

Job performance dynamics of a multigenerational workforce in Cabanatuan city hotels

Jamaica Santos Dela Cueva *

College of Hospitality and Tourism Management, Wesleyan University-Philippines, Cabanatuan City, Nueva Ecija, Philippines.

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2025, 28(03), 609-618

Publication history: Received 30 October 2025; revised on 06 December 2025; accepted on 09 December 2025

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2025.28.3.4099>

Abstract

This research explored how different generations working together affect the performance of employees in hotels in Cabanatuan City, Nueva Ecija, from the point of view of hotel managers and employees themselves. Its goal was to find out what impact on job performance has the different generational attitudes and what methods the managers use in order to overcome these difficulties. The paper utilizes a descriptive research design. To obtain the data, the researcher developed a questionnaire and submitted it to hotel managers, supervisors, human resource officers, and employees. The questions were partly from the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire (WPQ) and partly from Northhouse's Leadership: Theory and Practice. Statistical procedures such as frequency distribution, percentage, and weighted mean were employed for data analysis. The results of the survey reveal that overall job performance is multifaceted, with employees often rating themselves slightly higher, especially younger workers who value multitasking and technology, while older supervisors emphasize reliability and consistency. These differing perspectives highlight the need for structured feedback systems and regular performance conversations to align expectations, enhance transparency, and reduce rating discrepancies. Integrating such tools into the Employee Engagement Program will promote fair, skill- and efficiency-based evaluations that strengthen mutual understanding and overall service quality in hospitality settings.

Keywords: Multigenerational Workforce; Job Performance; Hotel Industry; Employee Engagement; Managerial Perspectives

1. Introduction

At present, as new generations join the workforce, managers are pursuing strategies to cultivate a successful team. Each generation possesses distinct characteristics and skills that enhance workplace diversity. Managers are tasked with comprehending generational disparities and fostering a cohesive workforce. Savino (2017) asserted that a stimulating, motivating, healthy, and productive work environment that aligns with the organisation's fundamental values is essential. The 21st-century workplace may encompass up to three generations of employees, each possessing distinct ideas, habits, attitudes, and job expectations. Generation X comprises individuals born from 1965 to 1980 and is considered a transitional cohort between traditional older generations and technology-oriented younger generations. They are seen as independent, self-sufficient, and task-oriented. They possess a robust sense of individuality, prioritizing personal independence and autonomy in both personal and professional domains.

The majority of Generation X individuals are resourceful and decisive, actively pursuing opportunities to assert their independence. Moreover, they have a strong and goal-driven mentality, excelling at establishing objectives and pursuing them with unwavering determination. Generation X individuals welcome challenges and readily take the initiative, rendering them invaluable assets in the professional environment. Generation Y refers to individuals born between the

* Corresponding author: Jamaica S. Dela Cueva

1980s and 1990s, succeeding Generation X. This generation, known as millennials, has the potential to enter the workforce and undertake leadership roles inside organizations fully. Generation Y refers to those born between 1980 and after the years 1990, also called the millennials, and this generation has been or will be fully able to enter the workforce and take up leadership positions in organizations. Generation Y, or the millennial generation, describes people born in the period 1980 to 1999 (currently adults aged 25 to 44 years old).

Generation Z, the latest cohort, is seen as innovative and flexible (Dupont, 2015). This generation is characterized by reliance, freedom, individualism, and an addiction to technology and speed (Singh & Dangmei, 2016; Turner, 2015). As stated by Weidmer (2015), members of Generation Z are striving to comprehend the rapidly evolving world in which they will mature as future generations. Age diversity has consistently existed in the workplace, but it is now more prominent. Historically, several generations have coexisted in the workplace; nevertheless, contemporary generations exhibit greater divergence in work attitudes, values, and life experiences than their predecessors. Managing a multigenerational workforce with diverse attitudes and objectives is very tough in contemporary firms, given the age range exceeding eight decades (Shrivastava et al., 2017). Managers address generational workplace diversity by focusing on common objectives such as innovation, productivity, and employee retention. Organizations encounter increasing demand to guarantee that their employees are fully engaged in their tasks.

