JAM

Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen

Journal of Applied Management



pISSN: 1693-5241
eISSN: 2302-6332

Volume 18	Number 1	March 2020	pp. 1-210

JAM
JURNAL APLIKASI MANAJEMEN - JOURNAL OF APPLIED MANAGEMENT
MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT FACULTY OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS
UNIVERSITAS BRAWIJAYA, MALANG

Jl. Mayjen Haryono No. 165 Malang. Phone. +62-341-558224, 562154 Fax. +62-341-558224
Email: jurnaljam@gmail.com, jurnaljam@ub.ac.id Website: www.jurnaljam.ub.ac.id

EDITOR IN CHIEF

Misbahuddin Azzuhri (Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia)

CO-EDITOR IN CHIEF

Dian Ari Nugroho (Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia)

EDITORS

1. **Noermijati** (Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia)
2. **Fatchur Rohman** (Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia)
3. **Nanang Suryadi** (Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia)
4. **Dimas Hendrawan** (Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia)

INTERNATIONAL EDITOR

1. **Armanu Thoyib** (Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia)
2. **Devanto Shasta Pratomo** (Universitas Brawijaya, Malang)
3. **Wei Tung** (National Chiayi University, Taiwan)
4. **Marthin G Nanere** (La Trobe Business School - La Trobe University, Australia)
5. **Herman Budi Sasono** (Universitas Widya Kartika Surabaya, Indonesia)
6. **Bernardo Redona** (Colegio de San Juan de Letran-Calamba, Philippines)
7. **Vimolwan Yukongdi** (Asian Institute of Technology, Thailand)
8. **Arawati Agus** (University Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia)
9. **Sylvain Baumann** (University of Le Havre, France)
10. **Robert Mullings** (Nottingham Trent University, United Kingdom)
11. **Nor Aznin Abu Bakar** (Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia)
12. **Wynand Grobler** (North-West University Vaal Campus, South Africa)
13. **Ben-Roy Do** (National Central University, Taoyuan City, Taiwan)
14. **Budi Eko Soetjipto** (Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia)
15. **F Danardana Murwani** (Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia)

TECHNICAL EDITOR

1. **Eko Yuniarto**
2. **Angga Endre Restianto**
3. **Satriya Candra Bondan Prabowo**
4. **Agung Nugroho Adi**
5. **Hanantya Gilang Masterizki**

JOURNAL OF APPLIED MANAGEMENT (JAM)
MANAGEMENT DEPARTEMENT FACULTY OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS
UNIVERSITAS BRAWIJAYA, MALANG

Volume 18, Number 1 March 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Work-Family Conflict, Job Engagement, Emotional Exhaustion: Their Influence on the Turnover Intention of indigenous Papuan Female Employees
Noermijati Noermijati, Suratchanee Wongviboonrath, Wiwin Itlay, Achmad Sudiro ... 1 – 13

Effects of Sponsor-Event Congruence on Brand Image, Attitude toward the Brand, and Purchase Intention: An Empirical Analysis in the Context of Sport Sponsorship
Jun Young Park, Sabrina O. Sihombing ..... 14 – 27

Analysis Of Financial Performance Of Mining Companies Listed In Indonesia Stock Exchange.
Satriya Candra Bondan Prabowo, Nattawadee Korsakul ..... 28 – 45

Development of Bussines Model in Sentulfresh Agrotourism Services
Rifqi Az Zahid, Arif Imam Suroso, Sufrin Hannan ..... 46 – 56

Halal Perspective: A Concept Promotion Culinary Through Digital Marketing to Improve SMEs Performance in Batam
Putu Hari Kurniawan, Lismayasari, Dian Puspita Novrianti ..... 57 – 63

The Impact of Family Conflict toward Intention to Stay in the Family Business: The Moderating Effect of Socioemotional Wealth
Laij Victor Effendi ..... 64 – 74

Farmer Satisfaction Through Farmer Group Performance: A Study in Swampland, South Kalimantan
Binti Tsaniatul Marhamah, Masyhuri, Lestari Rahayu Waluyati ..... 75 – 85

Digital Marketing and Indonesia's Youth Entrepreneurs' Business
Maria Dini Gilang Prathivi ..... 86 – 94

Efficiency Analysis of Bank Bumn Buku Empat and Its Determinant in Indonesia
Sahruddin Nasution, Hermanto Siregar, Tanti Novianti ..... 95 – 104

The Effect of Experiential Learning on Attitudes and Intention: An Experimental Design
Denny Bernardus, Fulgentius Danardana Murwani, Imanuel Deny Krisna Aji
Liestya Padmawidjaja, Djoko Dwi Kusumojanto, Cipto Wardoyo, Stefan Yudana Jatiperwira ..... 105 – 112

The Effect of Successor Characteristics on Succession Planning of Family Companies
Luh Kadek Budi Martini, I Gusti Ayu Manuati Dewi ..... 113 – 121

Effect of Cash Holding on Firm Value with Ownership Structure as A Moderating Variable in Indonesia Company
Sumiati ..... 122 – 129

