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ABSTRACT

Objective: This research aims to use proactive interaction capability as a mediating variable for the influence of knowledge sharing on work team performance.

Method: This research method was developed in a causal research design in which research hypotheses will be tested, with the aim of identifying causal relationships between variables. The population in this study were all department managers in the 5 Star hotel industry in West Java with a sample of 22 hotels. These departments include Front Office, Food and Beverage service, Food and Beverage products, Housekeeping, Accounting, HRD, Engineering, Marketing and Security. Apart from that, the hotel owner is a member of the Indonesian Hotel and Restaurant Association (PHRI) and the hotel has been operating for more than 10 (ten) years. The data source used in this research is primary data with data collected using a list of statements submitted directly to respondents. The data analysis method used in this research uses variance-based or component-based SEM structural equation modeling techniques which include several steps including preparing flow diagrams, model fit research, and structural model assessment.

Results and Discussion: The results of this research show several findings, including (1) the work team efficacy variable is not able to mediate proactive interaction capability and work team performance, (2) the proactive interaction capability variable is able to mediate knowledge sharing on work team performance.

Originality/Value: Proactive interaction capability in this research is a new initiative in explaining the process of how knowledge sharing can improve work team performance.

Keywords: Hotel Industries, Knowledge Sharing, Proactive Interaction Capabilities, Work Team Performance.

A LIGAÇÃO ENTRE A CAPACIDADE DE INTERAÇÃO PROATIVA COM O DESEMPENHO DA EQUIPE DE TRABALHO EM HOTÉIS CINCO ESTRELAS

RESUMO

Objetivo: Esta pesquisa tem como objetivo utilizar a capacidade de interação proativa como variável mediadora da influência do compartilhamento de conhecimento no desempenho da equipe de trabalho.

Método: Este método de pesquisa foi desenvolvido em um desenho de pesquisa causal no qual serão testadas hipóteses de pesquisa, com o objetivo de identificar relações causais entre variáveis. A população deste estudo eram todos gerentes de departamento da indústria hoteleira 5 estrelas em West Java, com uma amostra de 22 hotéis. Esses departamentos incluem Front Office, serviços de alimentos e bebidas, produtos de alimentos e bebidas, limpeza, contabilidade, RH, engenharia, marketing e segurança. Além disso, o proprietário do hotel é membro da Associação Indonésia de Hotéis e Restaurantes (PHRI) e o hotel está em funcionamento há mais de 10 (dez) anos. A fonte de dados utilizada nesta pesquisa são dados primários com dados coletados por meio de uma lista de
afirmações enviadas diretamente aos entrevistados. O método de análise de dados usado nesta pesquisa usa técnicas de modelagem de equações estruturais SEM baseadas em variância ou baseadas em componentes que incluem várias etapas, incluindo a preparação de diagramas de fluxo, pesquisa de ajuste de modelo e avaliação de modelo estrutural.

**Resultados e Discussão:** Os resultados desta pesquisa mostram diversas descobertas, incluindo (1) a variável eficácia da equipe de trabalho não é capaz de mediar a capacidade de interação proativa e o desempenho da equipe de trabalho, (2) a variável capacidade de interação proativa é capaz de mediar o compartilhamento de conhecimento sobre desempenho da equipe de trabalho.

**Originalidade/Valor:** A capacidade de interação proativa nesta pesquisa é uma iniciativa nova para explicar o processo de como o compartilhamento de conhecimento pode melhorar o desempenho da equipe de trabalho.

**Palavras-chave:** Indústria Hoteleira, Compartilhamento de Conhecimento, Capacidades de Interação Proativa, Desempenho de Equipes De Trabalho.

1 INTRODUCTION

In every interdependent work process, no single individual can execute all the activities necessary for the enhancement of performance. Cooperation among individuals is essential, as
it requires combining and complementing differences in individual skills and perspectives to achieve mutual goals. This collaborative process maximizes the potential of the team (Wajdi, Putra, Haziroh, & Purusa, 2023). The integration of knowledge and skills represents a dynamic relationship strategy characterized by continuous interaction facilitated by human resources. This interaction can foster novelty across various organizational aspects. The development of a competitive advantage-driven organizational strategy can be informed by both external and internal sources. External sources encompass natural resources, technology, favorable labor markets, and other professional networks. Conversely, internal sources include employee capabilities, organizational structure, work systems, creativity in project development for organizational benefit, and knowledge management. The COVID-19 pandemic, which has unfolded over the past two years, has profoundly impacted the hotel industry in Indonesia. Media reports detailing the closure of hotel businesses underscore the pandemic's devastating effects on the sector (Haziroh, Putra, Christi, & Demircioglu, 2023).

