al., 2020; Greenhaus et al., 1987; Sawaneh & Kamara, (2019). In addition, previous studies showed differences between extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction levels based on differences in age and racial groups (Andrade & Westover, 2020; Andrade et al., 2019; Baroudi et al., 2022; Buitendach & Rothmann, 2009).

Goetz et al. (2012) found that although employees were dissatisfied with their pay, they were generally satisfied with the freedom in how they execute their work and the variety they experience in their jobs. These findings imply that employee job satisfaction depended on their attitudes, values, and motivations, and they were committed to their work and loyal to their employers as long as the organization tried to meet their needs (Ali & Anwar, 2021; Dziuba et al., 2020; Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Weiss, 2002). Therefore, the study of employee job satisfaction is a vital issue for all organizations, as employees play a vital role in shaping an organization's trajectory toward success by bringing their unique talents and fostering a positive workplace culture.

Overall, job satisfaction refers to judgments about work due to characteristics such as joy and gladness. At the same time, employee engagement is related to the employee's mood at work, such as enthusiasm and activation (Salas-Vallina & Alegre, 2021). Job satisfaction concerns employees' feelings about their working circumstances, such as pay, career prospects,

or relationships with coworkers. Job satisfaction is a passive and reactive concept linked to assessing whether employees experience the working conditions they want (Salas-Vallina & Alegre, 2021). According to Moorman (1993), the difference between job satisfaction and engagement is that job satisfaction evaluates conditions, opportunities, or outcomes. These considerations link to the next section on employee engagement and its mediating role in job satisfaction.

2.6 Employee Engagement

Employee engagement is essential because it is linked to SET, which suggests that "obligations are generated through a series of interactions between parties who are in a state of reciprocal interdependence" (Saks, 2006, p. 603). When workers have opportunities for social interaction, learning, and feedback on the job, they try to balance social exchange by responding with more effort and focus (Gabrielova & Buchko, 2021). Employee engagement has traditionally been defined as cognitive, emotional, and behavioral, which leads to positive organizational outcomes (W. A. Kahn, 1990; Saks, 2006; Shuck & Wollard, 2010). Furthering the study of engagement, Shuck et al. (2017) defined employee engagement as the "positive, active, work-related psychological state operationalized by the maintenance, intensity, and direction of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral energy" (p. 269). Engagement relates to the positive emotional relationship between employees and their job (Orgambídez-Ramos & de Almeida, 2017).

Cognitive engagement focuses on how employees think about and evaluate their job, company, and culture (Truss et al., 2013). Cognitive engagement occurs when the employees feel "that their work mattered, that they were supported in their work, and that their well-being was considered fairly" (Shuck et al., 2014, p. 245). A cognitively engaged employee is mentally

and psychologically committed to the task at hand, keeping intensity and moving in the right direction until finishing the task (Shuck, 2020). Cognitive engagement is the level and amount of mental energy an employee provides toward positive organizational outcomes (W. A. Kahn, 1990; Rich, 2006; Rich et al., 2010; Shuck & Reio, 2014; Shuck et al., 2015).

Nimon et al. (2011) found that an employee's overall engagement depends on their cognitive engagement, which is influenced by how employees perceive their work environment (Joo et al., 2017). This interpretation of the workplace catalyzes the intention to engage and is used to assess the situation's overall significance (Shuck & Reio, 2014). According to research findings, this psychological interpretation of work reflects an individual's level of engagement toward their work (S. P. Brown & Leigh, 1996) and parallels the expansion of resources as suggested by Fredrickson (1998, 2001). Individuals who believe their work matters embrace and engage with it (W. Kahn, 2010). Alternatively, employees encountering unfavorable working conditions (e.g., a hostile work environment) experience a downward spiral of emotions that causes a shortage of resources and leads to feelings of isolation, exclusion, and burnout (Fredrickson & Joiner, 2002; Maslach et al., 2001). According to Shuck and Reio (2014) and Shuck (2020), cognitive engagement concerns how employees evaluate their work environment and tasks.

Emotional engagement regards individuals' emotional connection with their place of work, and they contribute personal resources such as pride, trust, and knowledge (Shuck & Reio, 2014; Truss et al., 2013). The expenditure of such resources might appear unnecessary initially but consider the work of proud employees who trust their work environment (Shuck & Reio, 2014). Emotional engagement derives from cognitive engagement and is the positive emotion that results from perceived organizational support (Rich et al., 2010). The positive emotions of

pride and trust come from evaluations about the environment during a cognitive engagement, such as feeling that work is meaningful and safe and having the resources to complete their tasks. The results of positive emotion temporarily broaden employees' available resources and improve critical and creative thinking (Shuck & Reio, 2011). Additionally, during the emotional engagement process, an employee's feelings and beliefs influence and focus their outward efforts toward task completion (Rich et al., 2010).

Behavioral engagement is the physical manifestation of cognitive and emotional engagement (Rich et al., 2010). Shuck and Reio (2011) defined behavioral engagement as the "increased levels of discretionary effort" (p. 423) resulting from cognitive and emotional engagement. Behavioral engagement is characterized as increased levels of effort toward organizational goals and is seen as the physical manifestation of the interaction between cognitive and emotional engagement (Barnes et al., 2014; Macey & Schneider, 2008; Rich et al., 2010; Shuck & Reio, 2014; Shuck & Wollard, 2010; Truss et al., 2013). In other words, behavioral engagement is the overt display of a worker's increased range of resources (Shuck, 2020). Considering this context, employee effort of engagement is related to increased individual effort because engagement happens one employee at a time and is experienced uniquely through the lens of each employee (Shuck & Reio, 2014).

For organizational leaders, sustaining employee engagement is a challenge. Only 32% of American workers, according to J. Harter (2022), Hsu (2023), Horgan (2017), and Inc (2020), reported they are engaged at their place of employment. Employee disengagement causes job dissatisfaction, low organizational commitment, high absenteeism, and high intention to leave the company (V. Gupta & Kumar, 2013; Macey et al., 2009; Mone & London, 2009). Alternatively, highly engaged employees report high organizational citizenship behaviors, low

absenteeism, high job satisfaction, and high organizational commitment (Agarwal, 2014; Gruman & Saks, 2011; Saks, 2006). Managerial trustworthiness is discussed in the following section as an antecedent to employee engagement.

2.7 The Moderating Role of Managerial Trustworthiness

According to SET, when employees feel that their employers are investing in them, they are more likely to act outside the scope of their assigned roles (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Meira & Hancer, 2021). Whitener et al. (1998) suggested that trustworthy employee judgments likely result from employee inferences based on their observations of manager's behavior, which they called managerial trustworthy behavior. The definition of managerial trustworthy behavior is "volitional actions and interactions performed by managers that are necessary but insufficient to engender employees' trust in them" (Whitener et al., 1998, p. 115). Managerial trustworthiness is positively related to employee attitudes, which include employee satisfaction and turnover intentions, and is associated with trust-building between managers and their employees (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Mayer et al., 1995). Krosgaard et al. (2002) showed that managerial trustworthy behavior in a negative situation reflects the manager's favorable intentions (e.g., to be fair or helpful). In contrast, failing to exhibit this behavior may indicate apathy or malicious intent toward the employee (Krosgaard et al., 2002).

Employee opinions of top management's trustworthiness include senior management's ability, integrity, and benevolence (Mayer et al., 1995). Senior management's capacity means having the skills, competencies, and characteristics required to positively influence the organization's achievement through its behaviors (Colquitt et al., 2007). According to Caldwell and Hayes (2007), top management's integrity is measured by how well employees perceive top management's adherence to shared principles and values. Top management's benevolence is

related to employee impressions of how senior management helps their employees. Specifically, senior management's benevolence is defined as cognitive or attitudinal intention leading to support employees (Caldwell et al., 2014).

While researchers have tended to generalize employee responses to top management's dependability across all employees (e.g., Mayer & Davis, 1999; Mayer & Gavin, 2005), employees' perceptions of management's trustworthiness can differ among employees (Caldwell & Clapham, 2003; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Schoorman et al., 2007). The process by which an employee trusts top management is influenced by their attitudes and beliefs about individual managers (Caldwell & Hayes, 2007; Gullett et al., 2009; Xu et al., 2016). As a result, employees' perceptions of the top management's competence, moral character, and generosity fall under the category of top management trustworthiness (Mayer et al., 1995).

Employee perceptions of the trustworthiness of top management can be distinguished from employee perceptions of the trustworthiness of their immediate supervisor (Mayer & Gavin, 2005). Although employees' perceptions of their direct supervisor's trustworthiness positively affect workers (Byrne et al., 2011; Y. J. Cho & Perry, 2012; Colquitt & Rodell, 2011; A. M. Grant & Sumanth, 2009), perceptions of top management's reliability are also crucial. For instance, comparative research reveals that the trustworthiness of top management has a more substantial impact than that of supervisors, which encourages employees to focus on their work (Mayer & Gavin, 2005). Employees who trust their managers reciprocate these actions, strengthening a trusting relationship (Maxwell & Lévesque, 2014).

Such managerial actions are part of a larger social and economic exchange context. According to Gerstner and Day (1997), the SET better explains the interpersonal interactions between employees and managers. According to the SET, managers and employees have a

reciprocal relationship. Employees who believe managers are trustworthy feel respected and like a part of the leader's core group. Employees who trust others anticipate that others will act similarly (Korsgaard et al., 2015). Trust is essential to maintaining a positive relationship between leaders and their employees (Colquitt & Rodell, 2011; Whitener et al., 1998).

Suppose an employee believes top management is incompetent. In that case, this attitude likely raises questions about their ability to set organizational direction (Mayer & Davis, 1999), thus reducing the employee's confidence in top management's vision (Colquitt & Salam, 2009). A negative impression of senior management's integrity creates a perceived gap between senior management's words and actions. This gap appears to violate the principles and values accepted by the employee (Knoll & Gill, 2011; Simons, 2002). When employees feel that senior management does not demonstrate trustworthiness, they face senior management's inability to lead the company, including operating against their morals and not assisting them (Mölders et al., 2019). According to Frijda (1988), an increase in negative emotions may be a common reaction to these perceptions. Research has previously demonstrated how trust and emotions interact (C. C. Chen et al., 2011; Dunn & Schweitzer, 2005; G. R. Jones & George, 1998; Tomlinson & Mayer, 2009; M. Williams, 2007). According to Lindebaum and Gabriel (2016), unethical senior management can anger and disgust people when managers violate moral standards and doubt top management's morality (Smith-Crowe & Warren, 2014). Similarly, negative emotions like anger and sadness may surface when employees believe they are at the mercy of non-benevolent senior management (C. C. Chen et al., 2011). A lack of trustworthiness among top management may cause unfavorable employee reactions (Mölders et al., 2019).

2.8 Development Hypotheses

The conceptual model contains three consequent loyalty variables: employee loyalty, eNPS, and WOM. There are also three antecedent variables: job satisfaction, employee engagement, and managerial trustworthiness. The proposed empirical model for this study examines the direct relationship between job satisfaction and loyalty variables, such as employee loyalty, eNPS, and WOM, to determine if job satisfaction directly and positively affects each loyalty variable. Given these direct relationships, the model includes a moderating role of managerial trustworthiness between job satisfaction and employee engagement. Loyalty and trust are organizations' ethical bases (M. N. Islam et al., 2021; Men et al., 2020; Rosanas & Velilla, 2003) and are vital for forecasting employee loyalty. This research contributes to how employee engagement, job satisfaction, and managerial trustworthiness substantially affect employee loyalty.

2.8.1 Effect of Job Satisfaction on Loyalty Outcomes

Previous research suggested that when employees are satisfied with their working conditions, their organization has a lower likelihood of high employee turnover (Dhir et al., 2020). In the past, researchers have paid significant attention to the relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty. For instance, Walker and Boyne (2006) found that employees satisfied with their jobs became loyal when their organization offered them apparent career growth, opportunities to learn at work, and organizational growth opportunities. Khuong and Tien (2013) argued that high employee loyalty can be attained through teamwork, increased manager support, positive workplace culture, and high job satisfaction. Fosam et al. (1998) found that increased workplace satisfaction supports managers and employees to be loyal to their organization. Additionally, studies have shown that employees with a lifelong commitment to

their organization also influence employers to be more loyal to their employees by creating trust between these two factors (Kayeser Fatima & Abdur Razzaque, 2014). However, what makes a job satisfying depends not only on the nature of the job but also on the expectations people have of what their job should offer (Dhir et al., 2020).

Numerous empirical studies have investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty, revealing consistent positive correlations (L. Book et al., 2019; Dhir et al., 2020; Flecther & Williams, 1996; Kurdi et al., 2020; Tran Thi & Tran, 2020; Vuong et al., 2021; Wu & Norman, 2006). Employees who are content with their roles tend to remain with their current employer and often recommend the organization to others (Jun et al., 2006). A recent study further substantiated this connection focused on Indian organizations, underscoring the impact of job satisfaction on fostering employee loyalty (Dhir et al., 2020).

Conversely, a decline in job satisfaction frequently prompts employees to seek new opportunities actively (S. Chen et al., 2022; Durkin, 2007; Tran Thi & Tran, 2020; Turkyilmaz et al., 2011; Vuong et al., 2021). Moreover, recent research by W. Chen et al. (2022) indicated a positive predictive relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction among teachers in rural Chinese primary schools. Earlier investigations by Mobley et al. (1979), Price (1977), and Shaw (1999) uncovered that employees experiencing lower job satisfaction displayed a greater inclination to leave their positions. Thus, it can be inferred that reciprocal dynamics contribute to cultivating a sense of loyalty among workers toward their employeers.

Several studies demonstrated that job satisfaction is crucial to employee loyalty (Kurdi et al., 2020; Pei-Lee et al., 2017; Tran Thi & Tran, 2020; Turkyilmaz et al., 2011). Various studies carried out in different industries have indicated that job satisfaction influences employee loyalty in the Vietnam hospitality industry (Khuong & Linh, 2020) in university organizational

management (Helmi et al., 2022), in the hotel industry (Farrukh et al., 2020) and in the information technology industry (Veloso et al., 2021). Consequently, it is expected that job satisfaction would be influenced by employee loyalty. Therefore, the above discussion leads to the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1: Job satisfaction has a positive relationship with employee loyalty.

2.8.2 Effect of Job Satisfaction on eNPS

According to Legerstee (2013), Vochin et al. (2020), and Lynch (2022), little research exists regarding eNPS. The eNPS asks how likely employees are to recommend their company as an employer (Legerstee, 2013; Sedlak, 2020). The notable popularity of the eNPS question contributed to a demand for a modified NPS for employee satisfaction and engagement research (Legerstee, 2013). Based on Legerstee's (2013) and Sedlak's (2020) conclusions, the eNPS item is suitable for a general opinion evaluation in the organization. Managers should know whether their team is content but may not know why (Legerstee, 2013; Lynch, 2022). The collection of eNPS scores alone cannot change the company's situation because this tool does not target issues that underlie dissatisfaction (Biesok & Wyrod-Wrobel, 2021; Legerstee, 2013; Vochin et al., 2020).

This study examined how job satisfaction influences eNPS. Legerstee (2013) and Vochin et al. (2020) found that employee and customer loyalty are essential attributes of satisfaction. Therefore, increasing employee satisfaction fosters greater employee loyalty (Messersmith et al., 2011; Wright & Staw, 1999; Vochin et al., 2020). Employees who are satisfied and loyal to the organization can act as promoters that draw in talent (Vochin et al., 2020). Some studies have demonstrated that the NPS questionnaire has credibility and can be used with a loyalty expert of customers or employees (Legerstee, 2013; Vochin et al., 2020). ENPS does not represent

comprehensive information but can aid a company in identifying a strategy that could raise the score and increase the number of promoters (Legerstee, 2013; Vochin et al., 2020).

Several studies have found that satisfied employees with a high eNPS increase productivity and service levels (Legerstee, 2013; Lynch, 2022; Vochin et al., 2020). Implementing a tool for measuring satisfaction, such as eNPS, among employee and customer populations could lead to fewer complications in determining employees' happiness levels and the potential causes of unhappiness (Biesok & Wyrod-Wrobel, 2021; Legerstee, 2013). A need exists for deeper understanding and more research into the relationship between job satisfaction and eNPS. Also, more research on eNPS in the public sector could fill a gap in research (Biesok & Wyrod-Wrobel, 2021). Therefore, this study could bring a new perspective to understanding the relationship between employee satisfaction and their likelihood to recommend their workplace to others. Therefore, the following hypothesis was investigated in this research:

Hypothesis 2: Job satisfaction has a positive relationship with eNPS.

2.8.3 Effect of Job Satisfaction and PWOM

Employees who experience job satisfaction tend to demonstrate loyalty and appreciation to their organization through PWOM (Zhang et al., 2022). Employees share their experiences with other people in the same way that other customers do. Employees who are happy with their jobs promote their companies positively and politely and are proud to work for them (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Mohammad et al., 2011). Enhancing service employees' job satisfaction encouraged organizations' commitment to employees and, as a result, increased the PWOM promotion of the business (Chatzopoulou & de Kiewiet, 2021).

Studies have shown that when employees know their employer is loyal to their organization, positive outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational pride, and PWOM

(Chatzopoulou & de Kiewiet, 2021; Collier & Esteban, 2007; G. Jones & Kramar, 2010; Suh, 2016). These results suggested that promoting their organization can increase employee job satisfaction and loyalty. According to Chatzopoulou and de Kiewiet (2021) and Sakiyama et al. (2023), service employees with higher job satisfaction are more likely to be committed to their organization and spread PWOM. Additionally, the positive spread by satisfied employees can enhance the organization's overall success and reputation in the eyes of stakeholders and customers.

However, research has shown that job satisfaction is often believed to affect employees' physical and mental health (Sun et al., 2018). Li et al. (2010) found that employees' proactive initiatives are more likely to occur in conditions of higher job satisfaction. Zhang et al. (2022) stated that employees on social network sites may realize that their PWOM behavior leads to trouble for organizations. However, a higher level of job satisfaction protects against potential negative consequences. Therefore, job satisfaction may increase the relationship between motivation and employees' PWOM behavior (Zhang et al., 2022). Furthermore, it's important to note that there exists a notable scarcity of business literature that explores the connection between job satisfaction and PWOM constructs as far as the knowledge of this research extends. Consequently, based on these insights, the subsequent hypothesis was formulated:

Hypothesis 3: Job satisfaction has a positive relationship with PWOM.

2.8.4 Effect of Job Satisfaction on Employee Engagement

The literature supports the notion that SET is a theoretical basis for explaining the relationship between job satisfaction and employee engagement (Blau, 1964). Employees of a trustworthy organization feel satisfied when their needs are fulfilled in every aspect of their jobs. As a consequence of an employee's emotional connection to the company, a satisfied employee

reciprocates with positive attitudes and behaviors like extra-role activities, increased engagement, and organizational commitment (Frederiksen, 2017; Ilham, 2018; Riyanto et al., 2021). Hypothetically, when employees are satisfied with these interactions, engagement follows.

Having fully engaged employees is a way to keep people in today's competitive environment. A competitive environment is necessary to improve employee engagement and job satisfaction (Abraham, 2012; Riyanto et al., 2021). Saks (2006) found that job characteristics, rewards and recognition, organizational and supervisor support, and procedural and distributive justice positively predicted employee engagement. All these factors are antecedents of job satisfaction. Garg et al. (2017) investigated intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction of privatesector bank managers to determine the association of these satisfaction variables with their engagement. While both satisfaction measures correlated positively with employee engagement, intrinsic job satisfaction had a more significant impact than extrinsic job satisfaction (Yalabik et al., 2017).

Shuck et al. (2021) and Yalabik et al. (2017) indicated that employees who are satisfied with their work will display more vigor, dedication, and absorption. Their purpose was to determine if a relationship existed between these three dimensions and nine components of job satisfaction: the nature of work, operating conditions, pay, benefits, rewards, promotion, supervisor, coworkers, and communication. Following Macey and Schneider's (2008) approach, Yalabik et al. (2017) found that this impacts satisfaction; moreover, that job satisfaction is an emotional appraisal of the job. If employees' emotional appraisal is positive, then it motivates the employee to become engaged.

Along these lines, Tepayakul and Rinthaisong (2018) conducted a study with 490 human resource staff in Thailand to ascertain the relationship between job satisfaction and employee engagement. According to their findings, satisfaction directly promoted employee engagement, accounting for 80% of the variation in employee engagement. Ang and Rabo (2018) examined how four job satisfaction constructs relate to employee engagement. These constructs included work environment, benefits, management relationships, and career development. They found a significant positive relationship between each construct and employee engagement and determined that an increase or decrease in any independent variables similarly affected employee engagement (Shuck et al., 2021; Tentama et al., 2019; Tepayakul & Rinthaisong, 2018).

According to R. Jones (2018) and Xhang et al. (2020), job satisfaction and employee engagement are linked. Jones found that employees' job satisfaction positively impacted employee engagement. While Xhang et al. (2020) evaluated the relationship between job satisfaction and employee engagement in doctors' turnover intention, they found that the job satisfaction of doctors has an indirect effect through employee engagement. Also, Tentama et al. (2019) examined the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction among university lecturers. Their findings indicated that job satisfaction and employee engagement among lecturers at the university had a significant positive relationship. Finally, Shuck et al. (2021) tested competing structural models to determine which comes first, engagement or satisfaction. Therefore, the following hypothesis was investigated in this research:

Hypothesis 4: Job satisfaction is positively related to employee engagement.

2.8.5 Effect of Employee Engagement and Employee Loyalty

Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) found that many satisfied employees are more engaged at work and have a lower turnover rate. Employees who are satisfied with the organization have

higher levels of loyalty. Vazirani (2005) found that the engagement level of employees is an antecedent for a successful organization, as it influences employee loyalty. Haid and Sims (2009) and Nguyen and Ha (2023) indicated that employee engagement levels underlie their perception of the organization.

Several studies have shown that employee engagement is related to employee loyalty (Karatepe & Ngeche, 2012; Milliman et al., 2018; Salmela-Aro & Upadyaya, 2018). Additionally, Tyagi et al. (2023) studied the mediating impact of work engagement on the relationship between job satisfaction and the intention to leave a job. They discovered that engagement significantly impacts turnover intentions. On the contrary, turnover intention relates to employee loyalty. Vokić and Hernaus (2015) found engagement and employee loyalty to be positively related concepts. However, Syahrizal and Patrisia (2019) found that employee engagement did not significantly affect employee loyalty.

Others have found an association between employee engagement and loyalty (Abror et al., 2020; Karatepe & Ngeche, 2012; Milliman et al., 2018; Salmela-Aro & Upadyaya, 2018). According to Milliman et al. (2018), an association exists between employee engagement and job quality. When workers are personally invested in the organization, their employment attachment is more significantly linked to employee loyalty (Milliman et al. (2018). Alternatively, employee loyalty can predict turnover. Suardi et al. (2022) examined organizations implementing legislation and policies to foster employee loyalty and engagement in occupational health and safety. They found that employee engagement has a direct influence on employee loyalty. Employee engagement can improve workers' loyalty and, as a result, decrease their willingness to quit the firm (Nguyen & Ha, 2023; Suardi et al., 2022). However, when employees are satisfied with their job, they are more likely to be engaged and enhance employee

loyalty to their organization. Therefore, the following hypothesis was investigated in this research:

Hypothesis 5: Employee engagement has a positive relationship with employee loyalty.

2.8.6 Effect of Employee Engagement and eNPS

Rayton et al. (2012) and Bridger (2014) reviewed the work of Serco and Hewitt, which examined 274 Serco client contracts and showed a long-term correlation between employee engagement and the eNPS, a metric of customer loyalty. In the study, the eNPSs were 24% higher for contracts serviced by employees whose engagement increased over the year than for contracts serviced by employees whose engagement decreased. The study found that contracts completed by engaged employees had significantly higher levels of customer loyalty than contracts completed by less engaged employees. Furthermore, it highlights the importance of prioritizing employee engagement initiatives to not only improve eNPS scores but also enhance overall business performance.

ENPS indicates success-engaged employees' likelihood to promote their organization (Akingbola et al., 2022). Speaking with employees can help employers gain more profound and richer insights into employee engagement (Rayton et al., 2012). They can do this by encouraging them to share their concerns about themselves and others, learn about their perspectives at pivotal points in their careers, and more (Akingbola et al., 2022; Rayton et al., 2012). Based on the above literature, employee engagement behaviors are expected to enhance the impact of eNPS. Therefore, the following hypothesis was investigated in this research:

Hypothesis 6: Employee engagement has a positive relationship with eNPS.

2.8.7 Effect of Employee Engagement and PWOM

The most distinctive way satisfied employees show loyalty and respect for their organization is through PWOM (Van Hoye et al., 2016). According to Y. Lee (2022), social exchange, such as PWOM, directly affects employee engagement and communicative behavior. Bajaj et al. (2022) stated that when employees are encouraged to spread the word about the company, their engagement levels increase, and they feel more a part of the team, further enhancing productivity and retention. Also, the selected audience can more easily rely on the information employees share, as they are believed to know the organization's workings (Bajaj et al., 2022). The most recent research used employee advocacy as an alternative to PWOM (Ahmad et al., 2022; Sweeney et al., 2020). Men et al. (2020) defined employee advocacy as promoting a company through actions such as PWOM. A previous study suggested that employee engagement influences employees' advocacy and PWOM behavior (M. Kang & Sung, 2017). Y. Lee (2022) elaborated that employees' personal resource investment, commitment, and engagement can influence employees' advocacy and PWOM behaviors. Additionally, Y. Lee (2022) examined the impact of employee engagement on employee advocacy and PWOM and found positive and significant influences of engagement on these factors. As a result, Y. Lee (2022) found that highly engaged workers make an extra effort to promote their companies outside the company.

Previous research considered PWOM as advocacy and found that this employee advocacy supported organizations in recruiting highly qualified employees (Cervellon & Lirio, 2017; Collins & Stevens, 2002; Wilden et al., 2010). Also, in the study, the participants noted that PWOM influences employee retention and engagement (Collins & Stevens, 2002). These findings support earlier studies demonstrating that employee advocacy via PWOM increases the

likelihood of organizations retaining their employees (Y. Lee, 2022) and increasing employee engagement. An additional study found that employees felt more engaged and optimistic about their company after sharing work-related information (M. Kang & Sung, 2017; Y. Lee, 2022). Therefore, based on the literature cited above, it is expected that employee engagement's direct influence on PWOM could improve organizations' retention and employee loyalty through effective employee engagement strategies. Therefore, the following hypothesis was investigated in this research:

Hypothesis 7: Employee engagement has a positive relationship with PWOM.

2.8.8 Moderating Role of Managerial Trustworthiness between Job Satisfaction and Employee Engagement

Managerial trustworthiness may reduce the risk of that adverse incident diminishing interpersonal trust. Trusting managers showed greater employee engagement (Mölders et al., 2019). Trust is described as the willingness of a trustor to be vulnerable to the actions of a trustee (Mayer et al., 1995; Mölders et al., 2019). Trust has cognitive and affective components (Cui & Jiao, 2019; Kim & Kim, 2020; McAllister, 1995; Newman et al., 2014; Yuan et al., 2020) and can lead employees to voluntarily give management control over them (Caldwell & Hayes, 2007; Gullett et al., 2009).

Employee engagement involves a particular person's satisfaction with the eagerness for work (J. K. Harter et al., 2002; Y. Lee, 2022; Suardi et al., 2022). Managers who work with integrity and benevolence may give rise to the perception of justice and help employees cope with complex and challenging times in their organizational lives (Cui & Jiao, 2019). Also, when employees demonstrate a higher level of engagement in return if managers are sincere and support their employees (Bajaj et al., 2022; Colquitt & Rodell, 2011; Y. Lee, 2022). Gaining an

employee's trust is necessary for effective leadership (M. N. Islam et al., 2021; Men et al., 2020). Recent research showed that employee engagement positively correlated with employees' trust in their leaders (M. N. Islam et al., 2021). Some researchers have proposed that leaders' trustworthiness results from their interactions with employees and can lead to employee engagement (Colquitt & Rodell, 2011; Håvold et al., 2020; Whitener et al., 1998).

Overall, when managerial trustworthiness is high, the relationship between job satisfaction and employee engagement is stronger. Based on this literature, the level of trust employees have in their manager is expected to influence job satisfaction and the employee's level of engagement. Therefore, the following hypothesis was investigated in this research:

Hypothesis 8: Managerial trustworthiness will moderate the relationship between job satisfaction and employee engagement such that there will be a strong positive relation when managerial trustworthiness is high but a weak positive relation when managerial trustworthiness is low. A model was constructed of these hypotheses, and the research framework developed in this study is shown in Figure 2.1.

Figure 2.2

Theoretical Model



2.9 Summary

The following chapter discusses the sampling and research approach, methodology, and instruments for testing the conceptual model presented in this section.

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

Chapter three is divided into ten sections, identifying the methodological choices used to test the hypothesized relationships in this study. The first section provides an overview of the expected research design. The second section discusses data collection, including data sample, data analysis method selection, and sample size requirements. The third section discusses the survey design used. The fourth section explains informed consent and screening. The fifth section discusses BOT Checks, Instructional Manipulation Checks (IMCs), and attention checks. The sixth section explains the instrumentation measures used, details how the constructs were operationalized, and summarizes the items adapted for the questionnaire. The seventh section discusses control variance. The eighth section discusses the common method variance associated with this approach and the applicable remedies. Lastly, the ninth section is the summary.

3.1 Research Design

The intended study utilized a cross-sectional quantitative survey design as its chosen methodological framework. This design employed online techniques to gather self-reported data from participants, which was subsequently utilized to evaluate three antecedent variables (job satisfaction, managerial trustworthiness, and employee engagement) and three outcome variables (employee loyalty, eNPS, and PWOM). Furthermore, the study explored the potential moderating impact of managerial trustworthiness. Given the inherently subjective nature of these constructs, surveys have become a commonly employed empirical method for probing into employee loyalty (Matzler & Renzl, 2006), aligning with recommendations from the business literature as synthesized in Chapter 2.