The Role of Organizational Citizenship Behavior as Mediation Variables Between Organizational Commitments and Employee Performance: Evidence from The Hospitality Industry in Surabaya
Oscarius Yudhi Ari Wijaya ..... 130 – 141

The Influence of Brand Image on Satisfaction to Improve Customer Retention Towards Batik Keris in Malang City
Astrid Puspaningrum ..... 142 – 151

Leadership and Crisis Based on Contingency Approach and Leader's Fatal Flaws A Case Study in X Institute Indonesia
Yuli Kartika Dewi ..... 152 – 158

Strategy to Enhance Indonesia's Leading Industrial Centers Competitiveness
Rila Anggraeni, Risca Fitri Ayuni, M. Abdi Dzil I. ..... 159 – 167

Factors Affecting Salesperson Performance in SMEs Creative Industry of Central Java
Asyhari, Sitty Yuwalliatin ..... 168 – 180

Effectiveness of Marketing Technology Website Quality on Company Performance and The Impact on Smart Campus Student Satisfaction
Harrie Lutfie ..... 181 – 188

Customer Loyalty, Through Customer Satisfaction in Customers Pt. Xyz
Liliana Dewi ..... 189 – 200

Effectiveness of Performance Measurement in Realizing World-Class Companies in The Perspective of Malcolm Baldrige
Windha Dwi Kartikawati, Jono M. Munandar, Gendut Suprayitno ..... 201 – 210

THE ROLE OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR AS MEDIATION VARIABLES BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENTS AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE: EVIDENCE FROM THE HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY IN SURABAYA

JAM
18, 1
Received, September 2019
Revised, November 2019
December 2019
Accepted, December 2019

Oscarius Yudhi Ari Wijaya
Management Study Program - Academy of Secretary and Management Indonesia (ASMI) Surabaya

Abstract: To create hotel customer satisfaction, OCB is needed constantly so that employees themselves have expectations that exceed customer expectations themselves. As such, employees should continue to conduct OCB so that customers are satisfied with the high quality services shown by hotel employees. Therefore, it can be assumed that OCB has a fairly close relationship with the challenges of the hospitality industry services, so the understanding of OCB and its antecedent variables is important for the functioning of hotels effectively and efficiently. The purpose of this study is to examine the effect of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) as a mediator between organizational commitmentand employee performance. The number of research samples is 144 employees of 3, 4 and 5 star hotels in Surabaya. Research data was collected through questionnaires and processed using SmartPLS software. Three findings generated from this study are that organizational commitment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance both directly and through OCB as mediation, and OCB itself also directly has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The results of this study are also very significant in enriching the OCB research area because it provides a more meaningful OCB measurement framework in the service industry, with special emphasis on the hospitality industry especially in Surabaya. This is very important because OCB began to gain popularity in the hospitality discipline recently.

Keywords: organizational citizenship behavior, organizational commitment, employee performance

Cite this article as: Wijaya, Oscarius Yudhi Ari. 2020. *The Role of Organizational Citizenship Behavior as Mediation Variables Between Organizational Commitments and Employee Performance: Evidence from The Hospitality Industry in Surabaya*. Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen, Volume 18, Number 1, Pages 130–141. Malang: Universitas Brawijaya. http://dx.doi.org/10.21776/ub.jam.2020.018.01.13

Journal of Applied Management (JAM)
Volume 18 Number 1,
March 2020
Indexed in Google Scholar

Corresponding Author: Oscarius Yudhi Ari Wijaya, Management Study Program - Academy of Secretary and Management, Indonesia (ASMI) Surabaya, DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.21776/ub.jam.2020.018.01.13

The level of competition in the hospitality business in Surabaya is increasingly tighter, marked by the emergence of new hotels, ranging from budget classes to star hotels. The increasing number of hotels above also indicates that the interest of some investors to invest in the hotel sector is not decreasing (Rao, 2014). One way to compete in the hospitality industry is to strive to increase

the effectiveness of performance or maximize the utilization of Human Resources (HR) (Gabcanova, 2012; Lawler & Boudreau, 2007; Plessis, Douangphichit, & Dodd, 2016). Lovelock & Wright (2002) saidthat service quality needs to be supported by the availability of superior human resources. The success of an organization is dominated by the dependence on HR factors in operating the organization to be efficient and effective (Okoye & Ezejiofor, 2013). HR is seen as the most important asset because HR is always present and needed in every activity of the production of goods and services (Dike, 2013). On the other hand, companies often experience difficulties in managing HR due to the diversity of the nature of each individual that causes different behaviors among employees (Shen, Chanda, D'Netto, & Monga, 2009). Ulrich (1998) added that HR can also play a role as an initiator and agent of change in shaping organizational culture processes. Human resources with their diversity have different abilities as agents of change (Long, Ismail, & Amin, 2013).

