Human resource management in the hotel industry: A review of the literature

Gayani Hewagama

The University of Auckland Business School, Auckland, New Zealand

Email: g.hewagama@auckland.ac.nz
Human resource management in the hotel industry: A review of the literature

ABSTRACT

This article conducts a systematic review of the literature on human resource management (HRM) in the hotel sector in order to answer the following related questions: what human resource (HR) practices and strategies exist in the hotel sector and why do they exist? The paper discusses the challenges faced by the hotel industry and the relevant HR strategies and practices in this context. The findings reveal that there is a mix of HR strategies in the sector, with hotels blending numerical flexibility with externalized forms of labour, and functional flexibility with high-commitment HRM.
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Understanding diversity in human resource management (HRM) and how it is managed in different contexts is challenging (Boxall, Ang, & Bartram, 2011). This review focuses on HRM in the hotel sector. The study of HRM in the hotel sector is of particular importance because of the intensity of human resource (HR) use in this industry. Frontline employees in the hotel sector are important for the creation and provision of excellent service quality (Chand, 2010b; Tsaur & Lin, 2004). Human interaction in service delivery is typically seen as critical for customer satisfaction (Michel, Bowen, & Johnston, 2009; Schneider, 2004; Tsaur & Lin, 2004).

While research on HRM in the hospitality industry in general includes the hotel sector, the findings of such research are not necessarily generalizable to the hotel industry (Lucas, 2002). The purpose of this review is, therefore, to explore the following questions: 1) what HR practices and strategies exist in the hotel sector, and 2) why do they exist? A comprehensive review of the literature was undertaken by examining international empirical studies conducted in the hotel industry. The analysis identified the most consistently studied HR practices and the most commonly adopted HR strategies in the hotel sector in order to both deepen our understanding of why such practices exist and highlight the diverse nature of hospitality operations.
After this introduction, the review is structured into four main sections. Section 1 elaborates on the definition of hospitality and then addresses the context of hotel work. Section 2 presents the strategies of HRM in the hotel sector. Section 3 outlines the methodology adopted to review the articles, and then a discussion follows on the most consistently studied HR practices in the hotel sector. Section 4 concludes the article by discussing the challenges faced by the hotel industry in relation to HRM. This final also section includes suggestions for future research in the area and reflects on the limitations of this review.

**HOSPITALITY AND THE CONTEXT OF HOTEL WORK**

The term “hospitality” has not been clearly defined from a research perspective and there is a lack of clarity concerning its boundaries and separation from other service industries (Ottenbacher, Harrington, & Parsa, 2009). A succinct definition is hard to achieve, owing to the diverse nature of the hospitality industry (Lashley, 2000). Ottenbacher et al. (2009) argue that hospitality industries are the providers of “food, beverages, accommodation, entertainment, leisure, attraction, or some combination of those” (p. 273). They suggest that hospitality operations cover the sectors of lodging (hotels, motels), food service (restaurants, catering), leisure, conventions, travel, and attractions. Lodging operators are “providers of accommodation and other amenities for the travelers and other desiring customers” (p. 276). Accommodation is the main service provided by the lodging sector, which is further subdivided into resorts, luxury hotels, budget hotels, inns and motels, hostels, lodges, and other accommodations (Ottenbacher et al., 2009). The basis of this division is the nature of accommodation provided and the level of service offered to the customer. A definition provided for large-scale hotels is “hotels with star gradings of four to five (luxury hotels) [and] possessing more than 100 rooms” (Knox & Walsh, 2005, p. 62). In the hotel industry, the star rating system (ranging from one to five) is a universally recognized standard of quality of service (Hoque, 2013). Larger hotels provide a wider range of facilities to their customers and are therefore more likely to receive a higher star rating than small-scale hotels (Hoque, 2013).

In many countries, the tourism and hospitality sectors generate a large number of jobs (World Travel and Tourism Council: A career in Travel and Tourism, 2013). At the same time, however,
researchers have shown that labour turnover and skill shortage are critical problems in the hotel sector (e.g. Ahmad & Scott, 2013; Davidson & Wang, 2011). A hotel’s performance is said to depend to a large extent on its employees (Crick & Spencer, 2011). The career of a hotel employee is often advanced by moving from one hotel to another, which is a common practice in large and luxury hotels (Ahmad & Scott, 2013).

