



The effects of training satisfaction, employee benefits, and incentives on part-time employees' commitment



Caitlin Jaworski^a, Swathi Ravichandran^{b,*}, Aryn C. Karpinski^c, Shweta Singh^d

^a Hilton Garden Inn Twinsburg, 8971 Wilcox Dr., Twinsburg, OH 44087, USA

^b Hospitality Management, Kent State University, Kent, OH, 44242, USA

^c Evaluation and Measurement, Kent State University, Kent, OH, 44242, USA

^d Hospitality and Tourism Management, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, 47906, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Part-time employees

Hotel

Benefits

Incentives

Training

Commitment

Lodging

ABSTRACT

Training in hospitality organizations is associated with several benefits including consistency in job performance, greater job satisfaction, higher guest satisfaction, and reduction in business costs. Unfortunately, companies do not tend to put forth much effort into implementing effective training techniques, particularly for part-time employees. This study surveyed part-time hotel employees to determine if training method and duration impacted training satisfaction. The impact of benefits and incentives received, and training satisfaction on job commitment was also determined. On-the-job training and job shadowing were found to impact training satisfaction. Select benefits and incentives and training satisfaction impacted commitment. Implications are discussed.

1. Introduction

Training and development is a crucial activity in hospitality organizations because of the high costs associated with employee turnover. There are several benefits associated with training including consistency in job performance, greater job satisfaction, higher guest satisfaction, and reduction in business costs, to name a few (Wesley and Skip, 1999). Unfortunately, companies do not tend to put forth much effort into implementing effective training techniques. The hospitality industry has a poor reputation for lackluster techniques although this is not well supported empirically (Poulston, 2008). Specifically, management in hotels is usually reluctant to invest in proper training for their employees and in programs to train the trainer. Because of management's lack of willingness to invest in these types of programs, a cycle is being created in this industry where poor training of employees and the consequential lack of motivation and poor commitment of employees is never-ending ().

The large number of part-time employees in the hospitality industry adds to management's reluctance to invest in training because there is a widely held belief among hospitality managers that part-time workers have less commitment, competence, and willingness to work hard (Inman and Enz, 1995). Two out of five workers in the hospitality industry are part-time; this is more than twice the proportion of all other industries (Employment and Training Administration and U.S.

Department of Labor, 2010). According to a survey conducted by Harris Poll on behalf of CareerBuilder, 23% of employers expected to recruit part-time employees in 2015; this number is up 6% from 2014 (CareerBuilder, 2015). Positions held by part-time hotel employees include everything from front desk, housekeeping, cooks, servers, and maintenance, and even some management and accounting positions, making it essential to develop training programs for each of these positions.

Most part-time employees receive lower wages than their full-time colleagues and do not receive benefits (Inman and Enz, 1995) even though benefits and incentives could reduce part-time employee turnover rates (). This is despite the fact that employee turnover is a well-established problem in the hospitality industry resulting in a vicious cycle of recruitment, selection, and training. DiPietro and McLeod (2012) found that part-time hospitality employees showed significantly lower organizational commitment than those who perceived their work status as full-time. The short-term costs of part-time employee turnover involves spending time and money to constantly hire and train new employees; and in the long-term, inconsistent quality of service could result in lost revenue (La Lopa et al., 2000). According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2013), employees in the hospitality industry had the lowest tenure with their current employer. According to the American Hotel & Lodging Association, estimates of average annual employee turnover range from around 60–300 percent (Gautam, 2005).

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: Caitlin.Jaworski@Hilton.com (C. Jaworski), sravicha@kent.edu (S. Ravichandran), akarpins@kent.edu (A.C. Karpinski), fshweta@purdue.edu (S. Singh).

Research related to training and benefits of part-time employees in the hospitality industry and specifically the lodging segment is limited (Johnson and Cho, 2009). Enz (2001) found that motivation and care of hourly employees was a critical problem facing the hospitality industry in the U.S. Sobaih (2011) called for more research in this under-published area because part-time employees continue to be managed inappropriately by their employers. Given the large number of part-time employees in the accommodations sector, the projected increase (Employment and Training Administration and U.S. Department of Labor, 2010), and the persistent issue of high turnover (“Hospitality employee turnover rose,” 2015) among part-time lodging employees, it is imperative to research ways to increase this group’s job commitment. Hence, the purpose of this study was to explore the effects of benefits and incentives received by part-time lodging employees and their perceptions of satisfaction with training received, on job commitment.

Although the advantages of offering structured training and benefits and incentives to part-time hospitality employees have been touted, the lack of empirical evidence prompted the following research objectives specific to part-time lodging industry employees: (a) to determine the impact of training method, length of training, and follow-up training received by part-time employees on training satisfaction, and (b) to determine the impact of benefits and incentives received, and training satisfaction on job commitment.

2. Literature review

2.1. Theoretical underpinning

Frederick Herzberg created the motivator-hygiene theory in 1959 to study job attitudes. Herzberg et al. (1959) concluded that fourteen factors can be associated with how an employee feels about their job. These factors include: recognition, achievement, possibility of growth, advancement, salary, interpersonal relations, supervision, responsibility, company policy and administration, working conditions, the work itself, factors in personal life, status, and job security (Herzberg et al., 1959). Research related to training and job benefits and its potential relationship with select attitudes toward the job falls square within the scope of this study.

