The Effect of Employee Turnover in the Hospitality Industry: Quantitative Correlational Study
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Abstract

The purpose of this quantitative correlational study was to examine the relationship between employee turnover intention and job satisfaction, employee compensation, employee engagement, employee motivation, and work environment. A convenience sample of 156-services related employees from the hospitality industry in Western Georgia; Central Mississippi; and North Central Texas participants in the online surveys. The results from multiple linear regression models were significant in predicating employee turnover in the hospitality industry. In the final model, the five predictors accounted for approximately 36% of the variance in turnover intention, and the result was statistically significant, \( R^2 = .36, F (5, 105) = 11.57, p < .001 \). Motivation was not a significant predictor of employee's turnover intentions. The introduction of others organizational related variables by future researchers might enhance the effectiveness of the model. The practical implications for change include the ability of hospitality leaders' to implemented strategies and policies into their business practice to reduce employee turnover with industry, which is vital for organizational to retain skilled worker while maintaining profitability.
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1. Introduction

Employee turnover jeopardizes organizational performance and profitability because of its associated loss of important corporate resources and company assets (Guilding, Lamminaki, & Mcmanus, 2014). Performance and profitability are fundamental well-studied factors involved with organizational performance (Delmar, McKelvie, & Wennberg, 2013). Organizational leaders must understand those factors that have a significant potential to predict turnover and affect the performance of an organization (Hancock, Allen, Bosco, McDaniel, & Pierce, 2013). Hospitality leaders are in need of strategies and policies to maintain an adequate workforce and improve employee engagement, motivation, job satisfaction, and work environment within the industry (Marshall, Mottier, & Lewis, 2016). In a study by statisticians at the Bureau of Labor Statistics in 2014, employee turnover cost organizations more than $25 billion a year. Other findings resulted from a narrow focus, omitting an address of the immediate and long-term consequences of employee attrition (Chang, Wang, & Huang, 2013).

Determining the principal reasons hospitality employees leave their positions in such great numbers is difficult at best. Researchers proffer substantive reasons for hospitality employee turnover (Chang et al., 2013). Although researchers, such as Cheng, Yang, Wan, and Chu (2013) examined different aspects of workplace factors involving leaders and coworkers as hospitality professionals, there is a continuing need for additional study of the various types of relationships among variables that include turnover among hospitality workers in the employment environment. Hospitality leaders may use these findings of employee turnover to implement strategies to reduce the high turnover rate within the industry.

1.1 Problem & Purpose of the Study

Employee turnover is detrimental to organizational performance and profitability, leading to loss of diverse financial and intellectual resources and assets (Hofhuis, Van der Zee, & Otten, 2014; Lambert, Cluse-Tolar, Pasupuleti, Prior, & Allen, 2013; Ryu & Lee, 2013). In 2013, more than 25 million U.S. employees voluntarily terminated their employment, with costs to replace an employee averaging from 25% to as much as 500% of the terminated employee’s annual salary (Bryant & Allen, 2013). The general business problem addressed in this study was that employee turnover is detrimental to the competitiveness and profitability of organizations in the hospitality industry. The specific business problem addressed is that hospitality leaders do not know the relationships between employee compensation, employee engagement, employee motivation, job satisfaction, work environment, and employee turnover. The purpose of this quantitative, correlational study was to examine the relationships between employee compensation, employee engagement, employee motivation, job satisfaction, work environment, and employee turnover. The predictor variables were employee compensation, employee engagement, employee motivation, job satisfaction, and work environment. The dependent variable was employee turnover. The study population consisted of low- to mid-level hospitality employees working in Atlanta, Georgia; Dallas, Texas; and Jackson, Mississippi. The findings may be valuable to leaders of the organizations concerned with high employee turnover rates by implementing strategies and policies to retain skilled workers while increasing organization profitability. The findings from this study
may allow organizational leaders to promote a positive social change by the identification and implementation of initiatives and programs, and strategies that could reduce turnover intention, thereby leading to reduced unemployment, lower business operating costs, and improvements within the hospitality industry that could affect customers (Mohanty & Mohanty, 2014). The potential social benefits of the application of findings reported in this study include improved work-life experiences of employees that may reduce stresses and increase the earning potentials of employees who benefit from improvement to business practices (Kumar & Chakraborty, 2013).

1.1.1 Literature Review

Background of Hospitality Industry

The hospitality industry represents one of the most dynamic and thriving industries in the United States, as well as in countries all over the world. Some countries, such as the United States, have retained a large tourism industry that supports activities that have shaped the country’s economy. Before discussing why turnover represents a significant issue in the hospitality industry, it is important to understand the nature of the industry, as well as the potentially significant role of human-resources policies and strategies in reducing the turnover rate in the industry. Teng (2013) described the hospitality industry as an organization with a purpose to satisfy a full range of needs such as food, beverages, and accommodations. The hospitality industry involves frequent guest–host interactions and hospitality organizations that cater to the needs of a diverse group of people.

People have been traveling and using the hospitality and tourism industry for thousands of years. Initially, guests' mode of transportation involved navigation; however, as transportation evolved, tourists began to drive, and transportation eventually evolved to flight. Commercially, the hospitality industry has existed for almost 4,000 years. The hospitality industry remains a billion-dollar industry that depends on the disposable income and availability of its customers (Knani, 2014). The hospitality industry consists of various service fields that include lodging, restaurants, event planning, theme parks, transportation, cruise lines, and others. Numerous groups of employees run these establishments with various responsibilities, such as directors of operations, management or leadership roles, human resources facility maintenance, and marketing positions (Ruizalba, Bermúdez-González, Rodríguez- Molina, & Blanca, 2014).

