

Employee retention: A catalyst for the growth of tourism

Dr. Sasmita Mohanty

Assistant Professor, Hospitality & Tourism Management, School of Hotel Management, SOA Deemed to be University, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

Abstract

The tourism and hospitality are still in the nascent stage in the state of Odisha. Tourism is a highly labour intensive sector and has the potential to generate high employment growth through a mix of activities. It is the accommodation sector that amalgamates with a host of other employment generating sectors through back and forth linkages to maximise tourist satisfaction through competent human resource. Therefore, practices of good human resources can be considered as an alternative approach for the growth of tourism sector. Hence, is it considered that low pay, low career opportunity, poor employment conditions, low job security, etc are the issues prevalent in accommodation industry. This paper studies the key factors associated with turnover of employee in the accommodation sector in Odisha. The study has made a conscious attempt to discover aspects as perceived by the employees and employers as important for them to retain employment in the accommodation sector. Factor Analysis and Paired 'T' tests were carried out to find out the veracity of the hypotheses taken under the study.

Keywords: labour intensive, adventure tourism, strategy, accommodation sector

Introduction

Employees are the reason for any organisation's growth and success rate. According to modern school of thought by human resource experts, the most valuable assets an organisation can have is the human capital^[30]. The human architects have become the competitive advantage and is very difficult to duplicate them in any form or manner^[37]. Any person who has agreed to offer service in exchange for money is considered to be an employee for that particular establishment or organisation^[28]. Various researchers have studied on employee turnover^[24]. They are done extensive research on why employees leave their jobs and reasons behind their leaving the jobs. According to them the reasons could be low pay, poor career prospects, work-life balance due to hectic and erratic schedules, etc.,^[24].

Employee turnover has always been a major concern for hospitality industry for years and shall continue to be imperative as it affects employee morale, quality of service, and hotel business^[24]. One of the major benefits of the hospitality industry is that it provides employment due to its sectors such as travel agencies, tour operators, transportation, accommodation, food and beverage, etc., which require a rich and varied skills and competencies. The^[46] indicates that, employment in tourism and hospitality was estimated to be over 230 million jobs and over ten percent of the gross domestic product worldwide by 2007. Various studies suggest that there is a positive relationship between employee satisfaction and customer satisfaction^[3, 25, 39, 44]. One of the reasons for organisations' success is their ability to manage efficiently and quickly to satisfy the needs and wants of the customers^[17].

In order to meet the growing demand of tourists for accommodation, Government of Odisha accorded industrial

status to the hotel sector for the first time in the country so as to attract investors to increase the capacity of hotel rooms and beds at tourist centres in 1980. It provided provided land and financial support for the hoteliers like Oberoi, Taj, Swosti, Prachi group of hotels and other entrepreneurs to build all categories of hotel in the state. Hotel and Restaurant Association of Orissa (HRAO) was established in 1985, which is the largest body made up of tour operators and travel agents, travel trade owners and professionals' hotels and tourism educational institutions in Odisha. The members of the association operate in close cooperation with each other with one common motive of promotion of tourism industry of Odisha.

The Government of Odisha is giving high priority to the development and promotion of both tourism and hotel industry. As there was a shortage of skilled manpower in Odisha, hotels during their initial stage had no other options but to recruit employees from other States. Most of the recruitments were in managerial positions, especially, in the areas like Front Office, Food Production and Food and Beverage Services (Data collected from HR records of various standard Hotels of Bhubaneswar, Odisha). The data revealed that 40% of the recruitments were from West Bengal, 15% from Uttar Pradesh and 10% from Southern States. With the growing need of manpower in hotel industry, the State Government of Odisha introduced a 3 years Diploma Course in Hotel Management & Catering Technology and the Institute was renamed as "State Institute of Hotel Management" in 1981. The Institute was further upgraded to the national level by the Government of India and was named as "Institute of Hotel Management Catering Technology & Applied Nutrition" in the year 1984. It started its full-fledged programs like Diploma and Degree in Hotel Management and

Catering Technology. Students from the various parts of the country joined in this Institute and eventually, hotel industry in Odisha could address the manpower shortage issues. Employee retention as of today is a major issue in the Accommodation Sector of Odisha which is directly affecting the Hotel Business as well as the growth of Tourism. The important possible factors that affect the employee retentions are better career opportunities in other Metros, Compensation and benefits, family issues, working environment, job satisfaction and recognition.