As suggested by Sobaih (2011), the human capital theory is also central to this study. The theory states that organizations are less likely to invest if they perceive a low return (Becker, 1964). It is clear that hospitality managers offer fewer training programs for part-time employees because they perceive a low return on investment (Sobaih et al., 2008). Learning the relationship between investing in part-time employees’ training and benefits and its impact on job commitment may alter management practices.

2.2. Part-time workforce in the hospitality industry

There is no universal definition for a part-time employee; however, for the purpose of this paper and research, a part-time employee is an individual who works less than 35 h per week (Johanson and Cho, 2009). The reasons that people choose, or do not choose, to work part-time are varied. According to Doeringhaus and Feldman (1993), many part-time employees are students, have spouses that work full-time, or some even have another full-time job themselves. Some also work part-time for health reasons or because they have childcare responsibilities. These are considered voluntary part-time employees.

Involuntary part-time employees are those who wish to move up and work full-time, but are not given that opportunity. The number of involuntary part-time employees due to slack or unfavorable business conditions continues to be very high in the services industry; particularly in the leisure and hospitality sector (Cajner et al., 2014). The increase in the number of part-time employees has been attributed to factors such as the Affordable Care Act (Davidson, 2014) and post-recession economic conditions (Timiraos, 2014). It is arguable as to

whether the reason for the continued large number of part-time employees in the hospitality industry is cyclical or structural; there could very well be a structural component as employers rely more on a contingent workforce and avoid converting part-time to full-time positions (Timiraos, 2014).

Many employers feel that part-time employees are substandard to the rest of the workforce, are usually less concerned with quality of work and cleanliness, tend to have higher rates of absenteeism, and are likely to quit because they feel unappreciated (Inman and Enz, 1995). However, Johanson and Cho (2009) found in a study involving four upscale hotels that part-time employees actually have a higher level of organizational commitment, perform more action behaviors (such as going above and beyond what is asked of them), and tend to engage in more quality work performance compared to full-time employees. Part-time employees are essential for hospitality businesses to gain a competitive advantage as they are a flexible labor source during periods of fluctuating demand (Enz and Inman, 1992) and also play a key role in customer service and retention while resulting in labor cost savings (Stamper and Van Dyne, 2003).

Johanson and Cho (2009) stated that hospitality organizations should treat part-time employees the same as their full-time counterparts when it comes to training, benefits, and recognition. However, a review of the limited literature on the topic indicates that part-time employees do not have access to the same training opportunities as their full-time counterparts (Monk and Ryding, 2007; Sobaih et al., 2008; Sobaih et al., 2011) and do not receive the pay or benefits received by full-time employees even though they possess similar skills (Inman and Enz, 1995).

2.3. Part-time employee training in the hospitality industry

The hospitality industry lacks consistency and portability as far as training models are concerned (Employment and Training Administration and U.S. Department of Labor, 2010). Focusing on the hotel industry, Lai et al. (2008) concluded that management is very reluctant to invest in training of part-time employees because they feel that they are just constantly being replaced. There are also doubts about whether part-time employees are productive because of high levels of absenteeism, lack of commitment, and lower quality of performance (Marchington and Wilkinson, 2000). This perceived lack of productivity may be attributable to lack of training. Sobaih (2011) found seven obstacles when training part-time employees: (a) high cost of training and lower return on investment; (b) lack of training time; (c) working of irregular shifts; (d); working background of part-time employees; (e) low enthusiasm of part-time employees; (f) high turnover of part-time employees; and (g) lack of resources, knowledge and suitable training program. These obstacles are linked together and are associated with both the employees and employers (Sobaih, 2011).

If the company would put money into the training programs that they create, they can actually save more money over time (Poulston, 2008). Based on interviews with housekeeping managers, employment agency managers, and temporary hotel staff in the United Kingdom, Lai et al. (2008) added that if hotels provided training and allocated monetary rewards for temporary staff, they are more likely to act more like the hotel’s core staff.

The ability to provide effective training does relate positively to organizational commitment of the employee (Chew and Chan, 2008; Choi and Dickson, 2010). Poulston (2008) agreed that training programs can have a significant impact on reducing employee turnover in the hotel industry. Lundberg (1994) said businesses should consider the cost of not providing training or providing limited training for part-time employees. The result can be high turnover and other forms of resistance among part-time employees, thus increasing the cost of hiring and training per employee. According to Faulkner and Patiar (1997), training and development programs can also reduce stress that employees feel when they are not trained properly, and affect the

commitment an employee has to an organization and overall staff retention (Chiang et al. 2005; Lam and Zhang, 2003).

2.4. Training method, length of training, and follow-up training for hospitality employees

2.4.1. Training method

Every company has to conduct training and also has to find the methods that work best in its context. Employees who are not trained correctly cost the company more money in the long run (Poulston, 2008). Rakicevik et al. (2008) stated that there are two types of training; one-on-one and group. Examples of one-on-one training include buddy system, cross-training, computer training, and video. Group training includes classroom, demonstration, role-playing, and games. Shamim (2013) grouped training methods based on off- and on-the job delivery using the Hilton in Cyprus as a case. Off-the job methods included: lecture, computer-based methods, and games and simulations while on-the job methods included job instruction, job rotation, coaching, and apprenticeship. Many factors, including implementation issues, could impact the effectiveness of specific training methods. For example, using a sample of staff, supervisors, and managers in hospitality-related workplaces in Auckland, Poulston (2008) found misuse of on-the-job training. Cheap substitutes such as the “buddy system” or other “show as you got” methods were used prompting the “sink-or-swim” analogy (Poulston, 2008, p. 421). Furunes (2005) discovered a training paradox in a study involving Norwegian hotel managers. With the exception of one-on-one training, the author found that training methods used deviated from methods perceived to be effective.

