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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keywords:</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality industry</td>
<td>This study aims at investigating the effect of internal marketing on innovation in hotels. When the related literature was reviewed, the relationship between internal marketing and innovation were hypothesized. The study focused on internal marketing as an independent variable and innovation as a dependent variable. The study was based on the quantitative method.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Data was collected using a questionnaire to test the hypothesis of the study. Data was collected from (392) managers, supervisors, and employees working in these hotels in the greater Cairo governorate. Results and hypotheses have been analyzed and tested through SPSS V.16.0 and the partial least squares (PLS.3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal marketing</td>
<td>The results indicated the significant effect of internal marketing on innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation.</td>
<td>Furthermore, the study also made a number of recommendations, including the importance of maintaining the level achieved by the adoption of internal marketing, and further improving the innovation of surveyed hotels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Introduction

According to Lewis (2000), internal marketing is infrastructure and foundation service marketing and has become one of the vital and main strategies of many service companies including hotels. In addition, Gummesson (2003) illustrated that the implementation of internal marketing involved accepting the idea that the internal and external markets of an organization are similar and can be treated in a similar manner. Therefore, internal marketing will be addressed as a set of both internal and external exchange relationships. Furthermore, Lusch (2007) indicated that the role of service employees is indeed relevant for the success of any service organization, and internal marketing can help organizations to deliver service excellence and innovation. Innovation could be considered as an important factor that impacts a hotel’s position. In a competitive and uncertain economic environment, organizations need creative employees to enhance organizational effectiveness, and ensure long-term survival. The success of any organization depends on its ability to adapt to change that, in turn requires innovation.

Today, innovation in the contemporary competitive atmosphere is considered as the most significant factor for human development to survive the organizations and all other contexts.
Innovation is a source for organizations that need to support successful management of change (Balan and Noel, 2010). Innovation is a widely recognized concept that has attracted the interest of both the academic and business world, as well as the interest of the governments of all developed and developing countries (Bowen; Rostami; Steel, 2010).

In fact, innovation has become the main challenge for all types of organization (Andreeva and Kianto, 2011), since it seems to be a key driver of long-term business success (Enzing; Batterink; Janszen; Omta, 2011). Employees are the domestic customers and these customers can change or alter the organization’s future events and organizations cannot deny this fact. The organization should review the attitude and behavior of its employees to make them able to survive in the market (Isfahani and Kazemi, 2012). Internal marketing should function as a continuous improvement process, aligning organizational goals with stimulated employee behaviors that lead to better performance and assumed higher levels of responsibility. Therefore, improving the performance of the organization (To; Martin; Yu, 2015). The changing business environment drives the tight competition between companies in the global market place. Motivates the companies to have an innovation strategy to win the global market competition. For creative industries, innovation is a solution to survive and ready to face the global business challenges, and can be a critical success factor in achieving sustainable corporate growth. (Farida, 2016).

2. Literature Review

2.1 Internal marketing

Luvelock and Wirtz (2006) defined internal marketing as a program, guideline and strategies for employees in the organization to achieve higher job satisfaction and thus improve service quality for external customers. It is primarily an attempt to train and motivate employees of various organizations to effectively serve customers. In addition, Govindarajan (2007) stated that listening to the opinions and needs of customers, especially during the product supply chain, is an important way to strengthen the business relationship between organizations and customers. In this regard, most organizations encourage the formation of business groups that enable their employees to handle customer service effectively.

According to Kotler (2006) internal marketing is the job of recruiting, training, and motivating employees who want to serve customers well. It ensured that everyone in the organization, especially senior management, adheres to appropriate marketing principles. Smart marketers recognize that marketing activities inside the organization can be more important, or even more important than those performed outside the organization. There is no point in promising excellent service until the organization's employees are ready to provide it. According to Kotler and Keller (2009), internal marketing occurred at two levels. First, various marketing functions such as market research, product management, sales, customer service, and advertising need to work together and synchronize from the customer's perspective. Second, other units or areas of the organization must support marketing and think of customers.

According to Abzari, Ghorbani, and Madani, (2011), internal marketing is a technique used to solve problems concerning the productivity of internal services, direct market, successful implementation, appropriate programs, and consulting customers. Rafiq and Ahmed (2013) pointed out that internal marketing is known as the philosophy of treating employees as costumers by encouraging, developing, attracting, and retaining employees through job products policy tailored to their needs. Furthermore, Bowen and Schneider (2014) indicated that internal marketing involved the use of a range of systems that worked to increase the
knowledge of employees in corporate organizations and to adopt effective marketing strategies to further involve and involve them in a variety of processes.

