

The effects of organizational factors on work outcomes – The role of employee resilience in hospitality kitchens

Marija Jakubiv^{1*}, Mladen Pršić², Miloš Ćirić²

¹High School of Tourism, Belgrade, Serbia

²Academy of Applied Studies Belgrade, College of Hotel Management, Belgrade, Serbia

Abstract: This paper aims to examine the role of relationships between organizational factors, employee resilience and work outcomes, in order to test the mediatory role of employees in hospitality kitchens in Serbia. The paper represents a quantitative study; the research was conducted through a questionnaire which served as a means for collecting reliable data. The data were obtained from 182 respondents employed in hospitality kitchens in Serbia. The results of this research have shown that resilience has a mediatory role between organizational factors and work outcomes. This paper deals with an important research subject, which is currently not given enough attention, which is indicated by the fact that this type of research has not yet been conducted in hospitality kitchens.

Keywords: organizational factors, work outcomes, employee resilience, hospitality kitchens

JEL classification: J24 J28

Efekti organizacionih faktora na ishode posla – Uloga rezilijentnosti zaposlenih u ugostiteljskim kuhinjama

Sažetak: Ovaj rad ima za cilj da ispita ulogu odnosa između organizacionih faktora, rezilijentnosti zaposlenih i ishoda posla, sa namerom da se testira posrednička uloga zaposlenih u ugostiteljskim kuhinjama Srbije. Sam rad predstavlja kvantitativnu studiju. Ispitvanje je obavljeno uz pomoć upitnika koji je služio kao sredstvo za prikupljanje pouzdanih podataka. Podaci su prikupljeni od 182 ispitanika zaposlena u ugostiteljskim kuhinjama Srbije. Rezultati istraživanja su pokazali da rezilijentnost ima medijatornu ulogu između organizacionih faktora i ishoda posla. Sam rad se bavi bitnom istraživačkom tematikom, kojoj trenutno nije posvećeno dovoljno pažnje, što potvrđuje činjenica da ovakav model istraživanja do sada nije sproveden u ugostiteljskim kuhinjama.

Ključne reči: organizacioni faktori, ishodi posla, rezilijentnost zaposlenih, ugostiteljske kuhinje

JEL klasifikacija: J24 J28

* marejakubiv@gmail.com



This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Without satisfied employees, there are no satisfied consumers either, especially when it comes to service industries such as hospitality, precisely because of the creation and provision of services (Huertas-Valdivia et al., 2019; Zhao & Ghiselli, 2016). Increased employee satisfaction leads to increased consumer satisfaction, and this is the reason why the key task of a company's management is to enable and encourage the development of employees. This investment pays off many times over, because in this way not only employees are affected, but also consumers (Blešić, 2019). Many factors affect both employee and consumer satisfaction and as per Robbins (2003), they can be classified into two large categories of organizational and personal factors. It has been proven that the resilience of employees significantly affects work performance such as job satisfaction, employees participation and lesser inclination towards work abandonment in the organizational context (Hodliffe 2014). However, there is a lack of studies in the hospitality industry which are focused on investigating the effects of employee resilience and its potential circumstantial impact on the organisation factor and work result ratio (Saad & Elshaer 2020). Even though the abovementioned relations are tested by Hodliffe (2014) in the context of a construction company, the authors claim the usefulness of the model testing in a service-oriented industry such as hospitality. The key assumption is that the resilience in the hospitality industry, with the frontline employees being in direct contact with the client, will show bigger effects and be a lynchpin between all organizational factors and work results (which is not entirely proven in the Hodliffe study).

Organizational factors include different organizational variables that can affect the levels of satisfaction of the employee in certain ways. Organizational factors include (Spector, 1985):

- leadership,
- work conditions,
- culture of learning,
- interpersonal relationships,
- the opportunity for improvement,
- reward system.

Personal factors related to the possibility for the improvement of the individual affect employees in the way that they are becoming aware of the importance of education and development of their own abilities (Peccei & Rosenthal, 2000). Employees in the organization strive for personal improvement, which is supported and encouraged, as the organization is gaining better and more professional staff.

The modern professional environment goes through constant changes, because of the intensive global competition, technological innovations and waverings in economic and consumptive trends, which are getting more rapid and unpredictable (Malik & Garg, 2017). Because of this market state, organizations have to be able to continuously renew and protect their human capital, providing the workforce that can adapt to dynamic challenges, followed by keeping positive state of mental health and performance, same as evaluating and reconsidering their decisions (Duchek, 2019).

In the modern environment, the service sector, especially hospitality, requires not only an increase in productivity and a reduction in costs of business operations but also great attention is devoted to positive communication between consumers and employees (Teng & Borrows, 2009). In the interaction with a guest, employees experience many feelings. Service orientation is a result of employee satisfaction and implies an expression of those emotions that guests find favorable (Lee et al., 2016).

Resilience is a term introduced into the Serbian language from English, and it is difficult to translate it into one word because its meaning is multi-layered. Perhaps it is best explained by the phrase “resistance to negative stimuli” (Alamene et al., 2017; Radović-Marković,

2017). How employees deal with everyday stress can be equally important for efficiency and productivity at work as well as the psychological and physical health of employees themselves. The research on this concept in the hospitality industry is particularly important considering the fact that the level of stress is increasing in all sectors that have direct contact with clients, so resilience is necessary to provide quality service. The needs and demands of customers are now more demanding than ever, so meeting their expectations is key to the service economy. The current state of the market puts additional pressure on workers who need to become more resilient – “how to quickly design and implement positive adaptive behaviors in accordance with the immediate situation, with minimal stress”.

This paper aims to identify the effects of organizational factors and employee resilience on work outcomes in hospitality kitchens, to investigate the influence of organizational factors and resilience of employees on their satisfaction, participation in the organization and the intention to leave the job.