2.4.2. Training length and follow-up training

The hospitality literature is scant with respect to adequacy of training received. After conducting focus groups with private club managers related to training in food & beverage, Barrows (2000) found that managers were in consensus that employees could always benefit from more training. Managers also stated that the duration of initial training was most critical in determining the success of the employee and the training program. In addition, an emerging theme from responses was that private clubs not only focused on training of new hires but also on reinforcement of skills among longer-tenured employees. This is in contrast to the findings of Conrade et al. (1994) focusing on hotels where the bulk of the training budget is allocated to new employees.

In a study involving hotel trainees’ perceptions of knowledge, skills, behaviors, and attitudes gained in training, Putra (2004) found that trainees viewed the learning process as continual. They attributed their ability to perform any assigned tasks to continuous learning. Hotel industry veteran and founder of Signature Worldwide, a hotel consulting company, Don Farrell stated that it is critical to begin reinforcing and measuring the new skills after training (Farrell, 2005). Clark (1991) detailed how training starts but never really ends at the Opryland Hotel in Nashville. Employees at Opryland begin training with a highly structured two-day orientation program followed by department orientation. Upon the conclusion of a 90-day probationary period, employees are automatically enrolled in a follow-up orientation session. These are in addition to the skills training conducted by the hotel’s various divisions on an on-going basis.

2.5. Role of incentives and benefits among part-time hospitality employees

By providing all employees with incentives or benefits for doing their job well, most employers can expect a level of respect from their employees (Cunningham and Mahoney, 2004). Unfortunately, it is well known in the hospitality industry that most part-time employees do not receive many, if any, benefits, and incentives are very sparse (Cunningham and Mahoney, 2004). Inman and Enz (1995) advised that

the hospitality industry should base wage differentials on knowledge and skills as opposed to basing it solely on number of hours worked, which is the norm even today. Because the tasks performed by part- and full-time employees in a job position are similar, the authors also advised that firms should consider offering health-care and other benefits to part-time employees as well. Cho and Johnason (2008) found in a study that part-time restaurant employees perceived employer’s appreciation for their work and well-being as additional inducements, which influenced their intention to stay with the organization.

Doeringhaus and Feldman (1993) studied the top 25 benefits that part-time hospitality industry workers receive at their current job and found that out of 945 participants, no significant benefits, such as health care or insurance, were reported. The top five benefits included in a part-time employee’s compensation were free parking, vacation leave, merchandise discounts, sick leave, and retirement contributions. The authors also stated that most of these benefits were not an enticement to attract employees to a job or to retain these employees; instead they were just considered an added bonus.

Maroudas et al. (2008) researched the effects of incentives on their employees in the luxury hotel setting of Athens, Greece. The participants were given a questionnaire that asked hotel identity, biographical data, and motivators used. The questions that were asked pertained to a list of incentives that were offered to the employees which included, but was not limited to: gifts, bonuses, paid expenses to seminars, meals, transfers, events, and insurance (Maroudas et al., 2008). This research enhanced previous research done which stated that there is a link to employee motivators (such as incentives) and an overall employee’s performance.

Based on a study involving part- and full-time employees in 157 hotel properties in Taiwan Cheng-Hua et al. (2009) concluded that managers were more likely to apply control-based systems for external (part-time, casual) employees and commitment-based systems for internal (full-time) employees. La Lopa et al. (2000) found differences in mean employee turnover rates based on which employers offered various wage and benefit incentives to part-time employees. Based on secondary data provided by a quick-service hamburger chain restaurant located in Indiana and northern Kentucky, the authors found that offering benefits including Christmas bonus, wage/bonus incentives, shift wage differential, scheduled wage increases, health and life insurance, vacation commensurate with employment length, discounted stock prices, merchandise discounts, and scholarships resulted in lower turnover rates among part-time employees.

3. Research hypotheses

It is important to determine the impact of training satisfaction, and benefits and incentives received on job commitment while controlling for job satisfaction as job satisfaction has been found to be a key predictor of organizational commitment in past research in the context of the lodging industry (Gunlu et al., 2010; La Lopa, 1997; Ozturk et al., 2014). The hypotheses tested in this study include: (H1) Satisfaction with various training methods (i.e., lecture style, on-the-job, scenario, employment tests, skills tests) used, training length, and follow up training received will positively impact training satisfaction, (H2) Various benefits received (i.e., paid vacation, paid sick leave, retirement contributions by employee, retirement contributions by employer, worker’s compensation), controlling for job satisfaction, will positively impact job commitment, (H3) Various incentives received (i.e., job recognition, career exploration, pay-for-performance, more job responsibility), controlling for job satisfaction, will positively impact job commitment, and (H4) Training satisfaction, controlling for job satisfaction, will positively impact job commitment.

4. Methodology

4.1. Questionnaire development

A survey was developed that contained six sections. In the first section of the survey, the demographic questions included in this study were age, level of schooling, gender, previous related work experiences, and years employment. The decision to include these questions was made after reviewing several related past studies including Poulston (2008), Maroudas et al. (2008), and Chow et al., (2007).