2.2 The Importance of Internal Marketing

Tansuhaj, Randall, and McCullough, (1991) illustrated that internal marketing increased employee loyalty to the organization. As a result, increased employee satisfaction, improved job efficiency, and reduced staff turnover could support the interactive process. According to Kotler (2003), internal marketing improved internal and external consumer awareness, as well as the elimination of functional barriers, in order to increase the Organizational actor. In addition, concentrate on obtaining employees' attention to organizational activities that need some changes in order to increase the efficiency of external marketing. Furthermore, spreading the culture of organization, and facilitating the workers' acceptance of the latest developments service to the customer.

According to Lings and Greenle (2005), internal marketing is essential for inspiring employees and enabling them to provide excellent customer service, which will increase customer satisfaction with the organization's services. Also, it is important because it treated workers as profitable customers. This strategy necessitates a detailed understanding of internal consumer motivations, resulting in continuous contact at all levels of an organization. Employees and management communicate and collaborate in this way, leading to success (Kale, 2010).

2.3 Innovation

Andrew and Smith (1996) defined innovation as creativity of the marketing program as the extent to which marketing practices in the product category was measured. According to Hollenstein (1996), innovation activity is a complex process that takes place in different phases from basic research to the introduction of new products. Fichman (2001) claimed that innovation is a creative process of developing or implementing new ideas that focuses on improving the features and functions of a product or service in order to provide better quality services to the target customers. In addition, Lyytinen and Rose (2003) stated that improvements to existing products and services are continuous innovations, and major changes or complete changes to the product or service are known as radical configuration are referred to as architectural innovations. Furthermore, Chen, Zhaohui, and Xie, (2004) added that innovation referred to the inclusion of a new combination of key production factors in the production system. The impact of innovation on overall organization performance is evidenced by a considerable amount of literature.

Fisk (2008) showed that organizations can use innovation as a leading force for competitiveness, growth, and profitability. According to Melissa (2008), innovation could lie in product, service or process innovation; these three categories are referred to as three levels of innovation. In addition, Baregheh, Rowley, and Sambrook, (2009) illustrated that innovation is a multistage process in which organizations convert ideas into improved products, services, or processes to successfully develop, compete and differentiate themselves in their markets. According to Kim and Pennings (2009), successful innovations give organizations a competitive advantage in a changing environment. In addition, Burgelman, Christensen, and Wheelwright, (2009) stated that innovation skills were viewed as a broad set of elements that facilitate and support an organization's technological strategies in the business environment and facilitate the successful use of these skills to maintain the organization's competitive performance. Furthermore, Olavarrieta and Villena (2014) defined innovation as the development of new products, business processes, services and organic changes that create wealth.
2.4 The Importance of Innovation

According to Hill and Jones (2009), innovation gives organizations unique advantages that cannot be replicated by competitors. Innovation is the art of creating a new process and product that includes product innovation and process innovation. Innovation is a key factor for sustainable competitive advantage. In addition, Bowonder, Dambal, Kumar, and Shirodkar, (2010) suggested that an innovation strategy can help an organization in three ways; first, exciting customers, second, outperform competition, and third, create a new product portfolio. Furthermore, Mihaela (2011) illustrated that the intensity of the innovation is an explanatory factor for differences in economic performance between organizations, regions and countries. Innovative organizations that have succeeded in innovation activities succeed at the expense of humble competitors involved in innovation.

Mehrabani (2012) highlighted that innovation is the ability to find ways to solve problems. According to Sousa (2012), organizational innovation has described the collaboration in the business world that connects people, ideas and resources that interact and produce through innovation. In addition, Khajeheian (2013) added that in a competitive environment, a natural strategy to maximize sales requires increasing market share by reducing costs, increasing productivity, or by designing and offering other product-related benefits. Innovation enabled organizations to operate competitively and to survive in the markets.

