

# The Impact of the Organisational Commitment of Hotel Staff on their Job Satisfaction and Job Performance after Covid-19

İBRAHİM ÇETİNTÜRK \* [icetinturk32@gmail.com]

MEHMET BAHAR \*\* [mehmetbahar68@gmail.com]

**Abstract** | This study aims to investigate the impact of organizational commitment on the job satisfaction and job performance of hotel employees after the Covid-19 outbreak. Furthermore, this study examines the correlation between organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance in the context of hotel employee dismissals during the Covid-19 pandemic. This study's sample population comprises employees of hotels approved by the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism for operation. Data collection was carried out through the use of a questionnaire. The participants were contacted via email between September 10 and September 20, 2022, for an online survey administered through Google Drive, which yielded 398 survey forms suitable for analysis. The data were analyzed using the SPSS 21 software package. The study found that the organizational commitment of hotel employees significantly impacted their job satisfaction and performance after the Covid-19 pandemic. It was confirmed that affective commitment is a precursor to job satisfaction and performance. The results confirmed that those not laid off during the Covid-19 pandemic exhibited a higher average job satisfaction and performance.

**Keywords** | Covid-19, tourism, hotel, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, job performance

---

\* Çankırı Karatekin University, School of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of International Trade and Finance Çankırı, Türkiye

\*\* School of Applied Sciences, Cappadocia University, Nevşehir, Türkiye

## 1. Introduction

The World Health Organisation (WHO) has linked the definition of a disease as an epidemic based on the criteria that there must be “a new virus or mutated factor, that it is easily and continuously passed from person to person.” Scientists have stated that the reason for Covid-19 to be called a pandemic is that the new virus is quickly and continuously transmitted (Keskin et al., 2020). Covid-19 is the most severe health crisis of the century compared to the epidemics in history (Tekin, 2021). The World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) stated that several industry branches linked to tourism and hotel management had been negatively affected during the pandemic. The pandemic period has created a sense of threat on a global scale (Sarkhanov & Tutar, 2021). A significant decrease in especially hotel reservations and methods such as termination of activities or operations with limited capacities have been followed by several hotels.

In the tourism sector, guest relations are intense and human resources are an undeniable essence. Businesses that human resources mainly represent prefer to follow methods like resorting to layoffs for their employees or even terminating their job contracts during crisis periods. For example, airline businesses are approaching discharge of their employees when facing bankruptcy and economic crises (Karakavuz, 2020). In this context, employees in the tourism sector have been negatively affected by Covid-19, and a particular group was given a layoff or discharged. Some have been encouraged to work from home (Kang et al., 2021; Özdemir Güzel, 2021). During the Covid-19 pandemic, tourist businesses frequently resorted to layoffs, job losses, lowering wages, issuing paid-for-free furloughs, and other practices. A few employees continued their work with the home office system. Many white-collar people (the executive, sales department, etc.) worked from home and followed their work during this period. Cheng

and Kao (2022) stated that during the pandemic, firms should weigh in on applications to reduce employee stress and maintain high motivation to increase job satisfaction.

This work is based on the triaxial organizational commitment model Allen and Meyer (1990). The assignment aims to define the impact of the organizational commitment of hotel staff on their job satisfaction and performance. In the literature, there are numerous studies on the relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job performance, as well as job satisfaction and job performance (Gunlu et al., 2010; Kuruüzüm et al., 2009; Yang, 2010;). The critical point that differentiates this work is that it was investigated after the Covid-19 pandemic period. Furthermore, this work is essential based on researching the connection between giving employees layoffs and organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance. In this context, this study is thought to contribute to the literature.

During the Covid-19 pandemic, the tourism sector has been severely affected (Şengel, 2021). However, a gap exists in the literature regarding this impact. Previous scholarly research has investigated the influence of engagement on job satisfaction and performance in tourism. Nonetheless, no studies conducted such an examination in the context of a post-pandemic world. This research aims to address the research gap and provide significant new insights. This study's practical significance is evident as adjusted to the post-Covid-19 world, where understanding the connection between engagement, job satisfaction, and performance is vital. These findings offer a blueprint for decision-makers and leaders to promote employee support and productivity in a dynamic setting. The research is expected to uncover significant conclusions about how employee engagement affects job satisfaction and performance, even in a post-pandemic world. As a result, the study will provide insights into employees' resili-

ence, motivation, and adaptability. The research findings inform the development of strategies to build a better future for employees and the tourism industry. The study shows how the pandemic has impacted employee engagement, job satisfaction, and performance. The research is expected to provide valuable insights to help shape a more vital, effective workforce in the constantly evolving tourism industry.

## 2. Conceptual framework

Organizational commitment refers to the “psychological state of connecting the individual to the organization” (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Organizational commitment also encourages employees to share the firm’s goals and objectives. Employees want to always be with the firm with this trend (Kang et al., 2021). On the other hand, Wiener (1982) expressed organizational commitment as the sum of internalized normative pressures to act in a way that meets organizational goals and interests. So, dedicated individuals exhibit behaviours they believe are right and moral instead of self-interest. Allen and Meyer (1990) explored the classification of organizational commitment in three dimensions: “Emotional commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment.” Emotional commitment refers to employees’ behavioural commitment to the organization through positive work experience. This identifies the employee who created a connection between the organization and himself. However, emotional commitment is also driven by the employees’ will. Continuous commitment is based on the cost of leaving the business, as well as the cost of being perceived socially. Additionally, the commitment to continue is based on the employees’ needs, which are the organizations. Normative commitment reflects the employers’ perceived loyalty to the business. The employee’s responsibility towards the organi-

zation means that he stays there. Nevertheless, normative commitment is dictated by obligation. Consequently, there is no question that all types of commitment should yield positive results for organizations. Instead, it is thought that it may be helpful for scientists to understand the organizational behaviour of employees better (Bilgin & Demirer, 2012; Jaros, 2010; Kang et al., 2021).