The hospitality and tourism industry provides many jobs around the globe and extensively contributes too many countries’ gross domestic product (GDP) (Vasquez, 2014). Therefore, additional research may help leaders in such industries improve employees’ performance, enabling them to compete more effectively in the hospitality industry (Dobre, 2013; Dragoni, Park, Soltis, & Forte-Trammell, 2014; Verboss, Miller, & Goswami, 2014). Because the hospitality industry is comprised of production and service dimensions, the creation and delivery of services from the hotel to the customer are dependent on the employees (Faldetta, Fasone, & Provenzano, 2013). Thus, the success of this industry primarily depends on the recruitment, management, and retention of employees. This makes the high employee turnover rates of the hotel industry problematic.
The seasonal nature of the hospitality industry remains a significant reason behind the high turnover rates (Faldetta et al., 2013). The finding of the research conducted by Faldetta et al., 2013 revealed that hotel managers commonly hire and fire employees based on seasonal fluctuations, managers remain ignorant of the labor-versus-demand concept; therefore, hotel managers remain unprepared to synchronize labor to demand. Particular challenges from personalization/customization, service management, branding, and social media use might influence turnover rate. A significant need for industry leaders is to learn better management techniques that would aid in retaining the most valuable, well-trained employees, effectively helping the industry compete in the hospitality market with ease (Brown, Thomas, & Bosselman, 2015). Faldetta et al., 2013 indicated that In particular, high turnover could be detrimental and disruptive to the hospitality industry (Faldetta et al., 2013).

Organizations spend a significant amount of money to replace an already-trained manager (Mapelu & Jumah, 2013). Training a new employee or manager also means losing the productivity of the trainer (Bryant & Allen, 2013). Replacing experienced employees, from managers to hourly employees, could become costly to the hospitality industry because preparing new workers takes a significant amount of labor, which equals lost money (Milman & Dickson, 2014). Bryant and Allen (2013) indicated that organizational leaders spend 30% to 50% of the yearly salary for entry-level employees, up to 150% of the salaries annually for middle-level employees, and as high as 400% of the annual salary to replace those in upper management positions. It remains imperative for managers to encourage employees to stay. If a hospitality organization retains steady, long-term employees, its productivity would likely increase from increased employee loyalty (Mensah, 2013).

Reduction of the employee turnover rate could universally help the hospitality industry and the economy in the globalized world. Globalization has created business mobilization opportunities for individuals that are beneficial for the hospitality industry (Grobelna, 2015). The travel and tourism economy contributes trillions of dollars to the international GDP; at a global level, experts anticipate profits and revenues from the tourism and hospitality industry will continue to grow (Vasquez, 2014). The hospitality industry employs 7 millions workers worldwide (Grobelna, 2015). The hospitality industry has already surpassed other industries, such as agricultural science, mining, and even retail, in its contribution to international GDP and the number of people working for the industry.

**Employee Turnover Intentions**

Turnover intention is the behavioral attitude of a person desiring to withdraw from an organization (Awang, Amir, & Osma, 2013), and is an effective predictor of actual turnover. The success of hospitality industry primarily depends on the recruitment, management, and retention of employees. Also, the seasonal nature of the hospitality industry remains a significant reason behind the high turnover rates (Faldetta et al., 2013). Even though hotel managers commonly hire and fire employees based on seasonal fluctuations, managers remain ignorant of the labor-versus-demand concept; therefore, they remain unprepared to synchronize labor to demand (Faldetta et al., 2013). Particular challenges from personalization/customization, service management, branding, and social media use might
influence turnover rate. A significant need for industry leaders is to utilize better management techniques that would aid in retaining the most valuable, well-trained employees, effectively helping the industry compete in the hospitality market (Brown, Thomas, & Bosselman, 2015).

Gellatly, Cowden, and Cummings (2014) examined the relationship between staff nurses’ levels of commitment and turnover intentions, observing how organizational commitment could affect perceived work-unit relations. Gellatly et al. examined employee turnover using affective, normative, and continuance commitment data from 336 registered nurses. Zhang (2016) gathered data on how the RNs perceived their work-unit relations and their intentions to leave to their jobs. The findings of the research conducted by Gellatly, Cowden, and Cummings demonstrated that staff nurses who retained high levels of affective commitment and normative commitment expressed positive quality work-unit relations and, in comparison to other nurses with lower affective and normative commitment, were less likely to leave their organizations (Gellatly et al., 2014).

AbuKhalifeh and Som (2013) focused on the antecedents affecting employee engagement and organizational performance. Karatepe (2014) similarly studied and reported employee engagement as a component of organizational performance outcomes. Barrick, Thurgood, Smith, and Courtright (2014) also focused on employee engagement from the perspective of the collective in an organization. Employee engagement studies occurred to determine the factors that could shape employee engagement and work outcomes by studying the perceptions of leaders, human resource professionals, and employees. Similar outcomes were that employee support represented a momentous contribution to engagement and work outcomes of employees (AbuKhalifeh & Som, 2013; Barrick et al., 2014; Karatepe, 2014).

Bryant and Allen (2013) offered a range of possible effective strategies to aid in managing turnover rates. These strategies include compensation, benefits-based solutions, and solutions that go beyond providing material needs for employees. AlBattat, Som, & Helalat, 2014 indicated the biggest manager concerns in the hospitality industry involves how to mitigate the turnover crisis.