2. Background

Working conditions are factors that affect the workplace, that is, ensuring adequate conditions for work and creating a working environment that is adapted to the needs of the individual and that enables the expression of his potential, for the best possible business performance (Larsen, 2002). Factors related to the creation of interpersonal relations in the company are: creation of a positive working atmosphere, concern for the private life of employees, as well as a positive attitude of management towards employees (Mitschlich, 2000). The social context plays a significant factor in job satisfaction. Typically, employees are satisfied with their work if they cooperate with colleagues with whom they have developed and cherished close personal relationships including a pleasant social atmosphere at work as well. This view is especially true for people who are not particularly interested in mere career development. When an employee is on friendly terms with the management, if the management praises the employee more frequently, checks up their work and progress and has already built an open and trustworthy relationship with them, then the satisfaction of the employees is higher. It must also be noted that national culture can have deep impact on the importance of this job satisfaction factor. In collectivist cultures, the importance of warm and amiable social atmosphere and the absence of conflict is a very important factor in job satisfaction for most employees, even more important than the level of salary. Some recent investigations show that this is absolutely true for all companies with a collectivistic culture (Koderman, 2021). Based on the above, we can derive the following hypothesis:

X₁: Organizational factors have a positive influence on job satisfaction.

Lawler (2005) suggests that rewards linked to specific performance and result objectives incite and encourage employees' motivation, thus enhancing employee performance. In the same manner, it is underlined that employee empowerment refers to the allocation of power and responsibility among all levels of employees, leading to their independent development, innovation, motivation and decision-making (Kumar et al., 2009).

Additional responsibility for the effectiveness of decision-making enables employees to make significant contributions to improvement processes (Ooi et al., 2007; Sadikoglu & Zehir, 2010). Empowering and involving employees also creates a sense of contribution, initiates action and leads to better employee satisfaction (Jun et al., 2006), which consequently improves quality performance. A certain level of employee inclusion in the process raises employees' ability to solve problems leading to the product/service quality improvement and product rework reduction. Based on the above, we can derive the following hypothesis:

X₂: Organizational factors have a positive influence on attitudes to work.

Gallopín (2006) defined it as the capacity of a company to grapple with changes, adapt to and recover from negative influences stemming from the business environment. The key is the ability to take processes with a specific view to enhancing vulnerability and comprehending the interconnections and interdependencies between business processes, information and technology within the enterprise (Gomes, 2015). Countries that have well-developed and precisely tailored business plans and hazard action plans, as well as company resilience assessment programs, typically manifested a higher resilience index than those that did not. This concept also appears in interdisciplinary fields focusing on complex systems, such as enterprises, infrastructure systems and ecosystems (Carpente et al., 2001).

Considering the significance of resilience for organizations, Stephenson (2010) argues that organizational resilience directly affects and assists in the speed and success of community recovery after a crisis or disaster. Creating flexible companies is a strategic initiative that changes the way a company operates and connects its competitiveness (Sheffi & Rice, 2005). The authors emphasize that organizational resilience can be attained by cutting back on vulnerability and increasing flexibility, which points out to the capacity of a company to return to the 'right track' when a disturbance occurs (Naz, 2020; Stokes et al., 2019). When the organizational resilience of small and medium-sized companies is at stake, some authors specifically deal with the difference between large and small companies (Sullivan-Taylor & Wilson, 2009). It is argued that small and medium-sized companies appear to be more vulnerable than large companies, i.e. their resilience to climate and other disasters is much lower, given that they are not usually insured against disasters and have limited access to the credit choices. Additionally, creating organizational resilience hinges on employees and the management (Vogus & Sutcliffe, 2007) working in an organization that teaches them how to develop organizational systems capable of weathering turbulent conditions in the environment (Burnard & Ran, 2011). The results of research conducted in 2015 in hotels in Serbia showed that all organizational factors (learning culture, leadership, employee participation in the organization, corporate communication) have a strong positive collective relationship with employee resilience. This means that the more an organization, i.e. a hotel, dedicates itself to its employees, the higher their development will be. It is important to note that there are individuals who are resilient despite working in a non-resilient organization, as well as members of an organization who are only collectively resilient while having low resilience as individuals. This data indicates that individual resilience is not a guarantee of community resilience as well as that resilience of a community cannot guarantee the development of an individual (Trkulja, 2015).

In the field of tourism and hospitality, there is scarce literature linking employee resilience, organizational factors, and work outcomes. A study by Kuntz et al. (2017) conducted in four different organizations (one of which is from the field of tourism/hospitality) observed a correlation between regulatory profiles, workplace resources, and employee resilience. A recent study by Dai et al. (2019) conducted on employees in travel agencies discovered that employee resilience has a positive impact on their intention to stay in the organization as well as their work engagement.

Based on the above, we can derive the following hypotheses:

X₃: Resilience has a negative influence on the intention to leave the job.

X₄: Resilience has a positive influence on attitudes to work.

X₅: Resilience has a positive influence on job satisfaction.

Organizational learning occurs as a result of involving members of an organization in an exchange of knowledge and experience; we should differentiate between formal and informal organizational learning (Lau et al., 2019). It brings changes whose primary aim is to adapt the organization to changes in the environment and improve the competencies of the organization (Bishop, 2020; Lau et al., 2016).

Organizations with a strong culture of learning see changes as an opportunity for learning and improvement, not as a threat. Such cultures signal that the environment is rich in factors that promote resilience (e.g. feedback on the performance, support of colleagues and managers, responsibility for the results) and encourage the development of adaptive and proactive behaviors of resilience (Kuntz et al., 2016). Scientists have established a connection between the culture of learning and increased responsiveness to changes and more recently with the change of adaptability through the development of skills for facing current changes at work (Van Breda-Verduijn & Heijboer, 2016).

Limited empirical evidence so far suggests a positive relationship between learning culture and resilience (Marsick & Watkins, 2003). When offered constant possibilities to learn and improve their skills, employees feel safer disputing a status and experimenting with new ideas, thus becoming more adaptable and flexible (Malik & Garg, 2017). Such continuous learning improves a set of skills and a repertoire of behaviors, which facilitates adaptation to new or non-routine work events. Based on the above, we can derive the following hypotheses:

X₆: Organizational factors have a positive influence on resilience.

A key factor for encouraging organizational learning is leadership that prompts employees toward organizational learning (Richard, 2020). Good management or leadership is best reflected through corporate communication (Salehzadeh, 2019). Goodman (2000) says that corporate communication is a set of internal and external strategic communicational activities done by professionals in the name of an organization. It is characterized by the creation and maintenance of strong internal and external relations.

