

Reasons to Stay on the Job by Employees of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore- Employee Statement vs. HOD Perception - A Gap Analysis

Prasannakumar. J.P,

HOD- Management Studies - Hospitality,
Faculty of Hospitality Management & Catering Technology,
M.S.Ramaiah University of Applied Sciences, Bangalore

Abstract

Employees don't leave their company they leave their bosses- this same could be considered for their stay on the job. The current study conducted on the five star hotels of Bangalore to compare the reasons to stay on the job stated by employees and the reasons to stay on the job perceived by heads of the departments. Out of the thirteen five star hotels, nine five star hotels which were operational for at least two years prior to 2009 have participated in the study. A total of 450 questionnaires 54 questionnaires were administered to employees and Heads of the Departments of the 9 Five Star Hotels in Bangalore respectively. A total of 371 (response rate of 82.44%) and 51 (response rate of 94.4 %) completed valid questionnaires were returned by employees and heads of the departments of these 9 Five Star Hotels respectively. The study reveals that the most important reasons to stay on the job stated by employees of the Five Star Hotels of Bangalore are Good Supervisor/ Manager, Enjoyable Co-workers, Sense of Mission/ Purpose, Challenging job assignments, Interesting work, Feeling appreciated for what I do, Convenient location, whereas the most important reasons for employees to stay on the job perceived by the Heads of the Departments of the Five Star Hotels of Bangalore are Interesting work, Appreciation of what they do, Sense of Mission / Purpose, Education and development, Enjoyable co-workers and Challenging job assignments, Good supervisor / manager and Career opportunities. The study reveals that as far as Salary and Benefits & Perks as a reason to stay on the job by employees are concerned, there is significant difference between the statement of employees and the perceptions of Heads of the Departments of the Five Star Hotels in Bangalore.

Keywords: Hospitality Industry, Tourism Industry, Employee Satisfaction, Employee Turnover, Employee Retention

1. INTRODUCTION TO HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM INDUSTRY

Hospitality and tourism industry has emerged as one of the world's major industries during the past few decades. The hospitality and tourism industry has accounted for much economic growth, balance of payment, employment and regional balance in many countries. They are also important to the society, the culture and the environment of those who become tourists and for their hosts. Many businesses and other organizations, as well as governments take a lot of interest in the future of hospitality and tourism. (Lockwood and Medlik, (2001). Greenberg and Baron (1997), in their book, "Behavior in organizations", are of the opinion that the hospitality organization must be aware of the basic essential fact that its people are the key to the success of organizations. The hotel industry in India is at a turning point, where it is witnessing an influx of international and domestic branded hotels, along with a renewed interest by investors. One of the major challenges of the hotel industry, where the customer pays for much more than only the tangible product offerings, is managing manpower. The challenges faced in managing manpower include increasing salaries and benefits, high levels of employee turnover with the addition of new hospitality organizations and its contribution to other service industries such as retail and travel firms, and the frequent need for employee training in order to maintain standards in service.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Perspective of job satisfaction

Two - Factor Theory (Herzberg, 1959)

Frederick Herzberg (1959) found that the traditional view of job satisfaction was incomplete. He was of the view that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are at opposite ends of a single continuum. People might be satisfied, dissatisfied, or somewhere in between. But Herzberg had identified two different dimensions altogether: one ranging from satisfaction to no satisfaction and the other ranging from dissatisfaction to no dissatisfaction.

Herzberg argues that there are two stages in the process of motivating employees. First, manager must ensure that the hygiene factors are not poor. Pay and security must be appropriate, working conditions must be safe, technical supervision must be acceptable, and so on. By providing hygiene factors at an appropriate level, managers do not stimulate motivation but merely ensure that employees are not dissatisfied." Employees whom managers attempt to "satisfy" through hygiene factors alone will usually do just enough to get by. Thus, managers should proceed to stage two—giving employees the opportunity to experience motivation factors such as achievement and recognition. The result is predicted to be a high level of satisfaction and motivation. Herzberg also goes a step farther than most theorists and describes exactly how to use the two factor theory in the workplace. Specifically, he recommends