High turnover rates adversely affect profitability, and an unengaged staff undermines a robust business culture. A determinant of engagement is the interaction of many generations inside the workplace. Prior studies indicate that various generations prioritize distinct workplace behaviors and attitudes, necessitating tailored organizational assistance to maintain engagement (Handayani, Dewi, & Septiarani, 2023). This study analyzed the multigenerational workforce, focusing on the potential advantages, challenges, and risks, alongside job performance and both actual and perceived generational disparities that may influence the workforce, from the viewpoint of hotel managers in Cabanatuan City, Nueva Ecija. This study sought to uncover techniques for managing a multigenerational workforce in the workplace. In addition, this aimed to identify potential answers to the issues hotel managers currently have with a multigenerational workforce.

Moreover, understanding how hotel managers from developing countries such as the Philippines view and manage employees' job performance in the context of a multigenerational workforce remains underexplored. The use of multigenerational workforces is increasingly common in the hospitality sector. Although international studies (Birtha Maja & Nkala-Dlamini, 2020; Russen et al., 2023) have looked into generational differences within the hospitality industry, the vast majority appear to focus on Western countries and lack specific attention to Filipino hotel management practices. The review of the literature revealed three critical gaps: geographical gap, employee perspective bias, and lack of strategy implementation. Comparatively, little attention has been paid to the Philippine context in the study of hotels and hospitality, particularly in relation to organizational culture and structure, with most research stemming from Western countries.

Most studies center around employees, so there is a lack of data-driven insights on how managers perceive and assess performance among different generations. Furthermore, while there is research that examines differences among generations, there is a lack of research that seeks to develop performance management strategies that make use of these differences. This study aimed to address these gaps by examining how the respondents perceive multigenerational workforce performance and by formulating appropriate management responses that are culturally relevant. This study aimed to evaluate the job performance of a multigenerational workforce in hotels in Cabanatuan City, as assessed by hotel managers and employees themselves. Specifically, the study sought to explore the job performance of hotel employees, based on the managers' perspectives, in terms of Overall Job Performance, Productivity, Effort, Job-Related Knowledge, Interpersonal Skills, Quality, Leadership, Rule Following, Administrative Skills, and Multigenerational Workforce Dynamics in Hospitality.

2. Materials and Methods

This research utilized the descriptive research design to determine the job performance of a multigenerational workforce in hotels in Cabanatuan City, through hotel managers' perspectives. This design is most appropriate when the researcher wants to describe the existing conditions systematically and to note the similarities and differences between or among the naturally occurring groups without the manipulation of variables.

The study centered on accommodation establishments in Cabanatuan City. Prominent establishments include Harvest Hotel, Microtel by Wyndham Cabanatuan, Topstar Hotel, Hotel Sogo Cabanatuan, Acropolis North, Amada Plaza Hotel, and Rosey Hotel. Additionally, numerous inns, homestays, and apartelles, including The Quarters by Rosey, 518 Business Hotel, Jupiter Homestays, and DJCI Apartelle, are included, contingent upon their accreditation from the

Department of Tourism (DOT). All of these establishments cater to tourists and visitors to Cabanatuan City and nearby locations in Nueva Ecija.

The respondents of this study are Hotel Managers, Supervisors, or Human Resource Officers and employees across various departments such as front office, housekeeping, food and beverage, and administration. These individuals are selected because of their managerial authority and familiarity with employee performance standards and workplace behavior.

This study utilized purposive sampling, which is non-probability sampling, but one that allows for the selection of people who have direct accountability and relevant experience. As noted by Palinkas et al. (2015), purposive sampling allows researchers to identify individuals who are particularly knowledgeable about the topic being studied, which will help researchers collect rich and relevant data.

This research used a modified-adapted questionnaire as its survey tool. The questionnaire is from the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire (WPQ) developed by Dr. Hans De Witte, Dr. Ute Bultman, and Dr. Evelien Taris, and Leadership, Theory and Practice by Peter G. Northhouse, specifically to collect data pertinent to the aims of this study. "A questionnaire is a survey tool including a sequence of questions for respondents to address. The inquiries aimed to elicit ideas, actions, preferences, qualities, attitudes, and facts. Supporting material includes all elements essential for encouraging respondent engagement, offering context and background, and guiding them through the survey" (McGilvray, 2021).