A set of all organizational factors best reflects employee satisfaction. Job satisfaction is defined as a pleasant feeling that arises from the perception that one's job is fulfilling or that it enables the fulfillment of important business values (Kolak, 2020). Happy employees are productive employees. The most frequently used definition of job satisfaction is: "a positive emotional state or satisfaction which is a result of one's work evaluation or work experience". Feelings, knowledge, and thoughts are incorporated into the evaluation of employee satisfaction. One of the most influential factors that affect job satisfaction is the perception of the job itself. The most significant situational factor that affects job satisfaction is the job itself, which is connected with the self-evaluation of employees in the workplace (Jakšić & Jakšić, 2014).

The intention to leave work is defined as an employee's subjective estimate of the possibility of leaving the organization in the short or long term (Dai et al., 2019; Theron et al., 2014). Voluntary fluctuation or voluntary leaving a job is particularly important for organizations because employees who achieve good results at the workplace have more opportunities for employment outside the organization, so it is more probable that they will leave the organization (Dai et al., 2019), which is why high rates of voluntary fluctuations can have adverse effects on organizational performances.

Whether an employee will leave the organization or not also depends on their perception of whether leaving the job will be easy or not for the other side. Their perception of the ease of leaving the organization is influenced by many factors (Milikić, 2010). A group of factors that influence an employee's perception of the ease to leave the organization includes

organizational factors and factors outside the organization where employees work, and they are related to characteristics of the labor market such as representation and strength of unions, unemployment rate, supply and demand for a specific employee profile types, etc. (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986). Based on the above, we can derive the following hypothesis:

X₇: Organizational factors have a negative influence on the intention to leave the job.

Influence of organizational factors on work outcomes and employee resilience

Brooks (2005) defines resilience as the ability to successfully reduce stress and pressure, same as the capability to deal with life difficulties in a careful, optimistic, decisive, responsible and compassionate manner. Moreover, employee resilience can be viewed as the capacity of employees to predict future circumstances, adapt to changes, and persevere after exposure to changes or difficulties in the workplace (Alamene et al., 2017). Concerning the workplace, employee resilience is seen as the capability to overcome negative situations such as difficulties, conflicts, and lack of success (Zhu et al., 2019). Resilience is considered to be the most important positive characteristic among all other aspects of dealing with stress (De Clercq et al., 2021). Luthans et al. (2007) assumed that four factors of psychological capital (self-efficacy, optimism, hope and resilience) have cognitive values and they defined psychological capital as “individual positive psychological state of development” (p. 542). Resilient employees are less likely to allow insecurity at work to change their view of their relationship with the organization. They are less likely to express negative reactions to insecurity at work, such as harmful interpersonal relations (Shoss et al., 2018).

An organization can create and strengthen employee resilience, and these variations in the levels of employee resilience are susceptible to changes as far as their availability and practical use is concerned (Näswall et al., 2019). That is why we may assume that organizational factors affect employee resilience in the workplace context. In this regard, Kuntz et al. (2017a) also argued that employee resilience is a behavioral ability supported by an organization. Accordingly, it is in the interest of organizations to identify organizational factors that can help employees to increase resilience (Kuntz et al., 2017).

In terms of organizational factors influencing resilience, Malik and Garg (2017) showed that a learning organization has a positive influence on employee resilience and participation in the organization, whereas employee resilience proved to be a mediator in the regression between a learning organization and work engagement. Hodliffe (2014) also discovered a positive influence of a culture of learning on employee resilience. Pramanik et al. (2020) found a strong positive correlation between resilience and the work engagement of employees in four-star hotels in Jakarta. Moreover, empowering leadership, a proactive personality and optimism were significantly positively connected with resilient behavior (Nguyen et al., 2016). Leadership is significantly related to tolerance of incivility in the workplace, which can be considered a form of individual resilience (Richard, 2020; Välikangas, 2020). A study by Kim and Beehr (2018) showed that empowering leadership positively affects employee retention and psychological involvement, which can result in greater work engagement. Luthans et al. (2005) discovered that resilience affects the performance of the employees. A study conducted by Kašpárková et al. (2018) confirmed positive correlations between resilience and work performance: job satisfaction and work engagement. Scientists discovered that resilience had a positive, significant, and direct influence on job satisfaction. According to Luthans (2002) empirically, resilience is related to job performance, organizational commitment and job satisfaction. A study by Alola and Alola (2018) conducted in high-category hotels in Nigeria discovered that incivility in the workplace is unfavorable and that it significantly correlates with resilience. Resilience proved to be of great importance for general managers of hotels and their essential condition

for the regulation of emotions. The study by [Karatepe \(2015\)](#) on the first employees in the hotel industry showed that resilience is one of the best indicators of psychological capital. In addition, [Zhang et al. \(2017\)](#) suggest that more resilient employees are more engaged and persistent in their work.

X₈: Resilience has a mediating role between organizational factors (a culture of learning, leadership, participation of employees, and corporate communication) and work outcomes (job satisfaction, attitudes to work, and intention to leave the job).

3. Materials and methods

A survey questionnaire used in this research consists of four parts. The first part measures the sociodemographic characteristics of respondents (gender, age, education, monthly salary, job, hotel category, years of work experience in hospitality, and years of work experience in a specific hotel/restaurant). The second part of the questionnaire measures employee resilience using the scale with 13 items (EmpRes) developed by [Hodliffe \(2014\)](#). The third part examines organizational factors such as a culture of learning (a scale developed by [Marsick & Watkins, 2003](#)), leadership, and participation of employees (a scale by [Bouckenoghe et al., 2009](#)), modified by [Hodliffe \(2014\)](#)), and corporate communication ([Hodliffe, 2014](#)). The fourth part of the questionnaire measures work outcomes through attitude to work ([Saks, 2006](#)), job satisfaction, and the intention to leave the job ([Vandenbergh & Bentein, 2009](#)).

All statements were rated on a 7-point Likert scale (1 – I completely disagree, 7 – I completely agree). The obtained data were processed with the Statistical Package for Social Sciences, version 23 – SPSS. The research sample consists of employees in hotels and restaurants in Serbia. Research methods used are desk research of domestic and foreign literature, the analysis and synthesis method, survey research, and statistical methods: reliability (Cronbach's alpha), regression analysis, as well as descriptive analysis. Tabular displays will be used to display data and the results.

The research was carried out in the period from July to October 2021. An online questionnaire was also created and distributed via email to hotels and restaurants in Serbia. Employees in the hospitality industry participated in the research. In the survey, a total of 250 questionnaires were distributed. Of that number, 220 questionnaires were collected. There were 38 incorrect or incomplete questionnaires which were excluded from the research, so the total number of survey questionnaires collected in hotels for further analysis was 182.