According to Najib, Dewi, and Widyastuti, (2014), business innovation influences the impact on the performance of individuals and organizations. In addition, Kitsios, Champipi, and Grigoroudis, (2015a) stated that innovation is not limited to innovations in products or services, but also includes opportunities to improve management. Furthermore, Bookis (2016) stated that innovation is more important as a strategy for an organization's survival. It is not only a question of growth, but also important in order to increase intense competition and uncertainty about the environment. The role of innovation is crucial for organizational performance as it can give the organization a sustainable competitive advantage and contribute to its long-term success.

2.5 Internal Marketing and Innovation

According to Hayton (2005), internal marketing implementation could foster the creation of informal cooperative relationships among the members of the firm thereby leading to voluntary exchange of information and perspectives, which in turn facilitate innovation. In addition, Steiglitz and Heine (2007) pointed out that employees could be an essential factor in ensuring the organization’s success in moving toward innovation to a large extent. Furthermore, Han (2010) stated that one of the methods for developing an organizational innovation is to have skilled human resources that contribute to the self-efficiency of employees.

According to González, Ángel, and Leticia, (2012), internal marketing was referred to as an instrument for human resource development which tries to identify and meet the needs of internal customers, human resource development could increase tolerance against potential failures in the innovation process through supporting creativity and innovation. In addition, Akroush, Abu-ElSamen, Samawi, and Odetallah, (2013) stated that organizational effort in the context of human resources is supported by internal marketing, which helps its implementation and causes an increase in the success of innovation. According to Jiang and Liu (2015), internal marketing focuses on strengthening relationships or weakened when there
is a critical factor for encouraging and supporting or impeding creativity and innovation in organizations.

In addition, since horizontal and vertical relation channels provide access to information and opportunities for expressing opinions, having open relations quickly leads to new knowledge and innovative idea transfer, which leads to innovation enhancement at the organizational level. Kajalo and Lindblom (2015) stated that internal marketing has been proposed variously as a structured approach to diffuse innovations, to create a service culture, and increase internal service productivity. Furthermore, Farouk, Abu Elanain, Obeidat, and AlNahyan, (2016) indicated that appropriate training aimed at enhancing their skills and knowledge is critical to facilitate organizational innovation.

Therefore, the research aims to investigate the relationship between internal marketing and innovation in hotels. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed

H1: There is a significant impact of internal marketing on innovation.

3. Methodology
The study methodology was quantitative in nature and used to facilitate a deductive approach to exploring the internal marketing practices the hotels investigated, and the effect of these practices on innovation. The purpose of this research is to provide the logical basis for the methodological choices made during this research and to explain how the data were collected and analyzed. A descriptive and analytical approach was followed, which described the phenomenon, and then analysis, and interpretation, based on the collected data. Greater Cairo hotels have been chosen as a prime case research area.

3.1 Sampling and Data Collection
The questionnaire forms were distributed to 598 respondents of staff from several positions who worked in greater Cairo hotels in a simple random sample. Data were collected from 28 June 2021 to 27 October 2021. A total of 453 forms were received, representing a response rate of 75.7%. There are 61 forms that were not reliable. Therefore, the reliable number of questionnaire forms was 392 for this study.

3.2 Measurements
In this study the questionnaire form composed of three sections to facilitate the data analysis process. The first section contains the demographics of the respondents and other work-related information. The second one measures internal marketing. A total of four items of internal marketing were used, which was adopted from Alhakeem (2019) and Samawi and Salman (2019). The third section comes to measure innovation through 4 items adopted from Al-Qurneh (2014) and Alhawarni (2017). A 5 Likert scale was used, fixed from 1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree.

4. Results and Discussions
The conceptual model and the hypothesized relationship were tested using PLS-SEM through Smart PLS 3 software and SPSS v. 20 for descriptive statistics. The first step in evaluating the PLS-SEM results involved examining a set of criteria for the measurement model. The specifications of the reflective measurement model were applied, meaning that the direction of causality was from the constructs to their observed variables or claims. When the

* In Arabic references
assessment of the measurement model was satisfactory, the next step was to assess the structural model.