Quality of service to customers is the most important thing for the hotel industry (Minh, Thu Ha, Chi Anh, & Matsui, 2015; Mmutle & Shonhe, 2017), thus requiring active participation or contribution from all employees to be willing to take the best actions for companies than it will certainly make the employee's performance better (Chan, 2015; Pantelidis, 2016).Although service quality has been identified as a key factor for hotel success, the discussion of quality service itself is still one of the main challenges facing hotel managers in the 21st century. In the hotel context, service to customers is often carried out by frontline employees so that customers can assess the quality of service from the results of interactions between employees and customers. The problem that often occurs is the inconsistency of customer ratings because of the uniqueness of each individual employee in terms of personality, skills, and attitudes. In addition, the experience of services provided by hotels is a very interactive process that can be influenced by the moods of employees and customers so that service performance can be volatile.

In the current era of hotel competition, hotel customers are becoming more aware of the importance of service so that customer satisfaction is also more difficult. Zeithaml (1987) stated that customer perceptions about service quality are the result of a comparison between services received and expectations held. When services meet or exceed customer expectations, satisfaction will arise. But on the contrary, if the service received does not meet customer expectations, the customer will feel disappointed and dissatisfied. At this point, customers can move to other hotels that are competing to offer their services. Therefore, creating customer satisfaction will be more difficult if hotel employees only do what is stated in the job description, task list or policy manual. It is time for employees to be willing to do more than what is stated in the job description, task list or policy manual in order to meet or even exceed customer expectations.

Fortunately, hotel employees are often willing to do things that go beyond the job description so customers are satisfied. For example, front office employees often pay extra attention when there are customers who are sick. Another example is a hotel restaurant waiter helping store customer leftovers in the fridge. These examples are OCB forms which are individual contributions in the workplace that exceed role requirements and not the achievement of contractually valued work(Bateman & Organ, 1983). So OCB can be seen as an expectation to overcome challenges in providing quality services to customers. But it is not denied that not all hotel employees are willing to do OCB. So the question arises why employees become motivated to do OCB. Although research on OCB has been popular in management disciplines and organizational behavior for decades, there are still very few researchers who examine OCB in the context of hotels, especially in Indonesia.So this can raise theoretical and empirical questions that need answers to be understood in order to understand OCB as a whole in the hotel environment. OCB in the hotel context may have a more specific size because the hotel has unique and different properties compared to other organizations where constant intangible

services are an important component in its daily operations.

According to Mañas et al. (2018) and Morrison (1994), optimal employee performance is not only in the sense of doing work as written in the job description (in-role) but also able to do work outside of the job description voluntarily (extra-role). This extra-role behavior is also called OCB (Stoner, Perrewé, & Munyon, 2011). OCB is a specific behavior that does not necessarily base the job description as the main benchmark but rather emphasizes the individual to have the desire or willingness to do it or not (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006). According to Robbins & Judge (2008), OCB can be described as a form of voluntary and conscious willingness to work beyond what is formally demanded by organizations that are usually set forth in the form of job descriptions. For hotels, OCB can provide advantages, and if it is related to the service industry, it can be felt directly by both the company and the consumer. Furthermore, Hui, Lam, & Law (2000) states that OCB is a unique aspect of individual activities at work and is a habit or behavior that is done voluntarily, is not part of formal work, and is indirectly recognized by the reward system. Robbins & Judge (2008) added that companies whose majority of employees have good OCB behaviors are considered to have better organizational performance than other organizations. Therefore, OCB is known to increase the effectiveness, efficiency, and performance of an organization (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000).Employee performance as a part of organizational performance is the fruit of employee efforts in carrying out their duties and responsibilities within the organization (Igbaekemen & Odivwri, 2015; Kuranchie-Mensah & Amponsah-Tawiah, 2016).

Organ & Ryan (1995) states that one of the factors that can cause OCB in organizations is organizational commitment. Organizational commitment is closely related to the level of employee commitment to the company (Chandra, 2013). Organizational commitment is able to stimulate the realization of OCB in order to achieve higher performance and productivity in the company (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Robbins & Judge (2008) explain that organizational commitment is a picture of a situation where each individual has an alignment to the vision, mission and goals of the organization and has a desire to maintain its existence as a member of the organization. An employee who is highly committed tends to have an effort to actualize himself for the progress of the organization (Dike, 2013; Gallo, 2011). Conversely, employees with low commitment to the organization tend not to care for the progress of the organization, have the low working motivation, and tend to disobey the company rules as they should. Examples of such attitudes that directly or indirectly have a negative impact on the performance of employees themselves, so it can be concluded that organizational commitment is an important factor for organizational progress (Badubi, 2017; Vance, 2006).

Several studies have tried to observe factors that can affect employee performance such as organizational commitment and OCB. Lavelle et al. (2009) and Bakhshi, Dutt, & Kuldeep (2011) show how organizational commitment can increase the OCB. In addition, research by Fu & Deshpande (2014) also shows that organizational commitment can improve employee performance. Meanwhile, research by Ekowati, Troena, & Noermijati (2013) and Huei, Mansor, & Tat (2014) explains that OCB can improve employee performance directly.

This study aims to observe the extent to which the performance of hotel employees in Surabaya can be influenced by organizational commitment and OCB as shown in Figure 1. It is not clear whether the performance formed within hotel employees is limited to performance based on a job description or not closing likely to exceed the job description. So it is interesting to study deeper so that we can know how strong the participation of hotel employees who are not only working to meet the job description but also have a commitment to work beyond the job description.