4. Results and discussion

The next part of the paper presents the sociodemographic characteristics of the respondents.

Table 1: The sociodemographic characteristics of employees

Variable	N	%	Variable	N	%
Gender			Income (expressed in RSD)		
Male	122	67	Under 20.000	7	3.8
Female	60	33	20.000-30.000	8	4.4
Age			30.000-40.000	25	13.7
Up to 20 years of age	11	6	40.000-50.000	33	18.1
21-30 years of age	95	52.2	Over 50.000	109	59.9
31-40 years of age	46	25.3	Number of years of work experience in hospitality		
41-50 years of age	19	10.4	Up to 1 year	6	3,3
51-60 years of age	9	4.9	1-3 years	19	10.4
Over 61 years of age	2	1.1	3-5 years	27	14.8
Number of years of work experience in the present company			5-10 years	62	34.1
Up to 1 year	54	39.7	Over 10 years	68	37.4
1-3 years	63	34.6	Hotel categories		
3-5 years	45	24.7	**	1	0.5
5-10 years	17	9.3	***	5	2.7
Over 10 years	3	1.6	****	25	13.7
Level of education			*****	14	7.7
High school	82	45.1	Current job position		
Higher education or Bachelor's degree	89	48.9	Leading (executive chef, assistant sous chef...)	61	33.5
Magistrate or Master's degree	11	6	Cook, pastry cook, pizza chef ...	106	58.2
Organization where you are employed			Assistant cook	15	8.2
Hotel	48	26.4			
Restaurant	134	73.6			

Source: Authors' research

Table 1 shows the sociodemographic data of the respondents. The largest portion of respondents is male, which is 34% more compared to female respondents. If we observe the data concerning the age of employees in the kitchen, we can see that half of the employees are between 21 and 30 years old (52.2%), whereas the smallest number of employees are over 61 years old, as well as employees between 51 and 61 years of age. Employees between 31 and 40 are present with a share of 25.3% of respondents, and the next age group, between 41 and 50 years of age, has a share of 10.4% of respondents.

The next observed variable in the sociodemographic segment is the level of education. Employees in kitchens mostly have a secondary level of education (48.2%), but almost the same percentage of employees have higher education (45.5%), which tells us that highly

educated staff work in the hospitality industry in Serbia. Another significant characteristic of employees is the amount of monthly income (expressed in dinars). The results of this sample have shown that the largest share of employees has a monthly salary of 50,000 dinars (59.9%), while a very small portion of employees has salaries between 20,000 and 30,000 dinars. It is expected that this characteristic of employees will have a great influence on outcomes related to work (job satisfaction and attitude towards work, and intention to leave the job). As for the years of work in an organization, at the time of the survey, the largest share of employees (39.7%) worked for one year, followed by a group of respondents who worked in one organization for between one and three years (34.6%). What is noticeable during the research is that cooks are predominantly employed in restaurants – as many as 73.6% of respondents. As for the respondents who work in a hotel (26.4%), they are mostly employed in four-star (13.7%) or five-star (7.7%) hotels.

4.1. The analysis of the reliability of the questionnaire

The next part of the paper presents the analysis of the reliability of results for all examined determinants.

Table 2: The results of the analysis of reliability for determinants of organizational factors, the resilience of employees, and outcomes related to work

Variable	Reliability (Cronbach's alpha)
Organizational factors	
A culture of learning	0.912
Leadership	0.971
Participation of employees	0.915
Corporate communication	0.961
Employee resilience	0.922
Work outcomes	
Attitudes to work	0.898
Employee satisfaction	0.765
Intention to leave the job	0.875

Source: Authors' research

The obtained results indicate that the measuring scales used for the given variables (Table 2) are reliable and that they exceed the recommended value of the Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.7.

4.2. Descriptive statistical analysis

Attitudes of employees in the hotel and restaurant kitchens in Serbia concerning their perception of certain organizational factors were examined, and the obtained results are shown in Table 4. The employee perception of a culture of learning in their organization has 4.07 score, which means that employees partly agree that their organization practices and supports learning. Employees partly agree that mistakes are openly discussed in their organizations to learn from them, and that honest feedback and required information are provided quickly and effortlessly. The position with which employees partly disagree is that hotel employees are rewarded for exploring new and improved ways of doing work. The standard deviation for all statements that measure the perception of a culture of learning is

high, which means that large oscillation is present in the responses and that there are employees with a distinctly low perception of a culture of learning.

Regarding the perception of supporting leadership, the mean score obtained in this research is 4.11, which indicates that employees believe their leaders partly support them. The highest score was noted for the statement that the manager explains the rules and expectations to employees (4.57) and that they are worried about the welfare of employees (4.08). The two statements have lower standard deviation coefficients. It shows that employees believe managers partially involve them in business operations by encouraging them to participate. They also believe managers mainly explain the rules and expectations to them, with a lower coefficient of standard deviation (1.973) compared to other statements. What seems interesting about leadership is that all statements are generally rated the same with no significant variation.

Table 3: The results of descriptive statistical analysis for organizational factors

Factors	M	SD
Perception of a culture of learning	4.073	1.705
Leadership	4.114	1.894
Participation of employees	3.940	1.789
Corporate communication	4.057	1.939

Source: Authors' research

Employees rated the perception of involvement in the organization with a mean score of 3.94, and there is a higher degree of standard deviation in all statements. It is the same with the perception of corporate communication (score 4.05). At the same time, it should be noted that frequent and effective communication is present between departments, while to the slightest extent, employees believe that they receive information regarding goals and realization of that goal, as well as a general attitude that communication is the main feature of the organization. The standard deviation is high in most statements, which indicates an uneven situation concerning how employees see and experience their organization.

Table 4: The results of descriptive statistical analysis for employee resilience

Factors	M	SD
Employee resilience	5.088	1.725

Source: Authors' research

Table 4 presents the arithmetical means of the statement of the determinant of employee resilience. Employees in kitchens in Serbia believe that they learn from mistakes to the highest degree, thus improving their business (5.31), and the coefficient of standard deviation is the lowest for this statement. Next, they believe that they constantly revalue their performances and wish to improve them, that they know who to address if they need help, and not restrain themselves when they need to ask their manager for assistance. The biggest problem for employees is that they do not consider changes at work as opportunities to grow. This statement has the highest standard deviation coefficient (1.72506), which indicates that there are also employees who responded to this statement with a low score. Compared to all statements regarding employee resilience determinants, the statement that an invitation to an interview is considered an opportunity to evaluate their own business and advancement received the lowest score. That means that employees do not trust their organization enough or believe they will be rewarded for their work. The total score of resilience is 5.08, which indicates that employees are resilient at work. The findings of the study indicate that

leadership and participation of the employees show a considerable positive impact on employee resilience. This claim is in accord with the previous studies which have confirmed the influence of organizational factors on the resilience of employees (Blešić et al., 2019; Kim & Beehr, 2018; Malik & Garg, 2017).