job enrichment. He argues that jobs should be redesigned to provide higher levels of the motivation factors. Salazar, J & Hubbard, S (2000), stated that another benefit of job satisfaction is reduced turnover. Guthrie, (2001), is of the opinion that employees feel satisfied when they are provided certain degree of freedom in carrying out their tasks and taking job related decisions, and they enjoy performing jobs which demand higher levels of skills and knowledge. Arnett, D.B., Laverie, D.A., & McLane, C. (2002) that, Job satisfaction can be a leading contribution factor for the success of a service industry employer. Feinstein, (2002) tried to gain a better understanding of the relationships between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of employees at two locations of a national restaurant chain in Southern Nevada. Tenure satisfaction with policies, compensation, work conditions, and advancement were found to have a significant relationship to organizational commitment. Saker, A.H., Crossman, A. and Chinmeteepituck, P. (2003), stated that the satisfied workers will be more productive and stay with the organization longer, while dissatisfied workers will be less productive and will have more tendency to quit the work in between. Mc Shane & Glinow, (2005) in their book, "Organizational Behavior", states that Job satisfaction refers to how employees perceive their jobs. Green and Tsitsianis, (2005) stated that changing job insecurity does not explain the fall in job satisfaction in either country. It is found that intensification of work effort and declining task discretion account for the fall in job satisfaction in Britain. In Germany there was a modest fall in the proportion of people working the number of hours that they wanted to. However, while working too many or too few hours is a significant source of job dissatisfaction, the changes were too small to account for the fall in job satisfaction. Benz and Frey, (2008), states that both job content and job security are found to affect the overall job satisfaction of employees. Individuals value independence and dislike hierarchy as such, over and above the associated outcomes. Ivancevich, et al. (2008), stated that if employees experience high satisfaction with their jobs, it may create a pleasurable emotional state and a positive reaction with the organization. Rajendran and Chandramohan (2010) stated that the significance of job satisfaction can be assessed from the fact that it not only influences the efficiency of workers but also impacts job behaviour such as absenteeism, accidents, work stress and employee turnover.

3. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

To analyse the gap between the reasons stated by employees to stay on the job and reasons for employees to stay on the job perceived by the Heads of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore. Significance and Justification of the Study: Generally, the policy decisions by the top management of any organization are usually based on the recommendations or feedback provided by the Heads of the Departments. There are many studies conducted on reasons for employees to stay on the job and the reasons for employees to leave the job, but there is no research done to compare the reasons stated by employees to stay on the job and reasons for employees to stay on the job perceived by heads of the departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore. This study would definitely throw

light on the gap in the reasons stated by employees to stay on the job and for employees to stay on the job perceived by heads of the departments. Thus, a better employee compensation and retention strategy can be followed by the hotels.

3.1 Hypotheses

H₀= There is **no** significant difference between the reasons stated by employees to stay on the job and the reasons for employees to stay on the job perceived by the Heads of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The questionnaires in this study were self – administered. The researcher, with the help of employees from the HR departments of the hotels randomly administered the Employee Profile questionnaires to employees. The researcher explained all questions on the questionnaire to the HR employees who in turn explained them to the respondents. Several follow – up telephone calls were made by the researcher to the HR employees who assisted in administering the questionnaires. A total of 450 questionnaires 54 questionnaires were administered to employees and Heads of the Departments of the 9 Five Star Hotels in Bangalore respectively. A total of 371 (response rate of 82.44%) and 51 (response rate of 94.4 %) completed valid questionnaires were returned by employees and heads of the departments of these 9 Five Star Hotels respectively. The response rate of 82.44% and 94.4% achieved in the present study is adequate in line with the 30% estimated response rate recommended by Shaughnessy and Zechmeister (1997).

5. DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Data Analysis has been done using the basic parametric tools such as percentage, Mean, Standard Deviation, etc. In order to test the hypothesis an F-test using Levene's method and a t-test for equality of means have been done.