Figure 1 Research Model

METHOD

Employees of 3, 4 and 5 star hotels in Surabaya are the study population. Sampling uses a purposive sampling technique that is carried out proportionally and is based on two main considerations, namely the willingness of the hotel to be sampled and the wide area of hotel spread in Surabaya. The research sample was taken from February to April 2019. Questionnaires were given to permanent hotel employees who had worked for at least 2 years spread over 33 star hotels, including twenty-oneof 3-star-hotels, eight of 4-star-hotels and four of 5-star-hotels.

The number of questionnaires distributed was 165 questionnaires, meaning that each hotel received 5 questionnaires to be filled out by its employees. The selection of employees who are trusted to fill out the questionnaire is the authority of the hotel management. From the results of the distribution of the questionnaire, the researchers managed to get 144 questionnaires (87.3%) that were eligible for data processing. The method of data analysis uses SEM (Structural Equation Modeling) based on Partial Least Square (PLS) using the help of the SmartPLS software program.

All indicators to measure the three variables were adopted from several previous studies. Indicators of organizational commitment variables were adapted from Allen & Meyer (1996) study which consisted of 6 indicators. OCB variables are measured through 10 indicators from Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer (1996). While indicators to measure employee performance variables use 6 indicators belonging to Williams & Anderson (1991).

RESULTS

Based on the results of the questionnaire data processing, it is known that 79 respondents (54.9%) are male, while the remaining 65 respondents (45.1%) are female. From the age factor, 63 respondents (43.8%) were employees aged 20-30 years, 71 respondents (49.3%) aged 31-40 years, and the remaining 10 respondents (6.9%) aged over 40 years. Furthermore, from the length of work (length of service) of employees, it is known that 77 respondents (53.5%) have worked for 2-4 years, 51 respondents (35.4%) have worked in the range of 5-10 years, and 16 respondents (11.1%) have worked more than 10 years at the hotel where they are currently working. Based on the total salary received, 69 respondents (47.9%) get a salary of less than 4 million rupiah; 58 respondents (40.3%) get monthly salary in the range of 4-7.5 million rupiah; 9 respondents (6.3%) get salaries in the range of 7.6-10 million rupiah; while the remaining 8 respondents (5.6%) get salaries above 10 million rupiah. Judging from the marital status, it is obtained that 107 respondents (74.3%) are married; and the remaining 37 respondents (25.7%) were not married.

In Table 1 it is known that the response of respondents to the whole items of statements or indicators in the questionnaire both for organizational commitment, OCB and employee performance variables are included in the high category. This indicates that the average hotel employee has a high commitment to their jobs and to the hotel where he works at this time. In addition, hotel employees also

Table 1 Descriptive Respondents' Answers

Item	Indicator	Mean	Category
$X_{1.1}$	Emotionally attached to the company	3.93	High
$X_{1.2}$	Feeling to own a company	4.03	High
$X_{1.3}$	There are only a few other job choices when leaving the company	4.00	High
$X_{1.4}$	High risk of leaving the company to work elsewhere	3.87	High
$X_{1.5}$	Feel too many employees are entering and leaving the company	4.06	High
$X_{1.6}$	Feeling that switching companies frequently is a bad move	4.07	High
Organizational Commitment Variable (X_1)		**3.99**	**High**
$Y_{1.1}$	Willing to help other employees who have work-related problems	3.85	High
$Y_{1.2}$	Always be ready to give a helping hand to other employees	4.04	High
$Y_{1.3}$	Willing to overtime	4.21	High
$Y_{1.4}$	Do not take additional breaks	4.03	High
$Y_{1.5}$	Tolerance of changing conditions in the company	3.99	High
$Y_{1.6}$	Don't spend a lot of time complaining about trifles	3.99	High
$Y_{1.7}$	Respect co-workers	3.97	High
$Y_{1.8}$	Be aware that behavior can affect the work of other coworkers	4.25	High
$Y_{1.9}$	Attending an important meeting of the organization but not mandatory	3.93	High
$Y_{1.10}$	Building unnecessary functions with the aim to improve the company's image	3.89	High
Variabel Organizational Citizenship Behavior (Y_1)		**4.01**	**High**
$Y_{2.1}$	Responsible as expected in the job description	4.10	High
$Y_{2.2}$	Meet the formal requirements of job performance	4.08	High
$Y_{2.3}$	Willing to help coworkers whose workload is heavier even if not asked	4.07	High
$Y_{2.4}$	Take the time to listen to the complaints of coworkers	3.97	High
$Y_{2.5}$	Notifies the company when it does not come to work	3.9	High
$Y_{2.6}$	Maintain order by following company regulations	4.03	High
Employee Performance Variable (Y_2)		**4.04**	**High**

have a high average OCB behavior so the performance is also high.

The next step is to evaluate the outer model (measurement model) through the test results of convergent validity, discriminant validity, and composite reliability. The convergent validity test results in Table 2 show that all indicators have met the requirements because the outer loading value is above 0.5.

In addition to convergent validity, indicator validity is also seen from the discriminant validity test by comparing the loading factor values. Table 3 shows that all indicators used in this study have good discriminat validity.