Table 5: The results of descriptive statistical analysis for job-related outcomes

Factors	M	SD
Attitude to work	4.877	1.573
Job satisfaction	3.791	1.346
Intention to leave work	3.111	1.864

Source: Authors' research

In Table 5, we can see that employees believe that they are fully committed to work and to what they do, as well as that they are highly interested in their job. Also, employees somewhat believe that they commit themselves to work to such an extent that they lose track of time and that they are highly involved in the business operations of their organization, i.e. much less than in the job itself, while they partly disagree with the statement that they think about what others are doing while they are at work. The total score of employees' attitudes to work, i.e. their commitment is 4.87, which shows that employees are committed to their work. The standard deviation is very low for this determinant, meaning that respondents' responses are predominantly uniform and that there was not much oscillation in the responses.

As to job satisfaction, employees are not satisfied with their jobs to a large extent (3.79). The statement that employees like working in the present organization have the highest value of standard deviation (1.898), which indicates that there is a higher number of respondents who disagree with the mean score for job satisfaction. The intention to leave the job was assessed with a mean average score of 3.11, which indicates that employees partly do not intend to leave the job to the extent that they do not have an attitude regarding this claim. However, we should note that the coefficient of standard deviation for all three statements is remarkably high, which means there is a large number of employees who definitely, and surely, want to leave the organization they work for when the opportunity arises.

4.3. Regression analysis

Standard (stimulation) multiple regression is used to assess the possibility of individual organizational factors (a culture of learning, leadership, participation of employees, and corporate communication) to predict employee resilience. Due to the lack of research on the abovementioned concept in the tourism and hospitality reference books, this study has been inspired by multiple investigation courses carried out at different organizations with a view to testing the model (the linking of the concepts) defined by Hodliffe (2014), with its application in the context of the hospitality industry. The following table shows the results of regression analysis of independent variables, i.e. organizational factor for a dependable variable of employee resilience.

The results have shown that all analyzed organizational factors have a significantly positive influence on employee resilience, whereas in research Hodliffe (2014) the participation of the employees was not significantly correlated with employee resilience. In the same manner, corporate communication was not considerably correlated with resilience in the paper Hodliffe (2014). The coefficient of determination (R^2) is relatively high in each of the presented models, which indicates that organizational elements predict employee resilience.

Observing the column (R^2), we can conclude that the highest percentage of variation of employee resilience as a variable dependable on organizational factors can be predicted by participation in corporate communication (42.2%) and a learning organization (30.5%). These data indicate that organizational factors (all four of them) affect employee resilience, but that they are not crucial if observed individually. Considering that all four organizational factors ranging from 28.7% to 42.2% affect the level of employee resilience, we conclude that hypothesis H6 is confirmed.

Table 6: The results of regression analysis between organizational factors and employee resilience

Independent variables	Dependent variable – employee resilience			
	R^2	F	Sig.	B
A culture of learning	0.305	76.755	0.000	.552**
Leadership	0.287	70.008	0.000	.536**
Corporate communication	0.422	127.820	0.000	.650**
Participation of employees	0.420	126.817	0.000	.651**

** β significance at the 0.01 level

Source: Authors' research

The next table presents the degree to which organizational factors and employee resilience can predict work-related outcomes, i.e. attitude to work, job satisfaction and intention to leave the job.

Table 7: Regression between organizational factors, employee resilience and work outcome

Independent variables	R^2	F	Sig.	B
Job satisfaction				
A culture of learning	0.306	97.254	0.000	0.553**
Leadership	0.366	103.528	0.000	0.605**
Corporate communication	0.414	127.591	0.000	0.644**
Participation of employees	0.474	161.530	0.000	0.689**
Resilience	0.335	88.152	0.000	0.549**
Intention to leave the job				
A culture of learning	0.004	0.693	0.406	-0.062
Leadership	-0.320	15.881	0.016	-0.178*
Corporate communication	0.112	2.267	0.134	-0.112
Participation of employees	0.010	1.904	0.181	-0.100
Resilience	0.018	3.120	0.079	-0.132
Work ethics				
A culture of learning	0.191	42.501	0.000	0.437**
Leadership	0.228	52.178	0.000	0.477**
Corporate communication	0.265	64.924	0.000	0.515**
Participation of employees	0.321	84.654	0.000	0.566**
Resilience	0.652	328.072	0.000	0.808**

** β significance at the 0.01 level; * β significance at the 0.05 level

Source: Authors' research

Based on the results in Table 7, we can state that resilience has a significant positive effect on job satisfaction and attitude towards work, while the assumed negative effect on the intention to leave the job has not been proven, which confirms hypotheses H5 and H4, whereas hypothesis H3 is rejected. When it comes to the effect of organizational factors on work outcomes, we conclude that all factors have a significant positive effect on job satisfaction and attitude towards work, while only a leadership dimension has a significant negative effect on the intention to leave the job. This confirms hypotheses H1 and H2, while hypothesis H7 is partly confirmed (only for one out of four dimensions).