Part 1 of the questionnaire asked for the Hotel Profile that includes the hotel classification and size, years of operation, type of ownership, number of employees, generational composition of workforce, existence of a performance appraisal system, performance appraisal method used, and common job roles of employees. Part 2 examined the personnel profile according to age group classification, sex, educational qualifications, employment position, and tenure. Part 3 of the questionnaire asked how the job performance of the hotel employees was based on the manager's perspectives in terms of overall job performance, productivity, effort, job-related knowledge, interpersonal skills, quality, leadership, rule following, and administrative skills.

The questionnaire comprised closed-ended questions, including Likert Scale replies, to facilitate prompt statistical analysis. The questions addressed multiple facets of job performance, including technical proficiency, communication skills, managerial effectiveness, leadership among peers and team members, and peer management capabilities.

Industry specialists assessed the questionnaire to ensure its reliability and validity.

The data collection process for this study adhered to ethical standards to ensure efficient, reliable, and high-quality data acquisition. The initial step was securing the requisite authorization from the research advisor to ensure the study's compliance with institutional guidelines and ethical standards. Upon obtaining authorization, surveys were given to chosen respondents through in-person distribution at lodging establishments. This method guaranteed an expanded reach and accommodated respondent preferences, enhancing response rates.

The research concentrated on gathering quantitative data concerning the job performance of a multigenerational workforce at accommodation establishments in Cabanatuan City, along with the strategies employed by managers to address this workforce. The collected questionnaires were scrutinized to uphold data quality, swiftly addressing any concerns to ensure accuracy and integrity in the process. By following these processes, the study seeks to collect dependable and pertinent data that would aid in the formulation of performance management strategies for lodging establishments in Cabanatuan City.

Frequency distribution, percentage, and weighted mean were utilized to determine the profile of the respondents. A 5-point Likert Scale was employed for response measurement, incorporating verbal interpretation to categorize work performance and managerial techniques in relation to employees of differing ages. The following outlines the scale range for the 5-point Likert Scale:

Point	Scale	Verbal Description	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.20 – 5.00	Strongly Agree	Excellent Performance
4	3.40 – 4.19	Agree	Very Good Performance
3	2.60 – 3.39	Neutral	Meets Expectations
2	1.80 – 2.59	Disagree	Below Expectations
1	1.00 – 1.79	Strongly Disagree	Needs Significant Improvement

The data collected from the respondents were carefully checked, encoded, and processed with the assistance of a statistician.

3. Results and Discussion

Job Performance of Hotel Employees

3.1. Overall Job Performance

Table 1 Overall Job Performance of Employees (Managers vs. Employees)

Indicators	Managers Mean	VD	Employees Mean	VD
Consistently meet quality standards	4.34	SA	4.48	SA
Complete tasks within deadlines	4.30	SA	4.58	SA
Demonstrate skills & knowledge	4.46	SA	4.54	SA
Produce accurate and thorough work	4.32	SA	4.52	SA
Pay attention to details & minimize errors	4.44	SA	4.36	SA
Overall Weighted Mean	4.37	SA	4.50	SA

Table 1 illustrates the overall job performance of employees based on both managers and employees themselves. Both managers (OWM = 4.37) and workers (OWM = 4.50) firmly agreed that the overall performance is excellent. Managers thought their employees were excellent in demonstrating skills and knowledge (M = 4.46). For employees, they were excellent in completing tasks within deadlines (M = 4.58). On the contrary, completing tasks within deadlines (M = 4.30) was the worst thing for managers, and paying attention to details and minimizing errors (M = 4.36) was the worst thing for workers. The results reveal that managers/supervisors care more about technical skills than workers do about their own efficiency.

Katebi et al. (2021) asserted that perceptions of an individual's competence and punctuality directly influence performance evaluations, elucidating the divergent perspectives of managers and employees.