### 4.1 Descriptive Statistics of Internal Marketing

Table (1) indicates that the attitudes of the respondents were more positive in their feelings of internal marketing, since internal marketing achieved a total mean of 4.08 with a standard deviation value of 0.694 which can be considered a general agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 The hotel management brings in competent individuals who are willing to perform the required tasks.</td>
<td>0.8 3.8 13.5 43.6 38.3</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The hotel management participates employees in the setting of plans and objectives.</td>
<td>3.3 12.8 15.6 42.1 26.3</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.081</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 The hotel allocates the necessary resources to increase the awareness of employees about the products and services offered to customers.</td>
<td>0.5 2 12.5 47.7 37.2</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hotel management is working to rely on advanced training programs to improve the capabilities of employees.</td>
<td>0.8 3.8 9.9 40.3 45.2</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### 4.2 Descriptive Statistics of Innovation

Table (2) indicates that the total mean of innovation was 4.04 with a standard deviation value of 0.788, which can be considered as a general agreement of the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 The hotel provides full support for creative individuals.</td>
<td>2.3 4.3 25 37.8 30.6</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The hotel evaluates the performance of the staff using modern methods.

| 2 | The hotel evaluates the performance of the staff using modern methods. | 2.1 | 5.1 | 16.3 | 40.3 | 36.2 | 4.04 | .956 | Agree |

The hotel focuses on creating new products and services.

| 3 | The hotel focuses on creating new products and services. | 1.3 | 4.1 | 12 | 49.2 | 33.4 | 4.09 | .852 | Agree |

The hotel can devise advanced methods and tools that help persuade customers to purchase hotel products and services.

| 4 | The hotel can devise advanced methods and tools that help persuade customers to purchase hotel products and services. | 1.3 | 3.6 | 11.5 | 46.9 | 36.7 | 4.14 | .849 | Agree |


4.3 The Measurement Model (Outer Model)

The measurement model reflects the relationship between each latent variable that needs to be predicted and the indicators that are also referred to as manifest variables (Ringle, Sarstedt, and Mooi, 2010). To evaluate the reliability of the measurement model, which is particularly done in reflective models, internal consistency reliability and indicator reliability have been tested. Validity refers to the extent of the accuracy of the assessment in which the nominated assessment measurement items correspond to a particular construct predicted by a theory. To assess the validity of the measurement model, the convergent and discriminant validity are tested (Henseler; Ringle; Sinkovics, 2009).

Convergent validity is measured by the Average Variance Extracted (AVE), which reflects the proportion of the explained variance that is captured for a particular construct about the amount of variance due to measurement error. An AVE above 0.5 means that, on average, construct can explain more than half of the variance of its indicators. If the AVE is less than 0.5, then the variance due to measurement error is greater than the variance due to the construct. The convergence validity of the construct in this case is questionable. Discriminant Validity refers to the level of correlation between measurement items of another unrelated construct with measurement items of other unrelated construct(s), which should not be correlated with one another. There are two ways for testing the discriminant validity, the Fornell-Larcker-Criterion performed on the construct level and cross-loadings performed on the indicator level (Henseler et al., 2009).

Table (3): The assessment criteria to determine reliability and validity of the measurement model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>criterion</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha</td>
<td>The minimum acceptable threshold is 0.7, and preferably is more than 0.8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite reliability</td>
<td>The composite reliability must not be less than 0.7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor loading</td>
<td>Absolute standardized outer loads should be significant at the 0.5 level and greater than 0.7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>The average variance extracted should be greater than 0.5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cross-loadings
The item loading of each indicator is highest for its designated construct.

Fornell–Larcker criterion
The square root of the AVE of a construct should be higher than the correlations between the construct and other constructs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor Load</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>Ave</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal marketing</td>
<td>Im 1</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>1.294</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>0.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Im 2</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>1.664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Im 3</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>1.855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Im 4</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>2.029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Inv 1</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>2.807</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>0.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inv 2</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>2.662</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inv 3</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>2.644</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inv 4</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>2.076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in table (5), no items cross-loaded as AVE value for all constructs range from 0.650 to 0.886, and thus, demonstrating cross-loading.

Table (5): The Cross-Loadings results of the measurement model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal marketing</th>
<th>innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Im 1</td>
<td>0.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im 2</td>
<td>0.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im 3</td>
<td>0.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im 4</td>
<td>0.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inv 1</td>
<td>0.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inv 2</td>
<td>0.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inv 3</td>
<td>0.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inv 4</td>
<td>0.558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in table (6), the square root AVE is greater than the intercorrelations as the AVE value for all constructs is higher than other constructs and thus, demonstrating discriminant validity.
Table (6): The Fornell-Larcker-criterion measurement model results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Internal marketing</th>
<th>Innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal marketing</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 The structural model (inner Model)

The structural model is a set of directed paths reflecting a causal chain between constructs (Henseler et al. 2009); where the relationship originated from one construct and pointed to another construct. According to Ringle et al. (2010), a structural model is usually a theoretical model hypothesized. In addition, Mateos-Aparicio (2011) stated that in the structural model, a path analysis approach is applied to analyze the parameters. Therefore, the values that appear on the paths between each of the constructs in the structural model are called “path coefficients”.