3.2 Data Collection

3.2.1 Data Sample Source

Anonymous data was collected from United States respondents who were over 18 vears old from a diverse sample of employees across different industries. It also looked at full-time workers. The data was collected using the online survey platform Qualtrics^{MM}, and prospective participants were recruited anonymously for four weeks in October 2023 through Qualtrics[®]^{XM} online consumer research panel. Other researchers have used Oualtrics^{® XM} effectively for data collection (Belliveau & Yakovenko, 2022; Geldsetzer, 2020; Miller et al., 2020), and online market research panels have been shown to provide satisfactory data quality, particularly when compared with convenience or student samples (Anwyl-Irvine et al., 2021; Chandler et al., 2019; Eyal et al., 2021; Peer et al., 2017, 2022). Participants were enlisted by Qualtrics®^{XM} through an email invitation, and the survey was limited to desktop and laptop computers only due to its extended duration. Each Qualtrics®^{XM} email invitation contained a link to the Qualtrics®^{XM} survey. This link contained a random tracking identification for the participants, which allowed Qualtrics^{® XM} to determine which panel members should receive an incentive. No identifying panelist information was transmitted back to the researcher as part of data acquisition. Only participants who effectively completed the survey received incentives

provided by Qualtrics®^{XM}. The incentive provided adhered to the policies of Qualtrics®^{XM} and was considered appropriate considering the length and level of effort required for the survey. The incentive may include cash, airline miles, gift cards, redeemable points, charitable donations, sweepstakes entrance, and vouchers. Buhrmester et al. (2011) and Marinescu et al. (2021) state that reasonable incentives have not been found to significantly introduce bias into survey results.

The IRB training course on ethics was completed to demonstrate compliance with ethical guidelines, and all necessary approvals for the study were received from the University of Dallas Institutional Review Board (see Appendix A for a copy of the IRB approval letter). All answers were saved on a computer hard drive and in two different cloud-based repositories. The files were password-protected. Any summary findings and/or participation results were compiled before publication. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) exempted the ethical research proposed. Ethical principles were considered before data collection because this study involved human participants.

3.2.2 Data Analysis Method Selection

Business researchers often analyze relationships between latent variables measured by sets of observed variables to understand employee behavior better (Sarstedt & Cheah, 2019). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) is a way to examine latent variable models with multiple constructs and indicators. Partial least squares, also called PLS structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) or PLS path modeling (J. F. Hair et al., 2011; Tenenhaus et al., 2005), is a popular method for estimating these kinds of models (Afthanorhan et al., 2019; Khan et al., 2019). PLS-SME involves structural and measurement models, which has become a popular way to examine these relationships (Hair et al., 2014; Sarstedt & Cheah, 2019). PLS-SEM's model definition includes both the structure model and the measuring models. The structural model shows the internal links between the constructs, while the measuring models show the relationships between each construct and its related indicators (Hair et al., 2014; Sarstedt & Cheah, 2019). In a causal model, one reason to use PLS-SEM is that it greatly increases the explained variance of dependent latent traits. Cassel et al. (1999) found that PLS-SEM works well with data that is not normally distributed, a wide range of sample sizes, and complex models. It is also commonly used when the goals of the study are to find out more (Hair et al., 2011, 2014).

PLS-SEM is a variance-based analysis method with fewer limits on sample size, measurement scales, and residual distributions than covariance-based structural equation modeling (CB-SEM). PLS-SEM does not need data to be normalized as CB-SEM does and can provide reliable analysis even with the smaller sample size estimated for this study. Also, compared to CB-SEM, it can handle more extensive and more complicated models with many constructs and markers (Hair et al., 2014, 2021; Sarstedt & Cheah, 2019), which again fits with the parts of this study.

3.2.3 Sample Size Requirements

Barclay et al. (1995) and Hair et al. (2021) stated that the minimum sample size for PLS-SEM should be ten times the largest number of formative indicators that measure one construct or ten times the largest number of structural paths that lead to a certain latent construct in the structural model. Hair et al. (2021) stated that sample size
calculations should also take into account the power analysis for the part of the model with the most variables. A power analysis using G*Power 3.1.9.7 software (Faul et al., 2009) using a medium effect size of 0.30 and alpha of 0.05 showed that only 82 participants were needed for the study. However, these methods do not explicitly take into account the entire model; instead, they use the most complex regression in the (formative) measurement models and the structural model of a PLS path model as a benchmark for calculating the statistical power (Hair et al., 2021). In this manner, researchers typically strive for a power level of 80%. However, Kock and Hadaya (2018) stated that the resulting minimum sample size may still be insufficient. Kock and Hadaya (2018) addressed these concerns and propose the inverse square root method, which takes into account the possibility that the ratio of a path coefficient and its standard error will be higher than the critical value of a test statistic for a certain significance level. Since the inverse square root method is conservative, it slightly overestimates the sample size required to render an effect significant at a given power level (Hair et al., 2021). Using the inverse square root method (Kock & Hadaya, 2018), with a power level of 80%, significance levels of 5%, and a path coefficient of 0.20, the minimum sample size for this study is 155 participants. While this estimate is the minimum sample size, a larger sample of 250 was targeted for collection.

3.3 Survey Design

This study was a quantitative cross-sectional design among participants within the United States. Since the survey was conducted at a single point in time using a single data source to represent a larger population, special precautions were taken to mitigate the effects of prevalent method bias. Respondents were assured of their anonymity and told there were no right or wrong answers to reduce their desire to generate socially desirable responses (P. M. Podsakoff et al., 2012). P. M. Podsakoff et al. (2003) and P. M. Podsakoff et al. (2012) sequenced all variables so that dependent variables were temporally separated from independent variables, and questionnaire items in each measure were sequenced randomly whenever feasible. Also, each of the instruments used to measure the constructs was made to minimize the effects of priming, survey fatigue, item order, or other context effects (Gliner et al., 2016; Malhotra, 2019; Ward & Meade, 2017). Independent variables in the study were also presented in a randomized order. This approach ensured that any observed effects on the dependent variables were not influenced by the order in which the independent variables were presented. Additionally, randomizing the order of the questionnaire items within each measure helped to minimize any potential bias or order effects in participants' responses (Cooper et al., 2020; Stantcheva, 2022). Please refer to Table 3.1, which shows how the survey questions were arranged.

Table 3.1

Order Number	Instrument
1	Informed consent
2	Screener Variables (3 items)
3	BOT check
4	DV: Employee Loyalty Program (5 items)
5	DV: eNPS (1 item)
6	DV: PWOM (3 items)
7	IV: Job Satisfaction (6 items)
8	IV Employee Engagement (12 items)
9	IV: Managerial Trustworthiness (5 items)
10	Attention Check #1
11	Marker, Control, and Demographic Variables (8 items)

Example of Survey Item Sequencing

Note. DV=Dependent Variable. IV=Independent Variable. eNPS=Employee Net Promotor Score. PWOM=Positive Word of Mouth.

3.4 Informed Consent and Screening

Before being able to complete the survey, potential participants needed to provide informed consent, which ensured that they understood the purpose of the survey, the potential risks and benefits of participation, and their rights as participants. This step was crucial in ensuring ethical standards were met and protecting the privacy and well-being of the participants. In addition, informed consent was obtained from each participant, further emphasizing the importance of their voluntary participation and their ability to withdraw from the survey at any time without consequences. Additionally, participants were provided with contact information for the research team in case they had any questions or concerns throughout the duration of the study. Within the context of informed consent, participants were informed of the general objective of the study, their right to privacy, and that there were no right or wrong answers (P. M. Podsakoff et al., 2003). Participants were not allowed to continue with the survey if their consent was not given or if they could not answer one of the screening questions. Also, the participants had to pass three screener questions focused on whether the individual was 18 years of age or older, living in the United States, and had been working for at least one year before October 2023.

3.5 BOT Checks, Instructional Manipulation Checks, and Attention Checks

This research uses instructional manipulation, attention, and BOT checks to ensure the most complete and accurate survey results possible (Chandler et al., 2019; Goritz et al., 2021; Paolacci et al., 2010; Peer et al., 2017). After respondents responded to the screener questions, a BOT check question was added to avoid using BOTs to populate survey responses if they qualified to continue. After collecting data on three of the constructs in the study, a single attention check was administered to survey participants to ensure they were still engaged and attentive (Fayant et al., 2017; Hauser et al., 2018; Shamon & Berning, 2019, 2020). Participants in the survey were made aware of the use of these tests and passing them was required for them to be included in the final analysis. A respondent's survey session was ended if they failed the initial attention

77

check. Including the BOT check question and attention check played a crucial role in upholding the integrity of the data and guaranteeing that only authentic responses were taken into consideration. Implementing these measures served to minimize potential bias and invalid responses, improving the overall reliability and validity of the study's findings.

3.6 Measurement Instrumentation

What follows in this section is an explanation of the six measures used to test this study's theoretical model. One construct was tested using an 11-point Likert-type scale where respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement on one statement, with 0 indicating "very unlikely" and 10 indicating "very likely." Five constructs were tested using a 5-point Likert-type scale where respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement on various statements, with 1 indicating "strongly disagree" and 5 indicating "strongly agree." A summary of the measurements and scales is presented in Table 3.2. Each individual scale is described below, and all survey items are listed in Appendix B.

3.6.1 Employee Loyalty

Employee loyalty is the person's choice to stay with their current employer, and it can be used to assess the organization's work environment and management effectiveness, which are particularly significant indicators for growing organizations (Oliver, 1997). In this study, employee loyalty reflects the user's perception of their commitment to their employer. This construct included a parameter built based on five questions (Matzler & Renzl, 2006) adapted from Homburg and Stock (2005) and was used to compare to the eNPS since the eNPS is not empirically validated (Sedlak, 2020). The items concerning loyalty were "I speak positively about my company when talking to customers," "I speak positively about my company when talking to friends and relatives," "I can recommend the products and services of my company to others," "I would like to stay with this company also in the future" and "Turn down other jobs with more pay in order to stay with this company." A five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) was used to measure the degree to which the subject subjectively felt the statement of the question. The Cronbach' α coefficient of employee loyalty was 0.895, which is suitable for testing employees.

3.6.2 *ENPS*

ENPS is an employee experience that measures loyalty toward an organization (Andreski et al., 2020; Roberts et al., 2016). Highly satisfied and loyal employees are promoters themselves, and they recommend their company to their friends and family (Rao & Rajasekaran, 2019). This study referred to the studies of Legerstee (2013), Owen (2019), Sedlak (2020), and Yaneva (2018), which used one question to achieve the eNPS: How likely are you to recommend your company as a place to work to your friends and family?" As previously mentioned, the Net Promoter Score created by F. F. Reichheld (2003) allowed employees to rate their organization on an 11-point scale (0–10) and is based on the fundamental perspective that employees can divide into three (3) categories: promoters, passives, and detractors. F. F. Reichheld (2003) developed this score by evaluating correlations between assessment questions and organizational results from over 4,000 assessments (Sedlak, 2020).

3.6.3 PWOM

PWOM is the process of employees communicating information and opinions about the organization within and outside their social networks (Keeling et al., 2013, p. 89). The PWOM scale was measured using six items developed by Goyette et al. (2010), and in this study, PWOM refers to the likelihood that respondents will recommend the company to other people. The Goyette et al. (2010) scale was initially developed for consumers' information sharing related to products and services through the internet, social media, and mobile communication and was modified slightly for this study of the organization context. To apply to organizational studies, "this" was changed to "my company." Job satisfaction asks respondents to express how they personally feel about their jobs by indicating their agreement with phrases such as "I mostly say positive things about my company to other people" and "I am proud to say to others that I am an employee of this company." According to Goyette et al. (2010), PWOM measurement includes recommendations from others. The six items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), and item scores were summed to form an overall PWOM measure of 0.927.

3.6.4 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction reflected overall satisfaction rather than specific aspects of the job situation and applied to various jobs (Homburg & Stock, 2005; Schriesheim & Tsui, 1980). The measurement of job satisfaction has been conducted using a six-item scale derived from Schriesheim and Tsui's work (1980). This scale assesses the level of employee satisfaction in many aspects of their employment, including their present position, current wage, co-workers, promotional possibilities, and supervisors. Example questions include: "How satisfied are you with the nature of the work you perform," "How satisfied are you with the person who supervises you-your organizational superior," and "How satisfied are you with the opportunities which exist in this organization for advancement or promotion." Job satisfaction is scored using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The higher the score, the higher the job satisfaction. Cronbach's alpha coefficient of job satisfaction was 0.906, which is suitable for testing employees.

3.6.5 Employee Engagement

Employee engagement was measured using 4 items for each subscale, which included emotional, cognitive, and behavioral engagement, and the instrument yielded a higher-order factor supported by the three lower-order factors (Shuck et al., 2017). Building on the work of W. A. Kahn (1990), who described workplace engagement as the "harnessing of organization members selves to their work roles: in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, emotionally, and mentally during role performances" (p. 694). To put it differently, engagement employees put a lot of effort into their work because they can relate to it. Engaged employees are thought to bring their whole selves to their jobs because they are cognitively attentive, physically active workers are more likely to give their all to their jobs and are emotionally invested in their workplaces (W. A. Kahn, 1990; Rich et al., 2010).

3.6.5.1 Emotional. Emotion is a subscale of employee engagement using a 4-item scale. The four items appropriate for this study were adapted from Shuck et al. (2017)

and rated on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The emotional engagement (EE) scale asks respondents to indicate how much they agree with statements such as "Working at my current organization has a great deal of personal meaning to me." The coefficient alpha value for this study was 0.914.

3.6.5.2 Cognitive. Cognitive is a subscale of employee engagement using a 4item scale. The four items appropriate for this study were adapted from Shuck et al. (2017) and rated on a five-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The cognitive engagement (CE) scale asks respondents to indicate how much they agree with statements such as "I give my job responsibility a lot of attention." The coefficient alpha value for this study was 0.933.

3.6.5.3 Behavioral. Behavioral engagement is a subscale of employee engagement using a 4-item scale. The four items appropriate for this study were adapted from Shuck et al. (2017) and rated on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The behavioral engagement scale asks respondents to indicate how much they agree with statements such as "I am willing to put in extra effort without being asked." The coefficient alpha value for this study was 0.894.

3.6.6 Managerial Trustworthiness

Managerial trustworthy behavior is actions and interactions performed voluntarily by managers who demonstrate empathy and actively listen to employees' concerns and feedback to foster trust within the organization (Whitener et al., 1998). In this study, managerial trustworthy behavior was based on participants' perceptions of their managers' behavior (Krosgaard et al., 2002). A 5-item scale was developed by K. Yang and Kassekert (2010). Example questions include: "Overall, how good a job do you feel is being done by your immediate supervisor/team leader?" "In my organization, leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce." and "My organization's leaders maintain high standards of honesty and integrity." Participants were asked to rate each item on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Cronbach Alpha of the scale is 0.919.

Table 3.2

Summary of Measurements and Scales

Construct	Indicator Variables	# of Items	Scale	Measurement
Employee Loyalty		5	Loyalty (Matzler & Renzl, 2006)	5 - point Likert-type
Employee Net Promoter Score		1	Promoter F. F. Reichheld (2003)	11 - point Likert-type
Positive Word of Mouth		6	Goyette et al. (2010)	5- point Likert-type
Job satisfaction		6	Overall satisfaction (Schriesheim & Tsui, 1980)	5 - point Likert-type

Construct	Indicator Variables	# of Items	Scale	Measurement
Managerial trustworthiness		5	Trust K. Yang and Kassekert (2010)	5- point Likert-type
Employee ¹ Engagement				
	Emotional	4	Job Engagement (Shuck et al., 2017)	5- point Likert-type
	Cognitive	4	Job Engagement (Shuck et al., 2017)	5- point Likert-type
	Behavioral	4	Job Engagement (Shuck et al., 2017)	5 - point Likert-type

¹Employee engagement is measured through the three indicator variables: emotional, cognitive, and behavioral.

3.7 Control Variables

This study uses control variables for various factors that influence employee loyalty, eNPS, and PWOM. Demographic variables were recorded as dummy variables in order to control their effects on dependent variables. The findings of previous research show that differences in terms of gender significantly affect the perception of employee loyalty, eNPS, and PWOM. The gender variable was coded 1 when the respondent was female and 0 for males. The other is control variables and demographic measures, which include gender, age, education, tenure, work industry, work location (office, remote, hybrid), and employment status which have previously been shown to influence relationships in employee loyalty, eNPS, and PWOM and other acceptance research (S. Das et al., 2021; Fan et al., 2021; R. Jones, 2018; Lynch, 2022; Mittal et al., 2022). In addition, this study used intention to leave, which is expected to have effects on employee loyalty, eNPS, and PWOM (S. Das et al., 2021; Fan et al., 2021; Živković et al., 2021). Table 4.2 provides the descriptive statistics of the variables. Control items are listed in Appendix C.

3.8 Common Method Variance

Common method variance (CMV) is a potential risk in behavior research. Even though there are many possible sources of CMV, method biases are one of the most common causes of measurement error (Ghasemy et al., 2020; P. M. Podsakoff et al., 2003). CMV can occur when data from exogenous and endogenous constructs are collected simultaneously from the same respondent (P. M. Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). When CMV is excessive, common method bias (CMB) may result. In this study, the survey question presentation was randomized to reduce the likelihood of CMV (P. M. Podsakoff et al., 2012). To further reduce the likelihood of CMB, the scale points and anchor labels of scales were modified across constructs in the questionnaire design (P. M. Podsakoff et al., 2003). Although these measures may not have protected the study entirely from CMV, they reduced the likelihood of a significant CMB impact on the study results (Ghasemy et al., 2020; Straub et al., 2004).

3.9 Summary

This chapter reviewed the methods of the study, including research design, data collection (data sample source, data analysis method selection, and sample size requirement), survey design, informed consent and screening, BOT check, instructions manipulation checks and attention checks, measurement instrumentation, and IRB approval. In addition, the likelihood of common method variance and applicable remedies were reviewed. All constructs used existing measures. Measurement items for each construct in the model were based on a 5-point Likert-type scale, except for eNPS (which used a one-point scale). All items were adapted from the current literature to maximize the validity and reliability of the measurement model. With the study design and analysis approach detailed, the following chapter presents the results and findings of the study.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results after analyzing and testing the proposed theoretical model in this study. Through this analysis, the results answer a research question this study sought to answer. The analyses in this chapter reveal that seven hypotheses were supported, and one was not supported for the eight hypotheses proposed in this research. This chapter contains four sections that present these findings. First, the measurement model properties were evaluated. Second, the relationship between the indicators and the constructs within the measurement model was examined. Third, the hypothesized relationships reflected in the structural model were examined. Lastly, the research results were assessed and reported in the fourth section. Data Collection and Cleansing

This study is a quantitative cross-sectional design among participants within the United States. A total of 579 responses were received using a Qualtrics³⁰^{XM} survey link, and of this population, 119 respondents did not provide informed consent and were excluded from the final sample of 460 participants who met the screening parameters outlined in Chapter 3. Of these 460, 51 responses were eliminated based on the failure of a subsequent attention check question, one too short of a survey duration, and seven straight lines, which eliminated them from the data set due to a lack of full engagement. After executing these data cleansing procedures, a total usable sample size of 400 responses remained, indicating a 69% valid response rate, and was used for model assessment and hypothesis testing.

4.1 Study Participants' Characteristics

The study sample was collected through Qualtrics^{MM} online consumer research panel over a four-week period. Participants were enlisted by Qualtrics^{XM} through an email invitation containing a link to the Qualtrics^{XM} survey. Participation was voluntary, but completed responses were eligible for incentives provided by Qualtrics^{XM}.

After all data cleansing steps were completed, the sample contains the responses of 400 participants from industries including health care 13%, retail 11.5%, education 10.5%, general business 7.8%, financial institutions 7.0%, manufacturing 5.5%, construction 5.3%, information technology 5.0%, real estate 4.8%, logistics 4.3%, government 3.5%, grocery 3.3%, hospitality 2.8%, legal 2.8%, automotive 2.3%, insurance 2.3%, arts & entertainment 2.0% and other categories (each with less than 1.0%). For gender, 34.0% of respondents identified as male, 65.0% of respondents identified as female, and 1% of respondents identified as non-binary. The data shows skewness more toward female respondents and will be discussed as a limitation in Chapter 5. Also, it is important to consider the potential impact of gender bias on the results, as the overrepresentation of women in the sample could influence the outcomes and conclusions drawn from the study. In terms of age, 6.5% were aged 18-24, 23.0% were aged 25-34, 28.0% were aged 35-44, 17.5% were aged 45-54, and 25.0% of respondents were aged 55 or older. For ethnicities, most respondents were Caucasian or White, with 74.5% indicating as such, followed by 13.8% of participants identifying as African American or Black, 5.0% as Hispanic, 4.5% as Asian or Pacific Islander, American Indian/Other Native American 1.3%, and other 1.0%. For years of work experience, most participants, 47.5%, had less than one to 5 years, 25.5% with 6 to 10 years, 17.0% with 11 to 20 years, 6.3% with 21 to 30 years, and 3.8% with 31 and greater. For education, most respondents were 32.8% 4-year degree: Bachelor's, 13.2% 2-year degree:

associate degree, 11.5% master's/professional degree, and .8% doctorate. Finally, most respondents' work location was 58.8% in office, 22.0% remote, and 19.3% working hybrid. Table 4.1 depicts the demographic distributions of the valid respondents for this study. Appendix A illustrates the organization's industry description. It provides information on the nature of the organization's activities, products, and services.

Table 4.1

	Gender			Age	
Description	Count	Percent	Description	Count	Percent
Male	136	34.0%	18-24	26	6.5%
Female	260	65.0%	25-34	92	23.0%
Non-binary	4	1.0%	35-44	112	28.0%
			45-54	70	17.5%
			55+	100	25.0%

Industry and Sample Characteristics (n=400)

	Ethnicity			Education	
Description	<u>Count</u>	Percent	Description	<u>Count</u>	Percent
African American or			High school		
Black	55	13.8%	graduate	81	20.2%
American Indian/Other Native			Some college credit but		
American	5	1.3%	no degree	86	21.5%
			2-year		
			degree:		
Asian or Pacific			Associates		
Islander	18	4.5%	degree	53	13.2%
			4-year		
			degree:		
			Bachelor's		
Caucasian or White	298	74.5%	degree	131	32.8%
Hispanic	20	5.0%	Master's	46	11.5%
Other	4	1.0%	Doctorate	3	0.8%

	Work Location			Experience	;
Description	Count	Percent	Description	Count	Percent
In Office	235	58.8%	Less than 1 to 5	190	47.5%
Remote	88	22.0%	6 to 10	102	25.5%
Hybrid	77	19.3%	11 to 20	68	17.0%
-			21 to 30	25	6.3%
			31+	15	3.8%

	Industry Distribution	
Description	Count	Percent
Arts and entertainment	7	1.8%
Construction	21	5.3%
Educational services	39	9.8%
Finance and insurance	33	8.3%
Government/Defense	15	3.8%
Health care	48	12.0%
Hospitality	26	6.5%
Information services	17	4.3%
Manufacturing	26	6.5%
Mining	3	0.8%
Personal service	12	3.0%
Professional business services	72	18.0%
Real estate	9	2.3%
Repair and maintenance	9	2.3%
Retail services	40	10.0%
Transportation and warehousing	22	5.5%

Note. N=400. All percentages add up to 100%.

4.2 Statistical Assumptions and Assessment of Outliers

The descriptive statistics are presented in Table 4.2, which includes the minimum, maximum, statistical mean, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis statistics at both the construct indicator levels and correlation matrix (see Table 4.3) between the variables based on the result of the removal of three items (MT3, PWOM3, and PWOM5) due to Cronbach alpha scores above the maximum threshold of 0.95 (Hair et al., 2021, 2022; Ringle et al., 2023). The

kurtosis for certain cognitive engagement indicators (CE2–CE4) demonstrated leptokurtic characteristics due to the kurtosis being greater than 3, which indicates that the distribution has heavier tails and a flatter peak compared to a normal distribution. This suggests that there may be outliers or extreme values present in the data, impacting the distribution. The study will explore how these characteristics may affect the reliability and validity of the measurements used in this study. The univariate and multivariate data levels were also examined for outliers (Kline, 2016; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Z scores were computed to identify univariate outliers, and any score higher than the absolute value of 2.5 was considered for possible removal. Multivariate outliers were assessed using a Mahalanobis distance test with scores compared to a chi-square distribution to identify any extreme values in the dataset that deviated significantly from the expected pattern.

The Mahalanobis distance takes into account the correlations between variables, providing a robust measure of multivariate outliers. After further consideration and discovering univariate and multivariate outliers in the tests, it was decided to keep all the replies for analysis to avoid biasing the results. This decision was made to ensure that all data points were included and accurately represented the entire dataset in the analysis. Also, given the size of the sample (n = 400), certain outliers are predicted (Malhotra, 2019). Lastly, PLS-SEM is less sensitive to non-normal distributions compared to other methods, such as covariance-based structural equation modeling (CB-SEM). This makes PLS-SEM a suitable choice when data does not follow normal distribution. While it does not assume multivariate normality for the observed variables, its robustness makes it suitable for analyzing data that may not meet strict normality assumptions. Also, PLS-SEM is more tolerant of outliers compared to CB-SEM. According to Hair et al. (2021, 2022), outliers can have a significant impact on the results of statistical analyses, and

92

PLS-SEM's robustness allows for a more accurate interpretation of the data, even in the presence of outliers. This makes it a valuable tool for researchers working with datasets that may contain outliers or non-normal data. Overall, PLS-SEM offers a flexible and robust approach to structural equation modeling, making it a valuable tool for researchers in various disciplines (Hair et al., 2021, 2022).

Table 4.2

Construct	Min	Max	М	SD	K	S	CITC
EL1	1	5	4.277	1.039	2.365	-1.674	0.691
EL2	1	5	3.902	1.207	-0.08	-0.975	0.782
EL3	1	5	4.178	1.091	1.205	-1.376	0.683
EL4	1	5	4.077	1.203	0.959	-1.37	0.752
EL5	1	5	3.507	1.325	-0.886	-0.486	0.592
eNPS	0	10	7.048	3.051	-0.127	-1.005	0.639
PWOM1	1	5	3.91	1.178	0.287	-1.06	0.846
PWOM2	1	5	4.202	0.996	2.714	-1.635	0.771
PWOM4	1	5	3.695	1.289	-0.493	-0.752	0.839
WM6	1	5	4.225	1.032	2.452	-1.641	0.812
JS1	1	5	3.922	0.92	0.697	-0.832	0.727
JS2	1	5	3.703	1.239	-0.261	-0.823	0.678
JS3	1	5	3.87	0.963	0.418	-0.764	0.655
JS4	1	5	3.208	1.204	-0.688	-0.275	0.659
JS5	1	5	3.167	1.28	-0.931	-0.252	0.775
JS6	1	5	3.6	1.138	-0.234	-0.642	0.845
EE1	1	5	3.788	1.176	0.01	-0.878	0.665
EE2	1	5	3.888	1.129	0.363	-1.001	0.715
EE3	1	5	4.088	1.107	1.168	-1.318	0.653
EE4	1	5	4.215	1.048	2.109	-1.55	0.686
CE1	1	5	4.305	0.856	2.53	-1.472	0.749
CE2	1	5	4.42	0.808	3.366	-1.705	0.715
CE3	1	5	4.522	0.7	3.537	-1.663	0.694
CE4	1	5	4.48	0.731	3.993	-1.722	0.652
BE1	1	5	4.168	0.943	1.611	-1.291	0.663
BE2	1	5	4.357	0.886	2.515	-1.588	0.717
BE3	1	5	4.365	0.832	2.241	-1.45	0.663
BE4	1	5	4.162	0.909	1.383	-1.169	0.708

Descriptive Statistics for Construct Indicators (n = 400)

Construct	Min	Max	М	SD	K	S	CITC
MT1	1	5	3.603	1.265	-0.547	-0.671	0.817
MT2	1	5	3.808	1.239	-0.22	-0.872	0.841
MT4	1	5	3.795	1.205	-0.191	-0.856	0.798
MT5	1	5	3.915	1.234	0.101	-1.056	0.828

Note. n = sample size. M = Mean. SD = Standard Deviation. K = Kurtosis. S = Skewness. CITC = Corrected Item-Total Correlation. EL= Employee Loyalty. eNPS = employee Net Promoter score. PWOM = Positive Word of Mouth. JS = Job Satisfaction. EE = Emotional Engagement. CE = Cognitive Engagement. BE = Behavior Engagement. MT = Managerial Trustworthiness. MT3, PWOM3, and PWOM5 were removed to improve reliability and validity.

The correlation matrix (see Table 4.3) was created to show correlations among. All the control variables, intention to leave, age, education, ethnicity, gender, industry, work location, and years of work experience, were not statistically significant except for the correlation between intention to leave and employee loyalty (r = -0.51), intention to leave, and eNPS (r = -0.53), and industry and employee loyalty (r = -0.03). Also, employee loyalty is positively related to positive word of mouth (r = 0.75), employee net promoter score (r = 0.57), job satisfaction (r = 0.64), employee engagement (r = 0.64), and managerial trustworthiness (r = 0.60). Positive word of mouth is positively correlated to employee net promoter score (r = 0.63). Employee net promoter score is positively correlated to job satisfaction (r = 0.65), employee engagement (r = 0.66), and managerial trustworthiness (r = 0.63). Employee net engagement (r = 0.58), and managerial trustworthiness (r = 0.79). Employee engagement (r = 0.76) and managerial trustworthiness (r = 0.79). Employee engagement and managerial trustworthiness (r = 0.79).

Table 4.3

Bivariate Correlations

Construct	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Age	-													
2. Edu.	0.072	-												
3. ET	-0.159	0.002	-											
4. Gender	-0.005	-0.003	0.082	-										
5. IL	-0.096	0.038	-0.004	0.024	-									
6. WL	-0.016	0.071	0.056	0.183	-0.063	-								
7. YE	0.417	-0.019	-0.066	0.025	-0.072	-0.018	-							
8. Ind.	0.007	-0.067	-0.003	0.108	0.085	-0.105	-0.07	-						
9. EL	0.065	0.049	-0.022	0.012	-0.519**	0.073	0.081	-0.034**	-					
10. eNPS	0.033	0.011	-0.007	0.031	0.531**	0.107	0.011	-0.052	0.579*	-				
11. PWOM	0.029	0.054	-0.007	0.046	-0.509	0.122	0.076	-0.084	0.758*	0.629*	-			
12. JS	-0.021	-0.024	0.022	0.012	-0.645	0.058	0.075	-0.113	0.647*	0.659*	0.643*	-		
13. EE	0.110	0.039	-0.031	065	-0.601	0.104	0.164	-0.157	0.649*	0.582*	0.662*	0.769*	-	
14. MT	0.000	0.014	0.021	048	-0.573	0.109	0.053	-0.120	0.605*	0.650*	0.637*	0.792*	0.757*	-

Note. Edu. = Education. ET = Ethnicity. IL= Intention to Leave. WL = Work Location. YE= Years of Experience. Ind. =Industry. EL = Employee Loyalty. eNPS = employee Net Promoter score. PWOM = Positive Word of Mouth. JS = Job Satisfaction. EE = Emotional Engagement. CE = Cognitive Engagement. BE = Behavior Engagement. MT = Managerial Trustworthiness. MT3, PWOM3, and PWOM5 were removed to improve reliability and validity. Correlation is significant at *p < .01 & **p < .05.