Literature Review

A voluntary move by any organisation to engage its employees on a long-term basis for the betterment and creating an environment of trust and cohesiveness is through retention policy it adopts.

According to [9], this association should be able to create a bond between the employees and the organisation by infusing values and a sense of comradeship [21], work-life balance, subordinate and superior relationship, peer to peer relationship, lack of training [40, 6, 11], peer and supervisor relationship [14] cultural context [38], rewards [20], seasonality of business and nature of jobs [19, 12, 27, 29, 45]. Having control over these factors can possibly help the hospitality industry to grow and prosper [4, 5, 8] from high turnover cost [11].

Compensation plays significant role in attracting and retaining good employees specially those employees who give outstanding performance or unique skill which is indispensable to the organization. Several studies have pointed out the impact of employee compensation, rewards and employee relation on turnover and retention [2, 10, 16, 22, 31, 36, 43]. Financial and non-financial payments are nothing but benefits received by an employee which are positively linked to retention [35, 13, 23]. According to [41], recognition from superiors, team members, co-workers and customer enhances loyalty. Employee participation in effective decision making is also important [12, 15]. Job satisfaction is a set of feeling and emotions with which employees view their work that result from the perception that a job allows for the fulfilment of job values for the job holder [32, 7, 42] indicating that career development plan for the employees play a vital role in the retention of employees.

The other factors that may help to reduce turnover rate of the organizations as [33], suggested are vphysical environment of the work place, that effects the performance level, motivation

and satisfaction of the employees. Employee benefits provision (2010).Research also recognizes that organization whose support their employee in integrating between family responsibilities and work reduce the employee intention regarding leave the job [1]. [34] opined that, flexible work arrangement as a very important part of work-life balance that plays pivotal rule in the retention of employees.

Objectives of the Study

- To explore the reasons behind employee turnover in classified hotels of Odisha
- To explore key employment-related issues which could prove useful in reducing employee turnover rate and possibly identify employment traits or characteristics which would increase retention.

Research Methodology

The study relies on both secondary and primary data. The secondary data sources are publications of the tourism industry available from multiple sources including books, journals, brochures, reports, and the Internet. The primary data were gathered from (Executives and employees) of the classified hotels of Odisha. Data were collected from the HR department of various classified Hotels. For the purpose of the study 100 respondents from 10 hotels consisting of 35 executives and 65 non-executive categories of employees were interviewed.

Sampling

A sample survey of 200 numbers of respondents from 10 classified hotels were taken. Out of which 100 numbers were Employers and 100 numbers were employees. A total of 200 questionnaire were initially administered.

Measurement

The variables of employee retention factors was measured in 5 point Likert Scale format ranging from 1- 'Strongly Disagree' to 5 'Strongly Agree'.

Method of Analysis

Prior to hypothesis testing, Factor analysis was initially undertaken for the study using a co-variance Matrix as input to test the factors to evaluate the distinctiveness of the measures used in this study. The research hypotheses were subsequently tested using t-test.

Table 1: Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	1.533	19.161	19.161	1.533	19.161	19.161
2	1.328	16.602	35.763	1.328	16.602	35.763
3	1.257	15.716	51.478	1.257	15.716	51.478
4	1.097	13.716	65.194	1.097	13.716	65.194
5	.916	11.454	76.649			
6	.812	10.151	86.800			
7	.547	6.834	93.634			
8	.509	6.366	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

The table – 1 shows the out of eight variables of employee retention factors only the four factors are extracted. 65% of data is variable and 35% is invariable.

Table 2: Component Matrix^a

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
Salary and Reward	.274	.501	-.436	.052
Compensation	-.063	.586	.534	.003
Stress at Work Place	.396	.204	-.187	.667
Job satisfaction	-.727	.118	-.118	.467
Motivation	.437	.527	-.150	-.443
Career opportunity	.204	.083	.842	.153
Work Environment	.298	-.573	.044	-.190
Professional and Nonprofessional Tussle	-.670	-.256	.032	.419

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
a. 4 components extracted.

The table - 2 shows the out of eight variables of employee retention factors only the four factors are extracted, they are professional and nonprofessional tussle which contribute as the most important factors for employee retention followed by motivation, stress at work place and work environment.