Customer demand in the hotel industry fluctuates and therefore employing too few or too many permanent (full-time) employees for hotel operations is a significant risk (Knox & Walsh, 2005). Having inadequate staff numbers may impair service quality, whereas a large number of permanent employees increases operating costs. Thus, temporary and part-time employment and shift work are common characteristics of the hotel sector (Haynes & Fryer, 1999; Hoque, 1999b; Knox & Walsh, 2005; Luo & Milne, 2014). Fluctuating demand in the sector has led hotel managers to adopt a cost-reduction strategy by hiring more temporary and part-time casual staff (Knox & Walsh, 2005).

STRATEGIES OF HRM IN THE HOTEL INDUSTRY

This section surveys three different HR strategies applicable to the hotel industry. The first relates to the soft-hard dichotomy of HRM, which consists of two opposing goals: commitment versus control. This typology is mainly present in normative models of HRM. The distinction is usually based on whether the primary emphasis is placed on “human” or “resource” (Worsfold, 1999). Guest (1987) describes the soft version as considering the human aspect of HRM, treating employees as a valuable asset. In the soft version, more emphasis is placed on gaining employee commitment through which organizations can achieve higher performance (Guest, 1987). In contrast, the hard version of HRM focuses on control rather than commitment and implies that human resources are a cost that needs to be minimized. Employees are therefore managed in a more rational and instrumental way (Legge, 1995). Within the hotel sector, Worsfold (1999) contends that a soft version of HRM focused on commitment is more appropriate to luxury hotels. By contrast, budget hotels are more likely to advocate a hard version of HRM and give more consideration to control.
Lashley (1998) argues that the soft-hard dichotomy does not provide an adequate view of HRM in service organizations. He proposes that HRM should be influenced by the nature of the service delivered by service firms. In particular, the continua of tangibles/intangibles and customization/standardization are influential factors in determining approaches to HRM in service organizations (Lashley, 1998). Based on these factors, a service organization may determine the degree of discretion that employees can exercise in service delivery. Lashley proposes a matrix of four HRM archetypes suitable for different service organizations, and this is the second strategic approach discussed in this review. The four approaches are the involvement style, the command-and-control style, the professional style, and the participative style. In a highly standardized service offer like fast-food companies, employees have less discretion in performing services, perform simple routine tasks, and are subject to control-oriented management (Lashley, 1998). This type of service organization tends to adopt a more command-and-control approach to HRM.

Conversely, if the service offer can be highly customized, then employees have more discretion and autonomy which leads to either a professional or participative approach to HRM (Lashley, 1998). Such a situation exists in luxury hotels, where employees enjoy more discretion or empowerment in performing services. Hence, Lashley concludes that HRM policy and practice need to be compatible with the nature of the service provided to the customers. In line with this, Boxall (2003) proposes that different service markets require different strategies for the management of work and people. Boxall classifies the hotel sector as a mass market with a higher-value-added segment in which there is the possibility of targeting higher-value-added customers and greater variation in customer preferences. Hence, hotels compete through quality as well as costs. Boxall claims that jobs in this segment require a mix of skill levels and a moderate level of discretion, and there is clearly potential for job enrichment.

The third HR strategy in the hotel sector relates to organizational flexibility and the debate between “high-road HRM” and “low-road HRM”. Organizational flexibility can be exercised using two different methods: functional flexibility – emphasizing multi-skilling – and numerical flexibility – stressing a tight cost control policy (Knox & Walsh, 2005). The objective of functional flexibility is to
enable employees to move between tasks through the development of multiple skills (Knox & Walsh, 2005). High-road HRM adopts functional flexibility with high-commitment management practices, which share related thematic concerns. High-commitment management practices aim at developing a dedicated and flexible workforce and enabling hotels to respond quickly to changes in the competitive market environment (Knox & Walsh, 2005). Functional flexibility can be achieved through the HRM practices of training, career development, and participative decision-making activities (Knox & Walsh, 2005). On the contrary, low-road HRM involves reducing costs and a more restrictive approach to HRM characterized by numerical flexibility. Numerical flexibility is focused on externalized forms of labour such as casual or fixed-term contracts or on outsourcing labour to achieve an optimum cost structure (Kalleberg, 2003).