3.2. Productivity

Table 2 Productivity of Employees (Managers vs. Employees)

Indicators	Managers Mean	VD	Employees Mean	VD
High volume of work, quality maintained	4.32	SA	4.38	SA
Efficient use of working hours	4.30	SA	4.52	SA
Handle multiple tasks effectively	4.44	SA	4.52	SA
Demonstrate initiative	4.46	SA	4.38	SA
Manage workload effectively	4.44	SA	4.30	SA
Overall Weighted Mean	4.39	SA	4.42	SA

Table 2 demonstrates the productivity of employees based on the perception of managers and employees. Both managers (OVM = 4.39) and employees (OVM = 4.42) agreed that the productivity of employees was excellent. Managers emphasized demonstrating initiative ($M = 4.46$), while workers were efficient in using working hours, and they can handle multiple tasks effectively ($M = 4.52$). In contrast, the lowest score for efficient use of working hours came from managers ($M = 4.30$), and the lowest score for managing workload effectively came from employees ($M = 4.30$). This illustrates that managers and workers have different priorities: managers value taking the lead, whereas workers value getting things done quickly.

Chahar (2020) mentioned that strong performance review systems encourage workers to take charge and use their time wisely. This is particularly important for hotels that want to get things done.

3.3. Effort

Table 3 Effort of Employees (Managers vs. Employees)

Indicators	Managers Mean	VD	Employees Mean	VD
Go beyond duties when needed	4.44	SA	4.30	SA
Persistence in challenges	4.42	SA	4.38	SA
Strong commitment to service	4.50	SA	4.58	SA
Willingness to take added responsibility	4.44	SA	4.52	SA
Consistent effort in routine tasks	4.44	SA	4.42	SA
Overall Weighted Mean	4.45	SA	4.44	SA

Table 3 shows the effort of employees (managers vs. employees). Managers (OVM = 4.45) and employees (OVM = 4.44) totally agreed that employees were excellent at making an effort at the workplace. For managers, the most essential thing was having a strong commitment to service ($M = 4.50$), and so for workers ($M = 4.58$). This reveals that employees were excellent in exerting effort at work. Persistence in challenges obtained the lowest marks for managers ($M = 4.42$), and going beyond duties when needed got the lowest score for employees ($M = 4.30$). This shows that everyone agrees that strong service dedication is important, but it also shows that it can be hard to remain resilient.

Rabiul et al. (2023) noted that psychological safety and involvement make people more persistent and resilient. This means that hotel operations could use some work and must put in sustained effort to maintain consistency.

3.4. Job-Related Knowledge

Table 4 Job-Related Knowledge (Managers vs. Employees)

Indicators	Managers Mean	VD	Employees Mean	VD
Awareness of industry standards	4.28	SA	4.48	SA
Clear understanding of job description	4.38	SA	4.54	SA
Troubleshooting problems	4.36	SA	4.44	SA
Applying technical skills	4.30	SA	4.52	SA
Updated with new tools/procedures	4.34	SA	4.46	SA
Overall Weighted Mean	4.33	SA	4.49	SA

Table 4 illustrates the job-related knowledge (managers vs. employees). Managers (OVM = 4.33) and employees (OVM = 4.49) believed that the workforce in hotels has an excellent performance in having job-related knowledge. Managers ($M = 4.38$) and employees ($M = 4.54$) put much emphasis on having a clear understanding of the job description. For managers, having awareness of industry standards obtained the lowest score ($M = 4.28$), and for workers, troubleshooting problems got the lowest score ($M = 4.44$).

Ayouna et al. (2022) noted that how fair employees think their performance assessments are affects how they rate their own skills. This could be why they awarded themselves higher scores.

3.5. Interpersonal Skills

Table 5 Interpersonal Skills (Managers vs. Employees)

Indicators	Managers Mean	VD	Employees Mean	VD
Work well with others	4.62	SA	4.48	SA
Active listening	4.60	SA	4.44	SA
Respect and courtesy	4.62	SA	4.62	SA
Empathy	4.56	SA	4.44	SA
Build trust	4.50	SA	4.40	SA
Overall Weighted Mean	4.58	SA	4.48	SA

Table 5 shows the interpersonal skills (managers vs. employees). Both groups said that employees show excellent performance in having interpersonal skills (Managers OVM = 4.58 and Employees OVM = 4.48). Working well with others and having respect and courtesy were the most important things for managers ($M = 4.62$). For employees, having respect and courtesy was also essential in the workplace. Both managers and workers gave the lowest score to the competence of building trust ($M = 4.50$ for managers and $M = 4.40$ for workers).