Numerous industries have fallen short of their initial targets, with the hotel industry bearing a particularly heavy toll. Presently, according to data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS), Indonesia is home to a total of 28,243 lodging establishments, comprising 650,163 rooms and 950,417 beds. Within this figure, 3,314 are classified as hotels. Many hotels have been compelled to cease operations due to a lack of guests, resulting in vacant rooms and unoccupied food and meeting facilities. The Indonesian Hotel and Restaurant Association has reported that 1,642 hotels across Indonesia have been forced to shut down as a direct result of the COVID-19 outbreak. The closure of these establishments poses a significant risk to the tourism industry, with potential revenue losses reaching tens of trillions of rupiah (Layaman, Harahap, Djastuti, Jaelani, & Djuwita, 2021).

Based on the findings of a preliminary survey conducted among researchers at 5-star hotels in the West Java region, it was revealed that there are persistent issues at the team level within hotels. These issues include a lack of effective communication leading to misunderstandings among team members, inadequate skills development wherein certain members require training, autonomous decision-making without consulting other team members, and a lack of active engagement among team members, resulting in unmet targets. Notably, in five-star hotels, it is mandated that at least 50% of employees possess competency certifications, failing which may diminish the hotel's rating. This escalating need must be tactfully addressed by various stakeholders, particularly in light of the digital era and the rapid dissemination of information (Yepes & López, 2021). The hotel industry must equip its teams across all departments with the ability to think creatively and innovatively to differentiate
themselves from competitors. Enhancing the skills of local human resources (HR) is crucial for ensuring the long-term sustainability of investments. Moreover, this workforce should be accompanied by a higher level of skilled capacity within the team. Hence, facilitating the development and enhancement of the skills of the local workforce becomes paramount. Despite these imperatives, Indonesia's human resource performance in the tourism competitiveness index remains at the 64th position globally and is the 4th lowest in ASEAN (Nguyen, Nguyen, & Do, 2019).

These two types of sources exhibit distinct characteristics. External sources typically entail challenges in acquiring fundamental materials necessary for gaining a competitive edge. Organizations engage in fierce competition to secure external sources. Furthermore, advantages obtained from such sources are prone to imitation by other organizations. On the other hand, internal sources offer numerous advantages due to their difficulty to imitate and possession of unlimited competence (Suryawijaya, Utomo, & Ingsih, 2023). One such advantage inherent to organizations that remains underutilized is knowledge management. Knowledge is ingrained within the organization and each of its members. Within organizations, knowledge manifests in employee guidelines and procedures tailored to individual knowledge domains (Su & Zhang, 2020). The success of a company or organization in the competitive business landscape hinges on its adept utilization of existing individual knowledge resources, and its proficiency in managing organizational knowledge. Consequently, knowledge is regarded as an asset that warrants appreciation, development, and meticulous management (Wipawayangkool & Teng, 2019). The Knowledge-Based View (KBV) theory posits that knowledge-based resources make a more significant contribution to achieving superior organizational performance than tangible resources (Lo, Tian, & Ng, 2021). Sharing tacit knowledge among organizational members through social encouragement, acquired through experience and interactions among individuals, can also be disseminated and acquired through practice and observation. Tacit knowledge can be sustained when companies enhance employee interactions, foster collaboration, and disseminate it. In essence, knowledge sharing is a process of interaction, communication, and coordination that facilitates access to pertinent information for utilizing knowledge or expertise within an organization. Effective knowledge sharing can enhance organizational competence and performance (Eletter, El Refae, & Kaba, 2022).

Previous research states that knowledge sharing in organizations is believed to encourage increased team performance (Cutumisu, 2019). Other research that links the role of leadership and trust in knowledge sharing is believed to improve work team performance. Knowledge sharing can improve knowledge-based organizational capabilities and lead to
improved performance through the exchange and utilization of disseminated information, experiences, practices, insights and common understanding (Kong & Li, 2018). Meanwhile, other research such as Pan, Liu, Ma, & Qu (2018) found there was no influence between knowledge sharing and team performance. The following are several studies that have different influences or impacts between knowledge sharing and teamwork performance.