Another method in discriminating validity testing is referring to the value of AVE (square root of average variance extracted). In Table 4 it can be seen that all constructs produce AVE values above 0.5 so that they are declared to meet the validity requirements. The lowest value of AVE is 0.526245 on the OCB construct.

After knowing that all indicators in this study meet the element of validity, the indicators must also be tested for reliability. It is said to be reliable if the

Table 2 Outer Loading Result

Indicator	Original Sample (O)	Validity
$Y_{2.1}$	0.73	*Valid*
$Y_{2.2}$	0.77	*Valid*
$Y_{2.3}$	0.74	*Valid*
$Y_{2.4}$	0.74	*Valid*
$Y_{2.5}$	0.74	*Valid*
$Y_{2.6}$	0.73	*Valid*
$X_{1.1}$	0.76	*Valid*
$X_{1.2}$	0.72	*Valid*
$X_{1.3}$	0.72	*Valid*
$X_{1.4}$	0.72	*Valid*
$X_{1.5}$	0.73	*Valid*
$X_{1.6}$	0.75	*Valid*
$Y_{1.1}$	0.73	*Valid*
$Y_{1.2}$	0.72	*Valid*
$Y_{1.3}$	0.74	*Valid*
$Y_{1.4}$	0.73	*Valid*
$Y_{1.5}$	0.73	*Valid*
$Y_{1.6}$	0.73	*Valid*
$Y_{1.7}$	0.73	*Valid*
$Y_{1.8}$	0.71	*Valid*
$Y_{1.9}$	0.72	*Valid*
$Y_{1.10}$	0.72	*Valid*

Table 3 Discriminant Validity Test Results

Indiator	Employee	Organizational Commitment	OCB
$Y_{2.1}$	**0.724464**	0.503321	0.513905
$Y_{2.2}$	**0.769678**	0.577137	0.556645
$Y_{2.3}$	**0.740045**	0.646429	0.497199
$Y_{2.4}$	**0.740542**	0.490650	0.675745
$Y_{2.5}$	**0.748201**	0.573783	0.595402
$Y_{2.6}$	**0.733842**	0.691357	0.585465
$X_{1.1}$	0.582456	**0.762800**	0.557017
$X_{1.2}$	0.524311	**0.720141**	0.481148
$X_{1.3}$	0.560935	**0.715718**	0.365131
$X_{1.4}$	0.561048	**0.721306**	0.454421
$X_{1.5}$	0.542228	**0.729991**	0.537097
$X_{1.6}$	0.672371	**0.752137**	0.597216
$Y_{1.1}$	0.509203	0.442265	**0.725293**
$Y_{1.2}$	0.508808	0.501903	**0.721769**
$Y_{1.3}$	0.578917	0.500552	**0.736902**
$Y_{1.4}$	0.494591	0.383672	**0.727432**
$Y_{1.5}$	0.518399	0.546049	**0.734690**
$Y_{1.6}$	0.648798	0.552329	**0.730302**

Indiator	Employee	Organizational Commitment	OCB
$Y_{1.7}$	0.603226	0.470949	**0.726294**
$Y_{1.8}$	0.572160	0.463318	**0.714465**
$Y_{1.9}$	0.561743	0.574121	**0.719026**
$Y_{1.10}$	0.560648	0.516961	**0.717774**

Table 4 AVE Value

Variable	AVE
Employee Performance	0.551942
Organizational Commitment	0.538600
OCB	0.526245

value of Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability is above 0.7. From Table 5 it is known that all indicators are reliable.

In addition to evaluating the outer model (measurement model), the results of PLS data processing are also carried out an evaluation of the inner model (structural model) which is explained through

Table 5 Reliability Test Results

Variable	Composite Reliability	Cronbach's Alpha
Employee Performance	0.880789	0.837776
Organizational Commitment	0.874998	0.829115
OCB	0.917403	0.900091

the results of the R-Square value and hypothesis testing.

The R-Square value is a goodness-fit test model of this study. In Table 6, the results of the R-Square value for the construct of employee performance are0.7180 which means that employee performance can be explained by organizational commitment and OCB variables of 71.80%, while the remaining 28.20% is explained by other variables outside the model. The OCB construct itself has an R-Square value of 0.4731 which means that OCB can be explained by the organizational commitment variable of 47.31%. The remaining 52.69% is explained by other factors outside the model studied.

To get the answers to the research hypotheses, in Figure 2 and Table 7 presented the results of testing the hypothesis that contains the value of the path coefficients and t-statistics.

From the results of the hypothesis test in Figure 2 and Table 7, it is known that the three research hypotheses are acceptable because the t-

Table 6 R-Square Results on PLS Output

Variable	R Square
Employee Performance	0.7180
OCB	0.4731

statistic value is above 1.656 and the direction of the relationship also shows a positive number.

From the results of testing the three hypotheses above, it is also important to know the mediating effect of the OCB variable as a mediator variable as presented in Table 8.

From the results of the calculation of mediation effects, it is known that the indirect effect of 0.486 which is greater than the direct effect of 0.300. This indicates that OCB as a mediator variable in this research model is considered not strong enough to bridge the relationship between organizational commitment and employee performance.