Table 3: Mean Overall Employee’s Perception towards Employee Retention

Sl. No.	Employee Perception	Mean
1	Salary and Reward	1.83
2	Compensation	2.47
3	Stress at Work Place	3.13
4	Job satisfaction	3.55
5	Motivation	2.60
6	Career Opportunity	2.74
7	Work Environment	3.77
8	Professional and Nonprofessional Tussle	2.32
9	Grand Mean Index	2.8

As would be seen from the above Table - 3, employee perception is high with their job though not to an optimum level. The overall mean perception index score is 2.8. This means that they are satisfied with their jobs up to 80 per cent level. However, there are some attributes like ‘Salary and Reward’, ‘Compensation’, ‘Career opportunity’, ‘motivation’ and ‘professional and nonprofessional tussle’ in which

thelevel of dissatisfaction is high. The one area with which they are most dissatisfied is their ‘Salary and Reward’ (Mean – 1.83); and another aspect with which they are least reactive towards the Work environment (Mean – 3.77).

This table indicated the employer’s perception level towards the employee retention with the similar factors as perceived by the employees. The Mean is calculated and presented in the table.

Table 4: Mean Overall Employer’s Perception towards Employee Retention

Sl No.	Employer Perception	Mean
1	Salary and Reward	3.56
2	Compensation	3.81
3	Stress at Work Place	3.60
4	Job satisfaction	3.55
5	Motivation	3.40
6	Career Opportunity	3.56
7	Work Environment	3.82
8	Professional and Nonprofessional Tussle	3.88
9	Grand Mean Index	3.64

In Table – 4, the Perception level of employer is more than moderate. The grand mean index score of 3.64 implies that employer’s perception to a larger extent is up to a maximum level. To find out whether the differences were statistically significant or not, a paired ‘t’ test was employed. The results of this test are presented in the Table.

Hypothesis I proposed that are significant differences in the employee perception and employer’s perception with regard to Factors contributing to Employee Retention. In order to evaluate the differences paired sample t-test was conducted.

Table 5: Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Employers	3.6663	8	.16431	.05809
	Employee	2.808750	8	.6415926	.2268372

Paired Samples Test									
		Paired Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower				Upper
Pair 1	Employers - Employee	.8575000	.6227072	.2201603	.3369037	1.3780963	3.895	7	.006

The result is summarised in Table – 5 shows that the Sig. (2-Tailed) value is 0.006. This value is less than .05. Because of this we can conclude that there are significant difference in Employees and Employer’s perception towards the factors contributing to employee retention.

Hypothesis II: Proposed that there are significant differences in the employee perception and employer’s perception towards salary and reward as a factor for employee retention. In order to evaluate the differences paired sample t-test was conducted.

Table 6: Salary and Reward

Paired Samples Statistics					
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Salary and Reward (Employers)	3.56	99	1.255	.126
	Salary and Reward (Employees)	1.83	99	.893	.090

Paired Samples Test									
		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Salary and Reward (Employers) - Salary and Reward (Employees)	1.727	1.504	.151	1.427	2.027	11.428	98	.002

The result is summarised in Table – 6 the Sig. (2- Tailed) value is 0.002. This value is less than .05. Because of this we can conclude that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean towards the perception of salary and reward by employers and employees. Employees perceive that they get less Salary and reward whereas the employers perceive that the employees are well paid.

Hypothesis III proposed that there are significant differences in the employee perception and employer’s perception towards Compensation as a factor for employee retention. In

order to evaluate the differences paired sample t-test was conducted.

Table 7: Compensation

Paired Samples Statistics					
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Compensation (Employers)	3.81	99	1.085	.109
	Compensation (Employees)	2.47	99	1.082	.109

Paired Samples Test									
		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Compensation (Employers) - Compensation (Employees)	1.333	1.552	.156	1.024	1.643	8.549	98	.002

The result is summarised in Table – 7 the Sig. (2- Tailed) value is 0.000. This value is less than .05. Because of this we can conclude that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean towards the perception of Compensation by employers and employees. Employees perceive that their compensation package is not up to their expectation, whereas the employers perceive that the employees are well

compensated.

Hypothesis IV proposed that there are significant differences in the employee perception and employer’s perception towards Stress at work Place as a factor for employee retention. In order to evaluate the differences paired sample t-test was conducted.