The tourism industry is considered one of the most critical sub-groups of the service sector. Human resources are an essential sub-element of the tourism industry. Several studies are available in the literature on job satisfaction and performance issues that are important to study organizational behaviour. When investigating the literature, job satisfaction is handled with diverse definitions. Locke (1976) expressed job satisfaction as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experience.”. Hulin and Judge (2003) defined job satisfaction as “job satisfactions are multidimensional psychological responses to one’s job. The author also stated while these reactions possess cognitive, emotional, and behavioural components. Carmeli and Freund (2004) explained the difference between organizational commitment and job satisfaction, while organizational commitment is steadier and reflects a general employee attitude, job satisfaction shows a more fragile and variable one.

On the other hand, individuals who are satisfied with their work tend to be more active in their businesses than those in the workplace of individuals who are dissatisfied with their work. There is a relationship between job satisfaction and performance (Robbins & Judge, 2012). Jex and Britt (2014) defined job performance as “all the behaviours employees engage in at work.” However, the author noted that employees often engage in activities at work that have little or no relevance to work-specific tasks. Murphy and Kroecker (1988) rank performance as position activity, task performance, performance-impacting behaviour, interpersonal relationship, business competency,

business skills, and mission information. Borman and Motowidlo (1993, 1997) evaluated the sub-dimensions of job performance with two distinct dimensions: task performance and contextual performance. Task performance can be defined as employees performing activities by applying a portion of the technological process directly or indirectly, contributing to the technical essence of the organization. Task performance can be defined as employees performing activities by applying a portion of the technological process directly or indirectly, contributing to the technical nature of the organization. Contextual performance requires volunteering to perform tasks and assisting others in the organization to complete tasks and collaborate with them. Sonnentag et al. (2008) stated that critical organizational decisions were based on individual performance and that the most fundamental level of performance varied in process and results.

The correlation between job satisfaction and organizational commitment is being investigated under four topics. "The impact of job satisfaction on organizational commitment, the effect of the organizational commitment on job satisfaction, the mutual relationship between the organizational commitment and job satisfaction, the independence of organizational commitment and job satisfaction" (Kök, 2006, 300). On the other hand, the connection between organizational commitment and job performance has been investigated with a similar model as follows: The impact of organizational commitment on job performance (a), mutual connection between organizational commitment and job performance (b), and the independence of organizational commitment and again job performance (c) (Kargün and Koç, 2021; Rafiei et al., 2014; Sıgı, 2007; Tsai et al., 2010). In this study, the impact of organizational commitment on job satisfaction and job performance has been examined. When analyzing the literature, the positive effects of organizational commitment on job satisfaction and performance have been

noted. To define whether the same connection existed in the tourism sector during the Covid-19 or not, the below-mentioned hypotheses have been developed:

H1: Organizational commitment has a positive effect on job satisfaction.

The main difference between organizational commitment and job satisfaction is that organizational commitment addresses the organizations aims and values, whereby job satisfaction is about several dimensions of work. In the literature, numerous types of research on the effect of the organizational commitment level on job satisfaction considering employees in the accommodation business (Çelik et al., 2015; Namasivayam & Zhao, 2007; Liao et al., 2009). At the same time, based on some studies on hotel employees, it has been noted that an increasing organizational commitment of the employees leads to an increase in the job satisfaction levels (Arslan & Kılıçlar, 2018; Sökmen, 2019). Furthermore, Dramićanin et al. (2021), Liao et al. (2009), and Williams and Hazer (1986) indicated in their research that there is a significant connection between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. On the other side, there are also results on the fact that job satisfaction can enhance organizational commitment (Tsai et al., 2010; Yiing & Ahmad, 2009). During the Covid-19 pandemic, little research about the connection between organizational commitment and job satisfaction has been noticed (Chanana, 2021; Ratnasari, 2021; Salem et al., 2021). In Chanana's (2021) work, organizational commitment and job satisfaction of female and male teachers serving at private schools during the Covid-19 epidemic have been reviewed. As a result, a positive and vital connection has been seen between the teachers' organizational commitment and job satisfaction level. Ratnasari (2021) stated in her research that organizational commitment significantly affects job satisfaction. Salem et al. (2021) concluded that job satisfaction has

a positive and vital impact on organizational commitment.

H1a: Emotional commitment has a positive effect on job satisfaction.

H1b: Continuance commitment has a positive effect on job satisfaction.

H1c: Normative commitment has a positive effect on job satisfaction.

It can be seen in the literature that there are many studies on the connection between the sub-dimensions of organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Aksoy et al., 2018; Gunlu et al., 2010; Hakami et al., 2020; Öztürk et al., 2014; Özutku, 2008; Sohail and Ilyas, 2018; Yang, 2010). Hakami et al. (2020) propounded an essential connection between job satisfaction and normative commitment, emotional and continuance commitment, and the highest relationship among factors is between normative commitment and job satisfaction. According to Aksoy et al. (2018) study, normative and emotional commitment shows a positive connection, whereas normative and continuance commitment present a negative linear connection. Sohail and Ilyas (2018) expressed that, on the one hand, job satisfaction has a positive and significant impact on normative commitment, whereas on the other hand, job satisfaction does not have a significant effect on continuance commitment. Öztürk et al. (2014) confirmed in their research on hotel employees that there is an essential connection between job satisfaction and emotional commitment. According to Yang's research findings (2010): it has been confirmed that job satisfaction significantly contributes to emotional commitment. Considering the research of Gunlu et al. (2010) on managers, it has been identified that job satisfaction indicates a meaningful effect on normative and emotional commitment. As it is seen, considering the research on the sub-dimensions of organizational commitment as well as job satisfaction, the significant connection between emotional and normative commitment as

well as job satisfaction is being largely mentioned.