Borst et al. (2020) showed that when people are involved, they work together and talk to each other in a courteous way. This indicates how crucial people skills are for hospitality teams.

3.6. Quality of Work

Table 6 Quality of Work (Managers vs. Employees)

Indicators	Managers Mean	VD	Employees Mean	VD
Maintain performance under pressure	4.56	SA	4.28	SA
Meets set specifications	4.38	SA	4.32	SA
Avoid incomplete tasks	4.32	SA	4.48	SA
Efficient use of resources	4.30	SA	4.52	SA
Maintain cleanliness & organization	4.48	SA	4.54	SA
Overall Weighted Mean	4.41	SA	4.43	SA

Table 6 demonstrates the quality of work of employees. Managers (OVM = 4.41) and employees (OVM = 4.43) concurred that employees were excellent in the quality of work. Managers care a lot about maintaining performance under pressure ($M = 4.56$), but workers care more about maintaining cleanliness and organization ($M = 4.54$). Efficient use of resources received the lowest scores for managers ($M = 4.30$), whereas maintaining performance under pressure got the lowest score for employees ($M = 4.28$).

Wang et al. (2019) said that both resilience and cleanliness are vital for keeping service quality high. This shows that managers and employees think the same way.

3.7. Leadership

Table 7 Leadership (Managers vs. Employees)

Indicators	Managers Mean	VD	Employees Mean	VD
Composure under pressure	4.24	SA	4.38	SA
Responsibility for decisions	4.36	SA	4.42	SA
Guidance and coaching	4.30	SA	4.40	SA
Explains expectations clearly	4.34	SA	4.50	SA
Listens to feedback	4.48	SA	4.52	SA
Overall Weighted Mean	4.34	SA	4.44	SA

Table 7 presents the leadership skills (managers vs. employees). Managers (OVM = 4.34) and employees (OVM = 4.44) agreed that the workforce exhibits excellent performance when it comes to leadership. Managers ($M = 4.48$) and employees ($M = 4.52$) stated that listening to feedback was vital. The worst thing for both managers ($M = 4.24$) and employees ($M = 4.40$) was maintaining composure under pressure.

Georgiou (2025) and The Hotel School (2024) remarked that hotel business leaders need to establish a balance between being tough and being able to talk to people plainly.

3.8. Rule-Following

Table 8 Rule-Following (Managers vs. Employees)

Indicators	Managers Mean	VD	Employees Mean	VD
Adheres to policies	4.44	SA	4.42	SA
Demonstrates honesty	4.48	SA	4.52	SA
Upholds standards w/o supervision	4.32	SA	4.42	SA
Maintains a safe environment	4.40	SA	4.54	SA
Avoids misconduct	4.56	SA	4.52	SA
Overall Weighted Mean	4.44	SA	4.48	SA

Table 8 indicates the rule-following performance of employees. Both managers (OVM = 4.44) and employees (OVM = 4.48) agreed that the workforce shows excellent performance in following the rules for the operation to run smoothly. Managers prioritized avoiding misconduct ($M = 4.56$), whereas employees demonstrated honesty ($M = 4.52$) at the top of their list. Upholding standards without supervision got the lowest grade ($M = 4.32$ for managers and $M = 4.42$ for workers), and adhering to policies also got the lowest score $M = 4.42$ for employees.

Suta (2023) noted that when employees are loyal and involved, compliance is stronger. This illustrates that both people and organizations have a duty to observe the rules.

3.9. Administrative Competence

Table 9 Administrative Competence (Managers vs. Employees)

Indicators	Managers Mean	VD	Employees Mean	VD
Handle admin issues	4.46	SA	4.30	SA
Prioritize urgent tasks	4.50	SA	4.50	SA
Anticipates needs	4.44	SA	4.34	SA
Coordinates schedules	4.54	SA	4.34	SA

Follows proper procedures	4.40	SA	4.46	SA
Overall Weighted Mean	4.47	SA	4.39	SA

Table 9 presents the administrative competence (managers vs employees). Both managers (OVM = 4.47) and employees (OVM = 4.39) stated that employees deliver an excellent administrative competence. Prioritizing urgent tasks was the most popular thing for workers to do ($M = 4.50$), while coordinating schedules was the most popular thing for managers to do ($M = 4.54$). Managers gave the following proper procedures the lowest score ($M = 4.40$), and employees gave handling admin issues the lowest score ($M = 4.30$).