Table 8: Stress at Work Place

Paired Samples Statistics					
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Stress at Work Place (Employers)	3.60	99	1.277	.128
	Stress at Work Place (Employees)	3.13	99	1.122	.113

Paired Samples Test									
		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Stress at Work Place (Employers) – Stress at Work Place (Employees)	.465	1.606	.161	.144	.785	2.879	98	.005

The result is summarised in Table – 8 the Sig. (2- Tailed) value is 0.005. This value is less than .05. Because of this we can conclude that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean towards the perception of Stress at work place by employers and employees. Employees perceive that their job is very stressful, whereas the employers perceive that the employee’s work place is less stressful.

Hypothesis V proposed that there are no significant differences in the employee perception and employer’s perception towards Job Satisfaction as a factor for employee retention. In order to evaluate the differences paired sample t-test was conducted

Table 9: Job Satisfaction

Paired Samples Statistics					
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Job satisfaction (Employers)	3.70	99	1.305	.131
	Job satisfaction (Employees)	3.55	99	1.248	.125

Paired Samples Test									
		Paired Differences					t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Job satisfaction (Employers) - Job satisfaction (Employees)	.152	1.809	.182	-.209	.512	.833	98	.407

The result is summarised in Table – 9 the Sig. (2- Tailed) value is 0.407. This value is greater than .05. Because of this we can conclude that there is a statistically no significant difference between the mean towards the perception of Job satisfaction by employers and employees.

Hypothesis VI proposed that there are statistical insignificant differences in the employee perception and employer’s perception towards Motivation as a factor for employee retention. In order to evaluate the differences paired sample t-test was conducted.

Table 10: Motivation

Paired Samples Statistics					
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Motivation (Employers)	3.40	99	1.772	.178
	Motivation (Employees)	2.60	99	.957	.096

Paired Samples Test									
		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Motivation (Employers) - Motivation (Employees)	.808	2.074	.208	.395	1.222	3.878	98	.002

The result is summarised in Table – 10 the Sig. (2- Tailed) value is 0.002. This value is less than .05. Because of this we can conclude that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean towards the perception of Motivation by employers and employees. Employees perceive that are not motivated, whereas the employers perceive that the employees are well motivated.

Hypothesis VII proposed that there are significant differences in the employee perception and employer’s perception towards Career Opportunity as a factor for employee retention. In order to evaluate the differences paired sample t-test was conducted.

Table 11: Career Opportunity

Paired Samples Statistics					
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Career Opportunity(Employers)	3.56	99	1.272	.128
	Career opportunity (Employees)	2.74	99	1.046	.105

Paired Samples Test									
		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Career Opportunity (Employers) – Career opportunity (Employees)	.818	1.656	.166	.488	1.148	4.916	98	.002

The result is summarised in Table – 11 the Sig. (2- Tailed) value is 0.002. This value is less than .05. Because of this we can conclude that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean towards the perception of Career Opportunity by employers and employees. Employees

perceive that are their career opportunities are not good whereas the employers perceive that the employees get good career opportunities.

Hypothesis VIII proposed that there are no significant

differences in the employee perception and employer’s perception towards Work Environment as a factor for

employee retention. In order to evaluate the differences paired sample t-test was conducted.

Table 12: Work Environment

Paired Samples Statistics					
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Work Environment (Employers)	3.82	99	1.232	.124
	Work Environment (Employees)	3.77	99	1.141	.115

Paired Samples Test									
		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Work Environment (Employers) Work Environment (Employees)	.051	1.521	.153	-.253	.354	.330	98	.742

The result is summarised in Table – 12 the Sig. (2- Tailed) value is 0.742. This value is greater than .05. Because of this we can conclude that there is no statistically insignificant difference between the mean towards the perception of Work environment by employers and employees.

Hypothesis IX proposed that there are significant differences in the employee perception and employer’s perception towards Professional and Nonprofessional Tussle as a factor for employee retention. In order to evaluate the differences paired sample t-test was conducted.

Table 13: Professional and Nonprofessional Tussle

Paired Samples Statistics					
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Professional and Nonprofessional Tussle (Employers)	3.88	99	1.189	.119
	Professional and Nonprofessional Tussle (Employee)	2.38	99	1.184	.119

Paired Samples Test									
		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Professional and Nonprofessional Tussle (Employers) Professional and Nonprofessional Tussle (Employee)	1.495	1.781	.179	1.140	1.850	8.353	98	.002

The result is summarised in Table – 13 the Sig. (2- Tailed) value is 0.002. This value is less than .05. Because of this we can conclude that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean towards the perception of professional and nonprofessional tussle by employers and employees.