4.3 Employee Net Promoter Score (eNPS)

The eNPS was calculated with the employees' responses on a scale of 0-10 divided into three categories: promoters (9-10), passives (7-8), and detractors (0-6). Table 4.4 shows that promoters are highly satisfied and loyal employees who will likely recommend the company to others. Passives are generally satisfied but not as enthusiastic, while detractors are dissatisfied employees who may spread negative word-of-mouth about the company. The eNPS score is calculated by subtracting the percentage of detractors from the percentage of promoters, providing an overall measure of employee satisfaction and loyalty. The employee net promoter score may range from -100 to 100. Good eNPS scores fall between 10 and 30, and excellent scores fall between 50 and 70. If the eNPS score is above 80, it is likely to be among the highest scores in almost any industry (Eletive, 2023; Workleap Officevibe, n.d.). In this study, the overall eNPS score was 36, which indicates that there are more promoters than detractors and that most participants are likely to recommend their company.

Also, Table 4.4 depicts the eNPS of the 400 surveyed participants. Employees over 40 years old had the highest employee net promoter score (64). Females had the highest employee net promoter score (97) when compared to males (63) and others (2). Employees who work in the office had the highest (91). Employees with less than 10 years of work experience had the highest employee promoter score (108). The result also indicates that 32% of participants are unsatisfied with their organization.

Table 4.4

Employee Net Promoter Score Summary

	Detractors	Passive	Promoter	eNPS
Age				
< 40 years	63	39	69	6
>40 years	64	70	93	29
Gender				
Males	37	35	63	26
Females	88	74	97	9
Other	2	0	2	0
Work Location				
Office	81	63	91	10
Remote	29	26	32	3
Hybrid	17	20	39	22
Length of Work Experience				
< 10 years	89	81	108	19
> 10 years	38	28	54	16
Employee net promoter	127 (32%)	111 (28%)	162 (41%)	36

Note. eNPS = Employee Net Promoter Score.

Figure 4.1 shows that 41% (162) of the participants were categorized as promoters, indicating they will likely recommend their company to others by rating 9 and 10. While 28% (111) of participants were passively satisfied, they were not satisfied enough to recommend the company, scoring 8 and 7. Consequently, companies need to establish a relationship with their employees to get to know them better since they play a crucial role in determining the success of an organization. Also, 32% (127) of participants were detractors, scoring 0-6. Based on the scores, improvement steps must be taken to transform 27% of detractors into promoters, as unsatisfied employees (detractors) can damage the company brand through negative word of mouth. The best way for companies to know where they stand regarding employee loyalty is by surveying employees, taking their feedback, and implementing solutions to improve employee loyalty (Rao & Rajasekaran, 2019).

Figure 4.1



Employee Net Promoter Score Graph

Note: Promoters = 9 and 10. Passives = 7 and 8. Detractors = 0-6.

4.4 Measurement Model Assessment

Following the examination of these descriptive statistics, a PLS-SEM analysis was conducted to ascertain the measurement model's validity and reliability. According to Hair et al. (2011), the early analysis involved determining the data quality by utilizing the features of the measurement model. Data were gathered through an initial assessment of the outer model, confirming the validity of the constructs, which is the foundation for the basis of the assessment of the inner model relationships. Reflective and formative measures are included in the study to ensure a comprehensive evaluation of the measurement model. These analyses were performed using confirmatory composite analysis (CCA), Hair et al.'s (2020) recommended approach when using PLS-SEM for analysis. Hair et al. (2020) outline a CCA approach for reflective measurement models that involves analyzing item loadings, composite reliability, average variance extracted (AVE), and discriminant validity. Formative measurement models involve assessing the convergent validity, collinearity, significance, and contribution of indicators. Finally, the Common Method Bias (CMB) was checked using VIF scores (Chin et al., 2013; Iglesias et al., 2019; Kock & Lynn, 2012; Kock, 2015a).

4.4.1 *Indicator Reliability*

The reflective measurement model entails assessing the extent to which each indicator's concept accounts for its variance, indicating its dependability (Hair et al., 2021). To evaluate reliability, SmartPLS was used to determine each item's outer loading score relative to its corresponding latent construct in the model. This method helps researchers ensure that the indicators chosen for each construct accurately reflect the underlying concept being measured. By examining the outer loading scores, researchers can determine if any indicators need to be removed to improve the overall reliability of the measurement model if the loading score is equal

99

to or above 0.708 (Hair et al., 2020, 2021; Ringle et al., 2023). For this study, the factor loadings of all the items in the model have a value greater than the minimum acceptable value of 0.708 (Hair et al., 2020, 2021; Ringle et al., 2023). The outcome analysis indicates no indicator reliability issue and suggests that the measurements for all constructs are reliable (see Table 4.6).

4.4.2 Internal Consistency Reliability for Reflective Constructs

The reflective measurement model assessment process assesses internal consistency reliability. Reliability for internal consistency measures how closely indicators of the same construct are related to one another. To determine how well a set of items measures the same construct, internal consistency reliability was evaluated based on how well the items vary from one another or intercorrelate. According to Hair et al. (2020) and MacKenzie et al. (2011), a high degree of internal consistency reliability allows the researcher to interpret the composite score as a measure of the construct, and that composite reliability is generally interpreted in the same way as Cronbach's alpha (Hair et al., 2021, 2022; Ringle et al., 2023). The scores for the reflective constructs are provided in Table 4.5. The overall Cronbach's alpha and the composite reliability scores were above the suggested level of 0.700 but below the highest level of .95 (Hair et al., 2021, 2022; Ringle et al., 2023). The only indicators that were not included in the analysis were MT3, PWOM3, and PWOM5, which had a high level of reliability for internal consistency (see Table 4.4). These indicators exhibited extremely high Cronbach alpha scores, exceeding the recommended level of 0.95, indicating a potential issue with item redundancy or overlapping content. Therefore, their exclusion from the analysis was necessary to ensure the accuracy and validity of the results. Removing these indicators suggests that the measurements for all constructs are reliable and can be trusted for further analysis.

4.4.3 Convergent Validity for Reflective Constructs

The convergent validity of each construct. Convergent validity refers to the extent to which several indicators or measurements of a certain concept are strongly associated with one another. It helps in assessing if the indicators are capturing the same construct. Analyze the relationships between the indicators and determine whether they regularly exhibit high levels of statistical significance. Furthermore, the assessment of convergent validity may be conducted using factor analysis to see if the indications load into a single factor (see Table 4.5). The test involved computing the average variance extracted (AVE) for each indicator, which measures the amount of variance captured by the underlying construct. A higher AVE indicates adequate convergent validity. The assessment also included examining the indicators' composite reliability (CR), which measures the internal consistency of the construct. A higher CR value suggests greater reliability and convergent validity (e.g., Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Henseler et al., 2016; Mallin & Munoz, 2013). Each construct had AVE scores equal to or greater than the 0.50 threshold (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988; Hair et al., 2021). The scores for each reflective first-order construct have been determined to have adequate convergent validity for this study. Refer to Appendix B, which shows each scale item and its corresponding score.

Table 4.5

Results Summary for Reflective Measurements

			Convergent	Validity	Internal Consistency Reliability			
Latent Variable	Indicators ^a							
		Loadings	Indicator Reliability	t Statistic ^b	AVE	CA	Reliability _{pa}	$CR_{ ho c}$
Behavioral Engagement	BE1	0.925	0.856	32.603	0.752	0.890	0.894	0.924
	BE2	0.936	0.876	46.589				
	BE3	0.927	0.860	38.095				
	BE4	0.936	0.877	52.929				
Cognitive Engagement	CE1	0.951	0.904	73.332	0.817	0.925	0.933	0.947
	CE2	0.972	0.945	122.611				
	CE3	0.937	0.878	46.024				
	CE4	0.942	0.887	27.583				
Emotional Engagement	EE1	0.951	0.905	80.050	0.788	0.910	0.914	0.937
	EE2	0.956	0.914	94.353				
	EE3	0.937	0.878	52.533				
	EE4	0.923	0.852	40.019				

Latent Variable	Indicators ^a	Loadings	Indicator Reliability	t Statistic ^b	AVE	CA	Reliability _{pa}	$CR_{\rho c}$
Employee Loyalty	EL1	0.883	0.780	24.720	0.663	0.873	0.895	0.907
	EL2	0.941	0.886	71.769				
	EL3	0.888	0.788	26.571				
	EL4	0.931	0.867	47.546				
	EL5	0.861	0.742	23.078				
Job Satisfaction	JS1	0.906	0.821	41.338	0.663	0.897	0.906	0.922
	JS2	0.888	0.789	35.586				
	JS3	0.872	0.761	29.354				
	JS4	0.868	0.753	27.386				
	JS5	0.920	0.846	56.776				
	JS6	0.951	0.905	106.680				
Managerial Trustworthiness	MT1	0.944	0.892	59.534	0.798	0.916	0.919	0.940
	MT2	0.943	0.889	67.181				
	MT4	0.942	0.887	56.737				
	MT5	0.951	0.904	69.218				
Positive Word of Mouth	PWOM1	0.955	0.912	79.009	0.816	0.925	0.927	0.946
	PWOM2	0.950	0.903	72.871				
	PWOM4	0.943	0.890	64.715				
	PWOM6	0.952	0.907	79.252				

Notes: N= 400. AVE = Average variance extracted. CA = Cronbach's Alpha. CR = Composite Reliability. ^aMT3, PWOM3, and PWOM5 were removed to improve reliability and validity. ^bThe *p* value for each indicator was < .001. The eNPS indicator is not included in the table because it is a single measure.

4.4.4 Discriminant Validity for Reflective Construct

Next, the discrimination's validity is assessed by examining the evidence and data collected. Discriminant validity refers to how much a construct differs from other constructs according to empirical standards (Hair et al., 2020; Ringle et al., 2023; Roemer et al., 2021). Discriminant validity is important for concept validation as it confirms that the measure is distinct and separate from other measures based on empirical evidence. It assesses whether a latent variable is distinct from the indicators used to measure other latent variables (Hair, Babin, et al., 2019; Hair, Howard, et al., 2020; Ringle et al., 2023).

Recently, Hair et al. (2022) and Roemer et al. (2021) added to the heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT) criteria a statistical measure used to check discriminant validity in partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). The HTMT is a consistent estimation for the inter-construct correlation in the congeneric measurement models, and it involves correlations among positive observable variables (Hair et al., 2022; Roemer et al., 2021). Also, the HTMT considers both the shared variance and the heterotrait-monotrait ratio of correlations, allowing researchers to make more reliable judgments about discriminant validity. However, Ringle et al. (2023) stated that the results of both criteria would not significantly differ in typical applications; negative correlation patterns between variables might. HTMT+ addresses this issue by providing a more accurate measure of discriminant validity. It considers the potential presence of negative correlations and adjusts the threshold for assessing discriminant validity accordingly (Ringle et al., 2023). The HTMT+ criterion addresses the limitations of the original HTMT criterion by providing a more accurate evaluation of the distinctiveness between constructs (Ringle et al., 2023; Roemer et al., 2021). This enhancement ensures that researchers can draw more reliable conclusions about the distinctiveness of their constructs when using HTMT+ as compared to the

original HTMT criterion. Researchers are suggested to use the adjustment of the HTMT criterion (i.e., HTMT+) to evaluate discriminant validity (Ringle et al., 2023).

This study used heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT+) test criteria to determine discriminant validity. The HTMT+ statistics assess the discriminant validity of latent constructs or the degree to which one measure does not correlate with another whose underlying construct is unrelated. By evaluating the correlation between latent variables, HTMT+ provides researchers with a quantitative measure of discriminant validity by comparing the strength of relationships between different constructs within a model (Ringle et al., 2023). These statistics help researchers determine if their measurement model adequately captures the unique characteristics of each construct, ensuring that they are not measuring the same underlying concept multiple times (Roemer et al., 2021). The test result shows that HTMT+ ratio statistics for each reflective construct is less than or equal to .90 (Hair et al., 2020; Henseler et al., 2015; Ringle et al., 2023; Roemer et al., 2021). Since HTMT+ ratios were below the .90 cutoffs, the measurement model remained unchanged, and discriminant validity was not an issue in the model. All the HTMT ratios are summarized in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6

	BE	CE	EL	EE	IS	MT	PWOM	eNPS
BE	-	01	22	22			1 ,; 0101	
	-							
CE	0.750	-						
EL	0.372	0.364	-					
EE	0.587	0.540	0.708	-				
JS	0.468	0.487	0.710	0.840	-			
MT	0.496	0.449	0.656	0.824	0.869	-		
PWOM	0.422	0.401	0.836	0.719	0.701	0.690	-	
eNPS	0.349	0.338	0.603	0.607	0.694	0.677	0.651	-

Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT+)

Note. N=400. EL = Employee Loyalty. eNPS = employee Net Promoter score. PWOM = Positive Word of Mouth. JS = Job Satisfaction. EE = Emotional Engagement. CE = Cognitive Engagement. BE = Behavior Engagement. MT = Managerial Trustworthiness.

4.4.5 Assessment of Common Method Bias for Reflective Construct

A common method bias may arise in research where a model's independent and dependent variables are measured with the same instrument. It was necessary to assess whether common method bias existed and, if so, to correct it since this study collected all data for all constructs using a single instrument at a single point in time. This study used the variance inflation factor (VIF) to assess the presence of common method bias. According to Hair et al. (2021) and Kock (2015a), a model can be considered free of common method bias when all VIFs in the inner model resulting from a full collinearity test are equal to or lower than 3.3. The study used a random dependent variable to look at the effects of all the other variables added together and show that the shared variance was explained by a result that was not related to the other variables, not one that might have been related. Conducting this test is to avoid attributing shared method variance to what might share trait variance (Kock & Lynn, 2012; Kock, 2015a; Ringle et al., 2023). To conduct this test, a theoretically unrelated construct was added to the model as an exogenous variable (a single-indicator LV) that was connected to every other construct in the model. A new variable with random values was then constructed. Since every VIF ranges from 1.037 - 3.004, which is less than 3.3, it can be concluded that this study does not face common technique bias; therefore, there was no need to do any more data modifications.

4.4.6 Construct Validity of Formative Indicators

The composite reliability of the first-order reflective variables looks at the latent variables that are internally correlated. However, this method does not evaluate formative constructs well (Diamantopoulos & Winklhofer, 2001; Petter et al., 2007; Straub et al., 2004). In contrast to reflective indicators, formative indicators do not result from a latent variable but help the latent

variable form. Therefore, different techniques, such as VIF, should be used to evaluate the reliability of formative constructs (Hair et al., 2020; Ringle et al., 2023). A latent variable comprising uncorrelated measures has a zero, positive, or negative correlation with each outer loading, composite reliability, or the square root of AVE. If that is the case, the formative indicators do not capture the underlying construct well. So, researchers need to use collinearity diagnostics and significance tests for individual indicators to check the validity of formative constructs. Collinearity diagnostics can also be used to determine whether there is a high level of multicollinearity among the formative indicators, which may impact the construct's reliability. Thus, formatively measured constructs examine the significance and relevance of indicator weights, convergent validity, and collinearity (Hair et al., 2020; Sarstedt et al., 2019). Repeated indicators were used in this study (Hair et al., 2020; Hair et al., 2019; P. B. Lowry & Gaskin, 2014; Wold, 1982), which involves using multiple indicators to measure each construct, which helps to increase the reliability and validity of the measurement before doing hypothesis testing. Additionally, this approach allows for examining the consistency and stability of the construct across different indicators, providing a more comprehensive understanding of its underlying dimensions. As a result, the range of VIFs is 1.037–3.004, which is below the threshold of 3.3 (Ringle et al., 2023) and has bootstrapped statistical significance at the α =.05 level. Table 4.7 shows the results.

4.4.7 Statistical Significance and Relevance

Employee engagement was the higher-order construct in the study, based on three lowerorder constructs: behavioral engagement, cognitive engagement, and emotional engagement. In this study, in order to evaluate employee engagement as a higher-order construct, a two-stage approach was used to minimize the parameter bias in the structural mode relationships by using

107

reflective as lower-order constructs to produce the higher-order construct (Becker et al., 2023; Sarstedt et al., 2019). The analysis was conducted utilizing the bootstrapping technique and settings using PLS-SEM, following the guidelines of Hair et al. (2011, 2022). The survey data comprised 400 cases, which were obtained and analyzed by selecting 5,000 random subsamples. A large number of estimates for each model parameter were obtained by estimating the model for each subsample. This allowed for a comprehensive analysis of the variability in the model parameters across different subsamples. A second-order formative (higher-order) construct of employee engagement was included in these estimates as outer weights. It is essential that the indicators for formative constructs are approximately equal and that the t-statistics for the indicators are significant (Hair et al., 2020; Ringle et al., 2012). As shown in Table 4.7, the outer weight for emotional engagement is significant. While the outer weights for cognitive and behavioral engagements are not significant, since the outer loading is greater than 0.5, according to Hair (2022), both cognitive and behavioral indicators, still play a role in influencing the overall engagement level despite their insignificance. The results suggest that emotional engagement impacts overall engagement more than cognitive and behavioral engagement, which indicates an acceptable relationship between the formative indicators and constructs (Hair et al., 2021; Ringle et al., 2023).

4.4.8 Collinearity Assessment

Cho and Choi (2020) stated that multicollinearity puts formative indicators at higher risk than reflective indicators. Formative indicators are variables that their indicators influence, which implies that the indicators are what cause the construct. On the other hand, reflective indicators are variables that reflect or measure the construct (Purwanto, 2021). Therefore, multicollinearity can have a more detrimental effect on formative indicators, as it may lead to distorted relationships and unreliable results (Assaker & O'Connor, 2023; Hair et al., 2021; Purwanto,

2021). This is because multicollinearity can cause high correlations among the indicators of a formative construct, making it difficult to determine the unique contribution of each indicator to the construct. Additionally, multicollinearity can lead to inflated standard errors and unstable parameter estimates for formative indicators, further compromising the validity and interpretability of the results. A regression analysis must be conducted to assess multicollinearity among the indicators and to confirm formative construct validity (Assaker & O'Connor, 2023). This study used outer weights, outer loadings, and variance inflation factors (VIFs) to establish higher-order construct validity (Hair et al., 2022; Ringle et al., 2023). The assessment results of the lower-order constructs found all three items were below the 5.0 threshold (Kock & Gaskins, 2014; Kock, 2015b; Ringle et al., 2023; Sarstedt et al., 2019). The assessment results confirmed that for each of the formative indicators shown in Table 4.7, all criteria were met, and the higher-order construct validity was established, indicating that employee engagement is a valid formative factor and can be used to move forward.

Table 4.7

Construct	Formative Indicator	Outer Weights	Outer Loadings	t Statistic	95% Bca Confidence Interval	Outer VIF
Employee Engagement	BE	-0.002	0.558	0.043	[-0.099, 0.097]	2.054
	CE	0.073	0.554	1.327	[-0.036, 0.180]	1.972
	EE	0.962	0.998	33.159*	[0.901, 1.016]	1.465

Results Summary for Formative Measurements

Note: EE = Emotional Engagement. CE = Cognitive Engagement. BE = Behavior Engagement. *p < .001

4.5 Structural Model Assessment

The predictive ability of the structural model's capabilities must be validated, just like the measurement model. Validation of the measurement model makes certain that the observed
variables accurately reflect the underlying constructs being measured. The validation of the structural model ensures that the relationships between these constructs align with theoretical expectations and offer accurate predictions. Therefore, coefficients of determination (R^2 , or explained variance), predictive relevance (Q^2 , or external validity), effect sizes (f^2 and q^2), and the statistical significance of the path coefficients are the primary metrics related to the structural model. Since a moderator is a part of this model, the effects of each were also examined.

4.5.1 *Overall Model Predictive Power* (*R*²)

It is necessary to assess the model's predictive power following the validation of the path model fit. This study used bootstrapping to see how well the model could explain differences in the dependent values (Chin, 1998; Parady et al., 2021) of employee loyalty, employee net promoter score, and positive word of mouth by having a high R^2 and significant structural paths. The R^2 value shows the variance in the endogenous construct explained by the exogenous constructs and provides an overall measure of the model's predictive power (Chin, 1998; Hair et al., 2019, 2020, 2022; Rigdon, 2012; Sarstedt et al., 2019). Furthermore, significant structural paths indicate that the model effectively captures the relationships between the exogenous and endogenous constructs, further enhancing its ability to explain differences in the dependent values. For studies involving marketing, an R^2 value of .75, .50, and .25, respectively, is interpreted to be substantial, moderate, or weak (Hair et al., 2011; Henseler et al., 2009). Given these thresholds, the R^2 value (see Table 4.8) of EL (0.483), PWOM (0.487), eNPS (0.462), and employee engagement (0.655) were evaluated as being moderate in predictive power and are statistically significant.

Table 4.8

Predictive	Power	of the	Model
		./	

Endogenous Construct	R^2	R^2 adjusted	t statistic	p values
EL	0.483	0.479	7.514*	0.000
PWOM	0.487	0.483	7.072*	0.000
eNPS	0.462	0.458	8.572*	0.000
Employee Engagement	0.655	0.653	6.703*	0.000

Note. EL = Employee Loyalty. eNPS = employee Net Promoter score. PWOM = Positive Word of Mouth. * Correlation is significant at p < .001

4.5.2 *Effect* Size (f^2)

Evaluating the effect size resulting from removing a construct from the predictive model relationship is crucial, especially since the R^2 value has been determined to have significant predictive power. The increase in R^2 in relation to the percentage of variance left unexplained in the endogenous latent variable was used to calculate the effect size. Effect size is another measure of a model's predictive ability or explanatory power, providing a more comprehensive understanding of the relationship between the predictor and the outcome variables. According to Hair et al. (2020), effect size is determined by methodically eliminating predictor variables from the model and comparing the difference in R^2 that represents effect size, or f^2 , with the change in R^2 that represents each independent construct's predictive ability. The significance of this assessment (see Table 4.9) was evaluated by comparing the effect size results against the f^2 guidelines of small (.02-.15), medium (.15-.35), and large (.35 and above), with effect sizes less than .02 being considered to have no effect at all (Hair et al., 2020). Given these guidelines, El > PWOM (.410) was assessed as having a larger effect. Meanwhile, JS > Employee Engagement (.227) and JS > eNPS (.200) were assessed as having medium and significant effects. In addition, Engagement > EL (0.105), Employee Engagement > PWOM (.133), JS > EL (.105), JS > PWOM (.084), employee engagement > eNPS (.133), and the direct effect of EL > eNPS (.055)

were all assessed as having a small and significant effect. Lastly, the moderating effect of MT x

JS > Employee Engagement (.014) was assessed as having a negligible effect but being

significant in the study.

Table 4.9

Predictor Relationships	f^2	t statistics	p values	95% Confidence Intervals
Employee Engagement -> EL	0.105	6.385	0.000*	[0.260, 0.487]
Employee Engagement -> PWOM	0.133	6.510	0.000*	[0.289, 0.536]
Employee Engagement -> eNPS	0.025	2.818	0.005*	[0.062, 0.311]
JS -> EL	0.103	6.088	0.000*	[0.245, 0.477]
JS -> Employee Engagement	0.227	8.714	0.000*	[0.357, 0.562]
JS -> PWOM	0.084	5.334	0.000*	[0.203, 0.440]
JS -> eNPS	0.200	9.020	0.000*	[0.407, 0.629]
MT x JS -> Employee Engagement	0.014	2.114	0.035*	[-0.125, -0.001]
MT -> Employee Engagement	0.115	6.250	0.000**	[0.240, 0.461]
EL -> PWOM	0.410	6.000	0.000**	[0.349, 0.695]
EL -> eNPS	0.055	3.542	0.000**	[0.117, 0.373]

Effect Size (f^2) *of the Predictor Variables*

Note. EL = Employee Loyalty. eNPS = employee Net Promoter score. PWOM = Positive Word of Mouth. EE = Employee Engagement. MT = Managerial Trustworthiness. MT -> Employee Engagement, EL -> PWOM, and EL -> eNPS are post hoc analyses. Statistical Significance: *p < .001; ** p < .05

4.5.3 Assessment of Predictive Relevance (Q^2)

Evaluating the predictive relevance (external validity) is essential after determining the effect size (f^2) on the R^2 value to assess the predictive power of the proposed model in this study using Stone-Geisser's Q^2 value (Geisser, 1975; Stone, 1974). Stone-Geisser's Q^2 value measures the model's ability to predict the outcomes of new observations. It also provides additional insight into the findings' generalizability and helps evaluate the model's overall performance. The Q^2 value was calculated using a blindfolding technique where the model is applied iteratively to several training sets of data, with a value being calculated for endogenous constructs in the model (Hair et al., 2020). When evaluating Q^2 values, values larger than zero are meaningful,

with values between 0 and .24 indicating weak predictive relevance, values between .25 and .50 indicating moderate predictive relevance, and values above .50 indicating strong degree of predictive relevance (Hair et al., 2020). Employee engagement had a Q^2 value (see Table 4.11) of .642, which is a strong degree of predictive relevance. Whereas employee loyalty had a Q^2 value of .429, eNPS had a Q^2 of .448, and PWOM had a Q^2 of .439, all three indicate a moderate level of predictive relevance, and the study results demonstrated Q^2 values that support the model's acceptable predictive relevance.

Table 4.10

Predictive Relevance of Endogenous Constructs

Endogenous Construct	Q^2 predict
EL	0.429
PWOM	0.439
eNPS	0.448
Employee Engagement	0.642

Note. EL = Employee Loyalty. eNPS = employee Net Promoter score. PWOM = Positive Word of Mouth.

4.5.4 *Effect size* (q^2)

Considering the above-discussed moderate and strong degree of predictive relevance (Q^2) findings, the q^2 effect size was used to evaluate the relative impact of the predictive relevance on the overall model performance. The evaluation's significance was established by comparing the effect size findings with the q^2 standards of .35, .15, and .02, which indicate a small, medium, or large degree of predictive relevance, and any q^2 below .02 is deemed negligible (Chin, 1998; Hair et al., 2021; Henseler et al., 2009). This evaluation allows researchers to understand the relative impact of predictive relevance on the model's effectiveness. The q_2 results displayed in Table 4.14 identified a direct effect of job satisfaction > employee engagement (0.212) and the predictive relevance of the moderating effect of job satisfaction > employee engagement (0.154), which was identified as having a medium predictive relevance. While the direct effect of job satisfaction > employee loyalty (.021), job satisfaction > employee net promotor score (0.042), the direct effect of employee engagement > employee loyalty (0.043), a direct effect of employee engagement > employee net promotor score (0.031), and direct effect of employee engagement > positive word of mouth (0.050) was identified as having a small predictive relevance. Lastly, the direct managerial trustworthiness > employee engagement (0.000), the direct effect of job satisfaction > positive word of mouth (0.005), the direct effect of El > PWOM (0.007), and the direct effect of EL > eNPS (0.000) were assessed as being negligible.

4.5.5 Testing for Out-of-Sample Prediction

The methods used to measure predictive ability (R^2 , f^2 , Q^2 , and q^2) are more useful in evaluating predictive power based on in-sample data (Hair et al., 2020). Shmueli et al. (2019) suggested utilizing the PLSpredict using the Cross-Validated Predictive Ability Test (CVPAT) to address this issue and further evaluate the predictive power of models on out-of-sample data. The method was 10-fold predictive cross-validation 10 times. This means that, for this study, 400 observations were split into 10 subsets, which is the number of repetitions with 40 observations per subset (Hair et al., 2022). The purpose of using 10-fold predictive cross-validation was to evaluate the performance and generalizability of the predictive model on endogenous constructs. Repeating the process 10 times ensured that each observation had an equal chance of being in the test set and helped to minimize any potential bias in the results (Hair et al., 2022).

The indicator average (IA) is calculated by comparing the predicted values from the model to the actual values in the test set, and the average loss value of a linear model (LM) forecast is used as a more conservative standard. The average loss value is then compared to the average loss value of a prediction model to see how well the prediction model worked. Researchers can determine if the prediction model outperforms the naïve and more conservative

benchmarks by comparing the average loss values (Sharma et al., 2023). Additionally, it allows researchers to assess whether the prediction model is able to provide more reliable and precise predictions compared to other benchmark models. A negative difference in the average loss values indicates that PLS-SEM's average loss should be lower than the average loss of the benchmarks. The CVPAT assesses if the average loss of PLS-SEM is appreciably less than the average loss of the benchmarks. For the model to be considered more predictive than the prediction benchmarks, the difference in the average loss values must be substantially less than zero (Frömbling et al., 2023; Sharma et al., 2023). Based on Table 4.11, both CVPAT results found that PLS-SEM vs. IA obtained a negative average loss value difference for the overall model. The average loss of PLS-SEM is significantly lower than the average loss of IA for all constructs EL, EE, PWOM, and eNPS, as well as for the overall model because p-values were less than .05. This indicates that the PLS path model has predictive validity (Hair et al., 2020; Sharma et al., 2023; Shmueli et al., 2019). Meanwhile, PLS-SEM vs. LM did not obtain a negative average loss value difference for the overall model. No significant difference exists between the average loss of the PLS-SEM model and the linear model for any of the constructs, EL, EE, PWOM, eNPS, and the overall model; all p-values are greater than 0.05. This means the PLS path model cannot predict anything (Hair et al., 2020; Sharma et al., 2023; Shmueli et al., 2019).