Biswakarma (2022) found that systematic appraisal makes management more successful. This illustrates how crucial it is in cheap hotels like those in Cabanatuan.

3.10. Multigenerational Workforce Dynamics

Table 10 Multigenerational Workforce Dynamics (Managers vs. Employees)

Indicators	Managers Mean	VD	Employees Mean	VD
Understand different generations	4.40	SA	4.36	SA
Avoid stereotypes	4.42	SA	4.50	SA
Welcome new tech & respect tradition	4.42	SA	4.28	SA
Adapt to different work styles	4.38	SA	4.18	SA
Encourage cross-training/mentoring	4.36	SA	4.18	SA
Overall Weighted Mean	4.40	SA	4.30	SA

Table 10 illustrates the multigenerational dynamics (managers vs. employees). Managers (OVM = 4.40) and employees (OVM = 4.30) concurred that multigenerational dynamics in the workplace exist, and each generation delivers excellent performance. Both groups rated the highest in avoiding stereotypes ($M = 4.42$ managers, $M = 4.50$ employees). Also, welcoming new techniques and respecting tradition rated $M = 4.42$ by managers. In contrast, the lowest was encouraging cross-training/mentoring ($M = 4.36$ managers, $M = 4.18$ employees). In addition to that, adapting to different work styles got the lowest rating for employees ($M = 4.18$). The results suggest that people understand what inclusion means, but there is not much formal cross-training available yet.

Cismaru (2019) and Robb (2025) both mentioned that to close the generational gap, there needs to be structured mentoring programs that are in accordance with the areas that need to change.

The high level of agreement on understanding and avoiding stereotypes shows that the generations get along well, but the low ratings in "cross-training" and "adapting to different work styles" show where they should do better. Based on Viswesvaran's (1993) Ten Dimensions of Job Performance, these findings highlight the significance of interpersonal skills, effort, job-related knowledge, and leadership in promoting collaboration and flexibility among different generations. To improve these areas of performance, managers can create focused programs that encourage mutual learning. For example, experienced workers may teach younger workers how to do things technically and procedurally, while younger workers could teach older workers new ways to do things and how to use technology. Adding these practices to the Employee Engagement Program will improve teamwork, keep performance standards high, and help the hospitality industry have a cohesive and high-performing staff made up of people from different generations.

4. Conclusions

The following conclusions are drawn based on the findings of the study:

- Overall job performance is multidimensional, encompassing skills, punctuality, and attention to detail.
- Employees' slightly higher self-ratings suggest the presence of a common self-enhancement bias in performance evaluations.
- Younger employees tend to rate themselves higher due to strengths in multitasking and technology use.

- Older supervisors prioritize reliability and consistency when assessing performance.
- Differences in generational perspectives can create gaps in how performance expectations are interpreted.
- Structured feedback systems are essential for aligning employee and supervisor viewpoints.
- Regular performance conversations help clarify expectations and reduce rating discrepancies.
- Integrating these structured tools into the Employee Engagement Program promotes transparency and goal alignment.
- Balanced evaluations should incorporate both skill quality and work efficiency to ensure fairness.
- Better alignment in performance assessment will enhance mutual understanding and overall service quality in hospitality settings.