The data collected have been analysed using mean weight (Mean). Items falling against Mean Weights above five are considered as most important reasons to stay on the job and items falling below five are considered as the least important reasons to stay on the job. The ranks designated will determine the degree of importance (say rank 1 is the most important and rank 16 is the least important reason to stay on the job.)

The following points can be slated down regarding the most important reasons for employees to stay on the job:

- Good Supervisor/Manager (Mean=5.47) and enjoyable co-workers (Mean=5.47) have been rated as first most important reason stated by employees to stay on the job, where as interesting work (Mean=5.47) has been the first most important reason for employees to stay on the job by perceived the Heads of the departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore.
- The second most important reason stated by employees to stay on their job was Sense of Mission/ Purpose (Mean= 5.30), while the second most important reason for employees to stay on the

job perceived by the Heads of departments was Appreciation of what they do (Mean= 5.43).

- Employees stated Challenging job assignments (Mean = 5.29) as the third most important reason for staying on the job, while Heads of the Departments perceived Sense of Mission / Purpose (Mean=5.41) as the third most important reason for an employee to stay on the job
- The fourth most important reason stated by employees to stay on their job was interesting work (Mean = 5.17), while the fourth most important reason for employees to stay on the job perceived by the Heads of the departments was education and development (Mean= 5.25)
- Feeling appreciated for what I do (Mean= 5.13) has been the fifth most important reason stated by employees to stay on their job, while the fifth most important reasons for employees to stay on the job perceived by the Heads of the departments were enjoyable co-workers (Mean= 5.22) and Challenging job assignments (Mean= 5.22)
- The sixth most important reason stated by employees to stay on their job was convenient location (Mean = 5.06), where as the sixth most important reasons for employees to stay on the job perceived by the heads of the departments were good supervisor / manager (Mean= 5.20) and Career opportunities (Mean= 5.20) The least important reasons for employees to stay on the job are discussed below:
- The first least important reason stated by employees to stay on their job was Salary (Mean=3.71), while the first least important reason for an employee to stay on the job perceived by heads of the departments was no time to look for a new job (Mean=4.25)
- Benefits and Perks (Mean= 4.01) has been the second least important reason stated by employees to stay on their job, while the second least important reason for employees to stay on the job perceived by the heads of the departments was flexibility in working hours (Mean=4.33)
- The third least important reason stated by employees to stay on their job was Autonomy (Mean=4.18), where as the third least important reason for employees to stay on the job perceived by heads of the departments was also Autonomy (Mean= 4.39)
- The fourth least important reason stated by employees to stay on their job was no time to look for new job (Mean=4.32), while the fourth least important reason for employees to stay on the job perceived by heads of the departments was benefits and perks (Mean=4.65)
- The fifth least important reason stated by employees to stay on their job was Flexible work hours (Mean= 4.61), while the fifth least important reason for employees to stay on the job perceived by the heads of the departments was Salary (Mean=4.73)
- The sixth least important reason stated by employees to stay on their job was Work assignments vary (Mean= 4.79), while the sixth least important reason for employees to stay on the job perceived by the heads of the departments was also Work assignments vary (Mean= 4.82)

Test of Hypothesis H_1

H_0 = There is no significant difference between the reasons stated by an employee to stay on the job and the

reasons for employees to stay on the job perceived by the Heads of the Departments of 5 star hotels in Bangalore
The hypothesis is tested using Levene's Test for Equality of Variances and t-test for Equality of Means.

The outcomes of the test of hypothesis regarding the reasons to stay on the job, stated by employees and reasons for employees to stay on the job perceived by Head of the Departments, of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore are discussed below:

• **Salary:** The t test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean weight of "Salary" as a reason stated by employees to stay on the job has (M = 3.71, s = 1.683) and that the "Salary" as a reason for employees to stay on the job perceived by Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore has (M = 4.73, s = 1.550), $t(420) = 4.061$, $p = .000$, $= .05$. Since the $p < .05$, we reject the hypothesis. Hence, we can state that as far as salary as a reason to stay on the job is concerned there is a significant difference between the statement of employees and the perceptions of Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore.