Table 4.11

CVPAT – PLS SEM

	PLS-SEM vs. Indicator Average (IA)			PLS-SEM vs. Linear Model (LM)			
	Average loss	t	n voluo	Average loss	t	р	
	difference	value	<i>p</i> value	difference	value	value	
EL	-0.404	7.397	0.000**	-0.006	0.401	0.689	
EE	-0.346	6.228	0.000**	0.019	0.981	0.327	
PWOM	-0.474	6.994	0.000**	-0.011	0.677	0.499	
eNPS	-4.191	8.321	0.000**	0.039	0.208	0.835	
Overall	-0.703	8.901	0.000**	0.002	0.080	0.936	

Note: EL = Employee Loyalty. eNPS = employee Net Promoter score. PWOM = Positive Word of Mouth. **p < .05

In PLS-SEM, these assessments make predictions inside and outside the sample, which determines the average loss value (Liengaard et al., 2021; Sharma et al., 2023). To further evaluate the model's predictive power, by utilizing the following prediction statistics, the root mean squared error (RMSE) or the mean absolute error (MAE) can be calculated to determine the accuracy of the model's predictions (Hair et al., 2020, 2022; Shmueli et al., 2019). A model is considered to have strong out-of-sample predictive ability if the PLS-SEM model's error values are smaller than the regression model's error values (Hair & Alamer, 2022). This method allows for a direct comparison between the two models and quantitatively measures their predictive performance. By comparing the error values, researchers can determine which model is more accurate in predicting outcomes from unseen data. Assesses the PLS-SEM Q^2 value for all indicators of the measurement model, and the results showed that all Q^2 are greater than zero. Based on Shmueli et al., 2019 guidelines, when all Q^2 is greater than zero, then the prediction errors are highly symmetrically distributed, and the use of RMSE to assess the predictive model in PLS-SEM is less than the linear model (LM). Also, evaluating the PLS-SEM error histogram showed no evidence of high nonsymmetric, meaning no long left or right tail in the distribution

of prediction errors (Hult et al., 2021). Therefore, RMSE is a more appropriate prediction statistic.

RMSE values from the PLS-SEM analysis should be compared to LM values for each indicator. Hair et al. (2022) and Shmueli et al. (2019) identified four outcome comparisons. First, if none of the PLS-SEM prediction error results are lower than LM values, then the model lacks predictive power, which means that the model is not good at predicting the outcome correctly. Second, if a minority of indicators yield lower PLS-SEM prediction errors compared to LM, it may not be reliable for making accurate predictions, which is low predictive power. Third, if the majority of indicators yield lower PLS-SEM prediction errors than the LM, then it has medium predictive power. Fourth, it has high predictive power if all indicators yield lower PLS-SEM prediction errors than the LM. This study evaluates the results to determine whether the indicators are minority, majority, or all, which indicate low, medium, or high predictive power. Minority is less than 50%, majority is 50% and not 100%, and all are 100% of the PLS-SEM is lower than LM, which indicates low predictive power (Hair et al., 2020; Shmueli et al., 2019).

Table 4.12

Construct	Q ² predict	PLS-SEM_RMSE	LM_RMSE	PLS-SEM - LM
EL1	0.145	0.964	0.969	-0.005
EL2	0.424	0.919	0.92	-0.001
EL3	0.191	0.984	0.988	-0.004
EL4	0.366	0.961	0.945	0.016
EL5	0.264	1.14	1.135	0.005
BE	0.199	0.897	0.884	0.013
CE	0.192	0.901	0.898	0.003
EE	0.641	0.601	0.569	0.032
WM1	0.367	0.94	0.935	0.005

Manifest Variable Prediction

Construct	Q^2 predict	PLS-SEM_RMSE	LM_RMSE	PLS-SEM - LM
WM2	0.31	0.829	0.828	0.001
WM4	0.434	0.972	0.956	0.016
WM6	0.334	0.845	0.843	0.002
eNPS	0.448	2.274	2.231	0.043

Note: EL = Employee Loyalty. eNPS = employee Net Promoter score. PWOM = Positive Word of Mouth. The LM_RMSE bold values refer to higher values than PLS-SEM _RMS.

In the previous step, the prediction errors of the latent variable scores were analyzed and found to have low predictive power based on the RMSE statistic. Next, table 4.13 shows that comparing the four endogenous constructs in terms of RMSE values reveals that employee engagement has a better chance of exhibiting higher reliable and predictive abilities than the other constructs (Hair et al., 2022; Shmueli et al., 2019). Employee engagement stands out mainly because of its low prediction error (see Table 4.13). Also, Q^2 shows greater than zero on all endogenous constructs, indicating they have good predictive power at the inner model structural level (Hair et al., 2022).

Table 4.13

Endogenous Constructs Comparison using PLSpredict

Construct	Q ² predict	RMSE	
EL	0.432	0.759	
EE	0.642	0.601	
PWOM	0.443	0.752	
eNPS	0.448	0.748	

Note: EL = Employee Loyalty. eNPS = employee Net Promoter score. PWOM = Positive Word of Mouth.

4.6 Hypothesis Testing

PLS-SEM uses R² values to analyze structural models and evaluates the effect sizes, tvalues, and significance levels of all hypothesized structural path coefficients to determine the model's overall fit (Hair et al., 2020; J. Kang et al., 2015). The standard errors and t-values were estimated using a bootstrapping sampling approach that involved 5,000 samples (Hair et al., 2020). Figure 4.1 displays the path model in its original form, as discussed in Chapter 2. Table 4.14 presents a concise overview of the outcomes of the bootstrapping technique and the corresponding hypothesis testing. Additionally, Figure 4.2 displays the model, illustrating the path coefficients and indicating the results of the hypothesis testing.

Table 4.14

Hypotheses	Structural Path	Path Coefficients β	<i>t</i> value	p values	95% Confidence Intervals	f ² Effect Size	q ² Effect Size	Hypothesis Results
H1	JS -> EL	0.364	6.088	0.000*	[0.245, 0.477]	0.103	0.021	Supported
H2	JS -> eNPS	0.519	9.02	0.000*	[0.407, 0.629]	0.084	0.005	Supported
H3	JS -> PWOM	0.327	5.334	0.000*	[0.203, 0.440]	0.200	0.043	Supported
H4	JS -> EE	0.454	8.528	0.000*	[0.350, 0.558]	0.220	0.212	Supported
H5	EE -> EL	0.368	6.485	0.000*	[0.260, 0.487]	0.105	0.032	Supported
H6	EE -> eNPS	0.182	2.818	0.005*	[0.062, 0.311]	0.025	0.050	Supported
H7	EE -> PWOM	0.411	6.51	0.000*	[0.289, 0.536]	0.133	0.031	Supported
H8	MT x JS -> EE	-0.067	2.114	0.035*	[-0.125, -0.001]	0.014	0.154	Not Supported
Post Hoc Analysis	MT -> EE	0.398	7.216	0.000*	[0.286, 0.502]	0.169	0.000	-
Post Hoc Analysis	EL -> PWOM	0.533	6.000	0.000**	[0.349, 0.695]	0.410	0.007	-
Post Hoc Analysis	EL -> eNPS	0.233	3.542	0.000**	[0.117, 0.373]	0.055	0.000	-

Significance Testing Results of the Structural Path Coefficients

Note: JS = Job Satisfaction. EL = Employee Loyalty. eNPS = employee Net Promoter score. EE = Employee Engagement. MT = Managerial Trustworthiness. PWOM = Positive Word of Mouth. Statistical Significance: *p < .001; **p < .05

Figure 4.2

Structural Model Results (*p < .001; **p < .05)



4.6.1 The Effects of Job Satisfaction on Employee Loyalty, eNPS, PWOM, and Employee Engagement

Job satisfaction had a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty ($\beta = .364$, t = 6.09, p = .000) in support of H1. However, this path relationship only demonstrated a small f^2 effect size (0.130). Job satisfaction had a positive and significant effect on eNPS ($\beta = .519$, t = 9.02, p = .000) in support of H2. This path relationship demonstrated a small f^2 effect size (.084). Job satisfaction had a positive and significant effect on PWOM ($\beta = .327$, t = 5.33, p = .000) in support of H3. This path relationship demonstrated a medium f^2 effect size (0.200). Job satisfaction had a positive and significant effect on employee engagement ($\beta = .454$, t = 8.52, p = .000) in support of H4. This path relationship demonstrated a medium f^2 effect size (0.220). The results are summarized in Table 4.14.

4.6.2 The Effects of Employee Engagement on Employee Loyalty, eNPS, and PWOM

Employee engagement had a positive and significant effect on employee loyalty ($\beta = .368, t = 6.48, p = .000$) in support of H5. However, this path relationship only demonstrated a small f^2 effect size (0.105). Employee engagement had a positive and significant effect on eNPS ($\beta = .182, t = 2.81, p = .005$) in support of H6. This path relationship demonstrated a small f^2 effect size (.025). Employee engagement had a positive and significant effect on PWOM ($\beta = .411, t = 6.51, p = .000$) in support of H7. This path relationship demonstrated a small f^2 effect size (0.133). The results are summarized in Table 4.14.

4.6.3 Moderation Effect of Managerial Trustworthiness

The focus of this interaction test was to determine and explain the significance of a moderating effect of the formative construct. The second-stage calculation method was used to analyze the moderating effect of managerial trustworthiness. This study's moderating effect

results indicate that the H8 p-value is significant but does not support the hypothesis because the relationship between job satisfaction and employee engagement is negative versus a positive relationship when managerial trustworthiness is low. Therefore, H8 is a significant negative relationship, and the magnitude of this effect is relatively small. In other words, the effect of job satisfaction on employee engagement is not determined by the study population's managerial trustworthiness level. Also, both job satisfaction and managerial trustworthiness contribute 65.5% of the variance in employee engagement ($R^2 = 0.655$). The results are summarized in Table 4.14.

4.6.4 Simple Slope Analysis

The simple slope graph is valuable in moderating effect analysis because it visually compares the slopes of two or more regression lines. Moderating variables determine whether the relationship between an independent and dependent variable differs based on their levels of interaction. In this study, managerial trustworthiness is a moderating variable, and job satisfaction and employee engagement are the independent and dependent variables. The moderating impact is measured through the slope of the regression line, as illustrated in Figure 4.3, to examine their levels of interaction. As the interaction effect increases, the slope of the regression line also increases. The upper line represents plus one standard deviation, which represents a higher level of managerial trustworthiness. Also, the upper line has a less steep positive than the other two lines. This means that managerial trustworthiness positively influences job satisfaction and employee engagement. The lower line represents minus one standard deviation, which is the lower level of managerial trustworthiness, and the line is steeper than the other two lines. This indicates that when job satisfaction increases, it will not improve employee engagement, and this will be the case for the average managerial trustworthiness,

123

which is the middle line representing the mean. These findings suggest that managerial trustworthiness does not influence the relationship between job satisfaction and employee engagement. The two parallel line graphs, managerial trustworthiness at plus one standard deviation and managerial trustworthiness at minus one standard deviation, indicate that there is no significant interaction effect of job satisfaction and management trustworthiness on employee engagement. Appendix E illustrates the regression equations.

Figure 4.3

Simple Slope Analysis of the Interaction Effect of Managerial Trustworthiness



Management Trustworthiness x Job Satisfaction

4.6.5 *Post-Hoc Analysis*

After testing the eight hypotheses in this study, additional analyses were conducted to probe further the relationship between managerial trustworthiness and employee engagement, the relationship between employee loyalty and positive word of mouth, and employee loyalty and employee net promotor score as post hoc analyses. The stage one output of the analysis shows

that the two paths in the structural model are significant (p < 0.05). A significant main effect is found for job satisfaction > employee engagement, which is H4 in the model and was discussed in the above section. The direct effect of moderate variable managerial trustworthiness on employee engagement as a post hoc analysis ($\beta = 0.398$, t = 7.216, p = 0.000) with an f^2 effect size (0.169) was determined to be medium and significantly correlated (r = 0.824). These results suggest that employees are more likely to be engaged when they perceive their managers as trustworthy. This finding highlights the importance of building workplace trust to foster employee engagement.

The direct effect of employee loyalty and positive word-of-mouth ($\beta = 0.533$, t = 6.000, p = 0.000) with an f^2 effect size (0.410) was determined to be large and significantly correlated (r = 0.836). This indicates that when employees are loyal and speak positively about their organization, it significantly impacts various aspects of the business, such as employee morale, productivity, and overall company reputation. Additionally, positive word-of-mouth can also attract top talent to the organization. This can lead to increased productivity, improved employee satisfaction, and, ultimately, higher revenue for the organization. Also, the direct effect of employee loyalty and employee net promotor score ($\beta = 0.233$, t = 3.542, p = 0.000) with an f^2 effect size (0.055) was determined to be small and significantly correlated (r = 0.603). This indicates that there is a significant relationship between employee loyalty and their likelihood to recommend the company to others. This suggests that fostering loyalty among employees can positively impact employee satisfaction and loyalty. The results are summarized in Table 4.14.

4.6.6 *Finite Mixture-PLS*

The finite mixture partial least squares approach (FIMIX-PLS) is a statistical method used for modeling complex data structures. It combines the ideas of partial least squares (PLS)

125

regression and finite mixture modeling (Hair et al., 2022; Sarstedt et al., 2022). This way, it can manage situations where the data may come from more than one sample group or latent class. FIMIX-PLS allows for identifying and estimating these latent classes, providing a more comprehensive understanding of the underlying data structure. Additionally, it offers flexibility in analyzing heterogeneous data sets and has a major impact since it can detect heterogeneity and suggest how many segments to take out of the data. Failure to consider heterogeneity can severely threaten the validity of the PLS-SEM results (Becker et al., 2012). It is important to account for heterogeneity in order to ensure accurate and reliable findings in PLS-SEM analysis. Nevertheless, using FIMIX-PLS necessitates a number of decisions that, if made incorrectly, could produce inaccurate findings and conclusions (Sarstedt et al., 2022). To determine the number of segments before computing the FIMIX-PLS, Hair et al. (2021) defined a range of segment solutions to consider in the FIMIX-PLS analysis. When you divide the sample size n (n = 400) by the minimum sample size (n = 89), the largest integer is the theoretical maximum number of segments. In this study, the segments equate to four segments, and the FIMIX-PLS runs from one segment to four segments. Table 4.15 illustrates the criteria values and segment sizes from each analysis of the number of elements.

The selected information criteria for this research are the Akaike information criterion with factor 3 (AIC3) and the consistent Akaike information criterion (CAIC), which are considered to perform well together (Hair et al., 2021). The performance in FIMIX-PLS for AIC3 is known for fair to good performance, which tends to overestimate the number of segments. CAIC is considered to have good performance and tends to underestimate the number of segments, and the summed fit is the total segment of AIC3 and CAIC. Normed entropy statistic (EN) is another information criterion that was used in this research. It is known for

126

accurately estimating the number of segments and providing a balanced performance between AIC3, CAIC, and the summed fit, which Table 4.16 shows all minimum values are in K = 4. If the normed entropy statistic is greater than 0.5, it suggests that the two segments are well separated and that there is limited hidden heterogeneity. In other words, the observed segments are meaningful and capture most of the variation in the data. Based on Table 4.15, the EN value comparing k = 1, 2, 3, and 4. At k = 3, the EN value of 0.821 is the most significant, indicating that k = 3 is the best segment. Research using data from a population that is organized into clusters or strata will demonstrate a lack of variability in the variables being examined within each cluster or stratum (Sarstedt et al., 2022).

This type of research design allows for more accurate and precise conclusions about the population, as it considers the inherent variability within different subgroups (Putri et al., 2021). Additionally, by considering the specific characteristics of each cluster or stratum, researchers can better understand how different factors may influence the variables under investigation (Putri et al., 2021; Sarstedt et al., 2022). The results indicate no hidden heterogeneity, and the grouping was obtained from a probability value for each member in each segment.

Table 4.15

K	AIC3	CAIC	EN	Summed Fit
1	3397.352	3449.241	0.000	6846.593
2	2875.521	2983.290	0.710	5858.811
3	2580.730	2744.380	0.821	5325.110
4	2366.078	2585.609	0.761	4951.687

Fit Indices for a One to Four-Segment Solution

Note: K = Segments. AIC3 = Akaike information criterion with factor 3. CAIC = consistent Akaike information criterion. EN = Normed entropy statistic.

In each component, there is a percentage that is presented in Table 4.16. Also, the number of k = 4, the largest segment size is group 1, which is 0.475, or 47.5% of the total respondents. This means that nearly half of the participants fall into this particular group. Simultaneously, when the smallest segment size is group 4, and it comprises only 0.64% of the total number of respondents, it indicates that this particular segment is relatively small and less represented in the dataset. The FIMIX-PLS results support grouping the data into four groups, and the dataset is heavily skewed toward Group 1, while Group 4 is significantly underrepresented.

Table 4.16

Segment Size Summary

Summed Size	Segment 1	Segment 2	Segment 3	Segment 4	Sum
%	0.475	0.356	0.105	0.064	1.000

4.7 Controls Variable

The final model included control variables to ensure that no outside factors other than experimental manipulation had an impact on the results. In the models, this study uses the intention to leave, age, education, ethnicity, gender, industry, work location, and years of work experience as control variables that influence employee loyalty, employee net promoter score, and positive word of mouth as a direct effect, as displayed in Table 4.17. By controlling these variables, researchers can isolate the effects of the independent variables on the dependent variable, providing a more nuanced understanding of the relationship being studied. This study's results confirm a significant positive relationship between the intention to leave and employee loyalty ($\beta = -0.114$, t = 2.001, p = 0.045). According to these results, the intention to leave has

more than 1.14 to employee loyalty and the inverse relationship, which means that employees are less likely to leave the organization or have the intention to quit their jobs that are loyal to their organization. The f^2 effect size (0.014) had no effect. Also, intention to leave has a significant positive relationship with employee net promoter score ($\beta = -0.156$, t = 3.103, p = 0.002). That means the intention to leave has more than 1.5 to employee engagement and the inverse relationship, which means that employees are less likely to leave the organization or have the intention to quit their jobs, which will promote their organization as a great place to work. The f_2 effect size (0.025) was determined to be small. Lastly, the outcomes of intention to leave have an insignificant relationship with positive word of mouth in this sample ($\beta = -0.097$, t = 1.731, p = 0.080). That means the intention to leave does not significantly impact their likelihood of speaking positively about the organization to others. This suggests that even if employees intend to leave, it may not necessarily affect their willingness to recommend the organization to others. The f_2 effect size (0.009) had no effect.

The next set of control variables, such as age, education, ethnicity, gender, industry, work location, and years of work experience, were identified as the demographics in the sample characteristics discussion (see Table 4.1). None of the control variables were significant except for industry and employee loyalty. This study's results confirm a significant positive relationship between the industry and employee loyalty ($\beta = .066$, t = 2.139, p = 0.033), and the f^2 effect size (0.008) had no effect. The industry was found to significantly influence the outcome, suggesting that different industries may have varying effects on the variables being studied and that employee loyalty towards their organization can greatly affect the study results.

Intention to leave and industry were the only control variables that were significant for certain constructs. This discrepancy in the significance of control variables could be attributed to

the unique influence and impact that intention to leave and industry have on certain constructs compared to others due to individual motivations and priorities. Similarly, industry-specific factors may play a more prominent role in shaping perceptions and behaviors within certain constructs, leading to varying levels of significance across different industries. For example, the importance of sustainability practices may be higher in the fashion industry compared to the automotive industry. In this study, intention to leave and industry play a more prominent role in determining outcomes related to employee loyalty, while factors like age, education, ethnicity, gender, work location, and years of work experience may have a relatively lesser influence on these constructs. However, it is important to note that the relative influence of these factors may vary depending on the specific context and organization.

Table 4.17

Structural Path	Path Coefficients β	t value	f^2 Effect Size	<i>p</i> values	Results
IL -> EL	-0.114	2.001	0.014	0.045**	Significant
IL -> eNPS	-0.156	3.103	0.025	0.002**	Significant
IL -> PWOM	-0.092	1.731	0.009	0.080	Not Significant
Age -> EL	0.021	0.490	0.001	0.624	Not Significant
Age -> eNPS	0.039	0.572	0.002	0.310	Not Significant
Age -> PWOM	-0.019	1.016	0.001	0.567	Not Significant
Education Level -> EL	0.049	1.315	0.005	0.189	Not Significant
Education Level -> eNPS	0.016	1.305	0.000	0.656	Not Significant
Education Level -> PWOM	0.049	0.446	0.005	0.192	Not Significant
Ethnicity -> EL	-0.020	0.634	0.001	0.526	Not Significant
Ethnicity -> eNPS	-0.018	0.399	0.001	0.666	Not Significant
Ethnicity -> PWOM	-0.012	0.432	0.000	0.690	Not Significant
Gender -> EL	0.026	0.758	0.001	0.448	Not Significant
Gender -> eNPS	0.030	1.859	0.002	0.408	Not Significant

Control Variable Results of Direct Effect of the Outcomes

Structural Path	Path Coefficients β	t value	f^2 Effect Size	<i>p</i> values	Results
Gender -> PWOM	0.062	0.828	0.007	0.063	Not Significant
Industry -> EL	0.066	2.139	0.008	0.033**	Significant
Industry -> eNPS	0.034	0.483	0.002	0.385	Not Significant
Industry -> PWOM	0.018	0.869	0.001	0.629	Not Significant
Work Location -> EL	0.012	0.354	0.000	0.723	Not Significant
Work Location -> eNPS	0.053	1.321	0.005	0.141	Not Significant
Work Location -> PWOM	0.046	1.473	0.004	0.187	Not Significant
Years of Experience -> EL	-0.012	0.312	0.000	0.755	Not Significant
Years of Experience -> eNPS	-0.073	0.240	0.008	0.111	Not Significant
Years of Experience -> PWOM	-0.008	1.593	0.000	0.811	Not Significant

Note: IL = Intention to Leave. EL =Employee Loyalty. eNPS = Employee Net Promoter score. PWOM = Positive Word of Mouth. ** p < .05

4.7.1 Path Coefficient Multigroup Analysis

The control variables sample consists of a heterogeneous group of respondents with varying traits and experiences. Although there may be some shared views and observations among respondents, it is impractical to assume they are all the same. On the contrary, people are likely to have different perspectives and assessments (Cheah et al., 2023; Hair et al., 2020; Sarstedt et al., 2019). The multigroup analysis (MGA) functionality within SmartPLS 4 was used to evaluate the variance provided by the control variables and determine their impact on the research model. MGA allows for the comparison of different groups within the sample, providing insights into how these variables may influence the relationships between constructs. The MGA calculations using the default PLS parameters and a comprehensive bootstrapping technique were employed with 5,000 subsamples to evaluate the significance of the control variables and the significance of the path coefficient (Becker et al., 2012; Hair et al., 2022; Streukens & Leroi-Werelds, 2016). This analysis helps to identify any potential differences in the relationships between constructs across different groups, such as gender or age. By

conducting MGA, researchers can gain a deeper understanding of how these variables may moderate the relationships in their research model.

The findings revealed that most of the subgroup's differences were non-statistically significant at p < 0.05, except the differences are significant in the relationship between Caucasians and other ethnicities, and the other ethnicities impact of employee engagement on PWOM is higher than Caucasian ($\beta_{Difference} = -0.259$, p = 0.021). This implies that factors influencing employee engagement may vary across different ethnic groups, highlighting the importance of considering diversity and inclusion strategies in the workplace. Understanding these differences can help organizations tailor their approaches to effectively engage employees from diverse backgrounds and create an inclusive work environment.

Also, the differences are significant in the relationship between females and males, and the male impact of employee engagement on PWOM is higher than that of females ($\beta_{Difference} = 0.253$, p = 0.017). This indicates that male employees are more likely to be influenced by employee engagement when it comes to their perception of the workplace. However, it is important to note that the impact of employee engagement on PWOM may still be significant for both genders but to a slightly lesser extent for females.

In addition, the differences are significant in the relationship between working in an office and remotely, and working in the office's impact on employee engagement on eNPS is higher than working remotely ($\beta_{Difference} = 0.546$, p = 0.000). This suggests that employees who work in an office tend to have higher levels of engagement on eNPS compared to those who work remotely. Being physically present in an office environment may provide more opportunities for face-to-face interactions, collaboration, and a sense of belonging, which can

132

positively impact employee engagement. Additionally, the office setting may offer a structured routine and dedicated workspace that enhance productivity and focus.

While the differences are also significant in the relationship between working in an office and remotely and working remotely, the impact of job satisfaction on eNPS is higher than that of working in the office ($\beta_{Difference} = -0.269$, p = 0.024). This suggests that employees who work remotely experience higher levels of job satisfaction, leading to a more positive impact on their overall eNPS. Furthermore, the flexibility and autonomy offered by remote work can contribute to increased job satisfaction, as individuals have the freedom to create a work environment that suits their needs and preferences.

Also, the differences are significant in the relationship between working remotely and hybrid, and working in the hybrid environment has a higher impact on employee engagement in eNPS than working remotely ($\beta_{Difference} = -0.377$, p = 0.021) due to the increased sense of connection and collaboration that comes with being physically present in the office. Additionally, the hybrid model allows employees to strike a better work-life balance by providing them with the flexibility to choose when and where they work, leading to higher levels of employee engagement.

In addition, the differences are significant in the relationship between working in a services sector and non-services sector, and working in a services sector impacts employee engagement on eNPS is higher than working in a non-service sector ($\beta_{Difference} = 0.331$, p = 0.010). This suggests that employees in the services sector may experience a higher level of engagement with their work, potentially due to the nature of their job roles or the customer-centric environment they operate in, leading to a greater impact on eNPS scores compared to non-service sectors.

133

Finally, the differences are significant in the relationship between working in a services sector and non-services sector, and working in a non-services sector impacts job satisfaction on eNPS is higher than working in a service sector ($\beta_{Difference} = 0.091$, p = 0.010). This suggests that individuals working in non-service sectors may experience higher levels of job satisfaction compared to those working in service sectors. The nature of non-service jobs, which often involve tangible products or physical labor, may contribute to a greater sense of accomplishment and fulfillment in one's work. Additionally, the level of autonomy and variety in tasks may differ between the two sectors, potentially influencing job satisfaction levels. The results of the multigroup analysis are summarized in Table 4.18.

Table 4.18

Path Coefficient Multigroup Analysis

	C	Gender			Educ	cation		
Polationships	Famala	Mala	Difference	n voluo	Associate or	Bachelor or	Differenc	n voluo
Kelationships	Feillale	Iviale	β	<i>p</i> value	less	Higher	eβ	<i>p</i> value
EE -> EL	0.317	0.459	0.142	0.117	0.342	0.402	-0.059	0.313
EE-> PWOM	0.298	0.552	0.253	0.017**	0.346	0.470	-0.123	0.172
EE -> eNPS	0.112	0.297	0.185	0.097	0.173	0.229	-0.056	0.337
JS -> EE	0.478	0.442	-0.036	0.37	0.486	0.457	0.028	0.402
JS -> EL	0.344	0.382	0.039	0.355	0.357	0.376	-0.019	0.430
JS -> PWOM	0.339	0.354	0.014	0.454	0.316	0.381	-0.065	0.299
JS -> eNPS	0.531	0.485	-0.045	0.363	0.529	0.486	0.043	0.357
MT -> EE	0.483	0.328	0.155	0.211	0.370	0.396	-0.026	0.830
		Age			Work I	Location		
	18-30	31+	Difference β	p value	In office	Hybrid	Differenc e β	p value
EE -> EL	0.343	0.370	-0.027	0.429	0.415	0.469	-0.053	0.334
EE-> PWOM	0.395	0.411	-0.016	0.459	0.434	0.521	-0.087	0.277
EE -> eNPS	-0.016	0.218	-0.234	0.078	0.307	0.138	0.169	0.165
JS -> EE	0.380	0.478	-0.098	0.239	0.450	0.482	-0.032	0.403
JS -> EL	0.441	0.349	0.092	0.259	0.306	0.366	-0.060	0.313
JS -> PWOM	0.361	0.322	0.039	0.388	0.305	0.283	0.022	0.441
JS -> eNPS	0.662	0.497	0.165	0.134	0.452	0.554	-0.103	0.266
MT -> EE	0.474	0.372	0.102	0.489	0.4	0.426	-0.026	0.843
	Et	thnicity						

	Caucasian	Other	Difference β	p value	In office	Remote	Differenc e β	p value
EE -> EL	0.363	0.356	0.007	0.486	0.415	0.201	0.214	0.088
EE-> PWOM	0.356	0.615	-0.259	0.021**	0.434	0.176	0.258	0.090
EE -> eNPS	0.145	0.285	-0.14	0.186	0.307	-0.239	0.546	0.000**
JS -> EE	0.468	0.384	0.084	0.238	0.450	0.472	-0.022	0.442
JS -> EL	0.349	0.443	-0.094	0.247	0.306	0.470	-0.164	0.097
JS -> PWOM	0.358	0.198	0.161	0.122	0.305	0.484	-0.179	0.110
JS -> eNPS	0.548	0.438	0.111	0.204	0.452	0.721	-0.269	0.024**
MT -> EE	0.373	0.515	-0.143	0.261	0.400	0.332	0.068	0.620
	Work E	xperience						
	10 Years or less	>10 Years	Difference β	p value	Remote	Hybrid	Differenc e β	p value
EE -> EL	0.378	0.343	0.035	0.399	0.201	0.469	-0.267	0.061
EE-> PWOM	0.410	0.467	-0.058	0.318	0.176	0.521	-0.345	0.056
EE -> eNPS	0.247	0.063	0.184	0.088	-0.239	0.138	-0.377	0.021**
JS -> EE	0.461	0.414	0.047	0.356	0.472	0.482	-0.011	0.476
JS -> EL	0.346	0.404	-0.059	0.336	0.47	0.366	0.104	0.214
JS -> PWOM	0.305	0.337	-0.032	0.405	0.484	0.283	0.202	0.126
JS -> eNPS	0.466	0.612	-0.145	0.101	0.721	0.554	0.167	0.193
MT -> EE	0.401	0.442	-0.041	0.771	0.332	0.426	-0.094	0.612

	Ir	ndustry		
	Service	Non-Service	Difference	n voluo
	Sector	Sector	β	<i>p</i> value
EE -> EL	0.411	0.328	0.083	0.486

EE-> PWOM	0.401	0.487	-0.087	0.504
EE -> eNPS	0.329	-0.002	0.331	0.010**
JS -> EE	0.408	0.522	-0.115	0.293
JS -> EL	0.293	0.452	-0.159	0.173
JS -> PWOM	0.356	0.265	0.091	0.479
JS -> eNPS	0.389	0.680	-0.291	0.010**
MT -> EE	0.481	0.282	0.199	0.084

Note: **The differences are significant in the relationship between each subgroup (p<0.05).