Part two measured the level of satisfaction with the types of training methods used. One question related to six different training methods was asked. The choices of training methods provided were determined after consulting Cunningham and Mahoney (2004) and Poulston (2008). Each of these articles describes types of training that are effective or not effective, for hospitality employees. Responses for statements related to satisfaction with training methods used ranged from “Very Unsatisfied” (0), “Unsatisfied” (1), “Neither Satisfied/Unsatisfied” (2), “Satisfied” (3), and “Very Satisfied” (4). Part three measured the use of follow-up training and training satisfaction. The survey instrument used by Chew and Chan (2008) served as a guide for developing questions pertaining to training satisfaction and follow-up training. Kathman and Kathman (2000) were also consulted for questions about job training. Responses were measured using a 5-point Likert scale and ranged from “Strongly Disagree” (0), “Disagree” (1), “Neither Agree/Disagree” (2), “Agree” (3), and “Strongly Agree” (4).

Parts four and five measured the employee’s level of satisfaction with the benefits and incentives offered and received at their current job. Several relevant past studies (Chew and Chan, 2008; Doeringhaus and Feldman, 1993; La Lopa et al., 2000; Maroudas et al., 2008) were consulted to frame questions related to benefits and incentives that part-time hotel employees desire their employer to provide. Responses for statements related to benefits and incentives ranged from “Very Unsatisfied” (0), “Unsatisfied” (1), “Neither Satisfied/Unsatisfied” (2), “Satisfied” (3), and “Very Satisfied” (4).

Part six measured employees’ overall job satisfaction and job commitment. Chew and Chan (2008) were consulted to adapt questions used to measure the job satisfaction and job commitment constructs. In the current study, overall job satisfaction was measured with one item on the survey asking respondents to indicate their level of agreement with the following statement: “I am currently satisfied with my job.” Respondents were asked to rate this item on a 5-point Likert scale from “Strongly Disagree” (Coded 0) to “Strongly Agree” (Coded 4).

Job commitment was measured with two items on the survey. Respondents indicated their level of agreement on a 5-point Likert scale from “Strongly Disagree” (Coded 0) to “Strongly Agree” (Coded 4) with the following statements: (1) “I plan to stay at my current job position for as long as possible.”, and (2) “There is little to gain by sticking with this organization.” The second item was reverse-coded so that higher numbers of the Likert scale indicate more job commitment. The internal consistency reliability of the scores on the two job commitment items was acceptable (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.627$). This value is acceptable because there is a relationship between survey length (i.e., the number of items) and reliability (Lord and Novick, 1968). Shorter surveys have smaller internal consistency reliability.

4.2. Pilot test

Students in a Hospitality Management undergraduate program at a large northeast Ohio university, who worked part-time in the industry, were used in the pilot study for this research. The questionnaire was distributed to 24 students in an upper-division Hospitality Management class. Participants were asked to fill out the questionnaire and provide any feedback they felt was necessary regarding question clarity. Overall, questions were perceived to be clear and applicable to the study’s goals; only one minor revision was made to the question asking

about level of education, based on feedback received. Academic researchers in the lodging management area and hotel managers also reviewed the questionnaire for content clarity.

4.3. Data collection

A membership directory of hotels that were part of the local professional association representing lodging properties was obtained. Fifteen hotel properties were found within a 20-mile radius of the university whose Institutional Review Board granted approval for the study and were invited to participate in the study. A quick review of the types of lodging properties in the geographic area from which the properties were chosen revealed that there were only four independent properties. In addition, the vast majority were full-service properties.

Of the fifteen hotel properties, four agreed to participate. Members of the hotel’s management, the management company or franchisee (or owner in case of an independent hotel) of majority of hotels contacted were reluctant to participate in the study. As the General Manager of one of the properties that declined to participate stated, “Our management company facilitates an annual employee survey that is mandatory for all hourly and salary team members to fill out. I don’t feel that it is necessary or appropriate to ask our team members to participate in another survey that they aren’t going to be benefiting from the results. The management company spends a lot of time to ensure that we see results from the questions and responses and I don’t want to see their answers skewed because of another survey” (R. Greene, personal communication, November 12, 2015). Multiple follow up phone calls and emails did not change the properties’ decisions with respect to participating in the study. Contacting additional hotels in the area would not have yielded additional responses as they were owned or managed by the same companies contacted.

Low levels of participation and response rates is not unusual in the hospitality industry, especially when it involves potentially sensitive questions such as job satisfaction and commitment. Johanson and Woods’ (1999) comparison of publications in five mainstream hospitality management journals between 1987 and 1997 highlighted continuous challenges in achieving recommended response rates by hospitality researchers. Research in areas such as human resources are particularly prone to low response rates (Lucas, 1995, 2002). Keegan and Lucas (2005) attributed the low response rates to the potentially sensitive nature of the information sought. As explained later, despite the low participation rate, a power analysis indicated that 109 completed surveys would be needed for the data analysis method employed; 120 responses were generated.

All participating hotels were located in northeast Ohio. Three properties were part of nationally recognized chain hotels, and one was independently-owned. While one was a limited service, three others were full-service properties. The first full-service hotel had 291 rooms; the second had 240 guest rooms; while the third property had 116 rooms. The last property, which had 40 rooms, was limited service. Questionnaires were distributed to all employees who fit this study’s definition of part-time (employees who work less than 35 h per week). The survey participants were employed in several departments of the hotel, including but not limited to catering, front desk, maintenance, and housekeeping.