These two distinctive approaches are argued to have different consequences for employees as well as for firms. Tight cost-control practices have been identified in the hotel sector in many countries including the United Kingdom (Hoque, 1999b), Australia (Knox & Walsh, 2005), New Zealand (Luo & Milne, 2014), Malaysia (Ahmad & Scott, 2013), and Taiwan (Yang & Cherry, 2008). The negative consequences of such practices are low levels of job training and skill utilization and a lack of functional flexibility. Numerical flexibility may result in inferior employment conditions and pay, along with poor employment relations outcomes such as high staff turnover rates and absenteeism (Lucas, 2002). Numerical flexibility has been criticized for promoting a lack of interest in HRM and utilizing more informal, unsystematic HRM practices and control-focused management practices (Hoque, 1999b). On the other hand, commitment-based HRM is focused on achieving employee commitment to organizational objectives (Knox & Walsh, 2005). High-commitment HRM practices such as extensive training, multi-skilling, flexible job design, more comprehensive communication, and consultation were widely seen in large-scale hotels that had adopted a greater level of formal HRM practices (Hoque, 1999b; Knox & Walsh, 2005); this is discussed further in the next section.

There is a considerable debate as to which strategic approach to HRM is more suitable for the hotel sector. Lucas and Deery (2004) reviewed 100 papers on HRM in the hospitality sector. They claim that even though soft HRM policies are relevant in theory for achieving service quality and
customer care, in reality priority is given to hard, cost-driven HRM policies. The authors identify a number of critical issues that HRM hospitality researchers need to address, including the effect of a 24/7 work environment, the impact of shift work on employee health, safety and well-being, and career development.

In summary, there are three main strategic approaches to HRM advanced in the literature on the hotel sector: the soft-hard dichotomy; Lashley’s (1998) four HRM archetypes; and the notion of high-road versus low-road HRM. Fluctuating demand, the nature of the service offer, organizational flexibility goals (numerical vs. functional), and the business strategy that the hotel is pursuing are often seen as the decisive factors that determine HRM approaches in the hotel sector. The next section outlines the methodology adopted for this review and presents the findings from the analysis.

**METHODOLOGY: SEARCH CRITERIA AND REVIEW SAMPLE**

This article conducts a systematic review of the literature on HRM in the hotel sector. The literature search was conducted in two phases. In the first phase, similar to the search strategy adopted in the review article by Tang (2014), three primary online databases were identified: Business Source Premier (EBSCO), Pro Quest Business, and Science Direct. Next, eight tourism and hospitality management journals included in these databases were chosen on the basis of previous review studies (Hall, 2011; Tang, 2014). The selected journals were Anatolia, Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research, International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration, International Journal of Hospitality Management, Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality and Tourism, Managing Leisure and Tourism Management. A systematic search was conducted using the keywords “Human Resource Management (HRM)”, “Human Resource Practices”, “Human Resource Strategy” and “Hotel/s” within these journals. The keywords were identified based on the research questions.

The initial search results provided an inadequate sample for the review to be meaningful and, therefore, the second phase involved extending the search to include management and HRM journals included in the same databases. The same keywords were searched for in different combinations.
which returned a sample of 102 papers published between 1998 and 2014. The papers were filtered first by reading the abstract and then by reading the full article. The inclusion criterion was that the article had to be an empirical study that discussed HRM in hotels. Empirical studies on restaurants and the fast-food industry were excluded. The filtering resulted in 27 papers that fit the criteria. Content analysis was then used to classify the remaining papers. The empirical studies were classified according to research context, sample, method, evidence of HRM practices, and outcome variables (see Table 1 in the Appendix). Of the 27 hotel sector articles, 6 adopted a qualitative interview method while the remaining 21 used survey methods. The empirical studies were conducted in 12 different countries including the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, New Zealand, China, India, Malaysia, and Taiwan.

When considering the research populations, two types of samples can be identified. Some studies sampled at the individual level and had employees and/or managers as the unit of analysis (16 studies). Others used hotels as their samples and set their unit of analysis at the organizational level (11 studies). In general, the studies defined frontline employees as those working in the front office, restaurants, banquets, housekeeping, health centres, entertainment or reservations (Ahmad & Scott, 2013; Chen & Tseng, 2012; Karatepe, 2013a, 2013b; Li, Sanders, & Frenkel, 2012). Frontline employee roles included front desk agents, wait staff, bell attendants, guest relations representatives, bartenders, door attendants, and supervisors from the front office, restaurants and housekeeping. Frontline employees have direct contact with the customers and they handle service delivery and execution. The hotel sector relies heavily on customer service and many studies found that one of the major contributions HRM has made to hotel operations has been its focus on employees who deliver the service.