H2: Organisational commitment has a positive effect on job performance.

There are research samples in the literature about the significant contribution of organizational commitment on job performance (Kargün and Koç, 2021; Rafiei et al., 2014; Sıgır, 2007; Tsai et al., 2010). According to Sıgır (2007), organizational commitment is a determinant of performance. It has been confirmed by Tsai et al. (2010) research that in the hotel sector, organizational commitment directly and positively affects the employees' job performance. Rafiei et al. (2014) have expressed that organizational commitment positively affects job performance.

Among researchers investigating the effect of organizational commitment on job performance during the Covid-19 pandemic, Ersan and Süslü (2022) proved an essential and positive connection between organizational commitment and job performance. Anugrah and Priyambodo (2022) have also presented the critical and positive connection between the organizational commitment and performance of those working from home during the Covid-19 pandemic.

H2a: Emotional commitment has a positive effect on job performance.

H2b: Continuance commitment has a positive effect on job performance.

H2c: Normative commitment has a positive effect on job performance.

In the literature, the correlation between the sub-dimensions of organizational commitment and job performance is analysed by Boz et al. (2021): it is given that there is a meaningful correlation between emotional and normative commitment and job performance. Özutku (2008) expressed an essential and positive correlation between the emotional and continuance commitment and job performance, whereby no meaningful correlation was found considering the correlation between the

normative commitment and job performance. Dixit and Bhati (2012) worked in the automotive industry and found that employee loyalty (emotional, normative, continuance) was significantly associated with sustainable productivity. Suliman and Iles (2000) found a positive association between loyalty (each of the three components) and job performance.

H3: There are essential differences between layoffs given to employees and organizational commitment during the Covid-19 pandemic.

H4: There are essential differences between the layoffs given to employees and job satisfaction during the Covid-19 pandemic.

H5: There are essential differences between the layoffs given to employees and job performance during the Covid-19 pandemic.

This research is also necessary for considering the connection between the layoff enabled to employees during the pandemic and organizational commitment and job satisfaction and performance. Yüksek ve Kalyoncu's (2021) studies have found that "most employees are forced to take mandatory leave" and "not able to actively work" in the problems experienced by hospitality businesses during the Covid-19 pandemic period. The work of Yiğitöl and Büyükmumcu (2021) revealed a negative relationship between the employee's job performance and their intention to quit. In this context, the underperformance of the work is an essential reason for increasing employee redundancy. Based on Özdemir's research (2020) on the tourism sector, tourism employees' economic, social, and psychological results during the Covid-19 pandemic have been approached. It has been mentioned that this process resulted in issues such as taking compulsory unpaid leave, working part-time, and leaving employment for employees. Also, this situation has led to economic problems such as loss of income, job loss, and lack of solvency. As per the food and beverage sector research by Bilgin (2022): employees tended to look for more gua-

ranteed jobs to survive due to the dismissal and unpaid leave implementation of employees during the Covid-19 period. According to the research of Şen and Bütün (2021) on the aviation industry, it was expressed that companies first gave unpaid leave to their employees during the Covid-19 period. With the continuance of the epidemic, some businesses were forced to discharge their employees.

### 3. Method

This study aims to determine how organizational commitment affects hotel employees' job satisfaction and job performance following the Covid-19 pandemic. Moreover, this work explores how providing career opportunities to employees during the Covid-19 pandemic influences the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. This study focuses on hotel employees from hotels in Turkey certified by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. As per data from the Turkish Statistical Institute, evaluated by the Tourism Statistics Centre Tourism Databank, there are 435.153 wage workers in Turkish hotels (turizmdatabank.com, 2022).

A questionnaire was used as the primary data collection tool in the study. The questionnaire consists of four sections: demographic characteristics of the participants, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance. The questionnaire items were designed using a five-point Likert scale. The Organizational Commitment Scale was adapted from Allen and Meyer (1990) and specifically for the tourism sector by Perçin and Aslanergül (2020). The Job Performance Scale is based on Sigler and Pearson's (2000) study, while the Job Satisfaction Scale was adapted from Kuşluyan and Kuşluyan (2005) for use in the tourism sector.

Due to the difficulties associated with connecting with the population regarding process,

time, place, and cost, this study employed a data-collection sampling technique. The probability-based sampling method of simple random sampling was selected. The sample size was determined using G\*POWER 3.1 (Faul et al., 2007). The analysis determined a minimum sample size of 98 with a Power of 0.80,  $f^2$  of 0.15, and  $\alpha$  of 0.05. The study targeted a sample size of 384 participants with a 95% confidence interval. The participants were contacted via email between September 10 and September 20, 2022, for an online survey administered via Google Drive. 413 responses were collected from different regions and districts of Turkey, including white and blue-collar workers. Of the 413 forms contained, 15 were incomplete or inconsistent and hence excluded from analysis, yielding 398 survey forms suitable for analysis.

The ethics committee of Çankırı Karatekin University approved the ethical considerations for this work via meeting number 28 held on October 15, 2022 and approved accordingly. The collected data underwent several statistical analyses. The data's normal distribution was assessed using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, indicating a non-normal distribution ( $p < 0.05$ ). Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was 0.789 based on the reliability analysis. Demographic characteristics were analysed using frequency analysis, while highly correlated data was evaluated through descriptive factor analysis. Additionally, simple and multiple regression analyses were employed to study the relationships between the dependent and independent variables. A Mann-Whitney U test was applied to determine if a difference existed between the two means.

Acknowledging the limitations of this study is essential. The study was restricted to hotels that obtained an operational certificate from the Ministry of Culture and Tourism of the Republic of Turkey, limiting the findings' generalizability to other accommodations. Additionally, relying on self-reported data through questionnaires may lead to response bias, potentially affecting the accuracy of the results. Moreover, the study's cross-sectional

design captures a snapshot in time, limiting the ability to establish causal relationships or account for potential changes over more extended periods. Finally, external factors beyond the scope of this study, such as broader economic trends or cultural influences, could affect the observed relationships between organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance. The abovementioned limitations emphasize the need for further research and interpretation of the study findings.