Zopiatis & Theocharous (2018) research applied a survey strategy to collect sample data from 277 project team members working on international research projects. The sample consists of knowledge-intensive projects aimed at solving complex problems through innovative solutions that share relevant knowledge. The research focuses on the interaction and knowledge sharing of team members in international science and technology projects. During the project, scientists from different countries work together (from several months to several years), and engage in knowledge-intensive activities aimed at producing relevant scientific findings. Most of the survey participants were employees of research institutes and universities in Croatia, working on science and technology international projects in the fields of semiconductor industry, information technology, electronics, photonics, petrochemistry, medical sciences, and biochemistry. The research results prove that sharing tacit and explicit knowledge has an effect on team projects.

Previous studies have shown that there is an empirical gap. This conflict relates to research findings or propositions that need to be evaluated or verified empirically (Kozlowski, & Ilgen, 2016). Inconsistent research findings related to the variables studied will be a weakness and rejection for other researchers and practitioners as information needed in making and making decisions. This is considered to have not yet established the concept and gives rise to ambiguity regarding the concept (Rossignoli, Lionzo, Henschel, & Boers, 2023). There is a lack of rigorous studies in the previous literature. Previous studies only directly tested the relationship sharing knowledge on work team performance. This research aims to use mediation proactive interaction capabilities as a variable mediation for influence sharing knowledge on work team performance.

1.1 RESEARCH URGENCY

This research is different from previous studies which are manifested in the development of the concept of proactive interaction capabilities. This concept proposed in this research was developed from the concepts of extra-role behavior and organizational development. Proactive is a dimension of extra role behavior and development interaction.
capability is a dimension of organizational development. Proactive interaction capabilities are the result of the integration of these two concepts. This concept is a new variable which according to researchers does not exist in previous studies.

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Social relations between team members is a trigger for increasing knowledge sharing and other extra role behavior (Salim, Ab-Rahmah, & Wahab, 2021). Knowledge sharing in a team is the process of exchanging resources from team members to other team members. These resources can be in the form of tacit or explicit knowledge to form new knowledge. Knowledge sharing in a team can be defined as a team activity that encourages learning and increases the team's ability to achieve goals. Teams are further important in the organizational learning process because dialogue and knowledge exchange are needed to develop and combine knowledge for organizational innovation, especially that which occurs at the team level (Mo, Cui, Wang, & Cui, 2023). Lai, Lin, Lu, & Chen (2021) argued that repeated interactions facilitate learning about other members' areas of expertise when team members reveal information that demonstrates their specialized knowledge. He found that knowledge exchange in teams leads to the formation of transactive memory, which plays an important role in higher performance. Therefore, the above arguments suggest that knowledge sharing tends to result in higher performance.

H1: The higher the knowledge sharing, the higher the team work performance

Knowledge sharing can increase knowledge-based organizational resources/capabilities and lead to improved performance through the exchange and utilization of disseminated information, experiences, practices, insights and common understanding (Liu, Xu, Xin, Cui, Ji, & You, 2023). However, the existence of various potential obstacles, such as hostility, competition, search and transfer costs, guaranteed career advancement and uneven incentive systems, are organizational challenges in successfully implementing knowledge sharing (Qamari, Ferdinand, Dwiatmadja, & Yuniawan, 2020). So even the mere implementation of quality knowledge sharing does not necessarily guarantee the achievement of improved performance. Proactive behavior generally has a positive influence on how a person is perceived by others. In one of the studies by Wang, Zhang, Thomas, Yu, & Spitzmueller (2017). In another study on banking and marketing services companies, proactive managers were people who had great charisma, leadership qualities who were more likely to be strong contributors and make all aspects of the company good. Proactive behavior can lead to a variety of positive
consequences including better working relationships and other benefits.

**H2: Better knowledge sharing will increase proactive interaction capabilities**

Team-efficacy is not simply the sum of individual members' efficacy beliefs (Loi, Liu, Lam, & Xu, 2016). Chiu, Owens & Tesluk (2016) suggest that cognition is about what we can do about a challenging task. Williams, Perker, & Turner (2020) noted that effective collective action involves a complex path of social influence and reciprocal relationships, better than individual action alone. Team members must coordinate on tasks, and team members tend to be influenced by the beliefs, motivation, use of interpersonal power, adaptiveness and performance of their coworkers. Wang, Kim, Jiang, & Tang (2020) suggests that in team-efficacy what influences someone to join or choose to do work in a particular team, how much effort each team member has put into team performance, as well as the resilience of each team member when collective efforts failed to produce results. Other research that discusses the importance of team efficacy, namely Fay & Hüttges (2017) research, states that a team that is structured to support each other will increase team efficacy. Strong team efficacy tends to perform better because of a pervasive sense of determination characterized by high expectations for team performance, tenacity in the face of obstacles, and creativity in responding to problems. Research a team that interacts proactively, this interaction is increasingly used to improve skills and knowledge within the team. So the hypothesis proposed is:

**H3: The higher the proactive interaction capability, the higher the work team efficacy**

The concept of proactiveness has been operationalized at the individual level (Hong, Liao, Raub, & Han, 2016), team level (Kang, Matusik, Kim, & Phillips, 2016), and organizational level (Montani, Battistelli, & Odoardi, 2017). Individual-level proactive work behavior typically focuses on self-initiative and future-oriented action with the aim of changing and improving the situation or oneself (Parker, Wang, & Liao, 2019). In teams and organizations there is involvement in a mutualistic resource integration process Schilpzand, Houston, & Cho (2018), thus increasing collaboration in creating interactions that develop each other. The ability of the organization to help develop individual knowledge and competence in interacting to improve team performance. This interaction will educate individuals and partners and help reciprocally to become skilled associated with knowledge sharing quality.

**H4: The higher the proactive interaction capability, the higher the team performance**

At the team level, the size of the team's work results can vary. Strauss & Parker (2018) differentiate between performance behavior and performance outcomes. The first relates to
changes in team behavior as a result of the work process and team development. An example of performance behavior can be found in Strauss, Parker, & O’Shea (2017) who used supervisor ratings of team proactiveness, targeting future potential for solving tasks. In a later study of team process improvement, Takeuchi, Wang, & Farh (2020) showed that feedback, discussion and experimentation had a positive effect on team performance. Likewise, Wu, Parker, Wu, & Lee (2018) examined team learning behavior. Performance outcomes, on the other hand, refer to the factual results of a team’s work, implying that the output is directly related to the work team.

**H5: The higher the work team efficacy, the higher the work team performance**

The success of teamwork is determined by the ability and quality of teamwork. Studies on employee efficacy have become a key concept in explaining performance. Referring to the work of Krapež Trošt, Škerlavaj, & Anzengruber (2016) teamwork efficacy can be understood as a collective belief in their abilities or judgments about what they can do with their knowledge and skills to complete a particular job effectively. Adopting the study of Boonyarit (2023) teamwork Efficacy can be understood as a meta-skill created by an individual's background and includes implicit knowledge and hard skills as well as soft skills that are collective and disseminated effectively in teamwork. As a team, a collective portfolio of people with certain knowledge and skills or abilities, teamwork effectiveness will be established when team members regularly make efforts to bridge individual differences in teamwork, work together especially in challenging situations, and continue to utilize each other's strengths each member (Amundsen & Martinsen, 2015).

**H6: Work team efficacy mediates the relationship between proactive interaction capabilities and work team performance**

Knowledge sharing studies have attracted the attention of scientists at least in improving organizational performance (Bakker, 2017). Sharing knowledge within team members will have an impact on feelings of meaningfulness. In addition, activities related to providing information will have a positive impact on work productivity (Guzman & Espejo, 2018). Knowledge sharing is also considered as the exchange of knowledge between team members through teaching activities between team members to each other to pass on the knowledge learned and more importantly sharing knowledge. This is not recognized as a tool to increase the innovation that is expected from each team member to be able to lead to achievement. better performance. One of the fundamental dimensions that is quite essential in the knowledge sharing process is interaction between organizational members which may be influenced by various factors, including knowledge, attitudes, motivation and skills which will result in better
performance (Jones, Ma, & McNally, 2021).

**H7: proactive interaction capability mediates the relationship between knowledge sharing and work team performance**

Based on the hypotheses that have been developed, with the support of theoretical studies and research results that have been presented previously, an empirical research model can be formulated as follows:

**Figure 1**
*Conceptual Framework (Sulistiyani & Ferdinand, 2018), modified*

3 METHODOLOGY

This research was developed in a causal research design in which research hypotheses will be tested, with the aim of identifying causal relationships between variables. Cause and effect can be identified by looking for the actual type of fact to help understand and estimate the relationship, as well as carrying out a basic understanding of the theory and results of previous research, to then reveal the theoretical hypothesis and results of previous research, to then reveal the hypothesis that will be tested (Ferdinand, 2014). The population in this study were department managers in the hotel industry. These departments include Front Office, Food and Beverage service, Food and Beverage products, Housekeeping, Accounting, HRD, Engineering, Marketing and Security. The hotel industry used as the research object is 22 5-star hotels in the West Java region.