• **Benefits & Perks:** The t test revealed a statistically reliable difference between the mean weight of "Benefits & Perks" as a reason stated by employees to stay on the job has (M = 4.01, s = 1.708) and that the "Benefits & Perks" as a reason for employees to stay on the job perceived by Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore has (M = 4.65, s = 1.426), $t(420) = 2.925$, $p = .005$, $= .05$. Since the $p < .05$, we reject the hypothesis. Hence, we can state that as far as Benefits & Perks as a reason to stay on the job is concerned there is a significant difference between the statement of employees and the perceptions of Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore.

• **Interesting Work:** The t test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean weight of "Interesting Work" as a reason stated by employees to stay on the job has (M = 5.17, s = 1.460) and that the "Interesting Work" as a reason for employees to stay on the job perceived by Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore has (M = 5.47, s = .924), $t(420) = 1.987$, $p = .050$, $= .05$. Since the $p = .05$, we accept the hypothesis. Hence, we can state that as far as Interesting Work as a reason to stay on the job is concerned there is no significant difference between the statement of employees and the perceptions of Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore.

• **Enjoy the Co-workers:** The t test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean weight of "Enjoy the Co-workers" as a reason stated by employees to stay on the job has (M = 5.47, s = 1.418) and that the "Enjoy the Co-workers" as a reason for employees to stay on the job perceived by Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore has (M = 5.22, s = 1.316), $t(420) = 1.219$, $p = .224$, $= .05$. Since the $p > .05$, we accept the hypothesis. Hence, we can state that as far as "Enjoy the Co-workers" as a reason to stay on the job is concerned there is no significant difference between the statement of employees and the perceptions of Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore.

• **Sense of Purpose / Mission:** The t test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the

mean weight of “Sense of Purpose / Mission” as a reason stated by employees to stay on the job has ($M = 5.30, s = 1.354$) and that the “Sense of Purpose / Mission” as a reason for employees to stay on the job perceived by Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore has ($M = 5.41, s = 1.043$), $t(420) = .661, p = .510, = .05$. Since the $p > .05$, we accept the hypothesis. Hence, we can state that as far as “Sense of Purpose / Mission” as a reason to stay on the job is concerned there is no significant difference between the statement of employees and the perceptions of Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore.

Ñ **Convenient Location:** The t test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean weight of “Convenient Location” as a reason stated by employees to stay on the job has ($M = 5.06, s = 1.599$) and that the “Convenient Location” as a reason for employees to stay on the job perceived by Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore has ($M = 4.88, s = 1.478$), $t(420) = .736, p = .462, = .05$. Since the $p > .05$, we accept the hypothesis. Hence, we can state that as far as “Convenient Location” as a reason to stay on the job is concerned there is no significant difference between the statement of employees and the perceptions of Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore.

Ñ **Challenging Job Assignments:** The t test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean weight of “Challenging Job Assignments” as a reason stated by employees to stay on the job has ($M = 5.29, s = 1.519$) and that the “Challenging Job Assignments” as a reason for employees to stay on the job perceived by Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore has ($M = 5.22, s = 1.238$), $t(420) = .315, p = .753, = .05$. Since the $p > .05$, we accept the hypothesis. Hence, we can state that as far as “Challenging Job Assignments” as a reason to stay on the job is concerned there is no significant difference between the statement of employees and the perceptions of Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore.

Ñ **Flexibility in Work Hours:** The t test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean weight of “Flexibility in Work Hours” as a reason stated by employees to stay on the job has ($M = 4.61, s = 1.810$) and that the “Flexibility in Work Hours” as a reason for employees to stay on the job perceived by Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore has ($M = 4.33, s = 1.322$), $t(420) = 1.355, p = .179, = .05$. Since the $p > .05$, we accept the hypothesis. Hence, we can state that as far as “Flexibility in Work Hours” as a reason to stay on the job is concerned there is no significant difference between the statement of employees and the perceptions of Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore.