Initial contact was made by the researchers with the human resource (HR) directors (or in some cases the general manager, when an HR director was not available) by phone or email to explain the purpose of the study. For the properties that agreed to participate, the researchers enquired about the approximate number of part-time employees at the property so a sufficient number of surveys could be distributed. Based on the information provided by the HR director at each of the properties, 50 questionnaires were dropped off at the 291-room property, 40 surveys at the 240-room property, 30 surveys at the 116-room property, and 15 surveys at the 40-room property. Surveys were delivered in person to the HR director for each property that

participated. The HR directors were given one month to distribute and collect the surveys from their staff members. Each HR director was also given directions on how to distribute the surveys, a lock box, the surveys and consent letters, a uniquely identified envelope, as well as researcher's contact information for any additional questions. The HR directors were also informed about the definition of part-time employees according to this study so surveys were only distributed to those who worked for less than 35 h a week.

Surveys were distributed to all part-time employees at the four properties. Respondents also received an informed consent letter along with the survey that described research objectives and provided directions for survey completion. The voluntary nature of participation, and confidentiality and anonymity of responses were also stated in the consent letter. The survey and letter were placed in an envelope with the logo of the educational institution that the researchers belonged to. Respondents were directed to place the completed survey in the envelope and seal it, so as to ensure confidentiality of their responses. Given the sensitive nature of responses, respondents were asked to place the sealed envelopes in a locked box that could only be opened by the researcher. No identifiers were associated with the surveys. The HR director notified the researchers when completed surveys were returned and the lock box was ready to be picked up. Data collection yielded 120 completed and usable responses for a response rate of 88.9%.

4.4. Data analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23.0. Aside from basic descriptive analyses, the main analytic techniques implemented included: (1) Correlation analyses to examine relationships between all variables in the regression models, (2) one Free Entry Multiple Regression analysis to test the first hypothesis, and (3) three Hierarchical Multiple Regression analyses to test the second, third, and fourth hypotheses. For the regressions (i.e., 2 and 3 above), results were interpreted in two steps: (1) Examining if (i.e., *F* test) and how well (e.g., R^2) the overall model fits the data (i.e., if the combination of independent variables significantly predicts the dependent variable and how much total variance is explained), and (2) Determining if (i.e., *t* test) and how well (e.g., β) the individual independent variables predict the outcome (i.e., if the individual predictor coefficients are significantly different from zero in the population and the relative contribution of each to the total variance explained).

For the Free Entry Multiple Regression, training methods (i.e., satisfaction with six different methods), hours of training, and follow-up training (i.e., agreement with receiving follow-up training) were entered into the model simultaneously to determine which variables predict training satisfaction (i.e., agreement with overall training satisfaction). For all three Hierarchical Multiple Regressions, job satisfaction was included in the first block; as discussed earlier, job satisfaction has been identified as a key predictor of job commitment in previous hospitality literature, necessitating control for this variable to determine the impact of benefits, incentives, and training satisfaction on job commitment. The second block included separate groups of predictors; the first model contained incentives (i.e., level of satisfaction with four different incentives); the second model contained benefits (i.e., level of satisfaction with six different benefits) and the third model contained training satisfaction (i.e., agreement with overall training satisfaction). A priori power analyses were conducted using G*Power 3 (Power = 0.80, α = 0.05; Faul et al., 2007). For the four models listed above (i.e., the Free Entry and three Hierarchical Multiple Regressions), the minimum total sample sizes to detect medium effects (Cohen, 1988) were 109, 85, 98, and 55, respectively.

Table 1
Demographic Information (N = 120).

Variable	n(%)	M(SD)	Min/Max	Mdn(IQR)
Age	–	26.83(7.30)	17.00/ 53.00	24.00(8.75)
Time at Current Job (N = 118)	–	1.97(2.34)	0.10/15.00	1.00(2.50)
Gender (N = 119)				
Male	45(37.8)	–	–	–
Female	74(62.2)	–	–	–
Education (N = 119)				
GED/High School	49(41.2)	–	–	–
Bachelors/Graduate School	70(58.8)	–	–	–
Worked in Similar Position				
No	102(85.0)	–	–	–
Yes	18(15.0)	–	–	–

5. Results

5.1. Demographic information

Descriptives of the main demographic variables (i.e., age, gender, education, and time in current position) were examined for the sample (N = 120). The age of employees surveyed ranged from 17 to 53, and the mean was 26.83 (*SD* = 7.30; *Mdn* = 24.00, *IQR* = 8.75). Thirty-seven point eight percent of the sample (N = 119) was male (*n* = 45) and 62.2% (*n* = 74) was female. For education level of employees (N = 119), 49 (41.2%) had completed high school or their GED, and 70 (58.8%) had finished their Bachelors or another advanced degree (see Table 1). The reported amount of time spent at their current jobs (N = 118) ranged from one month to fifteen years (*M* = 1.97, *SD* = 2.34; *Mdn* = 1.00, *IQR* = 2.5). One additional item asked if employees have worked in any other hotel in a similar position. Eighteen (15.0%) employees had worked in a similar position at another hotel and 102 (85.0%) had not.