#### 4. Findings

Related to the frequency distribution of the participants' demographic findings, the participants are mainly employed (79,4%) at five-star hotels. The assigned positions of the participants in hotel businesses show a distribution such as 10,8% front office, 16,1% restaurant and bar, 10,8% kitchen, 8,8% housekeeping, and 11,1% other departments (animation, quality, security, public relations). According to the participants' genders, the distribution is 23,9% female and 76,1% male. The distribution considering the age of the participants is 19,8% as well as 18 and over age range, 22,6% between 30-40 age, 32,7% between 40-50, and 24,9% 50 and over age. As per the educational background of the participants, the distribution is undergraduate and associate degrees to a large extent. Additionally, the participants answered, "Has there been a layoff due to the Covid-19 period?" with 54,8% Yes, and 45,2% No.

According to the factor analysis results related to the organizational commitment scale, to test whether the sample size is appropriate for the factor analysis or not, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure (KMO) testing has been applied (Table 1). As a result of this analysis, the KMO value has been calculated as 0,837. In this context, it has been concluded that following the factor analysis for the sample size would be sufficient. At the

same time, the result of Barlett's Test of Sphericity was observed to be significant ( $p < 0,001$ ). The acceptance level for factor load values is set at 0,40. Four substances with a low factor charge value and charge value in multiple factors have been removed from the analysis. The calculation has been re-done based on the remaining 14 factors. The organizational commitment scale was collected under three factors, accounting for 54,81% of the total variance. The total variance description ratio of factors was found to be 24,5%, the second factor 16,01%, and the third factor 14,25%. The total variance rates in the factor analysis are between 40% and 60%, which is generally accepted (Scherer, 1988). There are also three factors whose values (eigenvalues) are more significant than one, similar to the type of factors in the field "emotional engagement, continuance, and normative engagement".

As for factor analysis results for the job satisfaction scale, the KMO test result 0,851 explains that the data set is suitable for the factor analysis. At the same time, the fact that Bartlett's test result is essential shows a high correlation among variables and that the data set is suitable for the factor analysis. The explanation rate of the total variance is 67,29%. Additionally, a single factor with a higher value than one has been noted, and this factor has been named 'job satisfaction.'

Regarding the factor analysis and its results based on the job performance, the KMO value 0,809 and the meaningful Barlett globality test result ( $p < 0,001$ ) show that this is suitable for the matrix factor analysis. A single factor has been noted, of which the value is over 1. This factor has been named "job performance." The rate of the total interpretation of the variance is 71,75%.

**Table 1** | Factor analysis results of the variables

|   | <b>Emotional<br/>commitment</b> | <b>Normative<br/>commitment</b> | <b>Continuance<br/>commitment</b> |
|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Statement 1                                   | 0,657                           |                                 |                                   |
| Statement 2                                   | 0,562                           |                                 |                                   |
| Statement 3 T                                 | 0,702                           |                                 |                                   |
| Statement 4 T                                 | 0,823                           |                                 |                                   |
| Statement 5                                   | 0,717                           |                                 |                                   |
| Statement 6 T                                 | 0,808                           |                                 |                                   |
| Statement 7                                   |                                 |                                 | 0,504                             |
| Statement 8                                   |                                 |                                 | 0,607                             |
| Statement 9                                   |                                 |                                 | 0,543                             |
| Statement 10                                  |                                 |                                 | 0,745                             |
| Statement 11                                  |                                 |                                 | 0,668                             |
| Statement 14                                  |                                 | 0,681                           |                                   |
| Statement 15                                  |                                 | 0,790                           |                                   |
| Statement 17                                  |                                 | 0,735                           |                                   |
| Eigenvalues                                   | 4,254                           | 2,178                           | 1,241                             |
| % of variance                                 | 24,544                          | 16,010                          | 14,254                            |
| Total explained variance 54,809               |                                 |                                 |                                   |
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling: 0,837 |                                 |                                 |                                   |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: 1364,689       |                                 |                                 |                                   |
| Sig.:0,000                                    |                                 |                                 |                                   |
| <b>Job satisfaction</b>                       |                                 |                                 |                                   |
| Statement 19                                  | 0,855                           |                                 |                                   |
| Statement 20                                  | 0,893                           |                                 |                                   |
| Statement 21                                  | 0,851                           |                                 |                                   |
| Statement 22                                  | 0,886                           |                                 |                                   |
| Statement 23 T                                | 0,573                           |                                 |                                   |
| Eigenvalues                                   | 3,364                           |                                 |                                   |
| % of variance                                 | 67,286                          |                                 |                                   |
| Total explained variance                      | 67,286                          |                                 |                                   |
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling: 0,851 |                                 |                                 |                                   |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: 1065,641       |                                 |                                 |                                   |
| Sig.: 0,000                                   |                                 |                                 |                                   |



**Table 1** | Factor analysis results of the variables (cont.)

| <b>Job performance</b>                       |        |
|--|--------|
| Statement 24                                 | 0,843  |
| Statement 25                                 | 0,868  |
| Statement 26                                 | 0,827  |
| Statement 27                                 | 0,849  |
| Eigenvalues                                  | 2,870  |
| % of variance                                | 71,745 |
| Explained variance percentage                | 71,745 |
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling:0,809 |        |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: 762,449       |        |
| Sig.: 0,000                                  |        |

To analyse to what extent job satisfaction and performance affect organizational commitment, a simple regression analysis has been applied. The results of the regression analysis are stated in Table 2. Concerning the regression analysis results, the analysis findings executed to test the effect of organizational commitment on job satisfaction are statistically significant ( $F:80,726$ ;  $p: 0,000<,05$ ). The  $R^2$  value improved based on the analysis results is 0,195. In this context, the variance in job

satisfaction of 19,5% depends on organizational commitment. Based on this result, the H1 hypothesis is accepted. The regression analysis findings are statistically significant in defining organizational commitments' effect on job performance ( $F:52,565$ ;  $p: 000<,05$ ). Regarding this model, the level of organizational commitment clarifies the variance of 13,5% in job satisfaction. In this context, hypothesis H2 is accepted.