**Description and discussion of studies**

This section presents an overview of the findings of the empirical studies that fit this review’s selection criteria. As noted in the previous section, HRM practices have been investigated both at the individual level and organizational level. The individual level relates to how individual employees and managers perceive HRM practices, while the organizational level relates to a firm’s “HRM system”
and takes into account a “bundle” or cluster of HRM practices (Boxall et al., 2011). However, most empirical studies under review examined HRM practices separately rather than combining these practices as an HRM system. Table 1 (see Table 1 in the Appendix) shows that the most commonly studied HRM practices were training, staffing, pay and rewards, performance appraisals, and work organization. Work organization includes job design, planned team briefings, quality circles and teamwork. Examining the HRM practices in 46 hotels in the United States, Chow, Haddad, and Singh (2007) found a significant relationship between the hotel size and the implementation of HRM practices. They also showed that HRM practices were more formalized in larger firms and greater in number. Based on their findings, the authors argue that usage of HRM practices differs with the type of facility (e.g. economy hotels vs. resorts).

Analysis of the empirical studies revealed that training is the most consistently studied HRM practice. Knox and Walsh (2005) reported that HRM practices in the Australian luxury hotel sector are geared towards training and skills development and achieving functional flexibility. Further, new employees in a hotel typically receive initial induction training and then on-the-job training. Functional flexibility initiatives such as multi-skilling and cross-functional training programmes are also common in the sector. Multi-skilling initiatives involve expanding the role of the employee, enabling him/her to work in various departments such as restaurants, bars or even housekeeping (Knox & Walsh, 2005). Managers in the Australian context emphasized that multi-skilling initiatives had led to greater job variety, thereby increasing staff retention and service quality.

In a study of 70 international hotels in Taiwan, Chen and Tseng (2012) examined the benefits of cross-functional training using a sample of frontline supervisors. Their sample consisted of multi-skilled supervisors and a control group of non-multi-skilled supervisors. The findings suggest that functional flexibility through cross-functional training can improve service quality and reduce staff turnover problems. Furthermore, the authors found that cross-functional training positively related to job satisfaction and career development of employees. Chen and Tseng argue that cross-functional training can make employees’ skills more flexible and facilitate functional flexibility. Thus, training is helpful for enhancing employees’ ability to perform a variety of tasks in different departments and
focuses on moving employees easily from one task to other. In this way, hotels can cope with the cyclical variation in customer demand by filling vacancies via the movement of flexible workers across and between departments. Cross-functional training is, therefore, one way that hotels can increase their functional flexibility (Crawford, 2013; Knox & Walsh, 2005). Benefits include improving cross-departmental communication and understanding as well as better customer service, reduced turnover, and enhanced internal promotions (Chen & Tseng, 2012; Crawford, 2013).

Most of research on HRM in the hotel sector also focuses on staffing in terms of recruitment and selection. Staffing policies in many countries are dominated by numerical flexibility and contingent workforce due to seasonal demand (Davidson & Wang, 2011; Knox & Walsh, 2005). Large-scale hotels are more likely to have a specialized HRM department to handle recruitment and selection (Hoque, 1999b; Knox & Walsh, 2005; Lockyer & Scholarios, 2004). Lockyer and Scholarios (2004) investigated the staffing practices of 81 Scottish hotels and found that compared to small-scale hotels the large hotels tend to place more value on structured staffing procedures. The large hotels utilized multiple recruitment sources such as referrals from existing staff, government agencies, and advertising. Widely used selection methods included one-on-one interviews and application forms. Further, large-scale chain hotels tended to have centralized staffing practices controlled by head office and a more holistic approach to employee selection. This holistic approach included the integration of the quality objectives of the hotel and the involvement of the HRM manager as well as other heads of departments in the selection process. Interestingly, dedicated assessment centers and psychometric personality testing are not common in the hotel sector (Hoque, 1999b; Lockyer & Scholarios, 2004).

In New Zealand and Australian contexts, multiple selection methods are used in the staffing process, including realistic job previews, trainability assessments and “multi-hiring” (Knox & Walsh, 2005; Luo & Milne, 2014). Knox and Walsh (2005) describe multi-hiring as a “distinctively novel HR practice” whereby “permanent employees [are] able to work on a temporary basis in a different department of the hotel” (p. 69). For example, a permanent hotel restaurant employee could do temporary work in the banqueting department when demand is high. The benefits to the hotel are that
employees become more familiar with work procedures and standards of quality are raised while recruitment costs are lowered. Furthermore, employees can receive additional income through multi-hiring.