Summary of the results

The summary of the results is discussed in the following. We conducted a comparison between the perception of employees and employers towards the factors contributing in retention of employees in hotels in Odisha. From the results, we may see that there are eight variables in the research questionnaires which were distributed to employers and employees in various star category hotels in Odisha. After a data acquisition in SPSS, it is found that the employees’ perception towards factors such as salary & reward, compensation, stress at work place, working with co-workers, motivation, career opportunity and professional and non-professional tussle were the major contributor of employee turnover in hotels.

Conclusion

From the inception of hotel business, employee turnover has

been a major issue in Odisha. These alarming issues not only affect the hotel enterprises but also growth and development of tourism industry in the State. This means that compensation is a major factor that employees consider when making the decision to leave or remain in an organisation. Due to the increase in sudden rise of global economy, the per capita income has also increased considerably and the prices of vital commodities like transportation, food, accommodations etc. have hiked. In this respect, Hotel and Restaurant Association of Odisha (HARRO), an apex body should take into consideration this important matter to meet the employee’s expectation leading to better practices of hotel business as well as to sustain the tourism and hospitality in the State. Due to the globalization and technological advancement, people get ample opportunity to explore in different places rather than their home town. Therefore, in this study, the factor better job opportunity also occupies a significant place. It is very important for management to develop a retention strategy that addresses employee compensation and job satisfaction as major factors. This means that management should be able to create a total reward structure that includes more than just compensation. Compensation and benefits package of

employees should be lucrative so that it attracts the valued employees to remain in the organization.

References

1. Allen TD. Family-Supportive Work Environments: The Role of Organizational Perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 2001; 58(3):414-435.
2. Becker BE, Huselid MA. High performance work systems and firm performance: A synthesis of research and managerial implications. *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*. 1998; 16:53-101.
3. Bernhardt KL, Donthu N, Kennett PA. A longitudinal analysis of satisfaction and profitability. *Journal of Business Research*. 2000; 47:161-171.
4. Birdir K. General Manager Turnover and root causes. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*. 2002; 14(1):43-47.
5. Brien A. The New Zealand hotel industry: vacancies increase while applicant and caliber decreases. *International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Administration*. 2004; 5(1):87-103.
6. Carbery R, Garavan TN, O'Brien F, McDonnell J. Predicting hotel managers' turnover cognitions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 2003; 18(7):649-679.
7. Cascio, Wayne F. *Managing Human Resources: Productivity, Quality of Work Life, Profits* (Seventh Edition). New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Company Limited. 2007.
8. Chalkiti K, Sagala M. Staff turnover in Greek tourism industry: A comparison of Insular and peninsular industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*. 2009; 22(3):335-359. doi: 10.1108/09596111011035945
9. Chaminade B. A retention checklist: how do you rate?. 2007. www.humanresourcesmagazine.co.au. Accessed, 28 November, 2007.
10. Cho S, Woods RH, Jang S, Erdem M. Measuring the impact of human resource management practices on hospitality firms' performances. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. 2006; 25:262-277.
11. Davidson MCG, Timo N, Wang Y. How much does labor turnover cost? A case study of Australian four-five star hotels. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*. 2010; 22(4):451-466. doi:10.1108/09596111011042686.
12. Davies R. How to boost staff retention. In *people management*. 2001; 7(8):54-56.
13. Deery MA, Shaw RN. An exploratory analysis of turnover culture in the hotel industry in Australia. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. 1997; 16(3):375-392.199
14. Lazear EP. Salaries and piece rates. *Journal of Business*. 1986; 59(1):405-431.
15. Garaen G, Dansereau F, Minami T. Dysfunctional leadership styles. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*. 1972; 7: 216-228.
16. Gold M. Breaking all the rules for recruitment and retention. *Journal of career planning and employment*. 2001; 61(3):6-8.
17. Guthrie J. High involvement work practices, turnover, and productivity: evidence from New Zealand. *Academy of Management Journal*. 2001; 44(1):180-90.
18. Gursoy D, McCleary KW. Travelers' prior knowledge and its impact on their information search behavior. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*. 2004; 28(1):66-94.
19. Harter JK, Schmidt FL, Hayes TL. Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business out-comes: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2002; 87(2):268-279.
20. Hartmen S, Yrle A. Can the hobo phenomena explain voluntary turnover? *International journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*. 1996; 8(4):11-16.
21. Hansen F, Smith M, Hansen RB. HRM and universalism: Is there one best way? *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. 2002, 221-228.
22. Holdsworth L, Cartwright S. Empowerment, stress, and satisfaction: An exploratory study of a call center. *Leadership and organizational Development Journal*. 2003; 3:13-22.
23. Huselid MA. The impact of human resource management practices on turnover productivity, and corporate financial performance. In *Academy of Management Journal*. 1995; 38:635-72.
24. Gruber J, Madrian B. Health insurance and job mobility: The effect of public policy on job lock. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*. 1994; 48:86-101.
25. Khatri N, Chong TF. Explaining Employee Turnover in an Asian Context. *Human Resource Management Journal*. 2001; 11(1):54-74.
26. Kirschenbaum A, Weisberg J. Predicting worker turnover: An assessment of intent on actual separations. *Human Relations*. 1990; 43:829-847.
27. Koys D. How the achievement of human-resources goals drives restaurant performance. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*. 2003; 44(1):17-24.
28. Kuslivan S. *Multinational enterprises in tourism; A case study of Turkey*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Strathclyde University, the Scottish Hotel School, Glasgow. 2003.
29. Ladkin A, Juwaheer TD. The career paths of hotel general manager in Mauratius. *International journal of contemporary Hospitality Management*. 2000; 12(2):119-125.
30. *Legal Dictionary*. Definition of employees. 2011. retrieved on 26 February 2011 from: <http://www.duhaime.org/LegalDictionary/E/Emoloyee.aspx>.
31. McCabe VS, Savery LK. Butterflying a new career pattern for Australia? Empirical evidences. *Journal of Management Development*. 2007; 26(2):103-116.
32. Mello JA. *Strategic Management of Human Resources*. Canada: Nelson Education, Ltd. 2011.
33. Milman A, Ricci P. Predicting job retention of hourly employees in the lodging industry. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*. 2004; 11(1):23-41.
34. Newstrom, John W. *Organizational Behaviour: Human Behaviour at Work* (Twelfth Edition). New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill Education Private limited. 2009.
35. Oldham Greg R, Brass Daniel J. Employee Reactions to