Employee turnover refers to the rate at which employees leave jobs in a company and are replaced by new hires. Bryant and Allen (2013) and (2015) explored ideas to reduce turnover rates. Bryant and Allen described high employee-turnover rates as costly and disruptive. Bryant and Allen offered a range of possibly effective strategies to manage turnover. Strategies included compensation and benefits-based solutions, as well as solutions that provide aid beyond the material needs of employees. The findings from Bryant and Allen identified several strategies that are available for organizations to employ, which could enable companies to more effectively lower turnover rates by providing varying solutions to such a dynamic problem.

Deery and Jago (2015) examined various strategies that the hospitality industry could employ to resolve the turnover crisis. The researchers considered talent management, work-life balance, and other retention strategies. Deery and Jago conducted a literature synthesis and analysis using a framework that demonstrated the possible correlations with the antecedents
of organizational and industry attributes, such as personal employee dimensions, work-life conflicts, organizational strategies, job-satisfaction outcomes, organizational commitments, and employee retention. A finding reported by Deery and Jago was that ensuring work-life balance was one of the most effective methods to improve retention rates. Deery & Jago, 2015 indicated that any change in work-life balance could directly influence factors such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, stress, and alcohol use. Other researchers have conducted studies to examine the reasons why turnover has remained high in this industry and what organizational leaders of the industry may do to change these high turnover rates (AIBattat & Som, 2013a; Sharon, Goziker, & Shahrabani, 2014). Although most researchers on turnover have posited that organizational factors such as commitment, engagement, satisfaction, and compensation could affect turnover (Kara, Uysal, Sirgy, & Lee, 2013) could explain the high turnover of the hospitality industry, the issue remains vague and worthy of further research. Nayak, Pai, Prabhu, & Granil, 2015; Pearlman & Schaffer, 2013 suggested high turnover rates of this industry are among the greatest challenges that HRMs face.

1.2 Factors Contributing to Employee Turnover

1.2.1 Compensation

AIBattat et al., (2014) argue that compensation and extrinsic rewards affect employee turnover in the hospitality industry. Unacceptable working conditions, poor training, and unsatisfactory salaries could also lead to high employee turnover. Lee & Chao (2013); Mohsin, Lengler, & Aguzzoli (2015) also argue that the effects of job security, earnings, and organizational loyalty on turnover correlate with one another. Mohsin et al. (2015) examined the quadratic and linear relationships between the intention to leave one’s job and their antecedents on a sample of 884 hospitality staff members in India and found the effects of organization enthusiasm and stimulating job experiences on employee turnover to be quadratic. Management was largely responsible for keeping staff from leaving.

Pohler and Schmidt (2015) also examined the relationship between financial incentives and employee turnover. They evaluated the effects of managerial pay-for-performance on the turnover of employees in non-management positions, using the agency and equity theory and concluded that managerial pay-for-performance policies might negatively affect the relationship between employees and management, leading to a high employee-turnover rate. The findings from research conducted by Pohler and Schmidt supported previous literature assertions that pay could affect employee outcomes such as job satisfaction. Aside from pay, institutional factors such as opportunities for advancement and promotions, the existence of work-group cohesion, effective and supportive leadership, and satisfactory compensation could influence turnover (Qiu, Haobin Ye, Hung, & York, 2015).

Santhanam, Kamalanabhan, and Dyaram (2015) evaluated the effects of frontline employees’ perceptions of human resource practices such as recruitment, selection, training, promotion opportunities, performance appraisal, feedback processes, and pay and found that among HR practices, perceptions about selection and compensation practices significantly affected turnover intentions among frontline employees. Also, they found that organizational identification could moderate the effects of perceived selection practices on employees’
Brown, Thomas, and Bosselman (2015) evaluated the turnover intention and actual turnover rate of Generation Y hospitality employees to discern why this generation's employees entertain thoughts of leaving their jobs or actually leave their jobs. They found that Generation Y employees leave for the desire of an exciting and challenging career. Other factors included work-life imbalance, insufficient remuneration, long working hours, and better opportunities elsewhere.

Kuria et al. (2012) examined factors affecting turnover in the hospitality industry in the context of three- and five-star hotels in Kenya. They identified factors such as management style, working environment, and compensation benefits that could affect turnover intentions. They found that performance of the organization affects turnover such as the (Kuria et al., 2012). Employees who perceive their organization to be in poor financial condition may anticipate future layoffs and may preemptively leave (Kuria et al., 2012). Similarly, the local or regional economy contributes to employees' decisions; poor economies may inspire employees to seek work elsewhere, and rich economies may provide opportunities for job growth and expansion, which may also result in employees leaving. Kuria et al., 2012, p. 314 indicated that personal factors such as employee's unrealistic expectations affect turnover.

1.2.2 Engagement and Embeddedness

Low employee engagement and loyalty could lead to higher turnover rates (Karatepe, Karadas, Azar, & Naderiadib, 2013). When individuals view positive levels of organizational collaboration, they become more motivated to show higher levels of effort. When they feel empowered, they become more likely to stay (Raub & Robert, 2013).

Biswas and Bhatnagar (2013) gathered data from 246 Indian managers in six Indian organizations and found employee engagement acts as a mediating variable between perceived organizational supports and person-organizational fit as antecedents, demonstrating employees' levels of commitment and satisfaction. Higher levels of perceived support could generate higher levels of employee engagement and better person–organization fit (Biswas & Bhatnagar, 2013). Because of this increased level of engagement, employees may become more satisfied and committed. When employees’ personal values conformed to organizational norms, they were more likely to receive more responsibilities. As a result, employees would feel more empowered and engaged, which could lead to better performance and higher overall job satisfaction (Biswas & Bhatnagar, 2013).