Apart from that, the hotel owner is part of the Indonesian Hotel and Restaurant Association (PHRI) and the hotel has been operating for more than 10 (ten) years and is only...
classified as a 5 (five) stars hotel. PHRI is a non-profit association of hotel and restaurant owners and professionals who focus their activities for the development and growth of important sectors of the Indonesian tourism industry. The data source used in this research is primary data with data collected using a list of statements submitted directly to respondents, consisting of questions regarding the characteristics of the respondent and question data about the variables studied. Statements are presented in the form of closed statements as well as scales to express responses and are supported by open questions that require short answers from respondents to determine the respondent's degree of understanding in providing answers. The statements in the list of questions relate to the assessment of managers, supervisors, leaders/heads of departments regarding knowledge sharing, proactive interaction capabilities and work team performance. The data analysis method used in this research uses structural equation modeling techniques (Structural Equation Modeling) based variance or component-based SEM which includes several steps including preparing a flow diagram (path diagram), study model fit, and evaluation model structural.

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 EXTERNAL MODEL

Figure 2

External Model

![External Model Diagram]
This outer model is used to determine the relationship between latent variables and their indicators. The PLS algorithm method is used to test this outer model. The external model analysis stage is measured by validity, reliability and multicollinearity tests.

4.1.1 Validity Test

4.1.1.1 Convergent Validity

The Outer Model Test is used to determine the relationship between latent variables and their indicators. The expected value exceeding > 0.7 or the limit value of 0.6 is often used as the minimum value for the load factor limit. The following is the external loading of the value of each indicator for the research variables:

| Table 1 |
| Outer Loading Value |
| Variables | Indicators | Outer Loading Value | Conclusion |
| Knowledge Sharing (X) | X1 | 0.799 | Valid |
| | X2 | 0.816 | Valid |
| | X3 | 0.784 | Valid |
| | X4 | 0.851 | Valid |
| | X5 | 0.819 | Valid |
| | Y1 | 0.837 | Valid |
| Work Team Performance (Y) | Y2 | 0.784 | Valid |
| | Y3 | 0.829 | Valid |
| | Y4 | 0.740 | Valid |
| | Z1.1 | 0.835 | Valid |
| Work Team Efficacy (Z1) | Z1.2 | 0.801 | Valid |
| | Z1.3 | 0.874 | Valid |
| | Z1.4 | 0.740 | Valid |
| | Z2.1 | 0.621 | Valid |
| | Z2.2 | 0.727 | Valid |
| Proactive Interaction Capabilities (Z2) | Z2.3 | 0.811 | Valid |
| | Z2.4 | 0.871 | Valid |
| | Z2.5 | 0.791 | Valid |
| | Z2.6 | 0.630 | Valid |

Source: Primary Data Analysis, 2024

From Table 1, it is known that there are many indicators of research variables. There are 17 variable indicators that have external loading pressure values > 0.7, and there are 2 variable indicators that have external loading pressure values > 0.6. However, according to Chin (1998), the external loading pressure measurement scale of 0.5 to 0.6 is considered sufficient to meet the requirements convergent validity. The data above shows that there are no variable indicators
with a loading pressure value <0.5, so that all indicators are considered suitable or valid for research purposes and can be used for further analysis. Apart from checking the external loading values, convergent validity can also be assessed by checking the AVE (Average Variance Extracted). The AVE value describes the extent of variance or diversity of the manifest variables of the latent construct. The AVE value with an average value > 0.5 is used as the determinant convergent validity. So, if < 0.5 then convergent validity invalid.

Table 2
Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Sharing (X)</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Team Performance (Y)</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Team Efficacy (Z1)</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive Interaction Capabilities (Z2)</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data Analysis, 2024

From the table above, the variables in Average Variance Extracted (AVE) with a value > 0.5. The Knowledge Sharing variable has a value of 0.662, the Work Team Performance variable has a value of 0.638, the Work Team Efficacy variable has a value of 0.662, and the Proactive Interaction Capability variable has a value of 0.559. This shows that the research is said to be valid

4.1.1.2 Discriminant Validity

Another method for measuring the validity of a questionnaire is by using discriminant validity. Discriminant Validity seen in the cross-loading between the indicators and their construct values. In research there is cross-loading between indicators and constructs. The following are the cross-loading values for each indicator:
Based on the table above, it can be seen that each indicator in the research variable has the largest cross-loading value on the variable it forms compared to the cross-loading value on other variables. Based on the results obtained, it can be stated that the indicators used in this research have good discriminant validity in compiling their respective variables.