Figure 2 Path t-Value Diagram in Research Models

Table 7 Hypothesis Test Results

Hypothesis	Path Coefficients	t-statistic	Sig.	Decision
Organizational Commitment → OCB	0.688	15.010	.000	Accepted
OCB → Employee Performance	0.436	4.776	.001	Accepted
Organizational Commitment → Employee Performance	0.486	5.990	.000	Accepted

Table 8 Mediation Effects of OCB Variables

Influence	Path	Influence coefficient
Directly	Organizational Commitment → Employee Performance	0.688 * 0.436 = 0.300
Indirectly	Organizational Commitment → OCB → Employee Performance	0.486

DISCUSSION

The first hypothesis test results show the influence between organizational commitment and OCB is significant with a t-statistic value of 15.010. The value of the path coefficients is positive, which is 0.688 which indicates that the direction of the relationship between organizational commitment and OCB is positive. The results of this first hypothesis test support the findings of several previous studies such as Bakhshi et al. (2011), Lavelle et al. (2009) and Schappe (1998). The first hypothesis test indicates that the higher the employee's commitment to the organization, the higher the potential for OCB behavior to be created. In other words, organizational commitment is able to encourage the creation of OCB behavior among employees (Williams & Anderson, 1991). OCB is a positive outcome from committed employees, which is marked by the contribution of extra contributions from employees to the company even though it is not recognized in the company's reward system (Bies, 2011). Conversely, when employees feel that their employment relationship is based solely on economic exchange, then they only try to meet the minimum requirements but there is no incentive to make extra efforts such as helping colleagues, making work improvement suggestions, carrying out tasks beyond the minimum requirements, and participating in organizational meetings (Stamper & Van Dyne, 2001; Yen & Niehoff, 2004). In addition, committed employees

tend to engage in behavior aimed at increasing their value in the eyes of the company so that it always seems to support the company. Thus, a positive relationship between organizational commitment and OCB makes sense. Organizational commitment is the strength of the individual employee's identification and involvement in the organization which is characterized by strong belief in the form of acceptance of organizational goals and values (commitment to values) and motivation to remain members of the organization (commitment to stay) (Angle & Perry, 2006; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979). Organizational commitment is a positive emotion from employees in response to positive job assessments (Zeinabadia, 2010).

Meanwhile, the results of the second hypothesis test concerning the influence between OCB and employee performance are significant with a t-statistic value of 4.776. The value of the path coefficients is positive that is 0.436 which indicates that the direction of the relationship between OCB and employee performance is positive. This finding supports the research of Ekowati et al. (2013) and Huei et al. (2014). From the results of the second hypothesis test, it can be concluded that the greater the potential for the creation of OCB behavior, then automatically also increases the performance of the employees themselves. Organizations that have a high OCB in the majority of themselves employees will have better performance than other organizations (Robbins & Judge, 2008). Therefore, OCB is able to increase the effectiveness, efficiency, and performance of an organization (Podsakoff et al., 2000). OCB for organizations can provide more advantages and if related to the service industry, then it can be felt directly by both the company and the consumer. Mañas et al. (2018) and Morrison (1994) conclude that optimal employee performance is not only in terms of in-role (working in accordance with the job description) but also willingly volunteering to work extra-roles (doing work beyond the job description). Podsakoff et al. (2000) state that OCB influences the stability of organizational performance because careful employees are more likely to maintain consistently high levels of output, thereby reducing variability in work unit performance. Yen & Niehoff (2004) provide an example that the attitude of helping colleagues, which is one of the dimensions of OCB, is considered capable of reducing the percentage of product costs and increasing the ratio of operational efficiency (Walz & Niehoff, 2000), because employees who help other coworkers can reduce work hours and help others become more productive employees (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

The last or third hypothesis test related to the influence between organizational commitment and employee performance shows a significant effect with a t-statistic value of 5.990. Path coefficients are positive which is equal to 0.486 which indicates that the direction of the relationship between organizational commitment and employee performance is positive. This means that increasing organizational commitment also has an impact on improving employee performance. These results are in line with research by Fu & Deshpande (2014). Employees with a strong level of commitment will try to remain in the organization (Kobulnicky, 2002). In addition, employees who have a strong commitment to the organization tend to try to develop their potential for the progress of the company (Dike, 2013; Gallo, 2011). On the other hand, employees with low commitment to the organization will tend not to care about the progress of the organization, lose motivation in working to even violate company rules. Such attitudes that directly or indirectly have a negative impact on the performance of employees themselves, so it can be concluded that organizational commitment is an important factor for organizational progress (Badubi, 2017; Vance, 2006). Organizational commitment implies that an employee is willing to make attachments and make various kinds of efforts on behalf of the organization (Mowday et al., 1979), and logically it is expected that those efforts will lead to an increase in the employee's performance.

That is, high employee performance improvement can be achieved through organizational commitment that is embedded in employees without the need to wait for OCB behavior to come up first.