A relationship exists between job embeddedness and worker intention in the Australian hospitality industry (Robinson et al., 2014). Robinson et al. (2014) gathered data from 327 frontline employees from varying hotels and found that several dimensions of job embeddedness could explain turnover and retention. In particular, dimensions of organizational sacrifice and community positively shaped organizational commitment. Organizational sacrifice could negatively affect turnover intention; however, it could also serve as a reason why employees would decide to stay. Findings from the Robinson et al. study suggested that if the cost of leaving was high, employees in the hospitality industry
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A relationship exists between job embeddedness and worker intention in the Australian hospitality industry (Robinson et al., 2014). Robinson et al. (2014) gathered data from 327 frontline employees from varying hotels and found that several dimensions of job embeddedness could explain turnover and retention. In particular, dimensions of organizational sacrifice and community positively shaped organizational commitment. Organizational sacrifice could negatively affect turnover intention; however, it could also serve as a reason why employees would decide to stay. Findings from the Robinson et al. study suggested that if the cost of leaving was high, employees in the hospitality industry
might find it less appealing to leave. Managers increased the perception of a high cost of leaving because this would improve the job embeddedness of employees (Robinson et al., 2014). Positive internal work events and constituent attachment could also shape turnover (Tews, Stafford, & Michel, 2014).

Karatepe and Shahriari (2014) evaluated the moderating effects of job embeddedness on the possible relationship between the factors of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice and turnover intention. To do so, the researchers gathered data from full-time frontline hotel employees serving in hotels across Iran. The findings from Karatepe and Shahriari research indicated that distributive, procedural, and interactional justice reduces turnover intentions. The relationship between justice dimensions and turnover intention was stronger among employees who had high levels of job embeddedness. If employees perceived employers treat them without bias, they feel dignified and respected, increasing their sense of self-identity and self-worth. As a result, they are less likely to leave their jobs. The findings from study conducted by Karatepe & Shahriari, 2014 indicated that study-supported factor other than job embeddedness such as that form of organizational justice determine turnover intentions and actual turnover rates of employees.

Tews et al. (2014) explained voluntary employee turnover through the lens of critical life events, as well as from the view of constituent attachment. They evaluated how critical events such as external personal events, external professional events, and internal work events could shape employee turnover. Using data collected from 290 servers employed in a U.S. restaurant chain, they showed that personal and professional events could shape turnover. In particular, positive and negative personal events could influence employees’ decisions to leave. In contrast, only positive external events related to turnover. Positive internal work events and constituent attachments could influence employees’ decisions to stay. The attachment of employees to their jobs could curb the effects of critical events affecting turnover rates. Tews et al. suggested that hospitality firms needed to understand the factors behind employee turnover because service employees are indisputably necessary for operations to run successfully.

1.2.3 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction could also influence employees’ decisions to stay or leave their job. Job satisfaction may also shape turnover rates (AlBattat & Som, 2013b; Zopiatis et al., 2014). Supervisory behavior could affect job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and an employee’s decision to quit a job (Mathieu, Fabi, Lacoursière, & Raymond, 2016). Herzberg et al. (1959) provided a set of motivational factors that could influence employees’ job satisfaction. Herzberg et al. (1959) assessed motivational levels of employees by asking them to describe what workplace conditions made them feel good about their jobs and what factors made them feel the opposite. Their research indicated that the motivation of employees increased in conditions where they felt that they could achieve and have more responsibility. Also, they found that hygiene factors were also influential on the satisfaction of employees. According to Venkataramani et al. (2013), meeting these factors does not immediately lead to satisfaction or motivation. Some hygiene factors resided in company policies, administrative
regulations, technical supervision, and the quality of relationships with supervisors, peers, and subordinates.

Katsikea et al. (2015) developed a comprehensive conceptual model that provided 17 hypotheses about relationships among structural, supervisory, and psychological factors behind turnover intentions of export sales managers. Their findings indicated that formalization and centralization could positively affect the role ambiguity and role conflict that most salespeople seem to experience. However, role stressors could negatively affect the satisfaction levels of salespeople, and as a result, make them want to leave their jobs. The study also indicated that job satisfaction directly related to job turnover intentions. Various factors found in the workplace shaped job satisfaction, and satisfaction directly affected employees’ turnover intention.

Zopiatis et al. (2014) examined the levels of job involvement, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction that caused employee turnover in the hospitality industry in Cyprus. They found positive causal relationships between job involvement, affective and normative commitment, and intrinsic job satisfaction. They also identified positive relationships between affective and normative organizational commitment levels and job satisfaction, extrinsic and intrinsic. Levels of job involvement, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction could all influence the decision to stay or leave one’s job. In particular, a negative relationship existed between affective organizational commitment, extrinsic job satisfaction, and turnover intention. Mismanagement of people and resources could lead to high turnover rates and, possibly, the demise of establishments in the hospitality sector (Zopiatis et al., 2014).

Psychological well-being and turnover intentions of hotel employees relate significantly (Amin & Akbar, 2013). Arnoux-Nicolas, Sovet, Lhotellier, Di Fabio, and Bernaud (2016) revealed that psychological resources mediate the relationship between work conditions and turnover across a variety of job contexts. Burnout can negatively affect satisfaction levels (Lu & Gursoy, 2013; Tsui, Lin, & Yu, 2013). Training and development could affect employees’ job satisfaction, and, ultimately, their intent to stay (Thomas, Thomas, Brown, & Kim, 2014).