**Table 2** | The Effect of organizational commitment on job satisfaction and job performance

|  | <b>Unstandardized Coefficients</b> |                | <b>Standardize coefficients</b> | <b>T value</b> | <b>Sig. (p)</b> |
|--|------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
|  | Beta                               | Standard error | Beta                            |                |                 |
| Constant   | 2,188                              | 0,165          |                                 | 13,257         | 0,000           |
| Organizational commitment                                | 0,435                              | 0,048          | 0,444                           | 8,985          | 0,000           |
| Dependent variable: job satisfaction                     |                                    |                |                                 |                |                 |
| Adjusted R Square: 0,195      Sig.: 0,000      F: 80,726 |                                    |                |                                 |                |                 |
| Constant   | 2,768                              | 0,197          |                                 | 14,080         | 0,000           |
| Organizational commitment                                | 0,419                              | 0,058          | 0,371                           | 7,250          | 0,000           |
| Dependent variable: job performance                      |                                    |                |                                 |                |                 |
| Adjusted R Square: 0,135      Sig.:0,000      F: 52,565  |                                    |                |                                 |                |                 |

To test the sub-dimensions of organizational commitment on the effect of job satisfaction and job performance, multiple regression analysis has been performed (Table 3). First, the impact of the sub-dimensions of organizational commitment on job satisfaction has been analysed. As per the table, the sub-dimension of organizational commitment explains 23% of the variance in job satisfaction. The sub-dimension of emotional commitment ( $\beta: 0,324$ ;  $p<,05$ ) is essential in explaining the dependent variable of job satisfaction.

The sub-dimensions of emotional commitment have an essential contribution to job performance in explaining the dependent variable. In this context, the H1a hypothesis is accepted. The continuance commitment ( $\beta: 0,061$ ;  $p>,05$ ) and normative commitment ( $\beta: 0,046$ ;  $p>,05$ ) from the other independent variables show an important contribution to job satisfaction. According to this result, H1b and H1c are rejected.

In the next phase, the effect of the sub-dimensions of organizational commitment on job

performance is analysed. Based on the model, the sub-dimensions of organizational commitment explain 16% of the variance in job performance. The sub-dimensions of the emotional commitment ( $\beta$ : 0,320;  $p < ,05$ ) show an important contribution to job performance in clarifying the dependent vari-

able. Considering this result, hypothesis H2a is accepted. The continuance and normative commitment from the remaining independent variables do not indicate any important contributions to job performance. Based on this result, hypotheses H2b and H2c are refused.

**Table 3** | Effect of the sub-dimensions of the organizational commitment on job satisfaction and job performance

|  | Unstandardized Coefficients |                | Standardized coefficients | T value | Sig. (p) |
|--|-----------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|---------|----------|
|  | Beta                        | Standard error | Beta                      |         |          |
| Constant   | 2,122                       | 0,162          |                           | 13,108  | 0,000    |
| Emotional commitment                                     | 0,324                       | 0,038          | 0,435                     | 8,583   | 0,000    |
| Continuance commitment                                   | 0,061                       | 0,041          | 0,080                     | 1,500   | 0,135    |
| Normative commitment                                     | 0,046                       | 0,033          | 0,073                     | 1,365   | 0,173    |
| Dependent variable: Job satisfaction                     |                             |                |                           |         |          |
| Adjusted R Square: 0,234      Sig.: 0,000      F: 34,570 |                             |                |                           |         |          |
| Constant   | 2,696                       | 0,194          |                           | 13,878  | 0,000    |
| Emotional commitment                                     | 0,320                       | 0,045          | 0,373                     | 7,050   | 0,000    |
| Continuance commitment                                   | 0,076                       | 0,049          | 0,087                     | 1,553   | 0,121    |
| Normative commitment                                     | 0,021                       | 0,040          | 0,029                     | ,521    | 0,603    |
| Dependent variable: Job performance                      |                             |                |                           |         |          |
| Adjusted R Square: 0,164      Sig.: 0,000      F: 22,627 |                             |                |                           |         |          |

The Mann-Whitney U test results are given in Table 4. To test whether there is an essential statistical difference between the situation of giving the employees layoffs during the pandemic period and organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance, the advantage was taken from the Mann-Whitney U test. According to the analysis results, there has not been noted any significant statistical difference between the situation of giving the employees a layoff during the pandemic period and organizational commit-

ment ( $p: 0,306 > ,05$ ). According to this finding, hypothesis H3 is rejected. On the other hand, an essential statistical difference has been noted when comparing the situation of giving the employees a layoff during the pandemic period and job satisfaction ( $p: 0,001 < ,05$ ) as well as job performance ( $p: 0,005 < ,05$ ). As per this result, hypotheses H4 and H5 are accepted. Those employees who were not given a layoff during the pandemic have a higher average of job satisfaction and performance.

**Table 4** | Mann-Whitney U test results

| Variables                                |                           | Mean rank | Mann-Whitney U | Z      |
|--|---------------------------|-----------|----------------|--------|
| Were you given a layoff due to Covid-19? | Organizational commitment | Yes       | 161,13         | -1,024 |
|  |                           | No        | 171,95         |        |
|  | Job satisfaction          | Yes       | 182,34         | -3,324 |
|  |                           | No        | 220,28         |        |
|  | Job performance           | Yes       | 185,25         | -2,776 |
|  |                           | No        | 216,76         |        |

## 5. Conclusion and Discussion

This study examines the impact of organizational commitment on job satisfaction and job performance among hotel employees after the Covid-19 pandemic. Additionally, this study investigates the relationship between layoffs during the Covid-19 pandemic and the levels of organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and employee performance.