Table 8: The mediatory effect of employee resilience on regression between organizational factors and work outcomes

Independent variable	Dependent variable	Model 1			B	Model 2			β
		R ²	F	P		R ²	F	p	
A culture of learning	Job satisfaction	0.306	97.254	0.000	0.553**	0.414	61.377	0.000	0.336**
	Intention to leave the job	0.004	0.693	0.406	-0.062	0.044	3.978	0.000	-0.194**
	Attitude to work	0.191	42.501	0.000	0.437**	0.652	163.178	0.814	0.013
Leadership	Job satisfaction	0.366	103.528	0.000	0.605**	0.457	72.854	0.000	0.414**
	Intention to leave the job	0.320	15.881	0.016	-0.178*	-0.105	10.108	0.000	-0.350**
	Attitude to work	0.228	52.178	0.000	0.477**	0.655	164.173	0.238	0.063
Corporate communication	Job satisfaction	0.414	127.591	0.000	0.644**	0.459	73.753	0.000	0.463**
	Intention to leave the job	0.112	2.267	0.134	-0.113	0.085	8.084	0.000	-0.342*
	Attitude to work	0.265	64.924	0.000	0.515**	0.652	163.217	0.775	0.017
Participation of employees	Job satisfaction	0.474	161.530	0.000	0.689**	0.502	87.086	0.000	0.543**
	Intention to leave the job	0.010	1.904	0.181	-0.100	0.080	7.477	0.000	-0.332**
	Attitude to work	0.321	84.654	0.000	0.566**	0.654	163.565	0.324	0.059

Source: Authors' research

The results presented in Table 8 show a mediatory role of employee resilience in regression between organizational factors and work outcomes. The full mediatory role of resilience has been achieved in mediation between:

- a culture of learning, intention to leave the job, and attitude to work (by introducing the resilience dimension, we change the impact of the organizational factors from insignificant to significant – intention to leave the job, and from significant to insignificant – attitude to work);
- leadership and attitude to work (the impact of organizational factor is changed from significant to insignificant);
- corporate communication, intention to leave the job, and attitude to work (by introducing the corporate communication dimension, the effect of organizational factors changes from insignificant to significant – intention to leave the job, and from significant to insignificant – attitude to work) and
- participation of employees and attitude to work (the effect of organizational factors changes from significant to insignificant).

Hereby we confirm that hypothesis H8 is partially confirmed.

Regression analysis results show that all analyzed organizational factors have a significant positive effect on employee resilience. The research data show that organizational factors (all four of them) affect employee resilience, but are not of crucial importance if observed separately. Considering that all four organizational factors ranging from 28.7% to 42.2% affect the degree of employee resilience, we conclude that organizational factors positively affect resilience. This indicates that each factor considered separately may be negligible, but that we should work on developing all four factors in order to get a resilient employee.

5. Conclusion

This research aims to examine employee resilience in hospitality kitchens in Serbia, as well as to examine its role in the business operations of hospitality facilities. The present study intended to test the correlation between employee resilience, organizational factors (a culture of learning, leadership, corporate communication, organizational commitment), and work outcomes (job satisfaction, work engagement, and intentions to fluctuate) in hospitality kitchens in Serbia. Resilience is in regression between organizational factors and work outcome. The main theoretical contribution is that it deals with a research gap in the field of tourism and hospitality because this is the first time this model has been applied in this research area.

The results of the research have shown that employees partly agree with the statement that their organization practices and supports learning. Employees partly agree that mistakes are openly discussed in their organization in order to learn from them, and that honest feedback and necessary information are given quickly and effortlessly. The statement with which employees partly disagree is that kitchen employees are rewarded for exploring new and improved ways of doing work, which indicates lower incomes in the hospitality industry. Research in the field of perception of supportive leadership gave us a mean score of 4.11, which shows that employees believe that their leaders partly support them.

Employees in the kitchens of selected hospitality facilities in Serbia believe they mostly learn from their mistakes, thus improving their business operations (5.13). They also believe that they constantly evaluate their performances and wish to improve them, that they know who to address when they need assistance, and not restrain themselves when they should seek help from their manager. The biggest problem for employees is that they do not believe that changes at work are growth opportunities. This problem in the economy could be avoided by encouraging the leader to see the team's mistakes, consider them, and then eliminate them with joint efforts.

Concerning all statements of employee resilience determinants, the worst-rated statement is that an invitation to an interview is perceived as an opportunity to assess one's business operations and advancement. It means that employees do not trust their organization enough or assume that they will be rewarded for their work. The total score for resilience is 4.87, which shows that employees are committed to their jobs. As for job satisfaction, the research has shown that employees are not satisfied with their job to a large extent. This leads to a big contradiction that starts from the conclusion that employees do not have enough commitment to their organization, but they love their work and are very dedicated to it. This is evidenced by the very nature of job instability. Generally speaking, the problem could be overcome by contracts for permanent employment that would give employees security.

The intention to leave the job was evaluated with a medium average score, which indicated that employees partially do not intend to leave their jobs or to the point that they do not have an attitude regarding this statement. However, we should notice an exceptionally high coefficient of standard deviation regarding all three statements, which means that there is a

large number of employees who definitely and surely want to leave the organization where they work when the opportunity arises.

The regression analysis has shown that resilience positively affects job satisfaction, as well as attitude to work. Also, regression analysis shows us that resilience does not negatively affect the intention to leave the job. Regarding the influence of organizational factors on work outcomes, the research has shown that all factors have a significant positive effect on job satisfaction and attitude to work, while only leadership has a significantly negative effect on the intention to leave the job. Research also showed that the H8 hypothesis is partially confirmed – that resilience has a mediatory role between organizational factors (a culture of learning, leadership, participation of employees and corporate communication) and work outcome (job satisfaction, attitude to work, intention to leave the job). This shows us that a resilient employee is a satisfied employee and has no tendency to quit his job, but also has a tendency to advance and improve. This research indicates to the management that it is very important to develop a resilient employee, but that this is only possible through the development of all the organizational factors.

Limitations and future research

The research sample consists of hotel and restaurant employees in Serbia. What can be seen as a limitation of the research is that hospitality facilities were included in the research by the method of convenient random sampling, and therefore, the results cannot be generalized. However, the size of the sample and the number of obtained responses are assumed to be sufficient for getting relevant results. The present study used a cross-sectional study in data collection. Although a cross-sectional study may prove practical, it could be hard to make a correct interpretation of causality. With this in mind, it would be more appropriate in future studies to use a longitudinal design that assesses correlations of the study associated with long-term collected data.

Future studies should carefully structure and examine the correlations of different roots of resilience. Determination of previous causes and effects of employee resilience, moderators, and reciprocal correlations between variables should be observed in more detail. In this regard, variables such as employee personalities should be studied concerning their resilience. Moreover, application of structural equation modeling can enable the determination of more complex correlations. This study empirically investigated resilience as a mediator between organizational factors and work results. Some other potential mediators such as stress symptoms, burnout syndrome, and negative affectivity may be investigated in future studies.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Alamene, W., Eke, B. C., & Anyanwu, S. A. (2017). Innovation and organizational resilience: A study of selected food and beverage firms in Port Harcourt. *International Journal of Advanced Academic Research*, 3(6), 1–15.
2. Alola, U. V., & Alola, A. A. (2018). Can resilience help? Coping with job stressor. *Academic Journal of Economic Studies*, 4(1), 141–152.