4.8 Summary of Results

This chapter outlines the data collection procedures involving gathering relevant survey information. After collecting the data, it undergoes a series of data analysis procedures to ensure its quality and reliability. These procedures include data cleansing to remove any errors or inconsistencies, data screening to identify outliers or missing values, and conducting statistical assumptions to determine the appropriate statistical tests to be used. Furthermore, reliability and validity tests are performed to assess the consistency and accuracy of the collected data. Finally, hypotheses were tested using SmartPLS-4. Overall, the data presented here as part of this study indicate that job satisfaction and employee engagement were significantly related to employee engagement, employee net promoter score, and positive word-of-mouth behaviors. Also, the main effect found for job satisfaction was significantly related to employee engagement. Furthermore, the relationship between job satisfaction and employee engagement was negatively moderated by managerial trustworthiness but did not support the hypothesis. Also, the parallel lines in the simple slope graph in Figure 4.2 indicate that there was no significant interaction effect of job satisfaction and managerial trustworthiness on employee engagement.

Finally, the intention to leave as a control variable was significantly related to employee loyalty and employee net promoter score. Also, the industry was significantly related to employee loyalty. The result indicates that employees will demonstrate loyalty toward their organization and recommend their company to others. Meanwhile, the intention to leave was not statistically significant for positive word of mouth. Chapter 5 will discuss the academic and practical implications of this research and the study's limitations.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION, MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSION

This chapter elaborates on the research results and explains the hypothesized relationships from the previous chapter. It consists of four sections. First, the findings are reviewed and discussed in more detail. Second and third, the scholarly implications and the practical implications of the results will be discussed. Finally, a review of the limitations is provided, recommendations for future research opportunities, and some general concluding remarks will be included.

5.1 Discussion of Results

Many companies are struggling to maintain the loyalty of their top talent as the job market becomes increasingly competitive. Also, employees want to feel valued and recognized for their contributions and have access to training and advancement opportunities, which are the preconditions for loyalty. This study specifically sought to investigate the impact of job satisfaction and employee engagement on employee loyalty, employee Net Promoter Score (eNPS), positive word of mouth (PWOM), and, in turn, the managerial trustworthiness level on job satisfaction and employee engagement in various industries in the United States.

5.1.1. Job Satisfaction and Employee Engagement and Their Effects on Employee Loyalty

The results supported that organizations with higher levels of job satisfaction exhibit higher levels of employee loyalty, consistent with other findings (Abror et al., 2020; Farrukh et al., 2020; Helmi et al., 2022; Khuong & Linh, 2020; Veloso et al., 2021), with an effect size that was considered small (Hair et al., 2020). The small effect size indicates that job satisfaction contributes less to employee loyalty. Even though the effect size for job satisfaction is small, the results indicate a significant relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty, which should not be overlooked by organizations aiming to improve employee loyalty. Satisfied employees loyal to their organization are more likely to be more effective and productive. Employees feel satisfied with their work when their expectations, such as working environment, work relationships, promotion opportunities, and salary policy, are met or exceeded (Rogers, 2018). Rajput et al. (2016) state that employees are the most valuable resource for all organizations because the longer employees work for a company, the more valuable their knowledge, skills, and experience become. However, employees who are not satisfied will be prompted to actively seek new opportunities and are more likely to leave the company, resulting in higher turnover rates. Therefore, loyal employees contribute to the organization's success, and job satisfaction helps achieve employee loyalty.

Also, the findings highlight that employee engagement positively and significantly impacts employee loyalty. This finding is congruent with several prior

studies (Abror et al., 2020; Karatepe & Ngeche, 2012; Milliman et al., 2018; Salmela-Aro & Upadyaya, 2018; Suardi et al., 2022) with an effect size that was considered small (Hair et al., 2020). The small effect size indicates that employee engagement has a less measurable effect on employee loyalty. However, this study found that employee engagement is crucial for employee loyalty and can improve organizational retention. Therefore, when employees are engaged with their organizations, they are loyal to them. Loyalty is demonstrated in various ways, such as the employees taking their work seriously and recommending the organization to others (Syahrizal & Patrisia, 2019). According to Istijanto and Purusottama (2023), employees with a high level of loyalty will work beyond ordinary conditions, be proud to tell others about the company, be more willing to accept various tasks, feel a sense of shared values, protect the company, and feel inspired. Conversely, employees not engaged with their organizations may feel disconnected and less committed to their work. An employee's longevity at a company is often determined by how beneficial job satisfaction and employee engagement are to their development and finances and whether better employment opportunities are available (Kot-Radojewska & Timenko, 2018).

5.1.2. Job Satisfaction and Employee Engagement and their Effects on Employee Net Promotor Score (eNPS)

To determine how companies can increase their eNPS, this study examined the relationship between job satisfaction and eNPS. Job satisfaction contributes to the eNPS, which measures the possibility that an employee will recommend their company to

others. This finding is consistent with several prior studies (Abror et al., 2020; Karatepe & Ngeche, 2012; Milliman et al., 2018; Salmela-Aro & Upadyaya, 2018) with an effect size that was considered medium (Hair et al., 2020). The moderate effect size indicates that job satisfaction has a more measurable effect on eNPS.

Also, employee engagement positively and significantly impacts the eNPS, which measures the possibility that an employee will recommend their company to others when engaged with the organization. This finding is consistent with several prior studies (Akingbola et al., 2022; Rayton et al., 2012) with an effect size that was considered small (Hair et al., 2020). The small effect size suggests that employee engagement has a more measurable effect on employee loyalty. The results found that job satisfaction and employee engagement can contribute to a positive work environment and promote collaboration and overall organizational success. Organizations must prioritize job satisfaction and employee engagement, which creates a supportive and thriving workplace culture that promotes growth and can indirectly impact their willingness to promote their organization to others. In addition, employee loyalty will be formed when employee satisfaction has been fulfilled; as a result, the eNPS will increase.

5.1.3. Job Satisfaction and Employee Engagement and their Effects on Positive Word of Mouth (PWOM)

Job satisfaction positively affects PWOM, consistent with several prior studies (Chatzopoulou & de Kiewiet, 2021; Zhang et al., 2022), with a small effect size (Hair et al., 2020). A small effect size indicates that job satisfaction has a less measurable effect

on positive word-of-mouth behavior. However, it is important to note that other factors may have a stronger influence on positive word-of-mouth behavior than job satisfaction alone. For example, factors such as company culture, work-life balance, and opportunities for growth and development can also significantly shape employees' perceptions and likelihood to recommend their employer to others. Ultimately, various factors contribute to overall job satisfaction and the likelihood of employees sharing positive feedback about their workplace.

Also, employee engagement can contribute to positive word of mouth, and this finding is consistent with several prior studies (Y. Lee, 2022; Bajaj et al., 2022), with an effect size considered medium (Hair et al., 2020). The medium effect size suggests that employee engagement has a more measurable effect on positive word of mouth. These studies indicate that employees are more likely to speak positively about their organization to others when they are engaged and satisfied with their work. Thus, positive word of mouth can enhance the company's reputation and potentially attract talented employees. These outcomes can increase brand reputation and growth opportunities and contribute to the company's success. Additionally, satisfied employees tend to be more engaged, which plays a crucial role in shaping a company's overall image and success in the eyes of internal and external stakeholders.

5.1.4. Job Satisfaction Effects on Employee Engagement

As expected, job satisfaction is positively related to employee engagement, and this finding is consistent with several prior studies (Tentama et al., 2019; Xhang et al., 2020), with an effect size considered medium (Hair et al., 2020). The medium effect size suggests that job satisfaction has a more measurable effect on employee engagement. When employees are satisfied and engaged in their organization, they are more likely to be productive and motivated to contribute their best efforts toward achieving the company's goals. It is important to note that the relationship between job satisfaction and employee engagement can vary depending on individual and organizational dynamics.

5.1.5. Moderating Effects of Managerial Trustworthiness on Job Satisfaction and

Employee Engagement

The moderating effects of managerial trustworthiness on the relationship between job satisfaction and employee engagement are such that there is a weak negative relationship when managerial trustworthiness is low. This indicates that when the level of trustworthiness of the manager is low, job satisfaction may not necessarily lead to higher employee engagement. A surprising result was uncovered: the level of managerial trustworthiness on job satisfaction and employee engagement relationships did not impact the participant's perception of their managers. This finding challenges the commonly held belief that high job satisfaction and employee engagement would naturally lead to a higher perception of managerial trustworthiness. Therefore, other factors may influence how employees perceive their managers' trustworthiness, regardless of their satisfaction and engagement levels. The effect size is negligible (Hair et al., 2020), indicating that the measurable effect of managerial trustworthiness on the relationship between job satisfaction and employee engagement is minimal.
5.1.6. Control Method: Intention to Leave

The results found that intention to leave as a control variable showed that employee loyalty and employee net promoter score were significant, while positive word of mouth was not. The relationship between intention to leave and employee net promoter score indicated that employees are less likely to leave or quit and will promote their organization as a great workplace. Meanwhile, the relationship between the intention to leave and eNPS was lower. As a result, employees who are loyal to their organizations are less likely to leave the company or intend to quit. Therefore, organizations should focus on reducing turnover intentions, enhancing job satisfaction, and developing a sense of employee commitment to ensure long-term loyalty.

The outcomes of intention to leave have an insignificant relationship with positive word of mouth, indicating that employees' intention to leave does not significantly impact their likelihood of speaking positively about the organization. According to the results, employees' willingness to recommend the company to other employees may not be affected by the fact that they intend to leave. Additionally, it highlights the importance of addressing factors related to the intention to leave to maintain a positive workplace environment and retain loyal employees. Overall, it suggests that employees who are more likely to leave are also less likely to recommend their organization to others. This finding highlights the importance of addressing employee concerns and improving overall satisfaction to increase loyalty and promote positive word of mouth within the organization. Also, the study results confirm a significant positive relationship between the industry and employee loyalty, suggesting that companies within these industries successfully foster a strong sense of commitment and dedication among their employees. Furthermore, the findings indicate that employees in these industries are more likely to be loyal to their companies than employees in other industries.

5.1.7. Multigroup Analysis

This study also used control variables to evaluate the variance and determine its impact on the research model using the multigroup analysis (MGA) functionality within SmartPLS 4. Four control variables (ethnicity, gender, work location, and industry) significantly impacted the relationship between the independent (employee engagement and job satisfaction) and dependent (PWOM and eNPS) variables. The results found that the other ethnicities and genders had a statistically significant impact on the relationship of employee engagement, and PWOM was statistically significant compared to Caucasians and males. This means that other ethnicities were significantly higher than Caucasians, while males also showed a significant impact compared to females. These findings suggest that diversity in ethnicity and gender may play a crucial role in determining levels of employee engagement within an organization. Companies must consider these factors when developing employee satisfaction and productivity strategies. Also, results showed that working in a service sector significantly impacts employee engagement on eNPS more than in a non-service sector, as employees in service industries often have more direct interactions with customers and clients. This can lead to a higher sense of purpose and job satisfaction in their work, ultimately boosting employee engagement.

Both working remotely and working in non-service sectors significantly impact job satisfaction in relation to eNPS. Working remotely versus in-office has the potential for a different set of challenges and benefits, such as increased flexibility but potentially decreased collaboration. While remote employees may feel more independent and have a better work-life balance, they may also struggle with isolation and a lack of connection to their colleagues. Organizations should foster collaboration and communication among these workers to ensure high job satisfaction. The results are natural when the corporate culture focuses on collaboration and emphasizes effective communication (Vitaske, 2023). Considering that it can lead to employees needing more information to complete a task effectively, Vitaske (2023) noted that poor communication has been cited as the number one stressor at work. Additionally, employees in non-service sectors may find fulfillment in their work's autonomy and specialization, contributing to their overall job satisfaction. This suggests that factors beyond the nature of the work itself, such as company culture and support systems, play a significant role in overall job satisfaction. Therefore, organizations must focus on creating a positive work environment for all employees, regardless of the sector they work in.

5.2 Scholarly Implications

From a scholarly perspective, this study highlights the importance of considering both eNPS and PWOM as valuable metrics for assessing employee job satisfaction and employee engagement within the context of organizational success and in a diverse range of industries. First, the findings of this study contribute to a better understanding of how eNPS can influence the likelihood that employees will promote their company to others. Also, this means that investigating eNPS has great research potential that is of use to managers. Many debated claims regarding eNPS suggest that researchers could be important in understanding which claims are supportable and which are not (Bendle et al., 2019). Despite criticism, the eNPS has gained popularity. More casual relationships in the eNPS literature need to be considered, as these have received little attention. Researchers need to focus more on dependent variables to ensure their ability to advise managers, and it is recommended that researchers drill down into the eNPS variable (Bendle et al., 2019). One of the first contributions of this study is creating a model that examines factors such as job satisfaction and employee engagement to increase eNPS, which adds to the existing literature.

Second, by examining the factors influencing PWOM, this study provides valuable insights into how organizations can enhance employee satisfaction and engagement. The results suggest that when employees are job-satisfied and engaged, it increases their positive feelings toward their organization, which in turn causes them to demonstrate positive behavior. Also, the positive behavior of employees plays a significant role in the outcomes of PWOM communication (Wang & Binti Omar, 2023). The second contribution of this study is formulating a model that tests factors such as job satisfaction and employee engagement to improve PWOM, which this research adds to the existing literature.

5.3 Practical Implications

This study has important practical implications. First, employers should understand how potential antecedents, such as job satisfaction and employee engagement, affect employee loyalty. Businesses always look for factors influencing job satisfaction and employee engagement to improve productivity and retain top talent (Azmy, 2021). Understanding these factors can help companies create a positive work environment and provide opportunities for growth and development. Businesses may also consider creating a healthy work-life balance to enhance job satisfaction and employee engagement and implementing employee recognition programs such as bonuses, awards, gifts, ceremonies, events, and other ways to thank employees. Also, organizations should provide more competitive salaries and create more advancement opportunities for employers to attract and retain workers. In addition, in order to bring high job satisfaction and employee engagement to employees, organizations can plan team-building design activities to build close relationships between superiors and subordinates and among colleagues, such as team retreats, group outings, and team-building workshops.

Second, based on the relationship between job satisfaction and eNPS and the relationship between employee engagement and eNPS, employers can increase eNPS by improving the work atmosphere, creating a sense of collegiality, and reducing workload. Employees who feel supported and valued are more likely to perceive their workplace positively and be willing to recommend it to others. Additionally, providing opportunities for professional growth and development can contribute to higher eNPS as employees feel invested in their careers and motivated to stay with the company.

Third, employers should understand antecedents, such as job satisfaction and employee engagement on PWOM. Managers can inform organizations by developing strategies to enhance employee satisfaction and encourage positive word-of-mouth, leading to improving organizational reputation and increasing employee loyalty. By recognizing the impact of job satisfaction and employee engagement on PWOM, organizations can prioritize creating a positive work environment and strong relationships with their employees. This, in turn, can cultivate a culture of advocacy where employees are more likely to speak positively about their organization, attracting potential employees and strengthening its long-term reputation.

Fourth, a stable employee environment makes it more likely to create loyal employees than a less stable environment. Regardless of their employment environment, every employee contributes to achieving the organization's goals (Kot-Radojewska & Timenko, 2018). The results of this study suggest that loyalty is reciprocal between the employer and the employee based on the social exchange theory, with the employer having a greater degree of power in this exchange. Organizations should, therefore, use other factors in the structural model in Figure 4.2 that may determine loyal behavior to shape employee attitudes. For example, managers should consider environmental components such as company image, employee-oriented marketing, corporate strategy, organizational culture, and the personality traits of job candidates. Also, activities that integrate teamwork, loyalty programs, and employee development can significantly influence loyal behavior (Kot-Radojewska & Timenko, 2018).

5.4 Study Limitations and Future Research

This research used cross-sectional data, which made it difficult to establish a causal relationship between independent and dependent variables, as outlined in the structural model Figure 4.2. Cross-sectional data can produce problems in measuring the net effects of job satisfaction, employee engagement, and managerial trustworthiness on work attitudes and performance. Furthermore, the study relied on self-reported data, which may be inaccurate and biased. Therefore, future research should consider using longitudinal designs, which could provide a more in-depth understanding of how these psychological factors and objective measures further validate the findings. Researchers can identify patterns and trends that may not be apparent in cross-sectional studies.

Second, the current study tested the relational impact of job satisfaction and employee engagement on employee loyalty based on the social exchange theory and ignored the other theories that explain the psychological determinants of employee loyalty. Employee loyalty can be influenced by other psychological factors, such as social and organizational identity theory and the theory of psychological contract. By solely focusing on the social exchange theory, it may not be able to provide a comprehensive understanding of the research problem or may not be able to account for all the variables that could affect the study's outcome. Additionally, the study may be biased toward the theory used, and the results may not be generalizable to other contexts or populations (C. Grant & Osanloo, 2014). Therefore, future research should consider incorporating these alternative theories to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the determinants of employee loyalty.

Third, this study included only participants from the United States, which limits the ability to generalize to other countries. Future research must include participants from diverse cultural backgrounds to ensure the findings can be applied to a broader range of participants.

Fourth, this study did not focus on a specific industry, which may limit the applicability of the findings. Future research could explore the determinants of employee loyalty within specific industries to gain a more comprehensive understanding of how these factors vary across different sectors.

Fifth, this study did not examine employee engagement as a mediator variable in the relationships among job satisfaction, employee loyalty, eNPS, and PWOM. Future studies should include employee engagement as a mediator; this variable would help assess the extent to which it influences the relationship between job satisfaction, employee loyalty, eNPS, and PWOM.

Sixth, the discovery of the moderating effects of managerial trustworthiness had a low and negative effect on job satisfaction and employee engagement relationships, suggesting that other factors may have a stronger influence on these outcomes. This finding highlights the need for further research to identify additional variables contributing to workplace job satisfaction and employee engagement. Additionally, understanding the specific mechanisms through which managerial trustworthiness impacts these outcomes could provide valuable insights for organizations seeking to enhance employee well-being and productivity.

Seventh, data showed bias toward female respondents, which indicated a higher proportion of women participated in the survey compared to men. This could potentially impact the ability to generalize the findings and may require future research to explore the reasons behind this gender imbalance. Additionally, efforts could be made to increase male participation in future surveys to ensure a more balanced representation of genders.

Lastly, future studies should compare the behavior of individuals across different cultural contexts, e.g., Australia, Japan, China, and Canada, since cultural context strongly influences individual behavior (Yao et al., 2019). Understanding how cultural differences impact loyalty factors such as employee loyalty, eNPS, and PWOM can provide valuable insights for organizations operating in diverse markets.

5.5 Conclusion

Employee loyalty has long been a focal point of business literature. Organizations must understand and prioritize employee loyalty to succeed in a competitive market. This study increased the level of understanding of factors that contributed to the outcome of loyalty factors, which are essential for organizations' long-term success and growth. There is limited empirical research on marketing factors such as eNPS and PWOM in business research. However, these factors have been widely used in customer loyalty

research and can be modified and adapted to measure employee loyalty. This study affirmed that the relationship between marketing factors and employee loyalty factors could provide organizations with more concrete insights and actionable strategies for employees. Organizations can effectively enhance loyalty and create a more engaged workforce by incorporating these marketing strategies into job satisfaction and employee engagement initiatives. Additionally, this study provides insights that allow managers to understand the drivers of employee loyalty and make informed decisions on improving it within the organization.

REFERENCES

- Aboobaker, N., Edward, M., & KA, Z. (2020). Workplace spirituality and employee loyalty: An empirical investigation among millennials in India. *Journal of Asia Business Studies*, 14(2), 211-225. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/JABS-03-2018-0089</u>
- Abraham, S. (2012). Job satisfaction as an antecedent to employee engagement. *Sies Journal of Management*, 8(2), 27 – 36.
- Abror, A., Patrisia, D., Syahrizal, S., Sarianti, R., & Dastgir, S. (2020). Self-efficacy, employee engagement, remuneration and employee loyalty in higher education: The role of satisfaction and Ocb. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(3), 5456-5470.

http://sersc.org/journals/index.php/IJAST/article/view/6061

- Abror, A., Patrisia, D., Trinanda, O., Omar, M. W., & Wardi, Y. (2021). Antecedents of word of mouth in Muslim-friendly tourism marketing: The role of religiosity. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, 12(4), 882–899. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/JIMA-01-</u>2020-0006
- Adnan Bataineh, K. (2019). Impact of work-life balance, happiness at work, on employee performance. *International Business Research*, 12(2), 99-112. <u>https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v12n2p99</u>
- Afthanorhan, A., Foziah, H., Rusli, R., & Khalid, S. (2019). Modeling reflective constructs in generalized structure component analysis: An application to service

quality and customer satisfaction in UniSZA library. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 7(10), 33-41.

https://ijicc.net/images/vol7iss10/71003_Afthanorhan_2019_E_R.pdf

- Agarwal, U. A. (2014). Linking justice, trust, and innovative work behavior to work engagement. *Personnel Review*, *43*(1), 41–73. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-02-</u> 2012-0019
- Aguinis, H., & Burgi-Tian, J. (2021). Measuring performance during crises and beyond The Performance Promoter Score. *Business Horizons*, 64(1), 149–160. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2020.09.001
- Ahmad, M., Ahmed, Z., Yang, X., Hussain, N., & Sinha, A. (2022). Financial development and environmental degradation: do human capital and institutional quality make a difference?. *Gondwana Research*, *105*, 299-310. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gr.2021.09.012</u>

 Akingbola, K., Rogers, S. E., & Intindola, M. (2022). Measuring Engagement: Theoretical Perspectives and Practical Approaches. In Employee Engagement in Nonprofit Organizations: Theory and Practice (pp. 173-190). *Cham: Springer International Publishing*. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-08469-0_8</u>

Al Fannah, J., Al Ismaili, S., Al Jahwari, F., Mohamed, O., & Al Awaidy, S. T. (2021).
 Improving the process of employee recognition: An exploratory study. *Journal of Hospital Administration*, *10*(6) 19–26. <u>https://doi.org/10.5430/jha.v10n6p19</u>

- Ali, B. J., & Anwar, G. (2021). An empirical study of employees' motivation and its influence job satisfaction. *Ali, BJ, & Anwar, G.(2021). An Empirical Study of Employees' Motivation and its Influence Job Satisfaction. International Journal of Engineering, Business and Management, 5*(2), 21-30.
 https://doi.org/10.22161/ijebm.5.2.3
- Allen, N. J., & Grisaffe, D. B. (2001). Employee commitment to the organization and customer reactions: Mapping the linkages. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11(3), 209–236. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(00)00049-8</u>
- Amanor-Boadu, V. (2022). Empirical evidence for the "Great Resignation", Monthly Labor Review, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Retrieved August 16, 2023. https://doi.org/10.21916/mlr.2022.29
- Anderson, E. W. (1998). Customer satisfaction and word of mouth. *Journal of Service Research*, *1*(1), 5–17. https://doi.org/10.1177/109467059800100102
- Andrade, M. S., & Westover, J. H. (2020). Global comparisons of job satisfaction across occupational categories. *Evidence-based HRM*, 8(1), 38-59. https://doi.org/10.1108/EBHRM-09-2019-0086
- Andrade, M. S., Westover, J. H., & Peterson, J. (2019). Job satisfaction and gender. Journal of Business Diversity, 19(3), 22-40. <u>http://t.www.na-</u> <u>businesspress.com/JBD/JBD19-3/2_AndradeMS_19_3.pdf</u>
- Andreski, P. M., Cole, B. E., Watcharotone, K., Brumar, A. T., & Brown, D. J. (2020). Using a diversity, equity and inclusion Net Promoter Score to measure confidence

in program impact. Journal of Hospital Management and Health Policy, 4(33),

1-7. <u>https://doi.org/10.21037/jhmhp-19-119</u>

Ang, M., & Rabo, J. (2018). Employee engagement and job satisfaction at company A.[Conference Session]. DLSU Research Congress.

Antonova, E. (2016). Occupational stress, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty in hospitality industry: A comparative case study of two hotels in Russia (Pub no. 1111525.) [Master Thesis, Modul University].
https://www.modul.ac.at/uploads/files/Theses/Master/Grad_2016/Thesis_11115
https://www.modul.ac.at/uploads/files/Theses/Master/Grad_2016/Theses/Master/

Grad_2016/Thesis__1111525_Evgenia_Antonova.pdf

Anwyl-Irvine, A., Dalmaijer, E. S., Hodges, N., & Evershed, J. K. (2021). Realistic precision and accuracy of online experiment platforms, web browsers, and devices. *Behavior Research Methods*, 53(4), 1407-1425.

https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-020-01501-5

- Argote, L., Beckman, S. L., & Epple, D. (1990). The persistence and transfer of learning in industrial settings. *Management science*, 36(2), 140-154. <u>https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.36.2.140</u>
- Aristana, I. N., Arsawan, I. W. E., & Rustiarini, N. W. (2022). Employee loyalty during slowdown of COVID-19: Do satisfaction and trust matter? *International Journal* of Tourism Cities, 8(1), 223–243. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/IJTC-03-2021-0036</u>

- Armstrong, M. (2006). *A handbook of human resource management practice* (10th ed.). Kogan Page.
- Aziri, B. (2011). Job satisfaction, a literature review. Management Research and Practice, 3(4), 77–86. <u>https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=136e0e77dd33</u> <u>87e59954df73294d3e0114a08435</u>
- Azmy, A. (2021). The effect of employee engagement and job satisfaction on workforce agility through talent management in public transportation companies. *Media Ekonomi Dan Manajemen*, *36*(2), 212-229.

https://doi.org/10.24856/mem.v36i2.2190

- Baehre, S., O'Dwyer, M., O'Malley, L., & Lee, N. (2022). The use of Net Promoter Score (NPS) to predict sales growth: Insights from an empirical investigation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 50(1), 67–84.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-021-00790-2
- Bagis, F., & Adawiyah, W. (2022). Work-life balance and work culture on employee loyalty in construction companies: The mediating role of job satisfaction [Paper presentation]. In Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference of Business, Accounting, and Economics. ICBAE 2022, Purwokerto, Central Java, Indonesia. http://dx.doi.org/10.4108/eai.10-8-2022.2320908

- Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 16(1), 74-94. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02723327
- Bajaj, S., Mukherjee, M., & Pranjal, P. (2022). Employee advocacy: What is it? What of it?. *ET HRWorld, The Economic Times*.
 <u>https://pure.jgu.edu.in/id/eprint/3751/1/hr.economictimes.indiatimes.com-</u>
 Employee%20advocacy%20What%20is%20it%20What%20of%20it.pdf
- Baker, A. M., Donthu, N., & Kumar, V. (2016). Investigating how word-of-mouth conversations about brands influence purchase and retransmission intentions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53(2), 225–239.

https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.14.0099

- Baker, M., & Zuech, T. (2022, April 28). Gartner says U.S. total annual employee turnover will likely jump by nearly 20% from the prepandemic annual average.
 Gartner. <u>https://www.gartner.com/en/newsroom/04-28-2022-gartner-says-us-</u> total-annual-employee-turnover-will-likely-jump-by-nearly-twenty-percent-fromthe-prepandemic-annual-average
- Barclay, D., Higgins, C., & Thompson, R. (1995). The partial least squares (PLS) approach to casual modeling: Personal computer adoption and use as an illustration. *Technology Studies*, *2*(2), 285-309.