4.1.2 Reliability Test

Reliability Test shows the consistency of a measuring instrument in measuring the same phenomenon. The main purpose of estimating reliability tests is to determine how much variability is due to measurement error and how much variability there is in actual test scores (Zhang, Wang, Cui, Qu, & Cheng, 2023). To test reliability use:

4.1.2.1 Composite Reliability

Reliability Test is carried out by measuring the correlation between answers and questions. A variable is declared reliable if it provides a value of Composite Reliability > 0.70. SmartPLS output results for composite reliability can be seen in the following table:
Table 4

Composite Reliability Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Composite Reliability Value</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Sharing (X)</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Team Performance (Y)</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Team Efficacy (Z1)</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive Interaction Capabilities (Z2)</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data Analysis, 2024

Based on the table above, each variable has composite reliability with a value of > 0.7 with the Knowledge Sharing variable with a value of 0.907, the Work Team Performance variable with a value of 0.875, the Work Team Efficacy variable with a value of 0.887, and the Proactive Interaction Capability variable with a value of 0.882. This shows that each variable used in this research can be said to be reliable.

4.1.2.2 Cronbach’s Alpha

Cronbach's alpha is a statistical technique used to measure internal consistency in instrument reliability tests or psychometric data. A construct is said to be reliable if the Cronbach's alpha value is more than 0.60. The following are the results of the Cronbach’s alpha value which will be displayed in the table:

Table 5

Cronbach’s Alpha Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Composite Reliability Value</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Sharing (X)</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Team Performance (Y)</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Team Efficacy (Z1)</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive Interaction Capabilities (Z2)</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data Analysis, 2024

From the table above, it can be seen that all Cronbach's Alpha results have a value greater than 0.60, which means that Cronbach's alpha meets the requirements for all constructs to be considered reliable.

4.1.3 Multicollinerarity Test

Multicollinearity Test is used to test whether there is a correlation between the independent variables of the regression model. Multicollinearity means that there is a perfect...
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linear relationship between several or all of the variables that explain the regression model (Han, Harold, & Cheong, 2019). The Multicollinearity Test can be determined from the tolerance value and its variation with the inflation factor (VIF). Multicollinearity Test can be detected with a tolerance value > 0.1 or the same as a VIF value <; 5. The following are the VIF values for this research:

**Table 6**

*Collinearity Statistics Value*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>VIF Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>1.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>2.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>1.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4</td>
<td>2.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>2.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>1.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>1.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>1.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y4</td>
<td>1.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1.1</td>
<td>2.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1.2</td>
<td>1.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1.3</td>
<td>2.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1.4</td>
<td>1.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z2.1</td>
<td>1.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z2.2</td>
<td>1.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z2.3</td>
<td>2.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z2.4</td>
<td>2.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z2.5</td>
<td>1.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z2.6</td>
<td>1.328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data Analysis, 2024

The table above shows the statistical results of collinearity value (VIF) to see multicollinearity tests with variable results. Each variable has a limit value > 0.1 or equal to a VIF value < 5 so that it does not violate the multicollinearity test.
4.2 INNER MODEL

**Figure 3**
*Inner Model*

4.2.1 Goodness of Fit Test

The purpose of the goodness-of-fit test is to find out whether the distribution of data obtained from the sample follows a certain theoretical distribution or not (Ahamad and Ariffin, 2018). Structural model estimation was carried out to show the relationship between manifest and latent variables of predictors, mediators, and main outcomes in a complex model. This model suitability test consists of three tests, namely R-square ($R^2$), f-square ($f^2$) and Q-square ($Q^2$).

4.2.1.1 R-Square

Nilai $R^2$ or R-square shows the assignment of exogenous variables to endogenous variables. Exogenous variables are variables whose variability is assumed to be determined by causes outside the model. Meanwhile, endogenous variables are variables whose variations can be explained by exogenous and endogenous system variables. So the higher the $R^2$ the value, the better the level of determination. $R^2$ values of 0.75, 0.50 and 0.25 can be reduced to strong, medium and weak (Cranmer, Goldman, & Houghton, 2019). The coefficient value for determining it can be taken from the following table:
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Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Team Efficacy (Z1)</td>
<td>0.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Team Performance (Y)</td>
<td>0.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive Interaction Capabilities (Z2)</td>
<td>0.620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data Analysis, 2024

Based on this table, it is known that the influence of the Team Efficacy Variable is 0.615, while the influence of the Work Team Performance Variable is 0.551 and the Proactive Interaction Capability Variable is 0.620.