3. Bishop, J. K. (2020). *Organisational learning culture: The relationship to employee well-being and employee resilience* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Canterbury. <http://dx.doi.org/10.26021/6127>
4. Blešić I., Kovačić S, Petrović M, & Milićević S. (2019). The effects of organisational factors on work outcomes in hospitality: The role of resilience, *European Journal of International Management*, 1(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.1504/EJIM.2021.10040417>
5. Blešić, I., Tepavčević, J., Stanić, M., Dragin, A., & Ivkov, M. (2019a). Impact of innovations on service orientation of employees in the hotel management. *Marketing*, 50(1), 13–23. <https://doi.org/10.5937/markt1901013b>
6. Bouckenoghe, D., Devos, G., & Van den Broeck, H. (2009). Organizational change questionnaire – climate of change, processes, and readiness: Development of a new instrument. *The Journal of Psychology*, 143(6), 559–599. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980903218216>
7. Brooks, R. B. (2005). The power of parenting. In S. Goldstein & R. B. Brooks (Eds.), *Handbook of resilience in children* (pp. 297–314). Boston, MA: Springer.
8. Burnard, K., & Ran, B. (2011). Organisational resilience: Development of a conceptual framework for organisational responses. *International Journal of Production Research*, 49, 5581–5599. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2011.563827>
9. Cotton, J. L., & Tuttle, J. M. (1986). Employee turnover: A meta-analysis with implications for research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 11(1), 55–70. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258331>
10. Dai, Y. D., Zhuang, W. L., & Huan, T. C. (2019). Engage or quit? The moderating role of abusive supervision between resilience, intention to leave and work engagement. *Tourism Management*, 70, 69–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.07.014>
11. De Clercq, D., Fatima, T., & Jahanzeb, S. (2021). Gossiping about an arrogant leader: Sparked by inconsistent leadership, mitigated by employee resilience. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 57(3), 269–289. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886320917520>
12. Duchek S. (2019). *Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization*. Faculty of Business and Economics, Technische Universita't Dresden, Germany. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7>
13. Gallopín, G. C. (2006). Linkages between vulnerability, resilience, and adaptive capacity. *Global Environmental Change*, 16(3), 293–303. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2006.02.004>
14. Gomes, R. (2015). Resilience and enterprise architecture in SMES. *Journal of Information Systems and Technology Management (JISTEM)*, 12, 525–540. <https://doi.org/10.4301/S1807-17752015000300002>
15. Goodman, M. B. (2000). Corporate communication: The American picture. *Corporate communications: An International Journal*, 5(2), 69–74. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13563280010372496>
16. Hodliffe, M. C. (2014). *The development and validation of the employee resilience scale (EmpRes): The conceptualisation of a new model* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Canterbury.
17. Huertas-Valdivia, I., Gallego-Burín, A. R., & Lloréns-Montes, F. J. (2019). Effects of different leadership styles on hospitality workers. *Tourism Management*, 71, 402–420.
18. Jakšić, M., & Jakšić, M. (2014). Organization performance and employee satisfaction. *Ekonomika*, 60(2), 117–128.
19. Jun, M., Shaohan, C., & Shin, H. (2006). TQM practices in Maquiladora: Antecedents of employees satisfaction and loyalty. *Journal of Operations Management*, 24(6), 791–812. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2005.09.006>
20. Karatepe, O. M. (2015). 'Do personal resources mediate the effect of perceived organizational support on emotional exhaustion and job outcomes?' *International*

- Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 27(1), 4–26.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-09-2013-0417>
21. Kašpárková, L., Vaculik, M., Procházka, J., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2018). Why resilient workers perform better: The roles of job satisfaction and work engagement. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*, 33(1), 43–62.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15555240.2018.1441719>
22. Kim, M., & Beehr, T. A. (2018). Can empowering leaders affect subordinates' well-being and careers because they encourage subordinates, job crafting behaviors?' *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 25(2), 184–196.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051817727702>
23. Koderman, Đ. I. (2021). Organizaciona posvećenost zaposlenih kao rezultat zadovoljstva poslom. *Trendovi u poslovanju*, 9(17), 16–24. <https://doi.org/10.5937/trendpos21010171>
24. Kolak, M. (2020). *Zadovoljstvo poslom i kvaliteta života osoba zaposlenih u IT sektoru* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of Psychology.
25. Kumar, V., Choisne, F., Grosbois, D., & Kumar, U. (2009). Impact of TQM on company's performance. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*, 26(1), 23–37. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02656710910924152>
26. Kuntz, J. R., Näswall, K., & Malinen, S. (2016). Resilient employees in resilient organizations: Flourishing beyond adversity. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 456–462. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2016.39>
27. Kuntz, J., Connell, P., & Näswall, K. (2017). Workplace resources and employee resilience: The role of regulatory profiles. *Career Development International*, 22(4), 419–435. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-11-2016-0208>
28. Kuntz, J., Malinen, S., & Näswall, K. (2017a). Employee resilience: Directions for resilience development. *Consulting Psychology Journal*, 69(3), 223–242. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cpb0000097>
29. Larsen, H. H. (2002). Oticon: Unorthodox project-based management and careers in a “spaghetti organization”. *Human Resource Planning*, 25(4), 30–37
30. Lau, K. W., Lee, P. Y., & Chung, Y. Y. (2019). A collective organizational learning model for organizational development, Leadership. *Organization Development Journal*, 40(1), 107–123. <https://doi.org/10.1108/lodj-06-2018-0228>
31. Lau, P., McLean, G., Hsu, Y., & Lien, B. (2016). Learning organization, organizational culture, and affective commitment in Malaysia: A person–organization fit theory. *Human Resource Development International*, 20(2), 159–179. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2016.124>
32. Lawler, E. E. (2005). Creating high performance organizations. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 43(1), 10–17.
33. Lee, J. J., Ok, C. M., & Hwang, J. (2016). An emotional labor perspective on the relationship between customer orientation and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 54, 139–150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2016.01.008>
34. Luthans, F. (2002). The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior, *Journal of organizational behavior*, 23, 695–706. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.165>
35. Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2007). Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 60(3), 541–572.
36. Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Li, W. (2005). The psychological capital of Chinese workers: Exploring the relationship with performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 1(2), 249–271. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2005.00011.x>
37. Malik, P., & Garg, P. (2017). The relationship between learning culture, inquiry and dialogue, knowledge sharing structure and affective commitment to change. *Journal of*