According to Hair, Sarstedt, Hopkins, and Kuppelwieser, (2014), when evaluating the structural model, there are five criteria were used. First, path coefficient must be of least (0.100) and at significance (at least 0.05). Second, values of coefficient of determination ($R^2$) were approximately 0.67, 0.33, and 0.19 are considered substantial, moderate, and weak, respectively (Hair; Sarstedt; Ringle; Mena, 2012). Third, effect size ($F^2$) the predictor variable values of .02, 0.15, and 0.35 reflect a low, medium, and large effect, respectively (Henseler and Chin, 2010). Fourth, the proposed threshold value for a tested model is predictive relevance ($Q^2$) should be > 0, where a higher $Q^2$ reflects a higher predictive relevance (Urbach and Ahlemann, 2010). Finally, goodness of fit (GoF) is the geometric mean of both the extracted average variances extracted (AVE) and the average of $R^2$ of the endogenous variables. The calculation formula of GoF is as follow:

$$GoF = \sqrt{(R^2 \times AVE)}$$

If GoF is less than 0.1, it means the model is no fit, if GoF is between 0.1 and 0.25 it means the model is a small fit, if GoF is between 0.25 and 0.36 it means the model is a medium fit, and when GoF is greater than 0.36 it means the model is large fit (Tenenhaus; Vinzi; Chatelin; Lauro, 2005; Wetzels; Odekerken-Schröder; Oppen, 2009).

As shown in Fig. 1 and Table (7) the results of the structural model show that internal marketing explains 48% of innovation; this result indicates a moderate explanatory power of internal marketing on innovation. In addition, Table (7) indicates that internal marketing had a strong appositive effect on innovation, as the value of $f^2$ value is 0.948 which > 0.35. As shown in Fig. 1 and Table (7) the result of the structural model shows that the value of $Q^2$ for the innovation > Zero which means that there is predictive relevance, and these results support the claim that this study model has adequate predictability. Furthermore, the result of the GoF for The Structural model is 0.5781 which is >0.36, this result means that the model is a large fit.
Figure (1): Structural model (Path coefficient, significance, and $R^2$)

Table (7): The results of the structural model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Effect Size ($F$)</th>
<th>coefficient of determination ($R^2$)</th>
<th>Prediction relevance ($Q^2$)</th>
<th>Goodness of Fit (GoF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal marketing -&gt; Innovation</td>
<td><strong>0.948</strong> (large)</td>
<td><strong>0.487</strong> (moderate)</td>
<td><strong>0.362</strong> (There is a Predictive Relevance)</td>
<td><strong>0.5781</strong> (Large fit)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Fig. 1 and Table (8) the result of the structural model shows that internal marketing had a positive relationship with innovation as ($\beta = 0.699$, p-value = 0.000); therefore, this result supported H1 [There is a statistically significant impact of internal marketing on innovation]. This result emphasized the dynamic relationship between internal marketing and innovation stated by Thomson and Hecker (2001) that by successfully implementing internal marketing, organizations could pave the way for creating innovation in their employees, and as well as improves their task performance. According to Prakash and Gupta (2008), internal marketing is one of the critical antecedents fostering high levels of organizational innovation. Ahmed and Rafiq (2003) claimed that internal marketing practices may create a favorable social climate that encourages employees for innovation. In this context, Narteh and Odoom (2015) believed that internal marketing could play a critical role in the process of creating and strengthening organizational innovation.

In addition, Jung, Jung, and Shin, (2016) explained that internal marketing is used by firms to inspire employees’ capabilities as internal customers and also to respond to organizational goals. Additionally, identified and highlighted the relationship between internal marketing and innovation in firm activities. Also, Popa, Soto-Acosta, and Martinez-Conesa, (2017)
provide empirical evidence for the positive effect of internal marketing on innovation capability of organization. Furthermore, Liao, Chen, Hu, Chung, and Liu, (2017) indicated that internal marketing allowed employees to express their creative thoughts and ideas without fear, which could lead to administrative innovation.