1.2.4 Work Environment

Perceived organizational climate and support could shape decisions to leave or stay. Relational organizational contracts could affect turnover intention, whereas transactional contracts could not (Guchait, Cho, & Meurs, 2015). Emotional support from coworkers negatively related to turnover (Subramanian & Shin, 2013; Tews, Michel, & Stafford, 2013). Guchait et al. (2015) examined the effects of perceived organizational support on transactional and relational contracts on employee turnover intentions in India. Their research indicated that perceived supervisor support could lead to better perceptions of organizational support by employees. They further found that perceived organizational contracts could improve relational organizational support, but not transactional contracts. More importantly, only relational organizational contracts could affect turnover intentions, whereas transactional contracts could not.
Tews et al. (2013) evaluated the effects of coworker support on employee turnover among workers in the hospitality industry. Using data gathered from a sample of 188 services employees in a restaurant chain in the United States, they evaluated how two types of coworker support, emotional and instrumental, could affect turnover. Their study revealed that only emotional support from coworkers was related negatively to turnover. Emotionally supportive coworkers led to higher employee retention. Instrumental coworker support led to a higher turnover, contrary to the Tews et al. hypothesis. Finding from this study emphasizes the need to discourage traditional hierarchical relationships and encourage work collaboration between employers and employees (Tews et al., 2013).

Kim et al. (2015) evaluated how mentoring could reduce the turnover rates in the hospitality industry. They examined how certain mentoring functions could alleviate role stress, improve job attitudes, and reduce turnover intentions among hospitality industry workers. Kim et al. gathered data in South Korea from employees who received mentoring while working for luxury hotels. Specifically, mentoring employees involved providing assistance on career development, offering psychosocial support, and setting up role models. Kim et al. found that among the three types of mentoring functions, psychosocial support led to the most significant effects on employees’ satisfaction levels and organizational commitment. Psychosocial support was also the most significant function for reducing role conflict, role ambiguity, and turnover intention. Therefore, effective mentoring programs should include a psychosocial-support function.

Madera et al. (2014) suggested that in the hospitality industry, which employs many immigrant employees, language barriers constitute a problem that might lead to employee turnover. With a majority of immigrant employees having limited English-speaking abilities, managers must often address miscommunication and other communication issues. Madera et al. specifically examined whether these communication barriers could affect turnover intentions by evaluating the effects of these barriers on managers’ satisfaction with employees and employees’ subsequent feelings of role ambiguity and role conflict. The results from a survey of 130 hotel and lodging managers indicated that managers who were able to engage in quality communications with employees who only spoke limited English could reduce feelings of role ambiguity and role conflicts, lowering turnover intentions. Their findings indicated that managers who faced these communication barriers remained unlikely to entertain thoughts of leaving. Managing these barriers might increase pressures from the job, create misunderstandings, and lead to conflicts that may lead to turnover intentions.

Occupational stress factors, especially unfair treatment, could lead to turnover (Hwang, Lee, Park, Chang, & Kim, 2014). According to Arnoux-Nicolas et al., (2016), work environment, which could represent a source of workplace stress, may lead to negative outcomes such as high turnover. The meaningful work mediates the relationship between poor working conditions and turnover intention in a variety of job contexts (Arnoux-Nicolaset al., 2014). Hwang et al. (2014) suggested that if employees perceive they receive unbiased treatment, they felt dignified and respected they increase their sense of self-identity and self-worth. They become less likely to leave their jobs (Karatepe & Shahriari, 2014).
The effects of organizational enthusiasm and stimulating jobs on employee turnover are quadratic (Mohsin et al., 2015; Mohsin, Lengler, & Kumar, 2013). A fun workplace could lead to employees feeling more attached to the workplace and make them want to stay (Gin Choi, Kwon, & Kim, 2013). Organizational culture could affect the well-being of employees in the hospitality industry (Blomme, Sok, & Tromp, 2013). Organizational culture can also enhance organizational commitment that could reduce turnover (Khalili, 2014).

Leadership behaviors may affect turnover intention indirectly through enhancing or decreasing job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Karatepe & Kilic, 2015; Mathieu et al., 2016). In their study of fun activities, Tews & Michel (2014) found that socialization with coworkers and managers’ support for fun activities, improved retention rates. Similarly, Mathieu et al. (2016) examined how other supervisory behaviors, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment could shape turnover intention. The findings were consistent with those of Venkataramani, et al. (2013) who studied positive and negative workplace relationships, noting the role of social satisfaction in employees’ organizational attachments.

According to Mathieu et al. (2016), supervisory leadership could affect the well-being of employees, their satisfaction levels, and their commitment to their jobs and the organization. Mathieu et al. proposed a structural turnover-intention model that encompassed the variables of supervisory behavior, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Using a sample data of 763 employees working across different types of companies, they demonstrated that supervisors who exhibited person-oriented leadership could influence employees’ feelings of satisfaction, commitment, and ultimately their decisions to leave or stay with the company (Mathieu et al., 2016).

Manager support also could alleviate the effects of work-family conflict on emotional exhaustion and turnover intentions of frontline employees working for travel agencies in northern Cyprus (Karatepe & Kilic, 2015). Karatepe and Kilic (2015) recommended that increased managerial support could be one of the most basic and most important strategies to lessen the risks of employee turnover. Management styles could also affect employees’ decisions to stay or leave the organization (Kara et al., 2013). According to Chen, Friedman, & Simons, (2014), mid-level managers’ satisfaction with senior managers’ supervision could affect line employees’ turnover intentions. Transformational leadership could also affect turnover intentions by motivating, inspiring, and showing empathy to their employees (Tse et al., 2013).