- Organizational Change Management*, 30(4), 610-631. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-09-2016-0176>
38. Marsick, V., & Watkins, K. (2003). Demonstrating the value of an organization's learning culture: The dimensions of the learning organization questionnaire. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 5(2), 132–151. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422303005002002>
39. Milikić, B. B. (2010). Fluktuacija zaposlenih: Uzroci, posledice i kontrola [Employee turnover: Causes, consequences, and management]. *Economic Themes*, 48(1), 131–144.
40. Mitchlitsch, J. F. (2000). High-performing, loyal employees: The real way to implement strategy. *Strategy & Leadership*, 28(6), 28–33. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10878570010380020>
41. Näswall, K., Malinen, S., Kuntz, J., & Hodliffe, M. (2019). Employee resilience: development and validation of a measure. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 34(5), 353–367. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-02-2018-0102>
42. Naz, N. (2020). *Impact of abusive supervision on employee well-being with the mediating role of perceived job insecurity and moderating role of resilience* (Unpublished master's thesis). Capital University of Science and Technology, Islamabad.
43. Nguyen, Q., Kuntz, J. R., Näswall, K., & Malinen, S. (2016). Employee resilience and leadership styles: The moderating role of proactive personality and optimism. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 45(2), 13–21.
44. Ooi, K. B., Barker, N. A., Arumugam, V., Vellapaqn, L., & Loke, A. K. Y. (2007). Does TQM influence employees job satisfaction: An empirical case analysis. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*, 24(1), 62–77. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02656710710720330>
45. Peccei, R., & Rosenthal, P. (2000). Front-line responses to customer orientation programmes: A theoretical and empirical analysis. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 11(3), 562–590. <https://doi.org/10.1080/095851900339765>
46. Pramanik, P. D., Dewi, T. R., & Ingkadijaya, R. (2020). Is the higher employees' resilience, the higher their work engagement will be? *Tourism Research Journal (TRJ)*, 4(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.30647/trj.v4i1.72>
47. Radović-Marković, M. (2017). Podsticanje rezilijentnosti preduzeća u Srbiji [Fostering resilience of the enterprises in Serbia]. *Trendovi u poslovanju*, 1–7.
48. Richard, E. M. (2020). Developing employee resilience: The role of leader-facilitated emotion management. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 22(4), 387–403. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422320949143>
49. Robbins, R. E. (2003). *Organisational behavior*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
50. Saad, S. K., & Elshaer, I. A. (2020). Justice and trust's role in employees' resilience and business' continuity: Evidence from Egypt. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 35, 100712. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2020.100712>
51. Sadikoglu, E., & Zehir, C. (2010). Investigating the effects of innovation and employee performance on the relationship between total quality management practices and firm performance: An empirical study on Turkish firms. *International Journal of Production and Economics*, 27(1), 13–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2010.02.013>
52. Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600–619. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169>
53. Salehzadeh, R. (2019). The effects of leaders' behaviors on employees' resilience. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 12(5), 318–338. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJWHM-02-2019-0016>
54. Sheffi, Y., & Rice Jr, J. B. (2005). A supply chain view of the resilient enterprise. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 47(1), 41–48.

55. Shoss, M. K., Jiang, L., & Probst, T. M. (2018). Bending without breaking: A two-study examination of employee resilience in the face of job insecurity. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23(1), 112–126. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000060>
56. Spector P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13, 693–713. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00929796>
57. Stephenson, A. (2010). *Benchmarking the resilience of organisations*. University of Canterbury.
58. Stokes, P., Smith, S., Wall, T., Moore, N., Rowland, C., Ward, T., & Cronshaw, S. (2019). Resilience and the (micro-) dynamics of organizational ambidexterity: Implications for strategic HRM. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(8), 1287–1322. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2018.1474939>
59. Sullivan-Taylor, B., & Wilson, D. C. (2009). Managing the threat of terrorism in British travel and leisure organizations. *Organization Studies*, 30(2-3), 251–276. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840608101480>
60. Teng, C. C., & Barrows, C. W. (2009). Service orientation: Antecedents, outcomes, and implications for hospitality research and practice. *The Service Industries Journal*, 29(10), 1413–1435. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02642060903026247>
61. Theron, M., Barkhuizen, N., & Du Plessis, Y. (2014). Managing the academic talent void: Investigating factors in academic turnover and retention in South Africa. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 40(1), 1–14.
62. Trkulja, T. (2015). Socijalna rezilijentnost kao teorijski pristup socijalnoj održivosti [Social resilience as a theoretical approach to social sustainability]. *Defendologija*, 18(36), 45–58.
63. Välikangas, L. (2020). Leadership that generates resilience: An introduction to second resilience forum. *Management and Organization Review*, 16(4), 737–739. <https://doi.org/10.1017/mor.2020.52>
64. Van Breda-Verduijn, H., & Heijboer, M. (2016). Learning culture, continuous learning, organizational learning anthropologist. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 48(3), 123–128. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-11-2015-0074>
65. Vandenberghe, C., & Bentein, K. (2009). A closer look at the relationship between affective commitment to supervisors and organizations and turnover. *Journal of Occupational and organizational psychology*, 82(2), 331–348. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317908X312641>
66. Vogus, T. J., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2007). Organizational resilience: Towards a theory and research agenda. *IEEE Conference on Systems, Man and Cyb*, Montreal, QC, Canada. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSMC.2007.4414160>
67. Zhang, Y., Guo, Y., & Newman, A. (2017). Identity judgements, work engagement and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating effects based on group engagement model. *Tourism Management*, 61, 190–197. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2017.01.005>
68. Zhao, X., & Ghiselli, R. (2016). ‘Why do you feel stressed in a “smile factory”? Hospitality job characteristics influence work–family conflict and job stress’. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(2), 305–326. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-08-2014-0385>
69. Zhu, Y., Zhang, S., & Shen, Y. (2019). Humble leadership and employee resilience: exploring the mediating mechanism of work-related promotion focus and perceived insider identity. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 673. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00673>