The study's findings confirm the first two hypotheses (H1, H2). The results indicate that organizational commitment significantly affects job satisfaction and performance after the Covid-19 pandemic. Literature studies further support the research findings (Arslan & Kılıçlar, 2018; Çelik et al., 2015; Liao et al., 2009; Namasivayam & Zhao, 2007; Özutku, 2008; Sıgı, 2007; Sökmen, 2019; Steers, 1977; Tsai et al., 2010; Yousef, 2000). Moreover, studies conducted during the Covid-19 pandemic corroborate the findings (Chanana, 2021; Ratnasari, 2021; Salem et al., 2021; Anugrah & Priyambodo, 2022).

The analysis conducted to test the effect of emotional commitment on job satisfaction indicates a significant association. Thus, we support hypothesis H1a. Similar results are also available in the literature (Aksoy et al., 2018; Gunlu et al., 2010; Kuruüzüm et al., 2009; Öztürk et al., 2014; Sohail & Ilyas, 2018; Yang, 2010). However, neither continuous commitment nor normative commitment had a significant impact on job satisfaction. Both hypotheses, H1b and H1c, were not supported by the data. Various field studies (Aksoy et al., 2018; Gunlu et al., 2010; Hakami et al., 2020; Sohail & Ilyas, 2018; Yang, 2010), and reported different results concerning the relationship between continuous commitment, normative commitment, and job satisfaction.

This analysis indicates that emotional commitment is associated with job performance. Therefore, we can confirm hypothesis H2a. The results align with prior research in the field (Boz et al., 2021; Özutku, 2008; Kuruüzüm et al., 2009).

Among the sub-dimensions of organizational commitment, emotional commitment was found to have the highest average.

Employees who develop positive relationships with and are committed to the organization are more likely to support it during negative periods such as crises. Continuous and normative commitment were found to have no significant impact on job performance compared to the other variables. These findings support hypotheses H2b and H2c. Previous studies have shown varied findings regarding the relationship between continuous and normative commitment and job performance (Boz et al., 2021; Özutku, 2008). Several studies indicate a positive link between job performance and all three components of organizational commitment (Dixit & Bhati, 2012; Khan et al., 2010; Suliman & Iles, 2000).

The remaining findings indicate no significant statistical difference between allowing employees to take leave during the pandemic and their level of organizational commitment. This result supports hypothesis H3. However, a significant difference exists between granting employees leave during the pandemic and employee job satisfaction and performance. These results support hypotheses H4 and H5. Employees who were not granted leave during the pandemic exhibit higher levels of job satisfaction and job performance, on average. In this context, the study's results are expected. The Covid-19 period has significantly impacted Human Resources. During this time, individuals sought to preserve their health while navigating the virus's economic impact. This period has also impacted the tourism industry and its affiliated businesses. Certain hotel businesses were compelled to maintain operations with low occupancy rates or shut down. Consequently, some businesses have introduced reduced work hours or partial salary payment policies. In contrast, others have carried out employee layoffs, which have resulted in complaints against some employers.

The literature describes various research

methods for exploring the relationship between organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance. This study significantly contributes to the literature by comprehensively analysing the relationship between these key concepts. The findings highlight that the links between organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance remain in place even after the Covid-19 pandemic.

The novelty of the research suggests the fact that even crisis periods do not impact the organization's strength of relationships and commitment. Furthermore, this study helps us comprehend the long-lasting consequences of employers' strategic decisions during crises by analysing the impacts of layoffs on organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance amidst the pandemic. This indicates that employers must contemplate the likely outcomes of layoffs when formulating their human resource management strategies.

Theoretically, this study furthers the understanding of the dynamic correlations among organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance. The persistence of these relationships in the post-pandemic period can be demonstrated, enabling businesses and researchers to comprehend how such factors can assist in strategic planning and policymaking. From a practical standpoint, this study's findings offer valuable recommendations for the hotel industry and similar sectors. Employers can consider these findings when creating approaches to enhance employees' organizational commitment and optimize job satisfaction and performance. Simultaneously, comprehending the effects of layoffs during crises is vital for managing human resource policies more effectively and enhancing employee well-being.

The study specifically found that emotional commitment has a positive effect on both job satisfaction and job performance. Employees' emotional commitment to their work and workplace leads to greater job satisfaction and higher performance. Therefore, developing strategies to enhance emoti-

onal commitment within the organization can provide significant advantages for both employees and the business. This study's results are significant for advancing knowledge in the academic and practical domains of organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance. Future studies are expected to examine the current findings and explore comparable relationships in various sectors of organizations. Two significant limitations are worth noting. The first limitation is that data were collected solely from hotel employees in Turkey. Thus, the generalizability of the findings to other industries or regions may be limited. The field research was conducted exclusively in hotel establishments within the sub-sectors of the tourism industry. Furthermore, one limitation of the study is that the respondents exclusively completed the questionnaire online. These research findings suggest several actions that researchers could consider. Thus, future research should consider examining one or more of the various sub-sections of the tourism industry. Furthermore, other important topics are to consider, such as investigating whether businesses meet their obligations towards their employees during crises and the concept of perceived organizational support by employers.

## References

- Aksoy, C., Şengün, H. İ. & Yılmaz, Y. (2018). Examination of the relationship between job satisfaction levels and organizational commitments of tourism sector employees: research in the southeastern Anatolia region of Turkey. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 17(65), 356-365. <https://doi.org/10.17755/esosder.343032>
- Allen, N. J. & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x>
- Arsilan, E. & Kılıçlar, A. (2018). Otel işletmelerinde çalışanların kişilik özellikleri ile örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişkide iş tatmininin aracılık rolü. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, 6(4), 360-375.