1.2.5 Employee Motivation

Maintaining business relations in the organization could lead to higher levels of employee motivation, and thus, lower levels of turnover (Ncube & Samuel, 2014). In the hospitality industry, in particular, motivation remains the key behind employee retention, due to frequent contact with the employees and clients or visitors (Marshall et al., 2016). The higher the level of motivation of employees, the happier they are, the more productive they may be in interactions with clients, and the better service clients may receive, with overall improvements in organizational performance (Dobre, 2013).
Employees perceive they are not merely selling products; instead, they could make an impression on the clients and cause clients to return or not to return to the organization and they may feel a sense of empowerment in their jobs (Sahin, Cubuk, & Uslu, 2014). Sahin et al. (2014) theoretically linked organizational support, transformational leadership, personnel empowerment, work engagement, and performance that enhanced psychological capital. Employee empowerment that can stem from leader effectiveness can result in positive behaviors and individual satisfaction (Hassan, Mahsud, Yukl, & Prussia, 2013). A dynamic and interactive environment, the higher the satisfaction of the employee who is always in direct contact with the clients, the higher employee retention and customer satisfaction for the hospitality industry are uniquely important (Robinson et al., 2014).

If hospitality employees perceive their efforts as sufficiently rewarded and recognized, they are more likely to stay in the organization and serve the needs of the customers. Studies by Karatepe (2013), and Karatepe and Vatankhah (2014) showed that better salaries and benefits offered at other organizations constituted one of the biggest reasons employees decided to leave the hospitality sector. If an organization offers adequate promotional opportunities and competitive pay, employee turnover is likely to diminish. Employees are less inclined to leave an organization that sufficiently provides for their financial and recognition needs, especially if they would be moving to another organization with the same job and similar task roles (Karatepe, 2013; Karatepe & Vatankhah, 2014).

Mapelu and Jumah (2013) studied how managers could reduce turnover in the hospitality industry by addressing more of employee needs, including training. They used surveys with 350 hotel employees. They found that employee development negatively affected employee turnover. The findings encompassed the idea that strategic approaches with a commitment strategy to develop psychological connections between leadership actions and employees' improve employee retention. An organizational culture that matches employees' needs and goals can improve employees' perceptions of their quality of work life, and this could lead to employee commitment, better organizational performance improved effectiveness (Khalili, 2014).

In a workplace setting, this means a leader or manager may be more effective if they gather the support and respect of employees and have achieved the respect and admiration of the community where the organization operates (Yucel, McMillan, & Richard, 2014). Leaders remain effective in influencing the retention of their employees if they can inspire employees to be motivated (Tse et al., 2013). Antonakis and House (2014) also described an effective leader as flexible, who can wear a different hat for each occasion or circumstance, taking on a new approach or decision to improve the organization.

An effective leader is one who can achieve financial growth by fostering team cooperation and effective performance of their employees (Wang, Tsai, & Tsai, 2014). Effective leaders improve retention rates of employees by building lasting relations with them (Tse et al., 2013). Employees who believe their supervisors work closely with them tend to perform better (Xu, Zhong, & Wang, 2013). By combining tactic and managerial edifice, leaders can make employees want to stay and commit to the organization’s goals and objectives (Kim & Lee,
Tews, Michel, and Stafford (2013) examined the impact of workplace fun on employee turnover and performance, based on the idea expressed by Vasquez (2014) that if undermining the role of leaders continues in the hospitality. They concluded that undermining of leaders roles in the industry hospitality would affect an organization's ability to increase employee retention, leading to economic destabilization. Employees stay with the hospitality industry as long as they perceive they have enough support from management, feel a sense of contentment or a sense of pride about the tasks they carry out for the organization, and social relationships appear to be fulfilling, rewarding, and stable (Venkataramani et al., 2013).

Other researchers have discussed possible challenges to employee retention and possible solutions. They have argued that although the retention strategies of other industries could apply in the hospitality industry, the industry has some unique challenges, making turnover a persistent problem (Mapelu & Jumah, 2013, Knani, 2014). First, the industry needs to attract efficient and suitable labors that can work effectively with diverse populations of consumers (Grobelna, 2015). However, when the industry has a continuously high level of employee turnover, this translates into a significant loss of investment in human capital and training (Bryant & Allen, 2013), and in the firm's quality of services, profitability, and success (Hancock et al., 2013). The lack of training and skill developments is key reasons the hospitality industry experiences such high turnover rates (Barbosa-McCoy, 2016). Formal and informal training is vital in reducing employee turnover (Mapelu & Jumah, 2013). As Mapelu & Jumah allude, although the hospitality industry remains highly people-intensive, employees may not receive enough career-growth opportunities to make them want to stay. To reverse the trend of high employee turnover, hospitality and tourism organizations should focus on inclusion of all staff in training activities and programs (Mapelu & Jumah, 2013).

The concept of a psychological contract is important for understanding employee turnover in the hospitality industry. This concept refers to the reciprocal and mutual obligations between organizations and employees. Each of the parties might have different perceptions of these obligations (Tsui et al., 2013). HR practices such as recruitment, training, performance appraisal, salary, and benefits affect an employee's employment relationship with the organization (Tsui et al., 2013). How these HR practices affect, employees' psychological contract might be critical in how organizations work on more consistent communication and management of this psychological contract. As employees and employers interact with each other, psychological contracts develop (Hemdi, Hafiz, Mahat, & Othman, 2014; Wu & Chen, 2015).

HR practices might influence psychological contracts between employees and employers in two ways (Hemdi et al., 2014; Wu & Chen, 2015). First, HR practices from recruitment, payment, and firing could affect employees' skills, attitudes, and behaviors, ultimately shaping how employees perform in the organization, and even their decisions to stay or leave. Second, HR practices could be integral to the development of structural and operational efficiencies, which could then affect employees' performance and decisions to stay with the organization. If employees perceive their employers have fulfilled the contract, they are more
likely to commit to the organization. In contrast, psychological contract breaches could leave employees feeling unmotivated, leading to higher turnover intentions (Hemdi et al., 2014; Wu & Chen, 2015).