- Barhorst, J. B., Wilson, A., Mclean, G. J., & Brooks, J. (2020). Service encounter microblog word of mouth and its impact on firm reputation. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 34(5), 717–733. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/jsm-07-2019-0263</u>
- Barnes, D. C., Collier, J. E., & Robinson, S. (2014). Customer delight and work engagement. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 28(5), 380-390. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-02-2013-0051</u>
- Baroudi, S., Tamim, R., & Hojeij, Z. (2022). A quantitative investigation of intrinsic and extrinsic factors influencing teachers' job satisfaction in Lebanon. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 21(2), 127-146.

https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2020.1734210

- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship." *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 587–595. <u>https://doi.org/10.2307/255908</u>
- Becker, J. M., Klein, K., & Wetzels, M. (2012). Hierarchical latent variable models in PLS-SEM: Guidelines for using reflective-formative type models. *Long Range Planning*, 45(5-6), 359-394. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2012.10.001</u>
- Beckers, S. F., Risselada, H., & Verhoef, P. C. (2014). Customer engagement: A new frontier in customer value management. *Handbook of Service Marketing Research*, 2(6), 97–120.
- Belliveau, J., & Yakovenko, I. (2022). Evaluating and improving the quality of survey data from panel and crowd-sourced samples: A practical guide for psychological

research. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology*, *30*(4), 400–408. https://doi.org/10.1037/pha0000564

- Bendle, N. T., Bagga, C. K., & Nastasoiu, A. (2019). Forging a stronger academicpractitioner partnership-the case of net promoter score (NPS). *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 27(2), 210-226. https://doi.org/10.1080/10696679.2019.1577689
- Bessen, B. R., & Connell, B. J. (2022). Another day, another currency: Self-interest, experience, and attitudes toward dollarization in Ecuador. *Political Behavior*, 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-022-09840-z
- Bhat, S. A., & Darzi, M. A. (2018). Antecedents of tourist loyalty to tourist destinations:
 A mediated-moderation study. *International Journal of Tourism Cities*, 4(2), 261–278. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJTC-12-2017-0079
- Biesok, G., & Wyrod-Wrobel, J. (2021). Net Promoters Score (NPS) and its relation to other marketing customer satisfaction measures. Proceedings of the 37th Business Information Management Association (IBIMA) (pp. 3543–3550). Spain, ISBN: 978-0-9998551-6-4, ISSN: 2767-9640
- Birkinshaw, J. (2013). Would your employees recommend you? *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 55(1), 95–96. <u>https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/would-your-</u> employees-recommend-you/docview/1438813445/se-2
- Blau, P. M. (1964). Justice in social exchange. *Sociological Inquiry*, *34*(2), 193–206. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.1964.tb00583.x

- Bluedorn, A. C. (1982). A unified model of turnover from organizations. *Human Relations*, 35(2), 135-153. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/001872678203500204</u>
- Bonaccio, S., Connelly, C. E., Gellatly, I. R., Jetha, A., & Martin Ginis, K. A. (2020).
 The participation of people with disabilities in the workplace across the employment cycle: Employer concerns and research evidence. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *35*(2), 135-158. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-018-9602-5</u>
- Bone, P. F. (1995). Word-of-mouth effects on short-term and long-term product judgment. *Journal of Business Research*, 3(2), 213–223. https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(94)00047-I
- Book, L., Gatling, A., & Kim, J. (2019). The effects of leadership satisfaction on employee engagement, loyalty, and retention in the hospitality industry. *Journal* of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism, 18(3), 368–393.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2019.1599787</u>
- Bridger, E. (2014). Employee engagement (Vol. 10). Kogan Page Publishers.
- Brown, M. I. (2020). Comparing the validity of net promoter and benchmark scoring to other commonly used employee engagement metrics. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 31(4), 355–370. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21392</u>
- Brown, S. P., & Leigh, T. W. (1996). A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to job involvement, effort, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4), 358–368, <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.4.358</u>

Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's mechanical Turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6(1), 3-5. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691610393980</u>

Buitendach, J. H., & Rothmann, S. (2009). The validation of the Minnesota Job
Satisfaction Questionnaire in selected organizations in South Africa. SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 7(1), 1–8.
https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC95902

- Byrne, Z., Pitts, V., Chiaburu, D., & Steiner, Z. (2011). Managerial trustworthiness and social exchange with the organization. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26(2), 108–122. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/02683941111102155.966S</u>
- Cable, D. M., & Turban, D. B. (2001). Establishing the dimensions, sources, and value of job seekers' employer knowledge during recruitment. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 20, 115–163. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-</u> 7301(01)20002-4

Cable, D. M., & Turban, D. B. (2006). The value of organizational reputation in the recruitment context: A brand-equity perspective. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33(11), 2244–2266. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-</u>

1816.2003.tb01883.x

Caldwell, C., & Clapham, S. E. (2003). Organizational trustworthiness: An international perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 47(4), 349–364. <u>https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1027370104302</u>

- Caldwell, C., Floyd, L., Taylor, J., & Woodard, B. (2014). Beneficence as a source of competitive advantage. *Journal of Management Development*, *33*(10), 1057–1079. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-01-2013-0007
- Caldwell, C., & Hayes, L. A. (2007). Leadership, trustworthiness, and the mediating lens. Journal of Management Development, 26(3), 261–281. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710710732155</u>
- Cassel, C., Hackl, P., & Westlund, A. H. (1999). Robustness of partial least-squares method for estimating latent variable quality structures. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 26(4), 435-446. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/02664769922322</u>
- Cervellon, M. C., & Lirio, P. (2017). When employees don't' like 'their employers on social media. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 58(2), 63-70. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11633.003.0022
- Chanana, N., & Sangeeta. (2021). Employee engagement practices during COVID-19 lockdown. Journal of Public Affairs, 21(4), 1-8. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2508</u>
- Chandler, J., Rosenzweig, C., Moss, A. J., Robinson, J., & Litman, L. (2019). Online panels in social science research: Expanding sampling methods beyond
 Mechanical Turk. *Behavior Research Methods*, *51*, 2022-2038.
 https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-019-01273-7

Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal*, *34*(3), 487-516. <u>https://doi.org/10.2307/256404</u>

Chatman, J. A., & Barsade, S. G. (1995). Personality, organizational culture, and cooperation: Evidence from a business simulation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(3), 423–443. <u>https://doi.org/10.2307/2393792</u>

Chatzopoulou, E., & de Kiewiet, A. (2021). Millennials' evaluation of corporate social responsibility: The wants and needs of the largest and most ethical generation. *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, 20(3), 521-534. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1882</u>

- Cheah, J. H., Amaro, S., & Roldán, J. L. (2023). Multigroup analysis of more than two groups in PLS-SEM: A review, illustration, and recommendations. *Journal of Business Research*, 156, 113539. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.113539</u>
- Chen, C. C., Saparito, P., & Belkin, L. (2011). Responding to trust breaches: The domain specificity of trust and the role of affect. *Journal of Trust Research*, 1(1), 85–106. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/21515581.2011.552438</u>
- Chen, S., Xu, K., & Yao, X. (2022). Empirical study of employee loyalty and satisfaction in the mining industry using structural equation modeling. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1), 1-15. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-05182-2</u>
- Chen, W., Zhou, S., Zheng, W., & Wu, S. (2022). Investigating the relationship between job burnout and job satisfaction among Chinese generalist teachers in rural primary schools: A serial mediation model. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(21), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192114427

- Chen, Y., Mandler, T., & Meyer-Waarden, L. (2021). Three decades of research on loyalty programs: A literature review and future research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 124(2021), 179-197. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.11.057
- Chen, Z. (2001). Further investigation of the outcomes of loyalty to supervisor: Job satisfaction and intention to stay. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *16*(8), 650-660. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM000000006305</u>
- Chin, W. W. (1998). The partial least squares approach to structural equation modeling. Modern Methods for Business Research, 295(2), 295-336.
- Chin, W. W., Thatcher, J. B., Wright, R. T., & Steel, D. (2013). Controlling for common method variance in PLS analysis: The measured latent marker variable approach.
 In H. Abdi, W. W. Chin, V. Esposito Vinzi, G. Russolillo, & L. Trinchera (Eds.), *New perspectives in partial least squares and related methods* (pp. 231-239).
 Springer. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-8283-3_16</u>
- Cho, G., & Choi, J. Y. (2020). An empirical comparison of generalized structured component analysis and partial least squares path modeling under variance-based structural equation models. *Behaviormetrika*, 47(1), 243-272. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s41237-019-00098-0</u>
- Cho, Y. J., & Perry, J. L. (2012). Intrinsic motivation and employee attitudes: Role of managerial trustworthiness, goal-directedness, and extrinsic reward expectancy.

Review of Public Personnel Administration, *32*(4), 382–406. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X11421495

Clack, L. (2021). Employee engagement: Keys to organizational success. In *The Palgrave handbook of workplace well-being*, 1001-1028.

Cocheo, S. (2006). Vernon Hill vs. the curve. *American Bankers Association ABA Banking Journal*, 98(5), 26–36. <u>https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/vernon-hill-vs-curve/docview/218501129/se-2</u>

- Collier, J., & Esteban, R. (2007). Corporate social responsibility and employee commitment. *Business ethics: A European Review*, 16(1), 19–33. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8608.2006.00466.x</u>
- Collins, C. J., & Stevens, C. K. (2002). The relationship between early recruitmentrelated activities and the application decisions of new labor-market entrants: A brand equity approach to recruitment. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(6), 1121–1133. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.6.1121</u>
- Colquitt, J. A., & Rodell, J. B. (2011). Justice, trust, and trustworthiness: A longitudinal analysis integrating three theoretical perspectives. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(6),1183–1206. <u>https://doi.10.5465/amj.2007.0572</u>
- Colquitt, J. A., & Salam, S. C. (2009). Foster trust through ability, benevolence, and integrity. In E. A. Locke (Ed.), *Handbook of principles of organizational behavior* (2nd ed., pp. 389–403). Wiley.

- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., & LePine, J. A. (2007). Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: A meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk-taking and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 909–927.
 https://doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.909
- Colvin, G. (2020). The simple metric that's taking over big business. *Fortune*. *Retrieved*, *3*. <u>https://fortune.com/longform/net-promoter-score-fortune-500-</u> <u>customer-satisfaction-metric/</u>
- Cooper, B., Eva, N., Fazlelahi, F. Z., Newman, A., Lee, A., & Obschonka, M. (2020).
 Addressing common method variance and endogeneity in vocational behavior
 research: A review of the literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *121*, 103472. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103472</u>
- Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C., & Stone, E. F. (1992). *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance* (pp 45–51). Lexington Books.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874-900. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602</u>

Cui, Y., & Jiao, H. (2019). Organizational justice and management trustworthiness during organizational Change: Interactions of benevolence, integrity, and managerial approaches. *Information Processing & Management*, 56(4), 1526– 1542. <u>https://doi:10.1016/j.ipm.2018.10.008</u> Darmon, R. Y. (1990). Identifying sources of turnover costs: A segmental approach. *Journal of Marketing*, *54*(2), 46-56.

https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299005400204

Das, S., Ghani, M. U., Rashid, A., Rasheed, R., Manthar, S., & Ahmed, S. (2021). How customer satisfaction and loyalty can be affected by employee's perceived emotional competence: The mediating role of rapport. *International Journal of Management (IJM)*, *12*(3), 1268-1277.

https://doi.org.org/10.34218/IJM.12.3.2021.119

- Davenport, T. H., Harris, J., & Shapiro, J. (2010). Competing on talent analytics. *Harvard Business Review*, 88(10), 52–58. <u>www.hbr.org</u>
- Day, G. S. (1971). Attitude change, media, and word of mouth. *Journal of Advertising Research*, *11*(6), 31–40. <u>https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1972-28012-001</u>
- Dechawatanapaisal, D. (2020). 'Millennials' intention to stay and word-of-mouth referrals. *Evidence-based HRM*, 8(1), 60–78. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/EBHRM-03-2019-0021</u>
- De Matos, C. A., & Rossi, C. A. V. (2008). Word-of-mouth communications in marketing: a meta-analytic review of the antecedents and moderators. *Journal of the Academy of marketing science*, 36(1), 578-596. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-008-0121-1

- Denning, S. (2011). Another Myth Bites the Dust: How Apple listens to its Customers. Forbes. <u>https://www.forbes.com/sites/stevedenning/2011/08/26/another-myth-bites-the-dust-how-apple-listens-to-its-customers</u>
- De Paula, M. (2005). Dispensing with the data dump to achieve customer loyalty. US Banker, 115(2), 24–25. <u>https://www.americanbanker.com/news/dispensing-with-</u> the-data-dump-to-achieve-customer-loyalty
- Dhir, S., Dutta, T., & Ghosh, P. (2020). Linking employee loyalty with job satisfaction using PLS-SEM modeling. *Personnel Review*, 49(8), 1695–1711.

https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-03-2019-0107

- Diamantopoulos, A., & Winklhofer, H. M. (2001). Index construction with formative indicators: An alternative to scale development. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38(2), 269-277. <u>https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.38.2.269.18845</u>
- Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4),

611-628. https://doi:10.1037//0021-9010.87.4.611

- Duboff, R., & Heaton, C. (1999). Employee loyalty: A key link to value growth. *Strategy* & *Leadership*, 27(1), 8-13. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/eb054624</u>
- Dunn, J. R., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2005). Feeling and believing: The influence of emotion on trust. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(5), 736–748. <u>https://doi:10.1037/0022-3514.88.5.736</u>

Durkin, D. (2007). "How loyalty and employee engagement add up to corporate profits," *Chief Learning Officer*, 6(11), 30–34. <u>https://www.chieflearningofficer.com/2007/11/02/how-loyalty-and-employeeengagement-add-up-to-corporate-profits/</u>

 Dziuba, S. T., Ingaldi, M., & Zhuravskaya, M. (2020). Employees' job satisfaction and their work performance as elements influencing work safety. *System Safety: Human-Technical Facility-Environment*, 2(1), 18-

25. https://doi.org/10.2478/czoto-2020-0003

- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The Psychology of Attitudes*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- East, R., Hammond, K., & Lomax, W. (2008). Measuring the impact of positive and negative word of mouth on brand purchase probability. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 25(3), 215–224.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2008.04.001

e Cunha, M. P. (2002). "The Best Place to Be": Managing Control and Employee Loyalty in a Knowledge-Intensive Company. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *38*(4), 481–495. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/002188602237793</u>

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500</u>

- Eletive. (2023). *eNPS The ultimate guide to employee net promoter score*. <u>https://eletive.com/blog/the-ultimate-guide-to-employee-net-promoter-score/</u>
- Eyal, P., David, R., Andrew, G., Zak, E., & Ekaterina, D. (2021). Data quality of platforms and panels for online behavioral research. *Behavior Research Methods*, 54(1), 1643–1662 (2022). <u>https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-021-01694-3</u>
- Fan, X., Li, J., Mao, Z. E., & Lu, Z. (2021). Can ethical leadership inspire employee loyalty in hotels in China?-From the perspective of the social exchange theory. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 49, 538-547. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2021.11.006
- Farrukh, M., Kalimuthu, R., Farrukh, S., & Khan, M. S. (2020). Role of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in employee loyalty: Empirical analysis from Saudi hotel industry. *Int. J. Bus. Psychol*, *2*, 1-20.
 <u>https://www.academia.edu/download/61774830/Farrukh M et al 20202020011</u> 3-108771-1nkvagq.pdf
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A. G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G* Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, 41(4), 1149-1160. <u>https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149</u>
- Fayant, M. P., Sigall, H., Lemonnier, A., Retsin, E., & Alexopoulos, T. (2017). On the limitations of manipulation checks: An obstacle toward cumulative science. *International Review of Social Psychology*, 30(1), 125-130. <u>https://doi.org/10.5334/irsp.102</u>

- Ficarra, L., Rubino, M. J., & Morote, E. S. (2020). Does Organizational Culture Affect Employee Happiness? *Journal for Leadership and Instruction*, 19(2), 38-47. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1282787
- Forbes. (2011). The "relative NPS" trap: Why Philips isn't delighting its customers, August 25, 2016. http://www.forbes.com/sites/stevedenning/2011/11/02/the-rela tive-nps-trap-why-philips-isnt-delighting-its-customers/.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *18*(1), 39-50. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800104</u>
- Fosam, E. B., Grimsley, M. F. J., & Wisher, S. J. (1998). Exploring models for employee satisfaction; with particular reference to a police force, *Total Quality Management*, 9(2), 235–247.
- Frederiksen, A. (2017). Job satisfaction and employee turnover: A firm-level perspective. *German Journal of Human Resource Management*, *31*(2), 132–161.

https://doi.org/10.1177/2397002216683885

- Fredrickson, B. L. (1998). What good are positive emotions? *Review of General Psychology*, 2, 300–319. <u>https://doi.org/doi:10.1037/1089-2680.2.3.300</u>
- Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 218.

- Fredrickson, B. L., & Joiner, T. (2002). Positive emotions trigger upward spirals toward emotional well-being. *Psychological Science*, 13, 172–175. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00431
- Frijda, N. H. (1988). The laws of emotion. *American Psychologist*, *43*(5), 349–358. https://doi.org/10.1037//0003-066X.43.5.349
- Frömbling, L., Damberg, S., Saari, U. A., & Ringle, C. M. (2023). Predicting Sustainable
 Consumption Behavior of Europeans Using the CVPAT. In *State of the Art in Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) Methodological Extensions and Applications in the Social Sciences and Beyond* (pp. 115-121).
 Cham: Springer International Publishing. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-34589-0_13</u>
- Gabrielova, K., & Buchko, A. A. (2021). Here comes Generation Z: Millennials as managers. *Business Horizons*, 64(4), 489–499. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2021.02.013
- Garg, K., Dar, I. A., & Mishra, M. (2017). Job satisfaction and work engagement: A study using private sector bank managers. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 20(1), 58–71. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422317742987</u>

Gaskin, J., Ogbeibu, S., & Lowry, P. B. (2023). Demystifying Prediction in Mediation Research and the Use of Specific Indirect Effects and Indirect Effect Sizes. In: Latan, H., Hair, Jr., J.F., Noonan, R. (eds) *Partial Least Squares Path Modeling*. *Springer, Cham.* <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-37772-3_8</u>

- Geldsetzer, P. (2020). Use of rapid online surveys to assess people's perceptions during infectious disease outbreaks: a cross-sectional survey on COVID-19. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 22(4), e18790. <u>https://doi.org/10.2196/18790</u>
- Gerhart, B., & Fang, M. (2015). Pay, intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, performance, and creativity in the workplace: Revisiting long-held beliefs. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 2(1), 489–521. <u>https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032414-111418</u>
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-Analytic review of leader–member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(6), 827–844. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.6.827</u>
- Ghasemy, M., Teeroovengadum, V., Becker, J. M., & Ringle, C. M. (2020). This fast car can move faster: A review of PLS-SEM application in higher education research. *Higher Education*, 80(6), 1121-1152. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-</u> 020-00534-1
- Gillespie, N., Searle, R., Gustafsson, S., & Hailey, V. H. (2020). Preserving employee trust during crisis. *Behavioral Science & Policy*, 6(2), 59-68. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/237946152000600208</u>
- Gliner, J. A., Morgan, G. A., & Leech, N. L. (2016). *Research methods in applied settings: An integrated approach to design and analysis.* Routledge.
- Goetz, K., Campbell, S. M., Broge, B., Dörfer, C. E., Brodowski, M., & Szecsenyi, J. (2012). The impact of intrinsic and extrinsic factors on the job satisfaction of

dentists. *Community Dentistry and Oral Epidemiology*, 40(5), 474-480. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0528.2012.00693.x

Gorgenyi-Hegyes, E., Nathan, R. J., & Fekete-Farkas, M. (2021). Workplace health promotion, employee wellbeing and loyalty during COVID-19 Pandemic—Large scale empirical evidence from Hungary. *Economies*, 9(2), 55. https://doi.org/10.3390/economies9020055

Goritz, A. S., Borchert, K., & Hirth, M. (2021). Using attention testing to select crowdsourced workers and research participants. *Social Science Computer Review*, 39(1), 84-104. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2020.102520</u>

- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25(2) 161–178. <u>https://doi.org/10.2307/2092623</u>
- Goyette, I., Ricard, L., Bergeron, J., & Marticotte, F. (2010). e-WOM Scale: word-ofmouth measurement scale for e-services context. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration*, 27(1), 5-23. https://doi.org/10.1002/cjas.129
- Grant, A. M., & Sumanth, J. J. (2009). Mission possible? The performance of prosocially motivated employees depends on manager trustworthiness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(4),927–944. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014391</u>

Grant, C., & Osanloo, A. (2014). Understanding, selecting, and integrating a theoretical framework in dissertation research: Creating the blueprint for your "house."
 Administrative Issues Journal, 4(2), 4. <u>https://doi.org/10.5929/2014.4.2.9</u>

Greenhaus, J. H., Bedeian, A. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1987). Work experiences, job performance, and feelings of personal and family well-being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *31*(2), 200–215. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-</u> 8791(87)90057-1

Gruman, J. A., & Saks, A. M. (2011). Performance management and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(2), 123-136. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.09.004</u>

- Guillon, O., & Cezanne, C. (2014). Employee loyalty and organizational performance: A critical survey. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 27(5), 839–850. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-02-2014-0025</u>
- Gullett, J., Do, L., Canuto-Carranco, M., Brister, M., Turner, S., & Caldwell, C. (2009).
 The buyer-supplier relationship: An integrative model of ethics and trust. *Journal* of Business Ethics, 90(3), 329–341. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0430-4</u>
- Gupta, M., & Shaheen, M. (2017). Impact of work engagement on turnover intention: Moderation by psychological capital in India. *Business: Theory and Practice*, 18, 136-143. <u>https://doi.org/10.3846/btp.2017.014</u>
- Gupta, S., & Zeithaml, V. (2006). Customer metrics and their impact on financial performance. *Marketing Science*, 25(6), 827–844. <u>https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.1060.0221</u>

- Gupta, V., & Kumar, S. (2013). Impact of performance appraisal justice on employee engagement. *Employee Relations: An International Journal*, 35(1), 61–78. https://doi.org/10.1108/01425451311279410
- Haghighikhah, M., Khadang, M., & Arabi, M. (2016). Internal marketing: Employee satisfaction and word of mouth in Guilan's Saderat bank. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 8(2), 147. <u>https://doi.org/10.5539/ijms.v8n2p147</u>
- Haid, M., & Sims, J. (2009). Employee Engagement: Maximizing Organizational Performance. *Right Management*. Retrieved 15 June 2011, from <u>http://www.right.com/thought-leadership/research</u>
- Hair, J. F., & Alamer, A. (2022). Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) in second language and education research: Guidelines using an applied example. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, 1(3), 100027.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmal.2022.100027</u>
- Hair, J. F., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Black, W. C. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis* (8th ed.). Pearson Prentice.
- Hair, J. F., Howard, M. C., & Nitzl, C. (2020). Assessing measurement model quality in PLS-SEM using confirmatory composite analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 109, 101-110. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.11.069</u>

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) (3rd ed.). Sage Publishing. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-80519-7</u>

- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., Danks, N. P., & Ray, S.
 (2021). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) using R: A workbook (p. 197). Springer Nature. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-80519-7</u>
- Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet.
 Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 19(2), 139-152.
 https://doi.org/10.2753/MTP1069-6679190202
- 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. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203</u>
- Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L., & Kuppelwieser, V. G. (2014). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM): An emerging tool in business research. *European Business Review*, 26(2), 106-121.
 https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-10-2013-0128
- Hamidi, N., Saberi, H., & Safari, M. (2014). The effect of implementation of talent management on job satisfaction governmental organizations (Case Study: Ministry of Roads and Urban). *Journal of Novel Applied Sciences*, 3(1), 100–113.
- Hamouche, S. (2021). Human resource management and the COVID-19 crisis:
 Implications, challenges, opportunities, and future organizational directions. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 1-16. <u>https://doi:10.1017/jmo.2021.15</u>
- Hancer, M., & George, R. T. (2003). Job satisfaction of restaurant employees: An empirical investigation using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. *Journal*
of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 27(1), 85–100.

https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348002238882

- Harter, J. (2022, April 25). U.S. Employee Engagement Slump Continues. Gallup.com. https://www.gallup.com/workplace/391922/employee-engagement-slumpcontinues.aspx
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268–279. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268
- Harvey, S. D. (2023). Qualitative case study on the relationship between workloads and the impact it has on employee job satisfaction (Order No. 30417628) [Doctoral dissertation, Trident at University International]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (2798582487). <u>https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/qualitativecase-study-on-relationship-between/docview/2798582487/se-2</u>
- Hauser, D. J., Ellsworth, P. C., & Gonzalez, R. (2018). Are manipulations checks necessary?. *Frontier in psychology*, *9*, 998. <u>https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00998</u>
- Håvold, O. K. S., Håvold, J. I., & Glavee-Geo, R. (2020). Trust in leaders, work satisfaction and work engagement in public hospitals. *International Journal of Public Leadership*, 17, 145–159. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/ijpl-07-2020-0061</u>

- Helmi, S., Suyanto, M., Efendi, I., Hidayat, A., Mustafa, Z., Istanto, Y., & Susanto, S.
 (2022). The Influence of Internal Marketing on Internal Service Quality Mediated by Job Satisfaction and Employee Loyalty. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 3(6), 63-69. <u>https://doi.org/10.7176/JESD/13-6-09</u>
- Hendriks, M., Burger, M., Rijsenbilt, A., Pleeging, E., & Commandeur, H. (2020).
 Virtuous leadership: a source of employee well-being and trust. *Management Research Review*, 43(8), 951-970. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-07-2019-0326</u>
- Hennig-Thurau, T., Gwinner, K. P., Walsh, G., & Gremler, D. D. (2004). Electronic word-of-mouth via consumer-opinion platforms: what motivates consumers to articulate themselves on the internet? *Journal of interactive marketing*, *18*(1), 38-52. https://doi.org/10.1002/dir.10073
- Henseler, J., Hubona, G., & Ray, P. A. (2016). Using PLS path modeling in new technology research: Updated guidelines. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 116(1), 2-20. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-09-2015-0382</u>
- 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. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8</u>
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sinkovics, R. R. (2009). The use of partial least squares path modeling in international marketing *New Challenges to International*

Marketing (Vol. 20, pp. 277-319): Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

https://doi.org/10.1108/S1474-7979(2009)0000020014

- Herman, M. (2023). *Three surprising keys to employee retention*. Forbes, 200(1), 38–42. https://www.forbes.com
- Heskett, J. L., Jones, T. O., Loveman, G. W., Sasser, W. E., & Schlesinger, L. A. (1994).
 Putting the service profit chain to work. *Harvard Business Review*, 72(2), 164-170. <u>https://coloradohealth.org/sites/default/files/documents/2017-</u> 01/PuttingTheServiceProfitChaintoWork.pdf
- Hollebeek, L. D., & Haar, J. M. (2012). Direct and interaction effects of challenge and hindrance stressors towards job outcomes. *New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations*, 37(2), 58–76.

https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/informit.238728183774934

- Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63(6), 597-606. <u>https://doi.org/10.1086/222355</u>
- Homburg, C., & Stock, R. M. (2005). Exploring the conditions under which salesperson work satisfaction can lead to customer satisfaction. *Psychology & Marketing*, 22(5), 393-420. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20065</u>

Hoppock, R. (1935). Job satisfaction. Harper and Brothers.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2012.11.003

Horgan, D. (2017, April 7). Grads of Life BrandVoice: AT&T's Diverse Mentoring Relationships Accelerate Employee Engagement. Forbes. https://www.forbes.com/sites/gradsoflife/2017/04/07/atts-diverse-mentoringrelationships-accelerate-employee-engagement/?sh=274ff94464d4

- Hsu, A. (2023). *America, we have a problem. People aren't feeling engaged with their work.* NPR. <u>https://www.npr.org/2023/01/25/1150816271/employee-engagement-gallup-survey-workers-hybrid-remote</u>
- Hussain, R. I. (2012). The linkage of employee satisfaction and loyalty in hotel industries of Pakistan. Asian Economic and Financial Review, 2(8), 1098–1105. <u>https://archive.aessweb.com/index.php/5002/article/view/953</u>
- Hwang, K. P., & Wang, M. K. (2013). The impact of ethical issues on privatization:
 Employee perceptions of HRM systems, job satisfaction and organizational
 loyalty in the Taiwan telecommunications industry. *African Journal of Business Management*, 7(6), 381- 400. <u>https://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM10.1254</u>
- Iglesias, O., Markovic, S., & Rialp, J. (2019). How does sensory brand experience influence brand equity? Considering the roles of customer satisfaction, customer affective commitment, and employee empathy. *Journal of Business Research*, 96(March 2019), 343-354. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.05.043</u>
- Ilham, R. (2018). The impact of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and employee performance. *Journal of Advanced Management Science*, 6(1), 50-53. <u>https://doi.org/10.18178/joams.6.1.50-53</u>
- Inc, G. (2020, February 6). *State of the American Workplace report*. Gallup.com. <u>https://www.gallup.com/workplace/285818/state-american-workplace-report.aspx</u>

- Irving, P. G., & Montes, S. D. (2009). Met expectations: The effects of expected and delivered inducements on employee satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82(2), 431–451. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317908X312650
- Islam, J., Mohajan, H., & Datta, R. (2011). A study on job satisfaction and morale of commercial banks in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Economics and Research*, 152–172.
- Islam, M. N., Furuoka, F., & Idris, A. (2021). Mapping the relationship between transformational leadership, trust in leadership, and employee championing behavior during organizational change. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 26(2), 95–102. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmrv.2020.09.002</u>
- Istijanto, & Purusottama, A. (2023). Is traditional media communication less effective than social media and personal selling for brand building? Empirical evidence from a cosmetics brand in Indonesia. *Cogent Social Sciences*, *9*(2), 2276620. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2023.2276620
- Jaiswal, D., & Dhar, R. L. (2016). Impact of perceived organizational support, psychological empowerment, and leader-member exchange on commitment and its subsequent impact on service quality. *International Journal of Productivity* and Performance Management, 65(1), 58–79. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-03-2014-0043</u>

Jensen, J. (1994). Claude S. Fischer, America calling: A social history of the telephone to 1940. *American Journalism*, *11*(3), 278-280

https://doi.org/10.1080/08821127.1994.10731643

- Jiang, Y. (2019). A cognitive appraisal process of customer delight: The moderating effect of place identity. *Journal of Travel Research*, 59(6), 1029–1043. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287519872827</u>
- Johnson, P. R., & Indvik, J. (2001). Slings and arrows of rudeness: Incivility in the workplace, *Journal of Management Development*, 20(8), 705-714. https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM000000005829
- Jones, G., & Kramar, R. (2010). CSR and the building of leadership capability. *Journal* of Global Responsibility, 1(2), 250-259.

https://doi.org/10.1108/20412561011079380

- Jones, G. R., & George, J. M. (1998). The experience and evolution of trust: Implications for cooperation and teamwork. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 531–546. <u>httpss://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1998.926625</u>
- Jones, R. (2018). The relationship of employee engagement and employee job satisfaction to organizational commitment (Order No. 10746854). [Doctoral dissertation, Walden University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. <u>https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/relationship-employeeengagement-job-satisfaction/docview/2029930330/se-2</u>

- Joo, B. K., Zigarmi, D., Nimon, K., & Shuck, B. (2017). Work cognition and psychological well-being: The role of cognitive engagement as a partial mediator. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 53(4), 446–469. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886316688780
- Jun, M., Cai, S., & Shin, H. (2006). TQM practice in maquiladora: Antecedents of employee satisfaction and loyalty. *Journal of Operations Management*, 24(6), 791–812. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2005.09.006</u>
- Kahn, S. (2011). How Philips uses net promoter scores to understand customers. *Harvard Business Review*. <u>https://hbr.org/2011/05/how-philips-uses-net-promoter</u>
- Kahn, W. (2010). The essence of employee engagement: Lessons from the field. In S. Albrecht (Ed.), *Handbook of employee engagement* (pp. 20–30). Edward Elgar.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. Academy of Management Journal. 33, 692–724. <u>https://doi.org/10.5465/256287</u>
- Kang, J., Brashear-Alejandro, T., & Groza, M. D. (2015). Customer-company identification and the effectiveness of loyalty programs. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(2), 464-471. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2014.04.002</u>

Kang, M., & Sung, M. (2017). How symmetrical employee communication leads to employee engagement and positive employee communication behaviors: The mediation of employee-organization relationships. *Journal of Communication Management*, 21(1), 82–102. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-04-2016-0026</u>

- Kanungo, R. N., & Conger, J. A. (1993). Promoting altruism as a corporate goal. Academy of Management Perspectives, 7(3), 37–48. https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1993.9411302345
- Kaplan, J. (2016). The Inventor of Customer Satisfaction Surverys is Sick of them, too, <u>https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2016-05-04/tasty-taco-helpful-</u> hygienist-are-all-those-surveys-of-any-use
- Karatepe, O. M. & Ngeche, R. N. (2012). Does job embeddedness mediate the effect of work engagement on job outcomes? A study of hotel employees in Cameroon. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management, 21*, 440–461. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2012.626730</u>
- Karatepe, O. M., Yavas, U., Babakus, E., & Deitz, G. D. (2018). The effects of organizational and personal resources on stress, engagement, and job outcomes. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 74, 147-161. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2018.04.005
- Kaufman, J., Markey, R., Burton S. D., & Azzarello, D. (2013). Who's responsible for employee engagement? Bain Company Materials (pp. 1–12). <u>https://www.bain.com/contentassets/47694dff757b45c0b1bb34ebad6b9f</u>
 <u>c9/bain_brief_whos_responsible_for_employee_engagement.pdf</u>