From the results of the mediation test, although OCB has a smaller effect on employee performance

than the direct influence of organizational commitment on employee performance, to create hotel customer satisfaction OCB is constantly needed so that employees themselves have expectations that exceed customer expectations. As such, employees should continue to conduct OCB so that customers are satisfied with the high quality services shown by hotel employees. Therefore, it can be assumed that OCB has a fairly close relationship with the challenges of the hospitality industry services, so the understanding of OCB and its antecedent variables is important for the functioning of hotels effectively and efficiently. Due to the unique nature of the hotel industry where selling customer service is the main product of the hotel so that customers have a positive experience, therefore OCB in the context of hotels requires particular attention to the dimensions related to customer service. (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

All three hypotheses in this study are all acceptable. In this research model, organizational commitment as an exogenous variable has a positive and significant effect on the performance of hotel employees in Surabaya, both directly and indirectly, through the OCB variable as a mediating variable. This shows that the stronger organizational commitment in hotel employees will have a positive and significant impact on employee performance and employee OCB behavior. In addition, the results of this study also show that OCB also has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The OCB behavior carries out by a hotel employee is certainly not free from the commitment of the employee. This means that the stronger the commitment, the greater the chance of creating OCB behavior.

On the other hand, this study also has limitations that can be considered as opportunities for further research. This study only looked at one type of industry, the hotel industry and in one city. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct further research that analyzes more diverse types of industries and covers many cities or even one country. In addition, respondents chosen to represent hotels do not consider divisions or work units, as well as being interviewed so that the information obtained can be more complete, clear and objective. The next opportunity for further research is to analyze the potential for other intervening variables in analyzing the effect of organizational commitment on employee performance.

REFERENCES

Allen, N. J. and Meyer, J. P. 1996. *Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity*. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 49(3), 252–276. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.0043.

Angle, H. L., & Perry, J. L. 2006. *An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness*. Administrative Science Quarterly, 26(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.2307/2392596.

Badubi, R. M. 2017. *Theories of motivation and their application in organizations: A risk analysis*. International Journal of Innovation and Economic Development, 3(3), 44–51. https://doi.org/10.18775/ijied.1849-7551-7020.2015.33.2004.

Bakhshi, A., Dutt, S. A., and Kuldeep, K. 2011. *Organizational commitment as predictor of organizational citizenship behavior*. European Journal of Business and Management, 3(4), 78–87.

Bateman, T. S. and Organ, D. W. 1983. *Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship"*. Academy of Management Journal, 26(4), 587–595. https://doi.org/10.5465/255908.

Bies, R. J. 2011. *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Academy of Management Review, 14(2), 294–297. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1989.4282145.

Borman, W. and Motowidlo, S. J. 1993. *Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance: The meaning for personal selection research*. Personnel Selection in Organizations.

Chan, B. 2015. *Manual on Module II Introduction to Hospitality Contributors*. Tourism and Hospitality Studies.

Chandra, S. P. 2013. *The impact of employee engagement on organization's productivity*. In 2nd International Conference on Managing Human Resources at the Workplace (pp. 1–9).

Dike, P. 2013. *The impact of workplace diversity on organisations*. Degree thesis. [On line]. From:

https://www.theseus.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/63581/Thesisxx.pdf?fbclid=IwAR18VJ_p6gZGbjJ5k2yYeQK1zFyXJojeXJfcBhKiBywq3ZP2iA-oen78AH0.

Ekowati, V. M., Troena, E. A., and Noermijati, N. 2013. *Organizational citizenship behavior role in mediating the effect of transformational leadership, job satisfaction on employee performance: Studies in PT Bank Syariah Mandiri Malang East Java*. International Journal of Business and Management, 8(17). https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v8n17p1.

Fu, W. and Deshpande, S. P. 2014. *The impact of caring climate, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment on job performance of employees in a China's insurance company.*Journal of Business Ethics, 124(2), 339–349. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1876-y.

Gabcanova, I. 2012. *Human Resources Key Performance Indicators.*Journal of Competitiveness, 4(1), 117–128. https://doi.org/10.7441/joc.2012.01.09.

Gallo, A. 2011. *Making sure your employees succeed. Harvard Business Review, Managing People*. [On line]. From: https://hbr.org/2011/02/making-sure-your-employees-suc.

Huei, T. Y., Mansor, N. N. A., and Tat, H. H. 2014. Role of OCB and demographic factors in the relationship of motivation and employee performance. Intangible Capital, 10(3), 425–447. https://doi.org/10.3926/ic.435.

Hui, C., Lam, S. S. K., and Law, K. K. S. 2000. *Instrumental values of organizational citizenship behavior for promotion: A field quasi-experiment*. Journal of Applied Psychology, 85(5), 822–828. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.5.822.

Igbaekemen, G. and Odivwri, J. 2015. I*mpact of leadership style on organization performance/ : A critical literature review*. Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review, 5(5). https://doi.org/10.4172/2223-5833.1000142.

Kobulnicky, P. J. 2002. *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research and application.*The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 24(2), 175. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0099-1333(98)90184-7.

Kuranchie-Mensah, E. B. and Amponsah-Tawiah, K. 2016. *Employee motivation and work performance: A comparative study of mining companies in Ghana*. Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management, 9(2), 255–309. https://doi.org/10.3926/jiem.1530.