4.2.1.2 F-Square

Apart from assessing whether there is a significant relationship between variables, assess the magnitude of the influence between variables using f-square (Shrum et al., 2013). An f-square value of 0.02 is considered small, 0.15 is medium, and 0.35 is large. Values less than 0.02 can be ignored or considered to have no effect (Lee, Pak, Kim, & Li, 2019). Here are the results of f-square:

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X AND Z2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Team Performance (Y)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data Analysis, 2024

Based on the table above, there are no large effect sizes with f-square criteria > 0.35. And those that have a medium effect, namely with an F-Square value between 0.15-0.35, are none. Meanwhile, the influence of X1 on Y, Z1 and Z2 is small because the f-Square value is in the range 0.02-0.15.

4.2.1.3 Q-Square

The Q-square value in structural model testing is determined by the Q-square value (predictive importance). Q-square values can be used to measure how well a model and its parameters produce the observed values. Q-square value > 0 indicates that the model has a
predictive value, while $Q^2$ value $< 0$ means the model has no predicted value. The following are the results of calculating the $Q^2$-squared value:

$$Q^2 = 1 - [(1 - R_1^2) \times (1 - R_2^2) \times (1 - R_3^2)]$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

$$= 1 - [1 - 0.615] \times (1 - 0.551) \times (1 - 0.620)$$

$$= 1 - (0.385 \times 0.449 \times 0.380)$$

$$= 1 - 0.0656887$$

$$= 0.93$$

Based on the calculation above, the $Q^2$-square value is 0.93. This value explains that 93% of the diversity of research materials that can be obtained is explained by the research model, while the remaining 7% can be explained by other factors outside this research model. So, the value of $Q^2 > 0$ indicates that the model is appropriate.

4.2.2 Hypothesis Test

4.2.2.1 Direct Test

Hypothesis testing in this research can be seen in the path of the direct and indirect influence coefficient values, especially for mediation. The path coefficient test uses a bootstrap/bootstrapping process to show the t-statistic or p-value (critical ratio) and the original sample value obtained from the process. A P-value of 0.05 means that there is no direct or indirect impact. The significance level used in this study is the t-statistic of 1.96 (significance level = 5%). The research hypothesis testing values are shown in the table below:
Table 9

Direct Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Original Sample</th>
<th>T-Statistics</th>
<th>P-Values</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Sharing -&gt; Work team performance</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>4.076</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Positive, Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Sharing -&gt; proactive Interaction capabilities</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>27.307</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Positive, Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proactive Interaction capabilities -&gt; Work team efficacy</td>
<td>H3</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td>24.532</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Positive, Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proactive Interaction capabilities -&gt; Work team performance</td>
<td>H4</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>3.941</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Positive, Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work team efficacy -&gt; Work team performance</td>
<td>H5</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>1.177</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data Analysis, 2024

Based on the results of the direct influence in the table above, it can be interpreted as follows:

1) Test the first hypothesis whether Knowledge Sharing has a positive effect on Work Team Performance. Based on the path coefficient table in the bootstrapping test, Knowledge Sharing has a positive and significant effect on Work Team Performance. This is shown by the T-statistic value of 4.076 > 1.96 and the P-value of 0.000 < 0.05. So it is concluded that the first hypothesis is accepted because there is a positive and significant influence between Knowledge Sharing on Work Team Performance;

2) Test the second hypothesis whether knowledge sharing has a positive effect on Proactive Interaction Capability. Based on the path coefficient table in the bootstrapping test, Knowledge Sharing has a positive and significant effect on Proactive Interaction Capability. This is indicated by a T-statistic value of 27.307 > 1.96 and a P-value of 0.000 < 0.05. Therefore, the second hypothesis is accepted because there is a positive and significant influence between Knowledge Sharing and Proactive Interaction Capabilities;

3) Test the third hypothesis whether Proactive Interaction Capability has a positive effect on Work Team Efficacy. Based on the path coefficient table in the bootstrapping test, Proactive Interaction Capability has a positive and significant effect on Work Team Efficacy. This is indicated by a T-statistic value of 24.532 > 1.96 and a P-value of 0.000 < 0.05. So the third hypothesis is accepted because there is a positive and significant influence between Proactive Interaction Capability on Work Team Efficacy;

4) Test the fourth hypothesis whether Proactive Interactive Capabilities have a positive influence on Work Team Performance. Based on the path coefficient table in the
bootstrapping test, Proactive Interactive Capability has a significant effect on Work Team Performance. This is shown by the T-statistic with a value of 3.941 < 1.96 and a P-value of 0.000 > 0.05. So the fourth hypothesis can be accepted because Proactive Interaction Capability has a positive and significant effect on Work Team Performance;

5) Test the fifth hypothesis whether Work Team Efficacy has a positive effect on Work Team Performance. Based on the path coefficient table in the bootstrapping test, Work Team Efficacy has no significant effect on Work Team Performance. This is indicated by a T-statistic value of 1.177 < 1.96 and a P-value of 0.240 > 0.05. So, the fifth hypothesis is not accepted.