- <https://doi.org/10.21325/jotags.2018.314>
- Bilgin, N. & Demirer, H. (2012). The examination of the relationship among organizational support, affective commitment and job satisfaction of hotel employees. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 51, 470-473. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.08.191>
- Bilgin, Y. K. (2022). Gençlik çalışmak istemiyor mu? Yiyecek-içecek işletmelerinde istihdamın işveren ve işgören açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Beykoz Akademi Dergisi*, 10(2), 235-257. <https://doi.org/10.14514/beykozad.1084702>
- Borman, W.C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman Ws., *Personnel selection in organisations*. Jossey-Bass.
- Borman, W. C. & Motowidlo, S. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 87(1), 99-109. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002_3)
- Boz D., Duran, C. & Uğurlu, E. (2021). Örgütsel bağlılığın iş performansına etkisi. *Manas Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 10(1), 345-355. <https://doi.org/10.33206/mjss.726618>
- Carmeli, A., & Freund, A. (2004). Work commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance: An empirical investigation. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, 7(3), 289-309.
- Chanana, N. (2021). The impact of covid-19 pandemic on employees organizational commitment and job satisfaction in reference to gender differences. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 21(4), e2695. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2695>
- Cheng, S. C., & Kao, Y. H. (2022). The impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on job satisfaction: A mediated moderation model using job stress and organizational resilience in the hotel industry of Taiwan. *Heliyon*, 8(3), e09134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e09134>
- Çelik, S., Dedeoğlu, B. B. & Inanir, A. (2015). Relationship between ethical leadership, organizational commitment and job satisfaction at hotel organizations. *Ege Academic Review*, 15(1), 53-64.
- Dixit, V., & Bhati, M. (2012). A study about employee commitment and its impact on sustained productivity in Indian auto-component industry. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 1(6), 34-51.
- Dramićanin, S., Perić, G. & Pavlović, N. (2021). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment of employees in tourism: Serbian travel agency case. *Strategic Management*, 26(4), 50-64. <https://doi.org/10.5937/StraMan2104050D>
- Ersan, A., & Süslü, M. (2022). Covid-19 korkusunun sağlık çalışanlarının iş performanslarına etkileri ve örgütsel bağlılığın aracılık rolü. *Akademik Hassasiyetler*, 9 (18), 231-266.
- Gunlu, E., Aksarayli, M. & Perçin, N. S. (2010). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment of hotel managers in Turkey. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 22(5), 693-717. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09596111011053819>
- Hakami, A., Almutairi, H., Al Otaibi, R., Al Otaibi, T. & Al Battal, A. (2020). The relationship between nurses job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Health Science Journal*, 14(1), 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.9790/1959-05114955>
- Hulin, C. L., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Job attitudes. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 255-276). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/0471264385.wei1211>
- Jaros, S. (2010). Commitment to organizational change: a critical review. *Journal of Change Management*, 10(1), 79-108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14697010903549457>
- Jex, S. M., & Britt, T. W. (2014). *Organizational psychology: A scientist-practitioner approach*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Kang, S. E., Park, C., Lee, C. K. & Lee, S. (2021). The stress-induced impact of covid-19 on tourism and hospitality workers. *Sustainability*, 13(3), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13031327>
- Karakavuz, H. (2020). Covid-19'un Türk havayolu işletmeleri üzerindeki etkilerine ilişkin bir swot analizi. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 15(8), 3573-3591.
- Kargün, S., & Koç, H. (2021). İşgörenlerin motivasyon düzeylerinin örgütsel bağlılık ve iş performansı üzerine etkileri: konaklama işletmelerinde bir inceleme. *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 13(4), 3786-3800. <https://doi.org/10.20491/isarder.2021.1356>
- Keskin, M. Ö., Yıldız, Ö. Ö., İnan K. & Aksakal, E. (2020). Göğüs cerrahisi alanında görev yapan doktorların covid-19 pandemisi öncesi ve pandemi sürecinde algılanan stres düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Ejons International Journal*, 4(15), 770-784. <https://doi.org/10.38063/ejons.334>