2. Theory and Hypothesis

The theoretical framework used in this study is important for providing an examination of the relationship between the variables as the perceived experience of participants in this research study. Herzberg's two-factor motivation hygiene theory was selected to enhance the understanding of the relationships between employee turnover intention and job satisfaction, employee compensation, employee engagement, employee motivation, and work environment (Herzberg et al., 1966).

Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory accounts for the relationships among employees' job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the environment where the employee performs the work. Herzberg et al. (1959) collected data from interviews with 200 engineers and accountants to understand motivating factors that related to employees' satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their employment. Motivation factors are those that can affect employees' job attitudes to be more positive because employees' self-actualization needs are satisfied. Examples of motivation factors include achievement, recognition, positive feedback, more responsibilities, advancement, and promotion, as well as the work itself (Herzberg et al., 1959). Herzberg identified the following motivational constructs affecting employees' motivation and job satisfactions: (a) achievement, (b) recognition, (c) employees' perceptions, (d) responsibility, (e) advancement, and (f) possibility of growth.

According to Herzberg (1966), when the satisfaction need of an employee is high, dissatisfaction diminishes, preventing poor performance; however, the only satisfaction of motivation factors can lead to improved productivity. According to the Herzberg theory, attitudes can affect performance. Favorable attitudes lead to better performance compared to unfavorable attitudes toward the company; negative attitudes toward the company can also lead to psychological withdrawal from the job (Herzberg, 1959). Job satisfaction is a predictor of loyalty. Unique to this theory is a deviation from the conventional notion of job satisfaction, which is that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are extremes of a single continuum (Herzberg, 1966). The hypothesis therefore is:

Hypothesis 1a. There is no relationship between a relationship between employee turnover intention and job satisfaction, employee compensation, employee engagement, employee motivation, and work environment.

Hypothesis 1b. There is a relationship between a relationship between employee turnover intention and job satisfaction, employee compensation, employee engagement, employee motivation, and work environment.
3. Methodology

3.1 Population and Sampling

The population for this study consisted of low- to mid-level hospitality employees who within the four sectors of the hospitality industry located in Atlanta, Georgia; Dallas, Texas; and Jackson, Mississippi. The four sectors include food and beverage, lodging, recreation, travel and tourism working in Atlanta, Georgia; Dallas, Texas; and Jackson, Mississippi. A convenience sample of 156 participants was used.

3.1.1 Instrumentation

The selected instruments for the measurement of the variables in this study were the following: (a) Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS) developed by Spector (1985) to measure job satisfaction, (b) Compensation Scale (CS) developed by Mensah (2014) to measure compensation, (c) Utrecht Work Employee Engagement Scale (UWES) developed by Schaufeli et al. (2002) to measure employee engagement, (d) Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale (WEIMS), developed by Tremblay et al. (2009) to measure employee motivation, (e) Work Environment Scale (WES) developed by Rossberg et al. (2004) to measure work environment, and (f) Turnover Intention Scale (TIS) developed by Khan and Du (2014) to measure employee turnover intentions. Although there were subscales present as part of the surveys, the composite scores of the scales were used. All surveys were in a Likert-scale format, and all composite scores resulted from summated items in each scale, after reversing scoring, as necessary and appropriate. The instruments were adopted, with author's permission, to collect data from the target population who were a service industry. They were initially tested for validity and reliability; therefore there was no need for revalidation.

4. Results

Table 1 displays the results of the descriptive analysis. Participants' views on the predictor variables were as follows showed that:

(i) Job satisfaction scores (M=129.01, SD = 16.19) indicating that participants were ambivalent than positive or negative about their views on their job satisfaction as reflected by a mean group score that was not much higher than the midpoint of 126.

(ii) Employee compensation scores (M=14.2, SD=4.67) indicating that the participants collectively expressed less satisfactory views of their compensation than neutral or positive views.

(iii) Employee engagement scores (M=66.51, SD=20.64) indicating that the participants collectively expressed higher satisfactory views of employee engagement than neutral or negative views.

(iv) Employee motivation scores (M=57.55, SD= 9.40) indicating that the participants collectively had more positive views of motivation than negative
or neutral perceptions about the motivation they experienced at work within the hospitality industry.

(v) Work environment scores (M= 24.26, SD= 7.03) was lower than the midpoint of 30, reflecting a less than neutral or positive collective view of participants about their work environments.

(vi) Employee turnover intention score (M= 10.28, SD = 2.34) indicating that the participants collectively had a slightly higher turnover intention than neutral views

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics (N-156)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>4.669</td>
<td>-.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>66.51</td>
<td>20.636</td>
<td>-.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>129.01</td>
<td>16.187</td>
<td>.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>57.55</td>
<td>9.403</td>
<td>-.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24.26</td>
<td>7.033</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>2.394</td>
<td>.464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 Correlation Analysis Results

Table 2 displays the results of the correlation analysis of the relationship between employee engagement, employee compensation, work environment, job satisfaction, and employee motivation and turnover intention. The results show significant associations between the dependent variable, turnover intention with employee engagement, employee compensation, work environment, job satisfaction, and employee motivation. In particular, the Pearson correlation coefficient of linear correlation between turnover intention and employee engagement was (r (139) = -.54, p< .01), indicating a significant moderate negative relationship. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis of no relationship between turnover intention and engagement. The Pearson correlation coefficient of linear correlation between turnover intention and compensation was (r (151) = -.34, p < .01), indicating a significant small negative relationship. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis of no relationship between turnover intention and compensation.