5.2. Research objective 1

5.2.1. Hypothesis 1 (H1) – training method, length, and follow-up as predictors of training satisfaction

The first objective of this study was to examine satisfaction with different training methods, hours of training, and follow-up training as predictors of overall training satisfaction. H1 proposed that satisfaction with various training methods used (i.e., lecture style, on-the-job, scenario, employment tests, skills tests), training length, and follow up training received will positively impact training satisfaction. The hypothesis was supported in that the overall model was significant (i.e., the combination of satisfaction with training methods, hours of training, and follow-up training significantly predicted training satisfaction). Of the predictors, two were statistically significant in the model – satisfaction with on-the-job training and shadowing. Specifically, employees who were highly satisfied with on-the-job training and shadowing were more likely to be satisfied with their overall training.

5.2.1.1. Outlier and assumption checking. Before conducting any analyses, a thorough outlier screening was implemented along with checking the assumptions of Multiple Regression. The data were screened for outliers to enhance statistical conclusion validity. Residual diagnostics were consulted, which suggest unusual outcomes (i.e., *Y* values in the regression formula) for specific cases. Large studentized residuals (i.e., $> \pm 3.0$) indicate poor prediction of *Y* for each case. No cases were flagged with extreme studentized residuals or Cook's *D* values. Mahalanobis Distance and Leverage values were also consulted, with no cases appearing as influential points (i.e., extreme

values). Thus, there were no outliers indicated for the regression model predicting training satisfaction ($N = 120$).

Before examining the regression models, multiple regression assumptions were investigated. The Durbin-Watson Test confirmed that independence was met. Linearity was upheld using residual scatterplots of Y and \hat{Y} . Using scatterplots of the IVs and DV, homoscedasticity was confirmed with the spread of values around the regression line remaining constant for all values of X . In addition, the errors were normally distributed by viewing histograms of the standardized residuals. Multicollinearity was not present by examination of a correlation matrix of the IVs. Other indices of multicollinearity corroborated this evidence (i.e., tolerances, variance inflation factors [VIFs], and collinearity diagnostics).

5.2.1.2. Training methods (IVs). Respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with several training methods on a 5-point Likert scale from “Very Unsatisfied” (Coded 0) to “Very Satisfied” (Coded 4). The methods included: (1) Lecture Style (i.e., group training in a classroom setting), (2) Shadowing (i.e., following the supervisor around), (3) On-the-Job (i.e., learn as you go), (4) Scenarios (i.e., discussing real life examples with a manager/supervisor; “what would you do?” scenarios), (5) Employment Tests (i.e., personality/integrity tests), (6) Skills Tests (i.e., testing skills performed during the job; examples like making a bed, taking a customer’s order at a restaurant, etc.). The training method with the highest average satisfaction was shadowing ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 0.72$; $Mdn = 4.00$, $IQR = 1.00$), with most endorsing “Satisfied” on the scale. The training method with the lowest average satisfaction was employment tests ($M = 3.07$, $SD = 0.74$; $Mdn = 3.00$, $IQR = 1.00$), with most endorsing “Neither” on the scale.

5.2.1.3. Training hours (IV). Training hours were measured with an item asking respondents to generate the number of hours of training that they received at their current jobs. The average number of training hours received in their current position was 35.07 ($SD = 23.06$; $Mdn = 30.00$, $IQR = 20.00$).

5.2.1.4. Training follow-up (IV). Follow-up training (i.e., “I have received follow-up training within the first year of my current job.”) was rated on a 5-point Likert scale from “Strongly Disagree” (Coded 0) to “Strongly Agree” (Coded 4). Respondents most frequently endorsed the “Neither” category ($M = 2.84$, $SD = 0.90$; $Mdn = 3.00$, $IQR = 2.00$).

5.2.1.5. Training satisfaction (DV). In the following sections, each variable in the regression for the first research objective is described and summary descriptive statistics are presented (i.e., Means, Standard Deviations, Medians, and Interquartile Ranges). Overall training satisfaction was measured with one item on the survey asking respondents to indicate their level of agreement with the following statement: “I am currently satisfied with the training I received for my current job.” Respondents were asked to rate this item on a 5-point Likert scale from “Strongly Disagree” (Coded 0) to “Strongly Agree” (Coded 4). Average training satisfaction was 3.28 ($SD = 0.77$; $Mdn = 3.00$, $IQR = 1.00$), with most endorsing “Neither Agree/Disagree” on the scale (see Table 2).

5.2.1.6. Correlations. A correlation matrix of all the predictors and the outcome was examined prior to conducting the Multiple Regression Analysis. The variable with the strongest relationship to the outcome was shadowing, which was significant and positive ($r_s = 0.444$, $p < 0.001$; see Table 3).

5.2.1.7. (H1) free entry multiple regression – training method, length, and follow-up. To examine the first research objective and H1, satisfaction with different training methods, hours of training, and follow-up training (i.e., the Independent Variables; IVs) were analyzed in

relation to training satisfaction (i.e., the Dependent Variable; DV) using a Free Entry Multiple Regression Analysis. The set of IVs provided a statistically significant explanation of variance in training satisfaction ($R^2 = 0.372$, $R^2_{adj} = 0.286$; $F(8, 58) = 4.302$, $p < .001$). Combined, 37.2% of the variance in training satisfaction was accounted for by the predictors, which is large according to Cohen’s standards (R^2 : 0.01 = Small, 0.06 = Medium, and 0.14 = Large; Cohen, 1988). Of the eight predictors, two were statistically significant in the model – satisfaction with shadowing and on-the-job training. The strongest predictor was satisfaction with on-the-job training ($\beta = 0.356$, $p = .007$) followed by satisfaction with shadowing ($\beta = 0.276$, $p = .036$; see Table 4). These results suggest that as respondents’ satisfaction with different training methods increases, they will be more satisfied with their overall training. Specifically, respondents indicating more satisfaction with on-the-job training and shadowing (i.e., with on-the-job training as the most important method) were more likely to have higher satisfaction with their overall training.