Ñ **Good Supervisor / Manager :**The t test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean weight of “Good Supervisor / Manager” as a reason stated by employees to stay on the job has ($M = 5.47, s = 1.636$) and that the “Good Supervisor / Manager” as a reason for employees to stay on the job perceived by Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore has ($M = 5.20, s = 1.132$), $t(420) = 1.548, p = .126, = .05$. Since the $p > .05$, we

accept the hypothesis. Hence, we can state that as far as “Good Supervisor / Manager” as a reason to stay on the job is concerned there is no significant difference between the statement of employees and the perceptions of Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore.

Ñ **Varying Work Assignments:** The t test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean weight of “Varying Work Assignments” as a reason stated by employees to stay on the job has ($M = 4.79, s = 1.506$) and that the “Varying Work Assignments” as a reason for employees to stay on the job perceived by Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore has ($M = 4.82, s = 1.144$), $t(420) = .189, p = .850, = .05$. Since the $p > .05$, we accept the hypothesis. Hence, we can state that as far as “Varying Work Assignments” as a reason to stay on the job is concerned there is no significant difference between the statement of employees and the perceptions of Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore.

Ñ **Feel Appreciated for What I do :**The t test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean weight of “Feel Appreciated for What I do” as a reason stated by employees to stay on the job has ($M = 5.13, s = 1.534$) and that the “Feel Appreciated for What I do” as a reason for employees to stay on the job perceived by Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore has ($M = 5.43, s = 1.118$), $t(420) = 1.734, p = .087, = .05$. Since the $p > .05$, we accept the hypothesis. Hence, we can state that as far as “Feel Appreciated for What I do” as a reason to stay on the job is concerned there is no significant difference between the statement of employees and the perceptions of Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore.

Ñ **Education and Development :**The t test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean weight of “Education and Development” as a reason stated by employees to stay on the job has ($M = 5.01, s = 1.543$) and that the “Education and Development” as a reason for employees to stay on the job perceived by Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore has ($M = 5.25, s = 1.339$), $t(420) = 1.063, p = .288, = .05$. Since the $p > .05$, we accept the hypothesis. Hence, we can state that as far as “Education and Development” as a reason to stay on the job is concerned there is no significant difference between the statement of employees and the perceptions of Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore.

Ñ **No Time to Look for New Job:** The t test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean weight of “No Time to Look for New Job” as a reason stated by employees to stay on the job has ($M = 4.32, s = 1.873$) and that the “No Time to Look for New Job” as a reason for employees to stay on the job perceived by Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore has ($M = 4.25, s = 1.695$), $t(420) = .228, p = .820, = .05$. Since the $p > .05$, we accept the hypothesis. Hence, we can state that as far as “No Time to Look for New Job” as a reason to stay on the job is concerned there is no significant difference between the statement of employees and the perceptions of Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore.

Ñ **Career Opportunities:** The t test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean weight of “Career Opportunities” as a reason stated by employees to stay on the job has ($M = 4.99, s = 1.640$) and that the “Career Opportunities” as a reason for employees to stay on the job perceived by Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore has ($M = 5.20, s = 1.249$), $t(420) = 1.049, p = .297, = .05$. Since the $p > .05$, we accept the hypothesis. Hence, we can state that as far as “Career Opportunities” as a reason to stay on the job is concerned there is no significant difference between the statement of employees and the perceptions of Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore.

Ñ **Autonomy:** The t test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean weight of “Autonomy” as a reason stated by employees to stay on the job has ($M = 4.18, s = 1.726$) and that the “Autonomy” as a reason for employees to stay on the job perceived by Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore has ($M = 4.39, s = 1.358$), $t(420) = 1.019, p = .311, = .05$. Since the $p > .05$, we accept the hypothesis. Hence, we can state that as far as “Autonomy” as a reason to stay on the job is concerned there is no significant difference between the statement of employees and the perceptions of Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore.

Ñ **Other Reasons:** The t test failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference between the mean weight of “Other Reasons” as a reason stated by employees to stay on the job has ($M = 1.59, s = 1.528$) and that the “Other Reasons” as a reason for employees to stay on the job perceived by Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore has ($M = 1.49, s = 1.362$), $t(420) = .444, p = .657, = .05$. Since the $p > .05$, we accept the hypothesis. Hence, we can state that as far as “Other Reasons” as a reason to stay on the job is concerned there is no significant difference between the statement of employees and the perceptions of Head of the Departments of Five Star Hotels in Bangalore.