- an Open-Plan Office: A Naturally Occurring Quasi-Experiment, *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 1979; 24(2):267-284.
36. Pasewark, William R, Ralph Viator E. Sources of Work-Family Conflict in The Accounting Profession, *Behavioral Research In Accounting*. 2006; 18(1):147-165.
 37. Odunlade RO. Managing employee compensation and benefits for job satisfaction in libraries and information centers in Nigeria, *Library Philosophy and Practice*. 2012; 714.
 38. Shaw JD, Delery JE, Jenkins GD Jr, Gupta N. An organization-level analysis of voluntary and involuntary turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*. 1998; 41(5):511-525.
 39. Schuler RS, Jackson SE. Organisation strategy and organisation level as determinants of human resource management practice. *Human Resource Planning*. 1987; 10(2):441-455.
 40. Sheridan JE. Organizational culture and employee retention. *Academy of Management Journal*. 1992; 35:1036-1054.
 41. Tornow WW, Wiley JW. Service quality and management practices: a look at employee attitudes, customer satisfaction, and bottom-line consequences. *Human Resource Planning*. 1991; 14:105-115.
 42. Tutuncu O, Kozak M. An investigation of factors affecting job satisfaction, *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*. 2007; 8(1):1-19.
 43. Walker JW. Perspectives Human resource planning. 2001; 24(1):6-10.
 44. Vos Ans D, Meganck A. What HR managers do versus what employees value Exploring both parties' views on retention management from a psychological contract perspective, *Personnel Review*. 2009; 38(1):45-60.
 45. Walsh K, Taylor MS. Developing in-house careers and retaining management talent: What hospitality professionals want from their jobs? *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*. 2007; 48(2):163-182.
 46. Wangenheim FW, Evanschitzky H, Wunderlich M. Does the employee–customer satisfaction link hold for all employee groups? *Journal of Business Research*. 2007.
 47. Willie PA, Jayawardena C, Laver B. Attracting and retaining quality human resource for Niagara's hospitality industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality*. 2008; 20(3):293-301. doi: 10.1108/09596110810866109.
 48. World Travel, Tourism Council. Year 2001: Tourism satellite accounting research summary and highlights. World Travel and Tourism Council : London. 2006.