- Khan, M. R., Ziauddin, J. F., & Ramay, M. I. (2010). The impacts of organizational commitment on employee job performance. *European journal of social sciences*, 15(3), 292-298.
- Kök, S. B. (2006). İş tatmini ve örgütsel bağlılığın incelenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 20(1), 291-317.
- Kuruüzüm, A., Çetin, E. I. & Irmak, S. (2009). Path analysis of organizational commitment, job involvement and job satisfaction in turkish hospitality industry. *Tourism Review*, 64(1), 4-16. <https://doi.org/10.1108/16605370910948821>
- Kuşluvan, Z. & Kuşluvan, S. (2005). Otel işletmelerinde iş ve işletme ile ilgili faktörlerin işgören tatmini üzerindeki görece etkisi: Nevşehir örneği. *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 16(2), 183-203.
- Liao, S. H., Hu, D. C. & Chung, H. Y. (2009). The relationship between leader-member relations, job satisfaction and organizational commitment in international tourist hotels in Taiwan. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20(8), 1810-1826. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190903087222>
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1343). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Murphy, K. R., & Kroecker, L. P. (1988). *Dimensions of job performance*. Colorado State Univ Fort Collins.
- Namasivayam, K. & Zhao, X. (2007). An investigation of the moderating effects of organizational commitment on the relationships between work-family conflict and job satisfaction among hospitality employees in India. *Tourism Management*, 28(5), 1212-1223. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2006.09.021>
- Özdemir Güzel, S. (2021). Beş yıldızlı otel çalışanlarının covid-19 sürecini değerlendirmesi. *Türk Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(2), 1018-1033. <https://doi.org/10.26677/TR1010.2021.751>
- Özdemir, M. A. (2020). What are economic, psychological and social consequences of the covid-19 crisis on tourism employees? *International Journal Of Social, Political And Economic Research*, 7(4), 1137-1163. <https://doi.org/10.46291/IJOSPERvol7iss4pp1137-1163>
- Öztürk, A. B., Hancer, M. & Im, J. Y. (2014). Job characteristics, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment for hotel workers in Turkey. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing ve Management*, 23(3), 294-313. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2013.796866>
- Özutku, H. (2008). Örgüte duygusal, devamlılık ve normatif bağlılık ile iş performansı arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *İstanbul Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi*, 37(2), 79-97.
- Perçin, N. Ş. & Arslanergül, B. D. (2020). Kurumsal itibar yönetiminin örgütsel bağlılık ve işten ayrılma niyeti üzerindeki etkisi: Kapadokya örneği. *Sosyal Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 20(39), 1-31.
- Rafiei, M., Amini, M. & Foroozandeh, N. (2014). Studying the impact of the organizational commitment on the job performance. *Management Science Letters*, 4(8), 1841-1848. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2014.6.046>
- Ratnasari, S. D. (2021). The importance of organizational commitment and job satisfaction on work productivity and intention to quit in the Covid-19 pandemic era. *it Business Excellence and Management*, 11(5), 237-247.
- Robbins, S., & Judge, T. (2012). *Örgütsel Davranış* (14. Basım b.). İ. Erdem, Çev.) Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Salem, I. E., Elbaz, A. M., Elkhwesky, Z., & Ghazi, K. M. (2021). The covid-19 pandemic: the mitigating role of government and hotel support of hotel employees in Egypt. *Tourism Management*, 85, 104305. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2021.104305>
- Sarkhanov, T. & Tutar, H. (2021). Covid-19 pandemisi ve Azerbaycan turizmi: sektör temsilcisi görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 32(1), 7-18. <https://doi.org/10.17123/atad.820004>
- Scherer, R. F. (1988). Dimensionality of coping: factor stability using the ways of coping questionnaire. *Psychological Report*, 62(3), 76-770. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1988.62.3.763>
- Sıgır, Ü. (2007). İşgörenlerin örgütsel bağlılıklarının Meyer ve Allen tipolojisiyle analizi: kamu ve özel sektörde karşılaştırmalı bir araştırma. *Anadolu University Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(2), 261-278.
- Sigler, T.H., & Pearson, C. M. (2000). Creating an Empowering Culture: Examining the Relationship between Organizational Culture and Perceptions of Empowerment. *Journal of Quality Management*, 5(1), 27-52. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1084-8568\(00\)00011-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1084-8568(00)00011-0)
- Sohail, M. & Ilyas, M. (2018). The impact of job satisfaction on aspects of organizational commitment (affective, continuance and normative commitment). *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, 12(3), 221-234.
- Sonnentag, S., Volmer, J., & Spychala, A. (2008). Job performance. *The Sage handbook of organizational behavior*, 1, 427-447.

- Sökmen, A. (2019). Örgütsel özdeşleşme, örgütsel bağlılık ve iş tatmini ilişkisi: otel işletmelerinde bir araştırma. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, 7(2), 980-990. <https://doi.org/10.21325/jotags.2019.403>
- Steers, R.M., (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22(1), 46-56. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2391745>
- Suliman, A. & Iles, P. (2000). Is continuance commitment beneficial to organizations? Commitment performance relationship: a new look. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(5), 407-426.
- Şen G. ve Bütün E. (2021). Covid-19'un pandemi salgınının havacılık sektörüne etkisi: gig ekonomisi alternatif. *Journal of Aviation Research*, 3(1), 106-127. <https://doi.org/10.51785/jar.857243>
- Şengel, Ü. (2021). COVID-19 and "new normal" tourism: Reconstructing tourism. *Journal of Tourism and Development*, (35), 217-226. <https://doi.org/10.34624/rtd.v0i35.24652>
- Tekin, A. (2021). Tarihten günümüze epidemiler, pandemiler ve ekonomik sonuçları. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, (40), 330-355.
- Tsai, M.-C., Cheng, C.-C., & Chang, Y.-Y. (2010). Drivers of hospitality industry employees' job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job performance. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(18), 4118-4134.
- Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in Organization a Normative View. *Academy of Management Review*, 7(3), 418-428. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1982.4285349>
- Williams L. J. & Hazer, J. T. (1986). Antecedents and consequences of satisfaction and commitment in turnover models: a reanalysis using latent variable structural equation methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(2), 219-231.
- Yang, J. T. (2010). Antecedents and consequences of job satisfaction in the hotel industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(4), 609-619. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.11.002>
- Yiğitöl, B., & Büyükmumcu, S. (2021). Covid-19 korkusu, kişilik özellikleri, iş performansı ve işten ayrılma niyeti arasındaki yordayıcı ilişkilerin incelenmesi. *OPUS International Journal of Society Researches*, 17(Pandemi Özel Sayısı), 3414-3447. <https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.890502>
- Yiing L. H., & Ahmad K. Z. B., (2009). The moderating effects of organizational culture on the relationships between leadership behaviour and organizational commitment and between organizational commitment and job satisfaction and performance. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 30(1), 53-86. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730910927106>
- Yousef, D. A. (2000). Organizational commitment: a mediator of the relationships of leadership behavior with job satisfaction and performance in a non-western country. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(1), 6-28.
- Yüksek, G., & Kalyoncu, M. (2021). Covid-19 küresel salgınının turizm sektörü üzerindeki etkileri. *Journal of Gastronomy Hospitality and Travel*, 4(1), 85-101. <https://doi.org/10.33083/joghat.2021.60>