6. CONCLUSION

The study reveals that the most important reasons to stay on the job stated by employees of the Five Star Hotels of Bangalore are Good Supervisor/ Manager, Enjoyable Co-workers (Mean = 5.47), Sense of Mission/ Purpose (Mean= 5.30), Challenging job assignments (Mean = 5.29), Interesting work (Mean = 5.17), Feeling appreciated for what I do (Mean= 5.13), Convenient location (Mean = 5.06). Whereas the most important reasons for employees to stay on the job perceived by the Heads of the Departments of the Five Star Hotels of Bangalore are Interesting work (Mean=5.47), Appreciation of what they do (Mean= 5.43), Sense of Mission / Purpose (Mean=5.41), Education and development (Mean= 5.25), Enjoyable co-workers and Challenging job assignments (Mean= 5.22), Good supervisor / manager and Career opportunities (Mean= 5.20). The study reveals that as far as Salary and Benefits & Perks as a reason to stay on the job by employees are concerned, there is significant difference between the statement of employees and the perceptions of Heads of the Departments of the Five Star Hotels in Bangalore.

Hence, the management when attributing a reason for an employee to stay on the job should not consider that the salary and benefits & perks as the most important aspect. It should look at other reasons as well.

6.1 Limitations of the Study

The study was limited to only five star hotels of Bangalore. The study can also be done on other star category hotels in other Indian cities. This study has taken into account the reasons to stay on the job by employees in general. The study can be done to find the reasons to stay on the job by employees based on the various demographic aspects of the Five Star Hotels in Bangalore and elsewhere.

REFERENCES

1. Arnett, DB, Laverie, DA, & McLane, C 2002, Using job satisfaction and pride as internal-marketing tools. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, pp. 87-96
2. Benz, M. and Frey, B. S. (2008), “Being Independent Is a Great Thing: Subjective Evaluations of Self-Employment and Hierarchy”. *Economica*, 75:362–383
3. Feinstein, A.H. (2002). A study of relationships between job satisfaction and organizational commitment among restaurant employees. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(7), 33-57
4. Frederick Herzberg (1959), “The Motivation to Work”. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.,
5. Green, F. and Tsisianis, N. (2005), An investigation of national trends in job satisfaction in Britain and Germany, *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 43(3), 401-429.
6. Greenberg, J., & Baron, R. A. (1997). *Behavior in organizations* (6th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
7. Guthrie J. P. (2001), ‘High-involvement work practices, turnover and productivity: Evidence from New Zealand’, *Academy of Management Journal* vol. 44(1), pp.180-190.
8. Ivancevich, J M, Konopaske, R, Matteson, M T (2008) *Organizational Behavior and Management*, 8th edn, McGraw-Hill/Irwin, New York.
9. Lockwood and S. Medlik (2001) *Tourism and hospitality in the 21st Century*, edited by. Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 2001. ISBN 0-7506-4676-4
10. McShane, S.L. & Von Glinow, M.A. (2005), *Organizational Behavior* (3th ed.). India: Tata McGraw-Hill Inc.
11. Rajendran, M. And Chandramohan, R. (2010), Job Satisfaction- An Overview, *Personnel Today*, Vol.30(4), Jan-Mar.,2010,pp.24-30.
12. Saker, AH, Crossman, A and Chinmeteeputuck, P 2003, The relationships of age and length of service with job satisfaction: An examination of hotel employees in Thailand. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, p. 18, pp. 745-58.
13. Salazar, J & Hubbard, S 2000, The relationship between empowerment and overall job satisfaction: A study of a southeastern resort. *Praxis: The Journal of Applied Hospitality Management*, Vol. 3, pp. 112-129.

14. Shaughnessy, J. J. & Zechmeister, E. B. 1997.
Research methods in psychology, 4th Edition.
Singapore: McGraw-Hill.