4.2.2.2 Indirect Test

The next step in the analysis is to test the indirect effects that can be seen from the results of certain indirect impacts. If P-Values < 0.05 then it really has an effect. This means that the mediating variable mediates the influence of the exogenous variable on the endogenous variable, in other words it is an indirect influence. If P-Value > 0.05 then it is not significant. This means that the intermediary variable does not mediate the influence of the exogenous variable on the endogenous variable. In other words, the impact is felt immediately (Qian, Song, Jin, Wang, & Chen, 2018). The results of certain indirect impacts are shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10</th>
<th>Indirect effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive Interaction Capability -&gt; Work team efficacy -&gt; Work team performance</td>
<td>H6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Sharing -&gt; Proactive Interaction Capability -&gt; Work Team Performance</td>
<td>H7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data Analysis, 2024

Based on the results of the indirect influence in the table above, it can be interpreted as follows:

1) The sixth hypothesis tests whether work team efficacy mediates the effect of proactive interaction capabilities on work team performance. Based on the path coefficient table in the bootstrapping test, Work Team Efficacy has no significant effect on proactive
interaction capabilities and Work Team Performance. This is indicated by a T-statistic value of 1.159 < 1.96 and a P-value of 0.247 > 0.05. So, the sixth hypothesis is not accepted, namely the work team efficacy variable is not able to mediate proactive interaction capabilities and work team performance;

2) The seventh hypothesis tests whether proactive interaction capabilities mediate the effect of knowledge sharing on work team performance. Based on the path coefficient table in the Proactive Interactive Capability bootstrapping test, it has a significant effect on Knowledge Sharing and Work Team Performance. This is shown by the T-statistic with a value of 3.839 < 1.96 and a P-value of 0.000 > 0.05. So the seventh hypothesis can be accepted because proactive interaction capabilities are able to mediate knowledge sharing on work team performance.

The results and discussions of an article must be presented in a clear and organized manner, based on the data collected and the analyzes carried out during the study. Initially, the results must be presented in an objective and concise way, using tables, graphs and statistics, if applicable, to highlight the main findings. Then, in the discussion section, the results are interpreted in light of existing literature, highlighting similarities, differences and implications for theory and practice. Furthermore, limitations of the study and possible directions for future research are discussed. It is essential that both the results and the discussion are based on solid evidence and that they contribute significantly to the advancement of knowledge on the topic addressed.

5 CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the analysis, it shows that proactive interaction capabilities are able to mediate knowledge sharing to improve work team performance at 5 Star hotels in West Java. These results contribute theoretically, namely contributing to the development of strategic resource management science, especially in the concept of organizational development, extra role behavior which is used as a basis for developmental interaction and developing the capabilities of organizational members in building proactive interactions. The contribution of this research is specifically related to the role of proactive interaction capabilities in overcoming gaps in research results and in efforts to improve work team performance. The outcomes of this research also contribute to providing a deeper understanding of the body of knowledge and provide a basis for further research regarding the important role of proactive interaction.
capabilities which can strengthen the influence of knowledge sharing and work team performance.

Practically, this research provides organizations with an understanding of the importance of developing knowledge to increase the capabilities of individuals, teams and organizations in adapting to overcome the challenges of rapid change. The capabilities of organizational members formed from proactive interactions become assets in improving performance. The higher the performance of individuals, work teams and organizations, the greater the organization's opportunity to achieve sustainable competitive advantage. The proactive interaction capability in this research is a new initiative in explaining the process of how knowledge sharing can improve work team performance. In the competitive tourism industry, proactive ability must be one of the main requirements in determining HR performance indicators in West Java 5 Star hotels so that they are continuously able to compete and adapt to current developments. As is common in scientific research, several research limitations faced include sample coverage of only one province, which has the consequence of limitations in the generalization of these findings. Therefore, further research should be directed at testing this concept in depth setting multi-provincial and multi-industry.
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