Compliance with ethical standards

Statement of informed consent

Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

References

- [1] Ayouna, B., Eyoun, K., Chen, H., & Arasli, F. (2022). Mapping the relationships between hotel employees' perceptions of performance appraisal fairness, satisfaction, and psychological contract. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 21(4), 593–618. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2022.2106618>
- [2] Birtha Maja, M., & Nkala-Dlamini, Dr. B. (2020). Generational Diversity as a Powerful Workplace Tool in the South African Hospitality Industry. *International Journal of Business and Applied Social Science*, 22–28. <https://doi.org/10.33642/ijbass.v6n12p3>
- [3] Biswakarma, S. K. (2022). Effect of performance appraisal system on employee satisfaction in budget hotels of Kolkata. *International Journal of Circular Economy and Waste Management*, 2(2), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.4018/IJCEWM.306211>
- [4] Borst, R., Kruyten, P., Lako, C., & De Vries, M. (2020). The Attitudinal, Behavioral, and Performance Outcomes of Work Engagement: A Comparative Meta-Analysis Across the Public, Semipublic, and Private Sector. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 40, 613 - 640. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X19840399>.
- [5] Chahar, B. (2020). Performance Appraisal Systems and Their Impact on Employee Performance: The Moderating Role of Employee Motivation. *Inf. Resour. Manag. J.*, 33, 17–32. <https://doi.org/10.4018/IRMJ.2020100102>.
- [6] Cismaru, L. (2019). Bridging the generational gap in the hospitality industry. *Sustainability*, 12(1), 263. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12010263>
- [7] Dupont, S. (2015). Z: The open source generation. *Minnesota Business Magazine*, 22(6), 16–17.
- [8] Georgiou, A. (2025, January 28). Leadership and the traits of a great leader in the hospitality industry. *e-hotelier.com*. <https://insights.e-hotelier.com>
- [9] Handayani, W., Dewi, S. P., & Septiarani, B. (2023). Toward adaptive water governance: An examination on stakeholders engagement and interactions in Semarang City, Indonesia. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 25(2), 1914–1943. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-022-02124-w>
- [10] Katebi, A., HajiZadeh, M., Bordbar, A., & Salehi, A. (2021). The Relationship Between "Job Satisfaction" and "Job Performance": A Meta-analysis. *Global Journal of Flexible Systems Management*, 23, 21 - 42. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40171-021-00280-y>.
- [11] McGilvray, D. (2021). *Executing Data Quality Projects: Ten Steps to Quality Data and Trusted Information* (2nd ed.). Academic Press / Elsevier.
- [12] Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 42(5), 533–544. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y>
- [13] Rabiul, M. K., Mohamed, A. E., Patwary, A. K., Yean, T. F., & Osman, S. Z. (2023). Linking human resources practices to employee engagement in the hospitality industry: The mediating influences of psychological safety,

availability and meaningfulness. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, 32(2), 223–240. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM&BE-12-2020-0347>

- [14] Robb, M. (2025, June 20). Evolving leadership in hospitality: Building a resilient, cross-generational team. *e-hotelier.com*. <https://insights.ehotelier.com/insights/2025/06/20/evolving-leadership-in-hospitality-building-a-resilient-cross-generational-team/>
- [15] Russen, M., Dawson, M., Madera, J. M., Kitterlin-Lynch, M., & Abbott, J. L. (2023). Leadership inclusion theory: a grounded theory study on hotel executives. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 35(11), 3825–3843. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-10-2022-1252>
- [16] Savino, E. M. (2017). Quick! How do I deal with a multigenerational workforce? *Strategic HR Review*, 16(4), 192–193. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SHR-09-2016-0087>
- [17] Shrivastava, S., Rajesh, R., & D'Souza, D. (2017). Managing multigenerational workforce: Challenges and opportunities.
- [18] Singh, A., & Dangmei, J. (2016). Understanding the generation Z: The future workforce. *South-Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 3(3), 1–5.
- [19] Suta, D. (2023). Exploring the Relationship among Employee Participation and Job Satisfaction, Employee Commitment and Employee Performance. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*. <https://doi.org/10.21275/sr231008004659>.
- [20] The Hotel School. (2024). 8 must-have leadership skills in hotel industry for success. <https://www.thehotelschool.com>
- [21] Turner, A. (2015). Generation Z: Technology and social interest. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, 71(2), 103–113. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jip.2015.0021>
- [22] Viswesvaran, C. (1993). Modeling job performance: Is there a general factor?
- [23] Wang, Y.-C., Chen, C.-T., & Zhang, H. (2019). Effects of selected positive resources on hospitality service quality: The mediating role of work engagement. *Sustainability*, 11(8), 2320. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11082320>
- [24] Weidmer, B. (2015). Generations do differ: Best practices in leading traditionalists, boomers, and generations X, Y, and Z. *The Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 15(1), 58–69.