Table (8): Results of the research hypothesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Std. Beta</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>T- Value</th>
<th>P- Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal marketing -&gt; Innovation</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>22.276</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

❖ Significance at (0.05)

5. Conclusion
The results of the study show that internal marketing explains 48% of innovation; this result indicates a moderate explanatory power of internal marketing on innovation. In addition, internal marketing had a large appositive effect on the innovation. The results of the study show that internal marketing has a positive relationship with innovation as (β = 0.699, p-value = 0.000). This result emphasized the impact of internal marketing on innovation.

6. Implications of the study
This study explored important results and contributed theoretically and practically to the importance of internal marketing and its positive impact on innovation. Additionally, this study has contributed to the body of knowledge on marketing of hotels in several ways. First, the study has shown through empirical testing that incorporating internal marketing into hotels would strongly improve their innovation. Therefore, this implies that hotels should incorporate marketing in all aspects of their operations. Second, the study developed a broader model of internal marketing and innovation that incorporates the variables. As shown in Fig. 1 the model holds the view that if hotels adopted this broader view, they would greatly improve their innovation in the hospitality industry.

The findings of this study, when connected to the review of literature, resulted in major recommendations that have to be directed to hotel management in the area of internal marketing application and innovation.

• Increasing hotel interest of the departments of the hotels in the research and development departments and giving them the appropriate importance to introduce and improve products and services to suit customer requirements.
• Attention to human capabilities in hotels to enable them to innovate and strategic thinking as they are the most important and essential element in the life cycle of the marketing service.
• Increasing the interest of the hotels in the types of marketing strategy as it is one of the basic tools that help it in introducing new products and services. Especially internal marketing, as it is through the results has a large effect on the hotels' innovation.

7. Limitations of the study
This study contained some limitations. First, the population of this study composed of respondents from five-star hotels. Due to the nature of the hotel industry, the results may not be generalizable to other different categories. Second, this study was confined to five-star hotels in greater Cairo geographic area in Egypt, so the findings may not be generalizable to
other areas or countries. *Third*, the results derived from the data collected within a specific time period "During June, 2021". Therefore, other empirical longitudinal studies are needed to give more reliable implications.

8. **Directions of future research**

Internal marketing research must be updated to reflect the experiences of organizations that have applied it. Furthermore, this study can be used to derive many ideas for possible future research. **First**, logical extension of this study is to conduct research that investigate the impact of internal marketing application on organizations' flexibility and organization’ performance. It would also be useful to compare the findings of this study with those reveled from other studies applied on four- and three-star hotels or different geographical areas. **Second**, further research may aim to investigate the same research hypothesis but, in another sector, or industry.
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دور تسويق الأداء في تحقيق ميزة تنافسية مستدامة للفنادق

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>معلومات المقال</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>الكلمات الدالة: صناعة الضيافة</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

بالتركيز على قطاع صناعة الضيافة، فإن الموظفين هم العوامل القلبي للمنظمة، ولديهم القدرة على تغيير مستقبل المنظمة، بالإضافة إلى ذلك، يتم الاعتراف بالإبداع كواحد من القدرات الرئيسية التي تؤثر على النجاح التنظيمي. لذلك تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى معرفة تأثير التسويق الداخلي على الإبداع في الفنادق. من خلال مراجعة الأدبيات ذات الصلة، تم افتراض العلاقات بين التسويق الداخلي والإبداع. وركزت الدراسة على التسويق الداخلي كمتغير مستقل والإبداع كمتغير تابع. اعتمدت الدراسة على المنهج الكمي. تم جمع البيانات من خلال الاستبانس لاختبار فرضيات الدراسة. تم جمع البيانات من (392) من المدراء والمشرفين والموظفين العاملين بهذه الفنادق بمحافظة القاهرة الكبرى. تم تحليل النتائج والفرضيات واحترافها من خلال برنامج SPSS V.16.0 وبرنامج PLS.3. أشارت النتائج إلى وجود تأثير كبير للتسويق الداخلي على الإبداع. علاوة على ذلك، تحمل هذه النتائج أهمية نظرية وعملية للفنادق. كما قدمت الدراسة عددًا من التوصيات، من بينها أهمية الحفاظ على المستوى الذي تم تحقيقه من خلال اعتماد التسويق الداخلي، وزيادة تحسين الإبداع في الفنادق الخاضعة للدراسة.