5.3. Research objective 2

The second objective of this study was addressed with three separate but related hypotheses (H2–H4). This objective examined satisfaction with different benefits, incentives, and training satisfaction as predictors of job commitment controlling for job satisfaction. The hypotheses are “separate,” as each contained one of the three main independent variables (IVs) from the second research objective (i.e., benefits, incentives, and training satisfaction). The hypotheses are “related” because job commitment was the predicted outcome (i.e., the dependent variable [DV]) common to all three statements. Each hypothesis is presented in separate sections below.

5.3.1. Hypothesis 2 (H2) – benefits as predictors of job commitment

Hypothesis 2 (i.e., the first hypothesis addressing the second research objective in this study) proposed that various benefits received (i.e., health insurance, paid vacation, paid sick leave, retirement contributions by employee, retirement contributions by employer, worker’s compensation), controlling for job satisfaction, will positively impact job commitment. The overall regression model was statistically significant (i.e., the combination of benefits received controlling for job satisfaction significantly predicted job commitment). Of the predictors, paid sick leave for benefits was negatively predictive of job commitment, controlling for the covariate job satisfaction as a positive predictor. Specifically, employees with paid sick leave may be less likely to commit to their job. Thus, H2 was partially supported in that paid sick leave significantly impacted job commitment, but the relationship was not in the expected (positive) direction.

5.3.2. Hypothesis 3 (H3) – incentives as predictors of job commitment

Hypothesis 3 (i.e., the second hypothesis for research objective 2) proposed that incentives received (i.e., job recognition, career exploration, pay-for-performance, more job responsibility), controlling for job satisfaction, will positively impact job commitment. The overall regression model was statistically significant (i.e., all incentives received controlling for job satisfaction in combination predicted job commitment). Of the predictors, pay-for-performance and job recognition incentives positively predicted job commitment (controlling for the positively predictive job satisfaction covariate). Specifically, employees who are more satisfied with their pay-for-performance and job recognition incentives are more likely to commit to their job. Therefore, H3 was supported in that pay-for-performance and job recognition incentives significantly and positively impacted job commitment.

5.3.3. Hypothesis 4 (H4) – training satisfaction as a predictor of job commitment

Hypothesis 4 (i.e., the third hypothesis for the second research objective) proposed that training satisfaction, controlling for job

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics for the Variables/Survey Items (N = 120).

Variable/Survey Item	Model	IV and/or DV	n(%)	M(SD)	Min/Max	Mdn(IQR)
Training Satisfaction	1 and 4	DV and IV	–	3.28(.77)	1/4	3.00(1.00)
Training Methods						
Lecture Style	1	IV	–	3.09(.92)	0/4	3.00(1.00)
Shadowing	1	IV	–	3.43(.72)	1/4	4.00 (1.00)
On-the-Job	1	IV	–	3.32(.75)	1/4	3.00(1.00)
Scenarios	1	IV	–	3.31(.68)	1/4	3.00(1.00)
Employment Tests	1	IV	–	3.07(.74)	1/4	3.00(1.00)
Skills Tests	1	IV	–	3.35(.67)	2/4	3.00(1.00)
Training Hours	1	IV	–	35.07(23.06)	1.00/168.00	30.00(20.00)
Training Follow-up	1	IV	–	2.84(.90)	0/4	3.00(2.00)
Incentives						
Job Recognition	2	IV	–	3.21(.98)	0/4	3.00(1.00)
Career Exploration	2	IV	–	2.71(1.32)	0/4	3.00(2.00)
Pay-for-Performance	2	IV	–	3.06(1.07)	0/4	3.00(1.00)
Job Responsibility	2	IV	–	3.16(.83)	0/4	3.00(1.00)
Benefits (No:Yes)						
Health Insurance	3	IV	77(64.2):43(35.8)	–	–	–
Paid Vacation	3	IV	77(64.2):43(35.8)	–	–	–
Paid Sick Leave	3	IV	90(75.0):30(25.0)	–	–	–
Retirement (Employee)	3	IV	47(39.2):73(60.8)	–	–	–
Retirement (Employer)	3	IV	44(36.7):76(63.3)	–	–	–
Worker's Compensation	3	IV	84(70.0):36(30.0)	–	–	–
Job Satisfaction	2–4	IV	–	3.39(.75)	1/4	4.00(1.00)
Job Commitment	2–4	DV	–	3.10(.75)	0.50/4.00	3.50(1.00)

satisfaction, will positively impact job commitment. Similar to the incentives model, the overall regression model was statistically significant with training satisfaction positively predicting job commitment (controlling for job satisfaction). That is, respondents who are more satisfied with their training are more likely to commit to their job. H4 was supported with training satisfaction significantly and positively impacting job commitment.