Earlier research on the hotel sector found that hotels tended to adopt a Taylorist form of work organization with little evidence of attempts to empower operational-level staff. For example, a study by Haynes and Fryer (1999) in 14 large New Zealand hotels showed that work was organized according to traditional Taylorism and characterized by tight control, hierarchical structure, specialization, and low discretion. A more recent study by Luo and Milne (2014) examined the use of 21 HR practices in 47 New Zealand hotels. The findings identified flexible job descriptions, work organized around teamwork, and staff involvement in setting performance goals.

In the Australian context, Knox and Walsh (2005) found that “luxury hotels placed much greater emphasis on enabling flexibility initiatives and the application of high commitment HRM practices” (p. 71) compared to the hotel sector in general. Large hotels placed more emphasis on formal training, staff appraisals, team building, formal systems of grievance handling, health and safety procedures, communication systems, and policies for equal employment. In addition, the authors noted that multi-skilling and flexible job design are increasingly being seen in the hotel sector (Hoque, 1999b; Knox & Walsh, 2005).

In terms of pay and benefits, Davidson and Wang (2011) found that low pay was common in the Australian context from a web-based survey of 64 hotels. Their findings indicate that low wages lead to skill shortages. In line with this, Ahmad and Scott (2013) showed that wages account for a high proportion of the operating costs in the Malaysian hotel sector and that managements try to curtail them as much as possible. Skill shortage is a critical issue in the Malaysian context, and the industry is highly reliant on part-time and casual staff. Casual employment is associated with numerical flexibility which focuses on controlling staff numbers and reducing wages cost. However, poor pay tends to result in high employee turnover (Davidson & Wang, 2011) and impede functional flexibility (Knox & Walsh, 2005).
In sum, these studies provide empirical insights into the diverse nature of HRM in the hotel sector and the most common HR practices adopted to overcome its unique challenges. Two key insights can be derived from these studies. First, fluctuating demand is a core characteristic of the sector, and a large number of hotels adopt temporal labour strategies to meet this challenge. Relying on contingent labour has negative consequences for hotels and employees, as mentioned above. However, it is unlikely that hotels will move away from contingent labour due to the fluctuation in demand and high labour turnover that characterize the sector. Furthermore, findings indicate that there is a tendency in the hotel sector to adopt both temporal labour strategies and high-commitment HRM simultaneously to provide solutions to these issues. Studies have shown that the hotel sector does not pursue an unequivocally low-road approach to HRM. In fact, hotels are increasingly experimenting with high-commitment HRM practices. High-commitment HRM practices such as extensive training, multi-skilling and flexible job design, formal staffing procedures, and more comprehensive communication and consultation were widely seen in large-scale hotels (Hoque, 1999a, 1999b; Knox & Walsh, 2005; Luo & Milne, 2014).

Secondly, hotels may vary in terms of size, location, ownership, services offered, and business strategy (competing on price vs. competing on quality), and therefore employment practices tend to vary according to the context. Further research work is needed on the relationship between these variables and HRM practices. HRM in hospitality is not necessarily generalizable to the HRM in the hotel sector since significant differentiation exists among the diverse contexts (Lucas, 2002; Lucas & Deery, 2004). It is, therefore, important that hospitality studies contextualize themselves within the field of HRM research.

**HRM CHALLENGES IN THE HOTEL INDUSTRY AND CONCLUSION**

The examination of the literature has revealed that labour turnover and skill shortages are common issues in the hotel sector in many countries. Significant consequences of staff turnover include increasing replacement and training costs, loss of productivity, and impairment of service quality (Yang & Cherry, 2008). Numerical and temporal labour strategies are one way to maintain a supply of mobile workers at low cost. However, temporal labour strategies may hinder functional flexibility. Compared to the permanent employees, casual workers usually get lower wages and
limited training opportunities and little career development (Davidson & Wang, 2011). Their commitment to the hotel is low, and lack of training may result in low service quality.

The hospitality literature identifies some of the primary challenges in the hotel sector in the areas of service quality, training and staffing (Davidson & Wang, 2011; Knox & Walsh, 2005; Yang & Cherry, 2008). Employee skill development has a positive impact on service quality, and this practice reinforces the behaviour, skills and attitudes of service employees (Tsaur & Lin, 2004). Multi-skilling and cross-functional training improves functional flexibility and reduces turnover issues (Chen & Tseng, 2012). Due to high employee turnover training of new employees becomes an enormous challenge (Davidson & Wang, 2011). All these issues will either directly or indirectly impact the quality of the service provided to the customer.