Kayeser Fatima, J., & Abdur Razzaque, M. (2014). Service quality and satisfaction in the banking sector. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 31(4), 367-379. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQRM-02-2013-0031</u>

- Keeling, K. A., McGoldrick, P. J., & Sadhu, H. (2013). Staff word-of-mouth (SWOM) and retail employee recruitment. *Journal of Retailing*, 89(1), 88–104. https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.jretai.2012.11.003
- Keiningham, T. L., Aksoy, L., Cooil, B., Andreassen, T. W., & Williams, L. (2008). A holistic examination of Net Promoter. *Journal of Database Marketing & Customer Strategy Management*, 15(2), 79–90.

https://doi.org/10.1057/dbm.2008.4

- Keiningham, T. L., Cooil, B., Andreassen, T. W., & Aksoy, L. (2007). A longitudinal examination of net promoter and firm revenue growth. *Journal of Marketing*, 71(3), 39–51. <u>https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.71.3.039</u>
- Kenton, W. (2023). Self-Interest. Investopedia.

https://www.investopedia.com/terms/s/self-interest.asp

- Khan, G. F., Sarstedt, M., Shiau, W. L., Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Fritze, M. P. (2019). Methodological research on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) An analysis based on social network approaches. *Internet Research*, 29(3), 407-429. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/IntR-12-2017-0509</u>
- Khuong, M., & Linh, U. (2020). Influence of work-related stress on employee motivation, job satisfaction and employee loyalty in hospitality industry. *Management Science Letters*, 10(14), 3279–3290.

https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2020.6.010

Khuong, M. N., & Tien, B. D. (2013). Factors influencing employee loyalty directly and indirectly through job satisfaction: A study of banking sector in Ho Chi Minh City, *International Journal of Current Research and Academic Review*, 1(4), 81–95.

https://www.academia.edu/download/85290417/Mai_20Ngoc_20Khuong_20and_ 20Bui_20Diem_20Tien.pdf

- Kidder, D. L. (2005). Is it "who I am," "what I can get away with," or "what you've done to me"? A multi-theory examination of employee misconduct. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 57(4), 389–398. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-004-6713-x</u>
- Kim, M., & Kim, J. (2020). The influence of authenticity of online reviews on trust formation among travelers. *Journal of Travel Research*, 59(5), 763-776.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287519868307

- Kinicki, A. J., McKee-Ryan, F. M., Schriesheim, C. A., & Carson, K. P. (2002). Assessing the construct validity of the job descriptive index: a review and metaanalysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 14-32. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.14
- Kline, R. B. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (4th ed.). The Guilford Press.
- Klotz, A. C., & Bolino, M. C. (2022). *When quiet quitting Is worse than the real thing*. Harvard Business Review. <u>https://hbr.org/2022/09/when-quiet-quitting-is-worse-than-the-real-thing</u>

- Knoll, D. L., & Gill, H. (2011). Antecedents of trust in supervisors, subordinates, and peers. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26(4), 313–330. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683941111124845
- Kock, N. (2015a). Common method bias in PLS-SEM: A full collinearity assessment approach. *International Journal of e-Collaboration*, 11(4), 1-10. <u>https://doi.org/10.4018/ijec.2015100101</u>
- Kock, N. (2015b). A note on how to conduct a factor-based PLS-SEM analysis. *International Journal of e-Collaboration*, 11(3), 1-9. https://doi.org/ 10.4018/ijec.2015070101
- Kock, N., & Gaskins, L. (2014). The mediating role of voice and accountability in the relationship between internet diffusion and government corruption in Latin America and Sub-Saharan Africa. *Information Technology for Development*, 20(1), 23-43. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/02681102.2013.832129</u>
- Kock, N., & Hadaya, P. (2018). Minimum sample size estimation in PLS-SEM: The inverse square root and gamma-exponential methods. *Information Systems Journal*, 28(1), 227-261. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12131</u>
- Kock, N. & Lynn, G. S. (2012). Lateral collinearity and misleading results in variancebased SEM: An illustration and recommendations. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 13(7), 546-580. https://doi.org/10.17705/1JAIS.00302
- Kollmann, T., Stöckmann, C., Kensbock, J. M., & Peschl, A. (2020). What satisfies younger versus older employees, and why? An aging perspective on equity theory

to explain interactive effects of employee age, monetary rewards, and task contributions on job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*, *59*(1), 101-115. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21981

- Korsgaard, M. A., Brower, H. H., & Lester, S. W. (2015). It isn't always mutual: A critical review of dyadic trust. *Journal of Management*, 41(1), 47-70. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314547521</u>
- Kot-Radojewska, M., & Timenko, I. V. (2018). Employee loyalty to the organization in the context of the form of employment. *Oeconomia Copernicana*, 9(3), 511-527. https://doi.org/10.24136/oc.2018.026
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person–job, person–organization, person–group, and person–supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2), 281–342. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744–6570.2005.00672.x</u>
- Krosgaard, M. A., Brodt, S. E., & Whitener, E. M. (2002). Trust in the face of conflict: The role of managerial trustworthy behavior and organizational context. *Journal* of Applied Psychology, 87(2), 312–319. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-</u> 9010.87.2.312
- Kulikowski, K., & Sedlak, P. (2020). Can you buy work engagement? The relationship between pay, fringe benefits, financial bonuses, and work engagement. *Current Psychology*, 39(1), 343-353. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-017-9768-4</u>

- Kumar, V., Dalla Pozza, I., & Ganesh, J. (2013). Revisiting the satisfaction–loyalty relationship: Empirical generalizations and directions for future research. *Journal* of Retailing, 89(3), 246–262. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2013.02.001</u>
- Kurdi, B., & Alshurideh, M. (2020). Employee retention and organizational performance:
 Evidence from banking industry. *Management Science Letters*, *10*(16), 39813990. <u>https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2020.7.011</u>
- Kurdi, B., Alshurideh, M., & Alnaser, A. (2020). The impact of employee satisfaction on customer satisfaction: Theoretical and empirical underpinning. *Management Science Letters*, 10(15), 3561-3570. <u>https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2020.6.038</u>
- Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., Stewart, K. A., & Adis, C.
 S. (2017). Perceived organizational support: A meta-analytic evaluation of organizational support theory. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1854–1884.
 https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315575554
- LaGree, D., Houston, B., Duffy, M., & Shin, H. (2023). The effect of respect: Respectful communication at work drives resiliency, engagement, and job satisfaction among early career employees. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 60(3), 1-31.
- Lam, T., & Qiu Zhang, H. (2003). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the Hong Kong fast food industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 15(4), 214–220. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/09596110310475667</u>

- Lawson, S., Boskovic, T., Zurowska, E., Shimizu, A., & DeRubeis, D. (2022). After the great resignation: Shifting expectations for employers. BlackRock. <u>https://www.blackrock.com/corporate/literature/whitepaper/after-the-great-</u> resignation-shifting-expectations-for-employers.pdf
- Lee, T. J. (2017). Relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction, and turnover intentions among internal auditors (Publication Number) (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University). ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global; ProQuest One Business <u>https://www.proquest.com/dissertationstheses/relationship-between-intrinsic-job-satisfaction/docview/1867051972/se-2</u>
- Lee, Y. (2022). Linking internal CSR with the positive communicative behaviors of employees: The role of social exchange relationships and employee engagement. Social Responsibility Journal, 18(2), 348–367. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-04-</u> <u>2020-0121</u>
- Legerstee, T. (2013). Asking employees the ultimate question: Developing the Employee Promotor Score. [Doctoral dissertation, Erasmus University Rotterdam]. https://thesis.eur.nl/pub/17875/Article-Employee-Promoter-Score-FINAL.pdf
- Leisen Pollack, B., & Alexandrov, A. (2013). Nomological validity of the Net Promoter Index question. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 27(2), 118-129. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/08876041311309243</u>

- Li, N., Liang, J., & Crant, J. M. (2010). The role of proactive personality in job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior: A relational perspective.
 Journal of Applied Psychology, 95(2), 395. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018079</u>
- Liengaard, B. D., Sharma, P. N., Hult, G. T. M., Jensen, M. B., Sarstedt, M., Hair, J. F., & Ringle, C. M. (2021). Prediction: coveted, yet forsaken? Introducing a cross-validated predictive ability test in partial least squares path modeling. *Decision Sciences*, 52(2), 362-392. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/deci.12445</u>
- Lindebaum, D., & Gabriel, Y. (2016). Anger and organization studies: From social disorder to moral order. *Organization Studies*, *37*(7), 903–918. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840616640848</u>
- Logan, G. M. (1984). Loyalty and a sense of purpose. *California Management Review*, 27(1), 149–156. <u>https://doi.org/10.2307/411651</u>
- Loi, R., Lam, L. W., Ngo, H. Y., & Cheong, S. I. (2015). Exchange mechanisms between ethical leadership and affective commitment. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 30(6), 645–658. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-08-2013-0278</u>
- Longo, M., & Mura, M. (2011). The effect of Intellectual Capital on employees' satisfaction and retention. *Information and Management*, 48(7), 278–287. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2011.06.005</u>
- Lovejoy, M., Kelly, E. L., Kubzansky, L. D., & Berkman, L. F. (2021). Work redesign for the 21st century: Promising strategies for enhancing worker well-being.

American Journal of Public Health, 111(10), 1787-1795.

https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2021.306283

- Lowry, D. S., Simon, A., & Kimberley, N. (2002). Toward improved employment relations practices of casual employees in the New South Wales registered clubs industry. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 13(1), 53–70. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.1013
- Lowry, P. B., & Gaskin, J. (2014). Partial least squares (PLS) structural equation modeling (SEM) for building and testing behavioral causal theory: When to choose it and how to use it. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 57(2), 123–146. https://doi.org/ 10.1109/TPC.2014.2312452
- Lu, L., Lu, A. C. C., Gursoy, D., & Neale, N. R. (2016). Work engagement, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions: A comparison between supervisors and line-level employees. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality* Management, 28(4), 737-761. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-07-2014-0360</u>
- Lucas, E. (2022, March 9). Employees say unsustainable workloads and expectations are driving them to quit. Forbes. <u>https://www.forbes.com/sites/emmylucas/2022/03/09/employees-say-</u> unsustainable-workloads-and-expectations-are-driving-them-to-

quit/?sh=2429fea97c34

Lynch, C. (2022). What are friends for?: The influence of workplace friendship on employee loyalty and organizational commitment (Publication No. 29163678) [Masters thesis, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. <u>https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/what-</u> <u>are-friends-influence-workplace-friendship/docview/2679830771/se-2</u>

- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial* and Organizational Psychology, 1(1), 3-30. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.0002.x
- Macey, W. H., Schneider, B., Barbera, K. M., & Young, S. A. (2009). Employee engagement: Tools for analysis, practice, and competitive advantage. Wiley-Blackwell.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2011). Construct measurement and validation procedures in MIS and behavioral research: Integrating new and existing techniques. *MIS Quarterly*, 35(2), 293-334. https://doi.org/10.2307/23044045
- Malhotra, N. K. (2019). *Marketing research: An applied orientation* (7th edition). Pearson.
- Mallin, M., & Munoz, L. S. (2013). An exploratory study of the role of neutralization on ethical intentions among salespeople. *Marketing Management Journal*, 23(2), 1-20. <u>https://ssrn.com/abstract=2461429</u>
- Marinescu, I., Chamberlain, A., Smart, M., & Klein, N. (2021). Incentives can reduce bias in online employer reviews. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 27(2), 393–407. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/xap0000342</u>

- Markey, R. (2014). *The Benefits of a Competitive Benchmark Net Promoter Score*, <u>https://www.bain.com/insights/the-benefits-of-acompetitive-benchmark-net-promoter-score</u>
- Marsden, P., Samson, A., & Upton, N. (2005). Advocacy drives growth. *Brand Strategy*, 1(198), 45–47. <u>http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/id/eprint/21889</u>
- Martin, E. (2004). Who's kicking whom? Employees' orientations to work. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 16(3), 182-188. https://doi.org/10.1108/09596110410531177
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 397–422. <u>https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397</u>
- Mason, C. M., & Griffin, M. A. (2002). Group task satisfaction: Applying the construct of job satisfaction to groups. *Small Group Research*, 33(3), 271–312. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/10496402033003001</u>
- Matzler, K., & Renzl, B. (2006). The relationship between interpersonal trust, employee satisfaction, and employee loyalty. *Total Quality Management and Business Excellence*, 17(10), 1261-1271. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/14783360600753653</u>
- Maxwell, A. L., & Lévesque, M. (2014). Trustworthiness: A critical ingredient for entrepreneurs seeking investors. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. 38(5), 1057–1080. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2011.00475.x</u>

- Mayer, R. C., & Davis, J. H. (1999). The effect of the performance appraisal system on trust for management: A field quasi-experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(1), 123–136. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.84.1.123</u>
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. Academy of Management Review, 20(3), 709-734. <u>https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080335</u>
- Mayer, R. C., & Gavin, M. B. (2005). Trust in management and performance: Who minds the shop while the employees watch the boss? *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(5), 874–888. <u>https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2005.18803928</u>
- Mazzola, J. J., & Disselhorst, R. (2019). Should we be "challenging" employees?": A critical review and meta-analysis of the challenge-hindrance model of stress.
 Journal of Organizational Behavior, 40(8), 949-961.
 https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2412
- McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect-and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 24–59. <u>https://doi.org/10.5465/256727</u>
- Megaladevi, P. (2023). The role of Net Promoter Score (NPS) in improving and predicting sales growth: An empirical investigation. International Journal of Research Culture Society, 7(3) 121 -123.

https://doi.org/10.2017/IJRCS/202303024

- Meira, J. V. D. S., & Hancer, M. (2021). Using the social exchange theory to explore the employee-organization relationship in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 33(2), 670–692.
 https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-06-2020-0538
- Men, L. R., Yue, C. A., & Liu, Y. (2020). "Vision, passion, and care:" The impact of charismatic executive leadership communication on employee trust and support for organizational change. *Public Relations Review*, 46(3), 101927. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2020.101927
- Meschke, S. (2021). *The Concept of Employee Loyalty. In: Employee Loyalty.* Springer, Cham. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-68425-9_3</u>
- Messersmith, J. G., Patel, P. C., Lepak, D. P., & Gould-Williams, J. S. (2011). Unlocking the black box: Exploring the link between high-performance work systems and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(6), 1105 -1118. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024710
- Miller, C. A., Guidry, J. P., Dahman, B., & Thomson, M. D. (2020). A tale of two diverse Qualtrics samples: information for online survey researchers. *Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention*, 29(4), 731-735. https://doi.org/10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-19-0846
- Milliman, J., Gatling, A., & Kim, J. (2018). The effect of workplace spirituality on hospitality employee engagement, intention to stay, and service delivery. *Journal*

of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 35, 56–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2018.03.002

- Mittal, S., Gupta, V., & Motiani, M. (2022). Examining the linkages between employee brand love, affective commitment, positive word-of-mouth, and turnover intentions: A social identity theory perspective. *IIMB Management Review*, *34*(1), 7–17 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iimb.2022.04.002</u>
- Mobley, W. H., Griffeth, R. W., Hand, H. H., & Meglino, B. M. (1979). Review and conceptual analysis of the employee turnover process, *Psychological Bulletin*, 86(3), 493–522. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.86.3.493</u>
- Mohammad, J., Quoquab Habib, F., & Alias, M. A. (2011). Job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior: An empirical study at higher learning institutions. *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, *16*(2), 149–165.
 https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jihad-
 Mohammad/publication/266872655_Job_satisfaction_and_organisational_citizens
 https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jihad-
 https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jihad-

An-empirical-study-at-higher-learning-institutions.pdf

Mohammed, L. A. (2023). Internal Marketing and Staff Satisfaction in Ras AL-Khaimah Police. Asian Journal of Research in Business and Management, 4(4), 165–175. <u>https://doi:10.5539/ijms.v8n2p147</u>

- Mölders, S., Brosi, P., Spörrle, M., & Welpe, I. M. (2019). The effect of top management trustworthiness on turnover intentions via negative emotions: The moderating role of gender. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *156*(4), 957–969.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3600-9issue
- Mone, E., & London, M. (2009). *Employee engagement through effective performance management: A practical guide for managers*. Routledge.
- Moorman, R. H. (1993). The influence of cognitive and affective-based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Relations*, 46(6), 759–776. https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267930460060
- Naus, F., Van Iterson, A., & Roe, R. (2007). Organizational cynicism: Extending the exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect model of employees' responses to adverse conditions in the workplace. *Human Relations*, 60(5), 683-718.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726707079198

- Newman, A., Kiazad, K., Miao, Q., & Cooper, B. (2014). Examining the cognitive and affective trust-based mechanisms underlying the relationship between ethical leadership and organizational citizenship: A case of the head leading the heart? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 123(1), 113–123. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1803-2</u>
- Nguyen, C. M. A., & Ha, M.-T. (2023). The interplay between internal communication, employee engagement, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty in higher education

institutions in Vietnam. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10(1), 329. <u>https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01806-8</u>

- Nimon, K., Zigarmi, D., Houson, D., Witt, D., & Diehl, J. (2011). The work cognition inventory: Initial evidence of construct validity. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 22(1), 7-35.
- Oliver, R. (1997). *Satisfaction: A behavioral perspective on the consumer*. The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc, New York.
- Orgambídez-Ramos, A., & de Almeida, H. (2017). Work engagement, social support, and job satisfaction in Portuguese nursing staff: A winning combination. *Applied Nursing Research*, 36(1), 37–41. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apnr.2017.05.012</u>
 <u>0897-1897</u>
- Organ, D. W. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *12*(1), 43–72.
- Owen, R. (2019). Net Promoter Score and its successful application. In K. Kompella (Ed.), *Marketing wisdom* (pp. 17–29). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-7724-1_2
- Owen, R., & Brooks, L. L. (2008). Answering the ultimate question: How Net Promoter can transform your business? John Wiley & Sons.
- Palich, L. E., Hom, P. W., & Griffeth, R. W. (1995). Managing in the international context: Testing cultural generality of sources of commitment to multinational

enterprises. Journal of Management, 21(4), 671-690. https://doi.org/10.1016/0149-2063(95)90005-5

- Paolacci, G., Chandler, J., & Ipeirotis, P. G. (2010). Running experiments on MTurk. Judgment and Decision Making, 5(5), 411-419.
- Parady, G., Ory, D., & Walker, J. (2021). The overreliance on statistical goodness-of-fit and under-reliance on model validation in discrete choice models: A review of validation practices in the transportation academic literature. *Journal of Choice Modelling*, 38, 100257. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jocm.2020.100257</u>
- Peer, E., Brandimarte, L., Samat, S., & Acquisti, A. (2017). Beyond the Turk: Alternative platforms for crowdsourcing behavioral research. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 70(1), 153-163. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.01.006</u>
- Peer, E., Rothschild, D., Gordon, A., Evernden, Z., & Damer, E. (2022). Data quality of platforms and panels for online behavioral research. *Behavior Research Methods*, 1-46. <u>https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-021-01694-3</u>
- Pei-Lee, T., Chen, C. Y., Chin, W. C., & Siew, Y. Y. (2017). Do the Big Five Personality Factors affect knowledge-sharing behavior? A study of Malaysian universities, *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science*, 16(1), 47–62.
 <u>https://jml.um.edu.my/index.php/MJLIS/article/view/6682</u>

Petter, S., Straub, D., & Rai, A. (2007). Specifying formative constructs in information systems research. *MIS Quarterly*, 31(4), 623-656. https://doi.org/10.2307/25148814

- Podsakoff, N. P., LePine, J. A., & LePine, M. A. (2007). Differential challenge stressorhindrance stressor relationships with job attitudes, turnover intentions, turnover, and withdrawal behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 438–454. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.438
- 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, 879-903. <u>https://doig.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879</u>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 539-569.
- Pollack, B. L., & Alexandrov, A. (2013). Nomological validity of the Net Promoter Index question. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 27(2), 118-129. https://doi.org/10.1108/08876041311309243
- Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management*, 12(4), 531-544. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/014920638601200408</u>
- Powers, E. L. (2000). Employee loyalty in the new millennium: Quarterly journal. *S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal*, 65(3), 4–8. <u>https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/employee-loyalty-new-millennium/docview/231140674/se-2</u>

Prabhakar, A. (2016). Analysis of high job satisfaction relationship with employee loyalty in context to workplace environment. *International Journal of Applied Research*, 2(4), 640-643. <u>https://www.academia.edu/download/81828734/2-4-</u> <u>29.pdf</u>

Price, J. L. (1977). The study of turnover. Iowa State Press.

Purwanto, A. (2021). Partial least squares structural squation modeling (PLS-SEM) analysis for social and management research: a literature review. *Journal of Industrial Engineering & Management Research*.

https://doi.org/10.7777/jiemar.v2i4

Putri, L. E., Rimawan, E., & Setyadi, A. (2021). The Relationship of Job Satisfaction, Flexible Working Arrangements and Employee Performance using SEM-PLS and FIMIX-PLS: A Case Study of Employees in Insurance Company. *Nveo-Natural Volatural & Essential Oils Journal/ NVEO*, 11978-11991.

https://www.nveo.org/index.php/journal/article/download/2487/2179/2524

Qualtrics. (2020). Transactional vs. Relational NPS,

https://www.Qualtrics.com/uk/experience-management/customer/transactionalvsrelational-nps

Raassens, N., & Haans, H. (2017). NPS and online WOM: Investigating the relationship between customers' promoter scores and eWOM behavior. *Journal of Service Research*, 20(3), 322-334. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670517696965</u>

- Rajasekaran, N. (2018). How net promoter score relates to organizational growth. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, 6(2), 972-981. https://ijcrt.org/papers/IJCRT1807351.pdf
- Rajput, S., Singhal, M., & Tiwari, S. (2016). Job satisfaction and employee loyalty: A study of academicians. *Asian Journal of Management*, 7(2), 105-109. <u>https://doi.org/10.5958/2321-5763.2016.00015.9</u>
- Rao, N. D., & Rajasekaran, N. (2019). Impact of employee net promoter score in organization growth. *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews*, 5(4) 1-6. <u>https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330103327</u>
- Rayton, B., Dodge, T., & D'Analeze, G. (2012). The evidence: employee engagement task force "Nailing the evidence" workgroup. Engage for Success. https://researchportal.bath.ac.uk/files/14684670/The_Evidence.pdf
- Reichheld, F. (2006a). The microeconomics of customer relationships. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 47(2), 73–79. <u>https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/the-</u> <u>microeconomics-of-customer-relationships/</u>
- Reichheld, F. (2006b). *The Ultimate Question Driving Good Profits and True Growth*. Bain & Company.
- Reichheld, F. (2011). *The ultimate question 2.0 (revised and expanded edition): How net promoter companies thrive in a customer-driven world*. Harvard Business Review Press.

- Reichheld, F., & Markey, R. (2006). *NPS: The next Six Sigma? The net promoter score* for measuring customer loyalty is emerging as a favorite metric for managers seeking organic growth. Bain & Company. <u>https://www.bain.com/insights/nps-</u> <u>the-next-six-sigma-the-net-promoter-score/</u>
- Reichheld, F. F. (1996). Learning from customer defections. *Harvard Business Review*, 74(2), 56-67.
- Reichheld, F. F. (2003). The one number you need to grow. *Harvard Business Review*, 81(12), 46–55 <u>https://www.nashc.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/the-one-number-you-need-to-know.pdf</u>
- Reichheld, F. F., & Markey, R. (2011). *The ultimate question 2.0: How net promoter companies thrive in a customer-driven world*? Harvard Business Press.
- Rentsch, J. R., & Steel, R. P. (1992). Construct and concurrent validation of the Andrews and Withey job satisfaction questionnaire. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 52(2), 357–367. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164492052002011</u>
- Rich, B. L. (2006). Job engagement: Construct validation and relationships with job satisfaction, job involvement, and intrinsic motivation (Publication No. 3228825)
 [Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/job-engagement-constructvalidation-relationships/docview/305326606/se-2

- 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. <u>http://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2010.51468988</u>
- Rigdon, E. E. (2012). Rethinking partial least squares path modeling: In praise of simple methods. *Long Range Planning*, 45(5), 341-358. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2012.09.010</u>
- Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., Sinkovics, N., & Sinkovics, R. R. (2023). A perspective on using partial least squares structural equation modelling in data articles. *Data in Brief*, 48, 109074. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2023.109074
- Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., & Straub, D. W. (2012). A critical look at the use of PLS-SEM in MIS Quarterly. *MIS Quarterly*, *36*(1), iii-xiv.

https://doi.org/10.2307/41410402

- Riyanto, S., Endri, E., & Herlisha, N. (2021). Effect of work motivation and job satisfaction on employee performance: Mediating role of employee engagement. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 19(3), 162. https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.19(3).2021.14
- Roberts, C., Alpert, F., & Roberts, C. (2016). Strategic drivers of customer engagement:
 Practical applications. In Brodie, R., Hollebeek, L., Conduit, J. (eds.) *Contemporary Issues in Customer Engagement*, (pp. 171-192). Routledge.
- Roemer, E., Schuberth, F., & Henseler, J. (2021). HTMT2–an improved criterion for assessing discriminant validity in structural equation modeling. *Industrial*

Management & Data Systems, 121(12), 2637-2650.

https://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-02-2021-0082

- Rogers, J. D., Clow, K. E., & Kash, T. J. (2014). Increasing job satisfaction of service personnel. *Journal of Service Marketing*, 8(1), 14-26. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/08876049410053267</u>
- Rogers, K. (2018). Do your employees feel respected? *Harvard Business Review*, August, pp. 62–71.
- Rosanas, J. M., & Velilla, M. (2003). Loyalty and trust as the ethical bases of organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 44(1), 49–59.
 https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023238525433
- Rusbult, C. E., Farrell, D., Rogers, G., & Mainous, A. G. (1988). Impact of exchange variables on exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect: An integrative model of responses to declining job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, *31*(3), 599–627.
 https://doi.org/10.2307/256461
- Safdar, K., & Pacheco, I. (2019). *The Dubious Management Fad Sweeping Corporate America*, <u>https://www.wsj.com/articles/thedubious-management-fad-sweeping-</u> <u>corporate-america11557932084</u>
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600–619.

https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169

Salas-Vallina, A., & Alegre, J. (2021). Happiness at work: Developing a shorter measure. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 27(3), 460–480. https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2018.24

Salmela-Aro, K. & Upadyaya, K. (2018). Role of demands-resources in work engagement and burnout in different career stages. *Journal of Vocational Behavioral*, 108(1), 190-200. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.08.002</u>

Samson, A. (2006). Understanding the buzz that matters: Negative vs positive word of mouth. *International Journal of Market Research*, *48*(6), 647–657.

https://doi.org/10.1177/147078530604800603

- Sarstedt, M., & Cheah, J. H. (2019). Partial least squares structural equation modeling using SmartPLS: a software review. *Journal of Marketing Analytics* 7, 196–202 (2019). <u>https://doi.org/10.1057/s41270-019-00058-3</u>
- Sarstedt, M., Hair, J. F., Cheah, J. H., Becker, J. M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). How to specify, estimate, and validate higher-order constructs in PLS-SEM. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 27(3), 197-211. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ausmj.2019.05.003</u>
- Sarstedt, M., Radomir, L., Moisescu, O. I., & Ringle, C. M. (2022). Latent class analysis in PLS-SEM: A review and recommendations for future applications. *Journal of Business Research*, 138, 398-407. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.08.051</u>
- Sawaneh, I. A., & Kamara, F. K. (2019). An effective employee retention policies as a way to boost organizational performance. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 7(2), 41-48.

- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 25(3), 293-315.
 https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248
- Scholl, R. W. (1981). Differentiating organizational commitment from expectancy as a motivating force. *Academy of Management Review*, 6(4), 589-599. <u>https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1981.4285698</u>
- Schoorman, F. D., Mayer, R. C., & Davis, J. H. (2007). An integrative model of organizational trust: Past, present, and future. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), 344–354. <u>https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.24348410</u>
- Schriesheim, C., & Tsui, A. S. (1980). Development and validation of a short satisfaction instrument for use in survey feedback interventions. Western Academy of Management Meeting 1980, 115-17.
- Sedlak, P. (2020). Employee Net Promoter Score (eNPS) as a single-item measure of employee work satisfaction. An empirical evidence from companies operating in Poland. In A. Michałkiewicz & W. Mierzejewska (Eds.), *Contemporary Organization and Management. Challenges and Trends.* 347–357. <u>https://doi.org/10.18778/8220-333-2.21</u>
- Serenko, A. (2023). The human capital management perspective on quiet quitting: recommendations for employees, managers, and national policymakers, *Journal*

of Knowledge Management, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-

print. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-10-2022-0792

Shamon, H., & Berning, C. (2019). Attention check items and instructions in online surveys with incentivized and non-incentivized samples: Boon or bane for data quality? *Survey Research Methods*, 14(1), 55-77.

https://doi.org/10.18148/srm/2020.v14i1.7374

- Shamon, H., & Berning, C. C. (2020). Attention check items and instructions in online surveys with incentivized and non-incentivized samples: Boon or bane for data quality? *Survey Research Methods*, *14*(1), 55-77. https://doi.org/10.18148/srm/2020.v14i1.7374
- Sharma, P. N., Liengaard, B. D., Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2023).
 Predictive model assessment and selection in composite-based modeling using
 PLS-SEM: Extensions and guidelines for using CVPAT. European Journal of
 Marketing, 57(6), 662-1677. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-08-2020-0636</u>
- Shaw, J. D. (1999). Job satisfaction and turnover intentions: The moderating role of positive affect. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *139*(2), 242–244. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/00224549909598378</u>
- Shiau, W. L., & Luo, M. M. (2012). Factors affecting online group buying intention and satisfaction: A social exchange theory perspective. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28(6), 2431–2444. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2012.07.030</u>

- Shields, M. A., & Ward, M. (2001). Improving nurse retention in the National Health Service in England: The impact of job satisfaction on intentions to quit. *Journal of Health Economics*, 20(5), 677-701. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-</u> 6296(01)00092-3
- Shmueli, G., Sarstedt, M., Hair, J. F., Cheah, J. H., Ting, H., Vaithilingam, S., & Ringle,
 C. M. (2019). Predictive model assessment in PLS-SEM: guidelines for using
 PLSpredict. *European Journal of Marketing*, 53(11), 2322-

2347. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-02-2019-0189</u>

- Shore, L. M., Bommer, W. H., Rao, A. N., & Seo, J. (2009). Social and economic exchange in the employee-organization relationship: The moderating role of reciprocation wariness. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24(8), 701-721. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940910996752</u>
- Shore, L. M., Tetrick, L. E., & Barksdale, K. (2001). Social and economic exchanges as mediators of commitment and performance [Unpublished Manuscript].
- Shuck, B. (2020). Employee engagement: A research overview. Routledge.
- Shuck, B., Adelson, J. L., & Reio, T. G. (2017). The employee engagement scale: Initial evidence for construct validity and implications for theory and practice. *Human Resource Management*, 56(6), 953-977. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21811</u>
- Shuck, B., Kim, W., & Chai, D. S. (2021). The chicken and egg conundrum: Job satisfaction or employee engagement and implications for human resources. *New*

Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development, 33(1), 4-24. https://doi.org/10.1002/nha3.20302

- Shuck, B., & Reio, T. G. (2011). The employee engagement landscape and HRD: How do we link theory and scholarship to current practice? *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13(4), 419–428. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422311431153</u>
- Shuck, B., & Reio, T. G. (2014). Employee engagement and well-being: A moderation model and implications for practice. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 21(1), 43-58. https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051813494240
- Shuck, B., Twyford, D., Reio, T. G., & Shuck, A. (2014). Human resource development practices and employee engagement: Examining the connection with employee turnover intentions. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 25(2), 239–270. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21190</u>
- Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. (2010). Employee engagement and HRD: A seminal review of the foundations. *Human Resource Development Review*, 9(1), 89-110. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484309353560
- Shuck, B., Zigarmi, D., & Owen, J. (2015). Psychological needs, engagement, and work intentions: A Bayesian multi-measurement mediation approach and implications for HRD. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 39(1), 2–21. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-08-2014-0061</u>

- Sihombing, S. O., & Berlianto, M. P. (2018). Antecedents of employee loyalty in educational setting: An empirical study. *International Research Journal of Business Studies*, 10(2), 99–109. <u>https://doi.org/10.21632/irjbs</u>
- Silva, P. (2006). Effects of disposition on hospitality employee job satisfaction and commitment. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 18(4), 317–328. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/09596110610665320</u>
- Simons, T. (2002). Behavioral integrity: The perceived alignment between managers' words and deeds as a research focus. *Organization Science*, 13(1), 18–35. https://doi:10.1287/orsc.13.1.18.543
- Simons, T., & Roberson, Q. (2003). Why managers should care about fairness: The effects of aggregate justice perceptions on organizational outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(3), 432–443. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.3.432</u>
- Singh, J. (1988). Consumer complaint intentions and behavior: Definitional and taxonomical issues. *Journal of Marketing*, *52*(1), 93–107.

https://doi.org/10.2307/1251688

Smith, J. L. (2015). Exploring patient loyalty as related to a large midwestern rehabilitation company (Doctoral dissertation, Capella University). Wanous, J. P., Poland, T. D., Premack, S. L., & Davis, K. S. (1992). The effects of met expectations on newcomer attitudes and behaviors: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(3), 1-195. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-</u> <u>9010.77.3.288</u>
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement: A strategy for the study of attitudes.* Rand McNally.
- Smith, R. E., & Vogt, C. A. (1995). The effects of integrating advertising and negative word-of-mouth communications on message processing and response. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 4(2), 133–151.

https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp0402_03

- Smith-Crowe, K., & Warren, D. E. (2014). The emotion-evoked collective corruption model: The role of emotion in the spread of corruption within organizations. *Organization Science*, 25(4), 1154–1171. <u>https://doi:10.1287/orsc.2014.0896</u>
- Spector, P. E. (1997). Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences (Vol. 3). Sage.
- Srirahayu, D. P., Anugrah, E. P., & Layyinah, K. (2021). Influence of satisfaction and loyalty on Net Promoter Score (NPS) in academic libraries in Indonesia. Library Management, 42(6/7), 325–339. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/LM-06-2020-0090</u>
- Stantcheva, S. (2022). How to run surveys: A guide to creating your own identifying variation and revealing the invisible. *Annual Review of Economics*, 15(1), 1-38. <u>https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-091622-010157</u>
- Straub, D., Boudreau, M. C., & Gefen, D. (2004). Validation guidelines for IS positivist research. *Communications of the Association for Information systems*, 13(1), <u>https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.01324</u>

- Streukens, S., & Leroi-Werelds, S. (2016). Bootstrapping and PLS-SEM: A step-by-step guide to get more out of your bootstrap results. *European management journal*, 34(6), 618-632. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2016.06.003Get rights and</u> <u>content</u>
- Suardi, L. S., Putra, R. M., Agustin, P. L., & Maharani, A. (2022). Investigating employee engagement: Will occupational health safety actually impact employee loyalty? *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Organisasi*, *13*(1), 74–94. https://doi.org/10.29244/jmo.v13i1.34664
- Suh, Y. J. (2016). The role of relational social capital and communication in the relationship between CSR and employee attitudes: A multilevel analysis. *Journal* of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 23(4), 410-423. https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051816627564

https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051816637564

- Suliman, A., & Al Kathairi, M. (2013), Organizational justice, commitment and performance in developing countries: The case of the UAE, Employee Relations, 35(1), 98–115. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/01425451311279438</u>
- Sun, Y., Jiang, H., Hwang, Y., & Shin, D. (2018). Why should I share? An answer from personal information management and organizational citizenship behavior perspectives. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 87, 146–154. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.05.034</u>

- Sverke, M., & Goslinga, S. (2003). The consequences of job insecurity for employers and unions: Exit, voice, and loyalty. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 24(2), 241-270. https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X03024002005
- Swan, J. E., & Oliver, R. L. (1989). Post-purchase communications by consumers. Journal of Retailing, 65(4), 516–533. <u>https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/postpurchase-communications-consumers/docview/228615798/se-2</u>
- Sweeney, J., Payne, A., Frow, P., & Liu, D. (2020). Customer advocacy: A distinctive form of word of mouth. *Journal of Service Research*, 23(2), 139-155. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670519900541
- Syahrizal, S., & Patrisia, D. (2019, September). *Employee engagement, satisfaction, and loyalty: Preliminary findings*. Proceedings of the Third Padang International Conference on Economics Education, Economics, Business and Management, Accounting, and Entrepreneurship (pp. 118–124). Atlantis Press. https://doi.org/110.2991/piceeba-19.2019.78

Syeyen, G. M., & Van Wyk, J. N. (1999). Job satisfaction: perceptions of principals and educators in urban black schools in South Africa. South African Journal of Education, 19(1), 37-44. <u>http://pascal-</u>

francis.inist.fr/vibad/index.php?action=getRecordDetail&idt=2011553

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (6th edition). Pearson. Tenenhaus, M., Vinzi, V. E., Chatelin, Y. M., & Lauro, C. (2005). PLS path modeling. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 48(1), 159-205. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csda.2004.03.005</u>

Tentama, F., Rahmawati, P. A., & Muhopilah, P. (2019). The effect and implications of work stress and workload on job satisfaction. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*, 8(11), 2498-2502.
 http://eprints.uad.ac.id/20124/1/The-Effect-And-Implications-Of-Work-Stress-

And-Workload-On-Job-Satisfaction.pdf

- Tepayakul, R., & Rinthaisong, I. (2018). Job Satisfaction and employee engagement among human resources staff of Thai private higher education institutions. *The Journal of Behavioral Science*, *13*(2), 68–81. <u>https://so06.tci-</u> thaijo.org/index.php/IJBS/article/view/109260
- Thibault, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups*. John Wiley and Sons.
- Thibault, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (2017). *The social psychology of groups*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315135007
- Tomlinson, E. C., & Mayer, R. C. (2009). The role of causal attribution dimensions in trust repair. Academy of Management Review, 34(1), 85–104. <u>https://doi:10.5465/AMR.2009.35713291</u>

- Ton, Z., & Huckman, R. S. (2008). Managing the impact of employee turnover on performance: The role of process conformance. *Organization Science*, 19(1), 56-68. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1070.0294
- Tran Thi, K. P., & Tran, T. V. (2020). Job satisfaction, employee loyalty and job performance in the hospitality industry: A moderated model. *Asian Economic and Financial Review*, 10(6), 698.

https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.aefr.2020.106.698.713

- Truss, C., Alfes, K., Delbridge, R., Shantz, A., & Soane, E. (2013). *Employee* engagement in theory and practice. Routledge London.
- Turkyilmaz, A., Akman, G., Ozkan, C., & Pastuszak, Z. (2011). Empirical study of public sector employee loyalty and satisfaction. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 111(5), 675–696. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/02635571111137250</u>
- Tyagi, A., Mishra, G., & Ansari, A. H. (2023). The mediating role of organization engagement and job engagement in the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention: A study in service organizations. *International Journal of Economics and Business Research*, 25(2), 229–248. <u>https://doi.org/10.1504/IJEBR.2023.127944</u>
- Tyler, T. R. (2001). Why do people rely on others? Social identity and social aspects of trust. In K. S. Cook (Ed.), *Trust in Society*, 285–306. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Uen, J. F., Ahlstrom, D., Chen, S., & Liu, J. (2015). Employer brand management, organizational prestige, and employees' word-of-mouth referrals in Taiwan. *Asia*

Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 53(1), 104–123.

https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7941.12024

- Van Hoye, G. (2013). Recruiting through employee referrals: An examination of employees' motives. *Human Performance*, 26(5), 451–464. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2013.836199</u>
- Van Hoye, G., & Lievens, F. (2005). Recruitment-related information sources and organizational attractiveness: Can something be done about negative publicity? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *13*(3), 179–187. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2005.00313.x
- Van Hoye, G., & Lievens, F. (2007a). Social influences on organizational attractiveness: Investigating if and when word of mouth matters, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37(9), 2024–2047. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00249.x</u>
- Van Hoye, G., & Lievens, F. (2007b). Investigating web-based recruitment sources: Employee testimonials vs word-of-mouse. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 15(4), 372–382. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2007.00396.x</u>
- Van Hoye, G., Weijters, B., Lievens, F., & Stockman, S. (2016). Social influences in recruitment: When is word-of-mouth most effective? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 24(1), 42–53. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12128</u>
- Vazirani, N. (2005). *Employee engagement*. SIES College of Management Studies, working paper series, viewed 15 July 2023.

- Vecchi, A., Della Piana, B., Feola, R., & Crudele, C. (2021). Talent management processes and outcomes in a virtual organization. *Business Process Management Journal*, 27(7), 1937-1965. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/BPMJ-06-2019-0227</u>
- Veloso, C. M., Sousa, B., Au-Yong-Oliveira, M., & Walter, C. E. (2021). Boosters of satisfaction, performance and employee loyalty: application to a recruitment and outsourcing information technology organization. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 34(5), 1036–1046. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-01-2021-0015</u>
- Vitaskek, K. (2023, January 16). Four tips for for building a 'culture of collabotation' within your business. <u>https://www.forbes.com/sites/katevitasek/2023/01/16/4-tips-</u> for-building-a-culture-of-collaboration-within-your-business/?sh=600b0ce946bc
- Vochin, O. A., Sârbu, M. A., Stanciu, S., & Mansour, J. (2020, June). Implementing net promoter score in the public sector organizations. In *6th BASIQ international conference on new trends in sustainable business and consumption. Messina, Italy* (pp. 532-539). <u>https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Bassel-Diab/publication/342124082_BASIQ_2020_Conference_proceedings/links/5ee37_056458515814a583fe1/BASIQ-2020-Conference-proceedings.pdf#page=532
 </u>
- Vokić, N. P., & Hernaus, T. (2015). The triad of job satisfaction, work engagement and employee loyalty–The interplay among the concepts. *EFZG Working Paper Series*, 15(7), 1–13. <u>https://hrcak.srce.hr/146725</u>
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation. John Wiley and Sons.

- Vuong, B., Tung, D., Tushar, H., Quan, T., & Giao, H. (2021). Determinates of factors influencing job satisfaction and organizational loyalty. *Management Science Letters*, 11(1), 203-212. <u>https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2020.8.014</u>
- Walker, R. M., & Boyne, G. A. (2006). Public management reform and organizational performance: An empirical assessment of the UK labor government's public service improvement strategy. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 25(2), 371–393. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.20177</u>
- Wang, X., & Binti Omar, N. A. (2023). Nexus between brand love, loyalty, affective commitment and positive word of mouth: In the context of social identity theory. *Sustainability*, 15(4), 1-12. <u>https://doi.org/10.3390/su15043813</u>
- Wangenheim, F. V., & Bayon, T. (2007). The chain from customer satisfaction via wordof-mouth referrals to new customer acquisition. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 35(1), 233–249. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-007-0037-1</u>
- Ward, M. K., & Meade, A. W. (2017). Applying social psychology to prevent careless responding during online surveys. *Applied Psychology*, 67(2), 231-263. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12118</u>
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(1), 82-111. <u>https://www.jstor.org/stable/257021</u>
- Weerasinghe, K. P. N. N., & Batagoda, C. K. (2015). The impact of work-family conflicts on employee job satisfaction: An investigation of employees in private

sector banks in Kandy district, Sri Lanka. *Human Resource Management Journal*, *3*(1), 10-17. <u>http://dr.lib.sjp.ac.lk/handle/123456789/3712</u>

- Weiss, H. M. (2002). Deconstructing job satisfaction: Separating evaluations, beliefs, and affective experiences. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(2), 173–194. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00045-1</u>
- Westbrook, R. A. (1987). Product/consumption-based affective responses and postpurchase processes. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 24(3), 258–270. <u>https://doi.org/10.2307/3151636</u>
- White, J. G. (2008). Examining net promoter score (NPS) as an effective evaluation tool for measuring customer and employee satisfaction (Publication No. 3335328).
 [Doctoral dissertations, Northcentral University] ProQuest Dissertations
 Publishing. <u>https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/examining-net-promoter-score-nps-as-effective/docview/304823545/se-2</u>
- Whitener, E. M., Brodt, S. E., Korsgaard, M. A., & Werner, J. M. (1998). Managers as initiators of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 513– 530.
- Wiklund, F., & Jansson, S. (2019). Employee loyalty and the factors affecting it: A qualitative study comparing people with different working experiences on their view of employee loyalty. (Order No. 161047) [Master's thesis, UMEA

University] Digitala Vetenskapliga Arkivet.

https://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:umu:diva-161047

- Wilden, R., Gudergan, S., & Lings, I. (2010). Employer branding: strategic implications for staff recruitment. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 26(1-2), 56-73. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/02672570903577091</u>
- Williams, M. (2007). Building genuine trust through interpersonal emotion management: A threat regulation model of trust and collaboration across boundaries. *Academy* of Management Review, 32(2), 595–621. <u>https://doi:10.5465/AMR.2007.2435186</u>
- Williamson, H. C. (2020). Early effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on relationship satisfaction and attributions. *Psychological Science* 31(12), 1479-1487. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797620972688</u>
- Willmott, J. (2005). Norwich Union: Why merely "good" customer service was no longer good enough and what we did about it. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 37(6/7), 341–347. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/00197850510626794</u>
- Wold, H. (1982). Soft modeling: The basic design and some extensions. In K. Joreskog & H. Wold (Eds.), *Systems Under Indirect Observation: Part I* (p. 1-54).Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Wong, A. K. F., Kim, S. S., Kim, J., & Han, H. (2021). How the COVID-19 pandemic affected hotel employee stress: Employee perceptions of occupational stressors and their consequences. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 93, 102798. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102798</u>

Workleap Officevibe. (n.d.). Employee net promoter score (eNPS). Retrieved December 4, 2023, from <u>https://help.officevibe.com/hc/en-us/articles/360030998132-</u> <u>Employee-Net-Promoter-Score-eNPS-</u>

Wright, T. A., & Staw, B. M. (1999). Further thoughts on the happy–productive worker. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(1), 31–34. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199901)20:1<31::AID-</u> <u>JOB952>3.0.CO;2-U</u>

Wu, L., & Norman, I.J. (2006). "An investigation of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and role conflict and ambiguity in a sample of Chinese undergraduate nursing students," *Nurse Education Today*, 26(4), 304–314. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2005.10.011

- Xu, A. J., Loi, R., & Ngo, H. Y. (2016). Ethical leadership behavior and employee justice perceptions: The mediating role of trust in organization. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 134(1), 493-504. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2457-4</u>
- Yalabik, Z. Y., Rayton, B. A., & Rapti, A. (2017). Facets of job satisfaction and work engagement. *Evidence-Based HRM*, 5(3), 248–265.

https://doi:10.1108/EBHRM08-2015-0036

Yaneva, M. (2018). Employee satisfaction vs. employee engagement vs. employee NPS. European Journal of Economics and Business Studies, 4(1), 221-227. <u>https://doi.org/10.2478/ejes-2018-0024</u>

- Yang, K., & Kassekert, A. (2010). Linking management reform with employee job satisfaction: Evidence from federal agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 20(2), 413–36. <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mup010</u>
- Yang, Y. C. (2012). High-involvement human resource practices, affective commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Service Industries Journal*, 32(8), 1209-1227. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2010.545875</u>
- Yao, T., Qiu, Q., & Wei, Y. (2019). Retaining hotel employees as internal customers: Effect of organizational commitment on attitudinal and behavioral loyalty of employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 76(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2018.03.018
- Yuan, S., Liu, L., Su, B., & Zhang, H. (2020). Determining the antecedents of mobile payment loyalty: Cognitive and affective perspectives. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 41, 100971.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.elerap.2020.100971

Zaki, M., Kandeil, D., Neely, A., & McColl-Kennedy, J. R. (2016). The fallacy of the net promoter score: Customer loyalty predictive model. *Cambridge Service Alliance*, 10(1), 1–25.

https://cambridgeservicealliance.eng.cam.ac.uk/system/files/documents/2016Octo berPaper_FallacyoftheNetPromoterScore.pdf

- Zeithaml, V. A., Berry, L. L., & Parasuraman, A. (1996). The behavioral consequences of service quality. *Journal of Marketing*, 60(2), 31-46. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299606000203</u>
- Zhang, Y., Zhang, J., & Liu, C. (2022). Motives for employees communicate positive electronic word of mouth (eWOM) on social network sites: Exploring moderating mechanisms. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 30(1), 60-73. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/18393349219994</u>
- Živković, A., Franjković, J., & Dujak, D. (2021). The role of organizational commitment in employee turnover in logistics activities of food supply

chain. LogForum, 17(1), 25-36. https://doi.org.org/10.17270/J.LOG.2021.536

APPENDIX A

IRB APPROVAL

Copy of IRB Approval Letter



IRB00007703

FWA 00016247

IORG0006409

September 16, 2023

Marcie Marks Satish & Yasmin Gupta College of Business University of Dallas Irving, TX 75062

RE: IRB approval of proposal # 2023064

Dear investigators:

Thank you for submitting your research proposal for prior approval by the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Your proposal was reviewed under the procedure for expedited review, as it poses minimal risk for participants using surveys with adults. You indicate that steps will be taken to procure informed consent and protect participants' identities. The reviewer(s) recommended approval of your request to complete the research described in your proposal under the conditions stated above.

As you complete your research, please keep in mind that substantive changes to the research method, participant population or project end date will require IRB review, and that any participant injuries or complaints must be reported to the IRB at the time they occur. The IRB policies require that you provide an annual report of the progress of this research project, or a report upon completion, whichever occurs first.

On behalf of the members of the IRB, I wish you success in this project.

Gilbert Garza, Ph.D. IRB Chair

1845 East Northgate Drive, Irving, TX 75062-4736

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

All Main Construct Scales Used in This Study

Employee Loyalty (Matzler & Renzl, 2006 adapted from Homburg & Stock, 2000)

- 1. I speak positively about my company when talking to customers.
- 2. I speak positively about my company when talking to friends and relatives.
- 3. I can recommend the products and services of my company to others.
- 4. I would like to stay with this company in the future.
- 5. I would not immediately change to another company if I got the job offer.

eNPS (F. F. Reichheld, 2003; Sedlak 2020)

 How likely are you to recommend this company as a place to work to your friends and family?"

PWOM (Goyette et al., 2010)

- 1. I recommended my company to other people.
- 2. I speak of my company's good sides.
- 3. I am proud to say to others that I am an employee of this company.
- 4. I strongly recommend people to work for my company.
- 5. I mostly say positive things about my company to other people.
- 6. I have spoken favorably of my company to others.

Job Satisfaction (Schriesheim & Tsui, 1980)

- 1. How satisfied are you with the nature of the work you perform?
- 2. How satisfied are you with the person who supervises you-your organizational superior?
- 3. How satisfied are you with your relations with your relations with others in the organization with whom you work-your co-workers or peers?
- 4. How satisfied are you with the pay you received for your job?
- 5. How satisfied are you with the opportunities which exist in this organization for advancement or promotion?
- 6. Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your current job situation?

Employee Engagement (Shuck et al., 2017)

Emotional

- 1. Working at my current organization has a great deal of personal meaning to me.
- 2. I feel a strong sense of belonging to my job.
- 3. I believe in the mission and purpose of my company.
- 4. I care about the future of my company.

Cognitive

- 1. I am really focused when I am working.
- 2. I concentrate on my job when I am at work.
- 3. I give my job responsibility a lot of attention.
- 4. At work, I am focused on my job.

Behavioral

- 1. I really push myself to work beyond what is expected of me.
- 2. I am willing to put in extra effort without being asked.
- 3. I often go above what is expected of me to help my team be successful.
- 4. I work harder than expected to help my company be successful.

Managerial Trustworthiness (Yang & Kassekert, 2010)

- 1. In my organization, leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce.
- 2. My organization's leaders maintain high standards of honesty and integrity.
- 3. I have a high level of respect for my organization's senior leaders.
- 4. Overall, how good a job do you feel is being done by your immediate supervisor/team leader?
- 5. I have trust and confidence in my supervisor.

APPENDIX C

DEMOGRAPHICS/CONTROL QUESTIONNAIRE

Items Used in This Study

- 1. What is your current employment status?
 - a. Full-time
 - b. Part-time
- 2. What is your age?
- 3. What is your gender?
 - a. male
 - b. female
 - c. non-binary/third gender
 - d. prefer not to say.
- 4. What is your ethnicity?
 - a. African American
 - b. Caucasian
 - c. Asian
 - d. Latino or Hispanic
 - e. Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
 - f. Native American

- g. Other
- 5. What is your work industry?
- 6. How many years of work experience?
- 7. Are you currently living in the United States?
- 8. How many years have you worked at your company?
- 9. What is your work location?
 - a. Remote
 - b. Hybrid
 - c. In office
- 10. What is your highest level of education you have completed?
 - a. Less than high school
 - b. High school graduate or equivalent (e.g., GED)
 - c. Some college credit but no degree
 - d. 2-year degree: Associate's degree (e.g., AA, AS)
 - e. 4-year degree: Bachelor's degree (e.g., BA, BS, BBA)
 - f. Master's/Professional degree (e.g., MBA, Med, MD, JD)
 - g. Doctorate (e.g., PhD, EdD, DBA)

Intention to Leave (Wayne et al., 1997)

- 1. As soon as I can find a better job, I'll leave my organization.
- 2. I am actively looking for a job outside my place of employment.
- 3. I am seriously thinking about quitting my job.

- 4. I often think of quitting my job at my organization.
- 5. I think I'll still be working at my place of employment 5 years from now. (r)

APPENDIX D

Organization Industry Description

Organization Industry	Count	Percent
Arts and entertainment (performing arts, spectator sports, and related industries; museums, historical sites, and similar institutions; amusement, gambling, and recreation industries)	7	2%
Construction (construction of buildings; heavy and civil engineering construction; specialty trade contractors)	21	5%
Educational services (elementary and secondary schools; junior colleges; colleges, universities, and professional schools; business schools and computer and management training; technical and trade schools; other schools and instruction; educational support services)	39	10%
Finance and insurance (monetary authorities banking; credit intermediation and related activities; securities, commodity contracts and other financial investments and related activities; insurance carriers and related activities; funds, and trusts)	33	8%
Government/Defense (federal; Military; Police office; state government)	15	4%
Health care (ambulatory health care services; hospitals; nursing and residential care facilities; social assistance; Assistant living; Behavioral et al.; Dental; Hygienic Technician; retirement living; Toxicology lab)	48	12%
Hospitality (lodging; travel and tourism; housekeeping; meetings; food and beverages, bars; travel agencies)	26	7%
Information services (publishing industries, excluding Internet; motion picture and sound recording industries; broadcasting, including internet; telecommunications; data processing, hosting and related services; other information services)	17	4%
Manufacturing (food manufacturing; chemical manufacturing; plastics and rubber products manufacturing; primary metal manufacturing; fabricated metal product manufacturing; machinery manufacturing; computer and electronic product manufacturing; furniture and related product manufacturing; miscellaneous manufacturing)	26	7%

Mining (oil and gas extraction; mining, excluding oil and gas; support activities for mining)	3	1%
Personal service (personal care services; death care services; barber; beautician; catering; childcare; fitness; pet grooming; other personal services)	12	3%
Professional, scientific, and technical services (legal services; accounting, tax preparation, bookkeeping, and payroll services; architectural, engineering, and related services; customer service and sales; computer systems design; management, scientific and technical consulting services; scientific research and development services; advertising, public relations, and related services; other professional, scientific and technical services)	72	18%
Real estate (real estate; rental; leasing services)	9	2%
Repair and maintenance (automotive repair and maintenance; electronic and precision equipment repair and maintenance; commercial and industrial machinery and equipment, excluding automotive and electronic repair and maintenance; personal and household goods repair and maintenance)	9	2%
Retail services (motor vehicle and parts dealers; furniture and home furnishings stores; electronics and appliance stores; building material and garden equipment and supplies dealers; health and personal care stores; clothing and clothing accessories stores; sporting goods, hobby, book, and music stores; general merchandise stores; miscellaneous store retailers)	40	10%
Transportation and warehousing (air transportation, rail transportation, water transportation, truck transportation; transit and ground passenger transportation; pipeline transportation; support activities for transportation; postal service, couriers and messengers; warehousing and storage) <i>Note:</i> $n = 400$ All percentages add up to 100%	22	6%
<i>Note</i> . II – 400. All percentages and up to 100%		

APPENDIX E

Reflective Measurements Summary

Construct	Adapted Item	Indicators ^a	Loading s	CA
Behavioral	I really push myself to work beyond			0.890
Engagement	what is expected of me.	BE1	0.925	
	I am willing to put in extra effort			
	without being asked.	BE2	0.936	
	I often go above what is expected of me			
	to help my team be successful.	BE3	0.927	
	I work harder than expected to help my			
	company be successful.	BE4	0.936	
Cognitive	I am really focused when I am working.	CE1	0.951	0.925
Engagement	I concentrate on my job when I am at			
	work.	CE2	0.972	
	I give my job responsibility a lot of			
	attention.	CE3	0.937	
	At work, I am focused on my job.	CE4	0.942	
Emotional	Working at my current organization			0.910
Engagement	has a great deal of personal meaning to			
	me.	EE1	0.951	
	I feel a strong sense of belonging to my			
	job.	EE2	0.956	
	I believe in the mission and purpose of			
	my company.	EE3	0.937	
	I care about the future of my company.	EE4	0.923	
Employee	I speak positively about my company			0.873
loyalty	when talking to customers.	EL1	0.883	
	I speak positively about my company			
	when talking to friends and relatives.	EL2	0.941	
	I can recommend the products and			
	services of my company to others.	EL3	0.888	
	I would like to stay with this company			
	in the future.	EL4	0.931	
	I would not immediately change to			
	another company if I got the job offer.	EL5	0.861	
Job	How satisfied are you with the nature			0.897
satisfaction	of the work you perform?	JS1	0.906	

	How satisfied are you with the person who supervises you-your organizational superior?	JS2	0.888	
	How satisfied are you with your			
	relations with your relations with others			
	in the organization with whom you			
	work-your co-workers or peers?	JS3	0.872	
	How satisfied are you with the pay you			
	received for your job?	JS4	0.868	
	How satisfied are you with the			
	opportunities which exist in this			
	organization for advancement or			
	promotion?	JS5	0.920	
	Considering everything, how satisfied			
	are you with your current job situation?	JS6	0.951	
Managerial	In my organization, leaders generate			0.916
trustworthine	high levels of motivation and			
SS	commitment in the workforce.	MT1	0.944	
	My organization's leaders maintain			
	high standards of honesty and integrity.	MT2	0.943	
	Overall, how good a job do you feel is			
	being done by your immediate			
	supervisor/team leader?	MT4	0.942	
	I have trust and confidence in my			
	supervisor.	MT5	0.951	
Positive	I recommended my company to other			0.925
Word of	people.	PWOM1	0.955	
Mouth	I speak of my company's good sides.	PWOM2	0.950	
	I strongly recommend people to work			
	for my company.	PWOM4	0.943	
	I have spoken favorably of my			
	company to others.	PWOM6	0.952	

Notes: N= 400. CA = Cronbach's Alpha. CR = Composite Reliability. MT3, PWOM3, and PWOM5 were removed to improve reliability and validity.

APPENDIX F

Measurement Model



APPENDIX G

Measurement Model with the Control Variables



APPENDIX H

Regression Equation

JS = .462* EE - .067*MT+ .347 MT*EE

I. If MT has low-level status (MT = -1)

JS _{MT_low} = .462* EE - .067(-1) + .347 (-1) *EE

= .067 + .115 * EE

II. If MT has medium-level status (MT = 0)

JS MT_medium= .462* EE - .067(0)+ .347 (0)*EE

$$= .067 + .115 * EE$$

III. If MT has high-level status (MT = 1)

JS _{MT_high} = .462* EE - .067(1) + .347 (1) *EE

= -.067 + .809 * EE

Note: Based on the equation from low to high, the slope of the regression line illustrates the relationship between JS and EE (from .115 to .462 and to .809).