The Pearson correlation coefficient of linear correlation between turnover intention and satisfaction was (r (139) = .25, p< .01), indicating a significant small positive relationship. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis of no relationship between turnover intention and satisfaction. The Pearson correlation coefficient of linear correlation between turnover intention and motivation was (r (137) = -.21, p< .01), indicating a significant small negative relationship. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis of no relationship
between turnover intention and motivation. The Pearson correlation coefficient of linear correlation between turnover intention and the environment was \( r (152) = -.26, p < .01 \), indicating a significant small negative relationship. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis of no relationship between turnover intention and work environment.

Additional statistically significant positive correlations also appeared among the several of the predictor variables. For example, compensation also correlated positively with engagement, motivation, and environment. Engagement had a similar statistically significant positive correlation with compensation, motivation, and environment. Motivation appeared to be significantly and positively correlated with employee compensation and employee engagement. Work environment positively correlated with all other predictor variables, except for motivation. Job satisfaction appeared to correlate positively with only the work environment to a statistically significant extent.

Table 2. Correlation Coefficient between Study Predictor Variables (N=156)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>10.793</td>
<td>1.885</td>
<td>5.725</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Scale</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>- .235</td>
<td>-2.34</td>
<td>.021.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utrecht Work Engagement Scale</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.398</td>
<td>3.592</td>
<td>.001.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spector Job Satisfaction Scale</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>2.053</td>
<td>.043.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>1.363</td>
<td>.176.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment Scale</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.164</td>
<td>1.905</td>
<td>.059.833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention Scale.

4.2 Multiple Regression Analysis Results

Table 3, 4 and 5 display the results of linear multiple regression showed that the model comprising the five predictors, work environment, employee motivation, job satisfaction, employee compensation, and employee engagement combined accounted for about 36% of variance in turnover intention and the result was statistically significant \( R^2 = .36, F (5, 105) = 11.57, p < .001 \). Therefore we fail to reject the null hypotheses of no statistically significant relationship between employee compensation, employee motivation, employee engagement, job satisfaction, and work environment to turnover intentions in the hospitality industry. A review of the beta weights specifies four variables, compensation \( \beta = -.23, t (105) = -2.34, p < .05 \); engagement \( \beta = -.39, t (105) = -3.59, p < .00 \), satisfaction \( \beta = -.17, t (105) = -2.05, p < .05 \), and environment \( \beta = -.16, t (105) = -1.90, p < .05 \), significantly contributed to the model. Motivation did not significantly contribute to the model \( \beta = -.13, t (105) = -1.36, p > .05 \). While the beta weights for four variables, employee compensation, employee
engagement, job satisfaction, and work environment were significantly related to turnover intention, motivation was not significantly related to turnover intention.

Table 3. ANOVA (N=156)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>222.295</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44.459</td>
<td>11.566</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>403.615</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>625.910</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention Scale.
b. Predictors: (Constant), Work Environment, Employee Motivation, Job Satisfaction, Employee Compensation, Employee Engagement.

Table 4. Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.596a</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>1.961</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Environment, Employee Motivation, Job Satisfaction, Employee Compensation, Employee Engagement

Table 5. ANOVA (N=156)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>222.295</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44.459</td>
<td>11.566</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>403.615</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>625.910</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention Scale
b. Predictors: (Constant), Work Environment, Employee Motivation, Job Satisfaction, Employee Compensation, Employee Engagement
Table 6. Correlation Coefficient between Study Predictor Variables (N=156)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>10.793</td>
<td>1.885</td>
<td>5.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Scale</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utrecht Work Engagement Scale</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spector Job Satisfaction Scale</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment Scale</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention Scale

7. Limitation of Study

The use of US-based employees working in the hospitality industry was the first limitation. The second limitation was the biases and honesty of the study's participant with their responses to the survey questions, as the validity and accuracy of instruments used in assessing the variables. Third, the sample of the participants was taken from an employee working in the industry in the following locations: (a) Atlanta, Georgia; (b) Dallas, Texas; and (c) Jackson, Mississippi; therefore, there could be differences in experiences among participant working in the different location. Fourth, the study was restricted to five independent variables and one dependent variable, thereby limiting the findings to the variables within the study. These factors limited the generalizability of the study's results.

8. Summary and Conclusion

The findings from this study apply to individuals, communities, organizations, and society. Retaining skilled and satisfied employees are essential to the growth, sustainability, and economic well-being of all business types, including the hospitality industry. Hospitality employee retention reduces the costs associated with recruiting, hiring, and training new workers. Therefore, understanding the factors that lead to employees leaving their jobs is necessary for organization survival. The results of this study indicate that job satisfaction, employee compensation, employee engagement, employee motivation, and work environment are significant factors related to hospitality employee turnover intention.

The extension of the study of factors involved with turnover serves as the basis for the development of solutions to the problem. The findings from this study encompass the idea that workplace compensation, motivation, engagement, environment, and job satisfaction are important factors to employees that may affect customers and the community in which they work. Employee turnover among hospitality employees affects an organization in several ways and threatens the service quality to the customers.
Parakandi and Behery (2016) indicated that organizational leaders are increasingly becoming aware of the need to have strategies and policies that lead to a sustainable workforce. Recommendations based on the results of this study include implementing conscious efforts to enhance employees' positive perceptions about job satisfaction, employee compensation, employee engagement, employee motivation, and work environment, as significant predictors of turnover intention in the hospitality industry.
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