In general, the hotel sector applies a cost-minimization strategy and adopts numerical flexibility to a considerable extent. However, it is also apparent that large-scale luxury hotels are adopting more formalized, systematic HRM practices and policies. These hotels are placing greater emphasis on enabling functional flexibility and practicing high-commitment HRM practices. Developing multi-skilled staff is one strategy that hotels use to overcome fluctuations in customer demand and reduce the high employee turnover issue. Flexibility in hotel operations is also maintained through job rotation, job enrichment, cross-functional training, and multi-hiring. Investment in training activities helps employees in their career progression and can result in better service quality.

On the other hand, the hotel sector is highly susceptible to fluctuating demand and, therefore, cannot ignore numerical flexibility staffing strategies. The empirical evidence shows that even large hotels adopt temporal labour strategies and use contingent labour to counter fluctuating demand (Davidson & Wang, 2011; Knox & Walsh, 2005; Lucas 2002). This suggests that a mix of labour strategies combining functional and temporal/numerical flexibility practices would be most effective in the hotel sector.

The main limitation of this systematic review is its small sample size – only 27 empirical studies were found to have been conducted in the hotel sector internationally, mainly in large-scale hotels. However, future research can build on the insights revealed here by investigating variations in
HRM across hotel star ratings, size, and ownership, and by exploring to what extent these factors affect the HR practices employed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author and the year</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>HR variables</th>
<th>Outcome variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Luo and Milne (2014)</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>47 hotels</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>HR practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Reynolds, Rahman, and</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>242 managers of 96 hotels</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Diversity-training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradetchi (2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Karatepe (2013b)</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>174 full-time hotel employees</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Work social support, turnover intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Karatepe (2013a)</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>110 hotel employees and their managers</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Job performance, work engagement, extra-role customer service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Crawford (2013)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>11 hotel managers</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Service quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Ahmad and Scott (2013)</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>14 front-office managers</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Front Office department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Tang and Tang (2012)</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>1133 employees &amp; 119 HR managers</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Organizational citizenship behaviour, justice and service climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Tavitiyaman, Zhang, and</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>317 hotels</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Organizational structure, hotel performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu (2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Li, Sanders, and Frenkel</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>298 employees and 54 supervisors</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Leader-member exchange, work engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Chen and Tseng (2012)</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>102 hotel staff</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Cross-functional training service quality, job satisfaction, and career development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Davidson and Wang (2011)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>64 five-star hotels</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Employee turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Chang, Gong, and Shum</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>196 hotels &amp; restaurants</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Chand (2010a)</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>57 hotel managers</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>HR practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Chand (2010b)</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>52 HR managers 260 employees, 260</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Service quality, customer satisfaction and organisational performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>customers</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Maroudas, Kyriakidou,</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>06 multinational hotels</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Organisational incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Vacharis (2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author and the year</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>HR variables</td>
<td>Outcome variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Yang and Cherry (2008)</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>14 hotels with hotel managers</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>HRM challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Sun, Aryee, and Law (2007)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>81 HR managers and 405 supervisors in 81 hotels</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Service-oriented citizenship behaviour, turnover, productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Connolly and McGing (2007)</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>40 hotels</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Empowerment, participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Tsaur and Lin (2004)</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>203 hotel employees and 272 customers</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Service behaviour and service quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Chow, Haddad, and Singh (2007)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>46 hotels</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction, Morale, Optimism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Lucas (2002)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1198 Workplace employment relations survey</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>Employee Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Lockyer and Scholarios (2004)</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>81 hotels</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>Recruitment and selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Hoque (1999a)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>232 hotels-209 used</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>HRM linked with service quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Hoque (1999b)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>230 hotels and 314 manufacturing firms</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>HR practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Haynes and Fryer (1999)</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Hotel managers and union officials</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>HRM practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Lashley (1998)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Hotels and restaurants</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>HRM archetypes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W- Work Organizations (Job design, quality circles, teams, and empowerment) / S- Staffing (recruitment and selection) / TD- Training and career development / P- Pay and Rewards PA- Performance appraisals / E- Employee voice, terms and conditions of employment, unions, communication, and consultation / H- Occupational health, safety and welfare
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