Lavelle, J. J., Brockner, J., Konovsky, M. A., Price, K. H., Henley, A. B., Taneja, A., and Vinekar, V. 2009. *Commitment, procedural fairness, and organizational citizenship behavior: A multifoci analysis*. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 30(3), 337–357. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.518.

Lawler, E. and Boudreau, J. 2007. *What makes HR a strategic partner/ ?*.Effective Organizations, 1(213), 0–23. https://doi.org/Article.

Long, C. S., Ismail, W. K., and Amin, S. M. 2013. *The role of change agent as mediator in the relationship between HR competencies and organizational performance*. International Journal of Human Resource Management, 24(10), 2019–2033. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2012.725080.

Lovelock, C. H. and Wright, L. K. 2002. *Principles of service marketing and management*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.

Mañas, M. A., Díaz-Fúnez, P., Pecino, V., López-Liria, R., Padilla, D., and Aguilar-Parra, J. M. 2018. *Consequences of team job demands: Role ambiguity climate, affective engagement, and extra-role performance*. Frontiers in Psychology, 8. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02292.

Minh, N. H., Thu Ha, N., Chi Anh, P., and Matsui, Y. 2015. *Service quality and customer satisfaction: A case study of hotel industry in Vietnam*. Asian Social Science, 11(10), 73–85. https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v11n10p73.

Mmutle, T. and Shonhe, L. 2017. *Customers' perception of service quality and its impact on reputation in the hospitality industry.*African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure, 6(3). https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1552-6909.2008.00291.x.

Morrison, E. W. 1994. *Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee's perspective*. Academy of Management Journal, 37(6), 1543–1567.

Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., and Porter, L. W. 1979. *The measurement of organizational commitment*. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14(2), 224–247. https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(79)90072-1.

Okoye, P. V. C. and Ezejiofor, R. A. 2013. *The effect of human resources development on organizational productivity*. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 3(10). https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v3-i10/295.

Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., and MacKenzie, S. B. 2006. *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. California: Sage Publications Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452231082.

Organ, D. W. and Ryan, K. 1995. *A meta analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of or-*

ganizational citizenship behavior. Personnel Psychology, 48(4), 775–802. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01781.x.

Pantelidis, I. S. 2016. *Hospitality Management: A Brief Introduction.*Tourism Management, 57, 311. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.06.010.

Plessis, A. J. du, Douangphichit, N., and Dodd, P. 2016. *HRM in relation to employee motivation and job performance in the hospitality industry*. Journal of International Business Research and Marketing, 1(4), 12–21. https://doi.org/10.18775/jibrm.1849-8558.2015.14.3002.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., and Bommer, W. H. 1996. T*ransformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citize.*Journal of Management, 22(2), 259–298. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(96)90049-5.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., and Bachrach, D. G. 2000. *Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research*. Journal of Management, 26(3), 513–563. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600307.

Rao, R. S. 2014. *Emerging trends in hospitality and tourism*. Journal of Research - Granthaalayah, 1(1), 1–8.

Robbins, S. P. and Judge, T. A. 2008. *Organizational behavior: Global edition*. Pearson.

Schappe, S. P. 1998. *The influence of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and fairness perceptions on organizational citizenship behavior.* Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied, 132(3), 277–290. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223989809599167.

Shen, J., Chanda, A., D'Netto, B., and Monga, M. 2009. *Managing diversity through human resource management: An international perspective and conceptual framework*. International Journal of Human Resource Management, 20(2), 235–251. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190802670516.

Stamper, C. L. and Van Dyne, L. 2001. *Work status and organizational citizenship behavior: A field study of restaurant employees*. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22(5), 517–536. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.100.

Stoner, J., Perrewé, P. L., and Munyon, T. P. 2011. *Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee citizenship*. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 26(2), 94–107. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683941111102146.

Ulrich, D. 1998. *A new mandate for human resources*. Harvard Business Review, 76(1), 124. [On line]. From: http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=25166324&Fmt=7&clientId=4574&RQT=309&VName=PQD%5Cnpapers3://publication/uuid/8341ECF7-B95B-4D3A-95B4-DAF14350A8EC.

Vance, R. J. 2006. E*mployee engagement and commitment*. SHRM Foundation (Vol. 22). [On line]. From: http://jsedres.sepmonline.org/content/22/1/11.abstract.

Walz, S. M. and Niehoff, B. P. 2000. *Organizational citizenship behaviors: Their relationship to organizational effectiveness.*Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research, 24(3), 301–319. https://doi.org/10.1177/109634800002400301.

Williams, L. J. and Anderson, S. E. 1991. *Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors*. Journal of Management, 17(3), 601–617. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700305.

Yen, H. R. and Niehoff, B. P. 2004. *Organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational effectiveness: Examining relationships in Taiwanese banks*. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34(8), 1617–1637. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb02790.x.

Zeinabadia, H. 2010. *Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) of teachers*. In Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences (Vol. 5, pp. 998–1003). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.225.

Zeithaml, V. A. 1987. *Defining and relating prices, perceived quality and perceived value*. Marketing Science Institute.