5.3.3.1. Outlier and assumption checking. Before testing the three hypotheses, the data were screened for outliers and assumptions were checked using the same procedures described in the first objective. No cases were removed after consulting the residual diagnostics including studentized residuals, Cook's *D*, Mahalanobis Distance, and Leverages. For each model, the assumptions of multiple regression were also investigated (i.e., Independence, Linearity, Homoscedasticity, and Multicollinearity) and upheld.

5.3.3.2. Benefits (IVs). For the second research objective (H2–H4), descriptive statistics for the predictors, covariate, and outcome are presented below (i.e., Means, Standard Deviations, Medians, and Interquartile Ranges). Respondents were asked to complete six items pertaining to benefits that they may have received with “Yes” (Coded 1) or “No” (Coded 0). These incentives included the following: (1) Health insurance, (2) Paid vacation, (3) Paid sick leave, (4) Retirement contributions by employee, (5) Retirement contributions by employer, and (6) Worker's compensation. In the sample, the benefit that had the highest frequency of affirmative responses was retirement contributions by the employers ($n = 76$, 63.3%), and the benefit with the highest frequency of “No's” was paid sick leave ($n = 90$, 75.0%).

5.3.3.3. Incentives (IVs). Respondents were asked to complete four items pertaining to their satisfaction with incentives that they may have received on a 5-point Likert scale from “Very Satisfied” (Coded 4) to “Very Unsatisfied” (Coded 0). These incentives included the following: (1) Job Recognition (e.g., reward systems, employee of the month programs), (2) Career Exploration (e.g., opportunities for new jobs, career training, internal job fairs), (3) Pay-for-Performance (e.g., merit pay based on performance), and (4) More Job Responsibility (e.g., employee supervision, added job tasks and duties). The item with the highest average satisfaction was job recognition ($M = 3.21$, $SD = 0.98$;

$Mdn = 3.00$, $IQR = 1.00$), with most indicating that they were “Satisfied.” The item with the lowest average satisfaction was career exploration ($M = 2.71$, $SD = 1.32$; $Mdn = 3.00$, $IQR = 2.00$), with the majority indicating that they were “Neither” or “Satisfied.”

5.3.3.4. Training satisfaction (IV). See previous section where details about the response formats for training satisfaction have been discussed.

5.3.3.5. Job satisfaction (IV/Covariate). As stated previously, overall job satisfaction was measured with one item inquiring about their level of agreement with their current job satisfaction. The item was on a 5-point Likert scale from “Strongly Disagree” (Coded 0) to “Strongly Agree” (Coded 4). Average job satisfaction was 3.39 ($SD = 0.75$; $Mdn = 4.00$, $IQR = 1.00$), with most endorsing “Strongly Agree” on the scale.

5.3.3.6. Job commitment (DV). From the methodology, job commitment was measured with two items asking respondents to indicate their level of agreement on a 5-point Likert scale from “Strongly Disagree” (Coded 0) to “Strongly Agree” (Coded 4). Using the total scores on the job commitment items (i.e., averaged), the mean endorsement was 3.10 ($SD = 0.75$), with most indicating that they “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” ($Mdn = 3.50$, $IQR = 1.00$; see Table 2).

5.3.3.7. Correlations. A correlation matrix of all the predictors and the outcome was examined prior to conducting the Multiple Regression Analyses. For incentives, the variable with the strongest relationship to the job commitment was satisfaction with pay-for-performance, which was significant and positive ($r_s = 0.455$, $p < .001$; see Table 3). For benefits, the variable with the strongest relationship to the job commitment was satisfaction with paid sick leave, which was significant and negative ($r_s = -0.294$, $p = .001$). Finally, training satisfaction was positively and significantly correlated with job commitment ($r_s = 0.212$, $p = .020$; see Table 3).

5.3.3.8. (H2) hierarchical multiple regression – benefits. In the following three sections, the IVs were analyzed in relation to job commitment (i.e., the DV) controlling for job satisfaction using a series of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses. In the first step, R^2 was

Table 3
Correlations between the Independent and Dependent Variables (N = 120).

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
(1) Training Satisfaction	-	0.082	.298*	.288**	.247*	.180	.180	0.035	.234*	.283**	0.016	.406***	.232*	-.0113	-.030	-.190*	0.058	0.114	-.0132	.194*	.212*
(2) Lecture Style		-	.262*	0.185	.310**	0.158	.246*	0.025	.120	0.190	0.069	0.129	-.0138	-.227*	-.0118	-.256*	0.046	-.0024	-.0150	0.162	0.099
(3) Shadowing			-	.273**	.444***	0.152	.231*	-.0067	.193*	.295**	0.223*	.351***	0.133	-.0047	-.082	-.074	0.070	0.021	-.0051	0.173	.312**
(4) On-the-Job				-	0.0270	0.048	0.051	0.042	.298**	.214*	0.075	0.130	.252**	-.0006	-.0119	-.081	-.016	-.0052	0.057	0.109	.201*
(5) Scenarios					-	0.105	.263**	0.103	.247*	.207*	0.046	.329**	0.153	-.0068	-.0026	-.107	.250**	.219*	-.0102	.199*	.416***
(6) Employment Tests						-	0.050	-.0078	-.0036	0.117	0.081	0.107	0.123	-.0167	0.181	-.052	-.023	0.007	0.049	-.0032	0.112
(7) Skills Tests							-	-.0068	.216*	0.078	0.106	.244*	0.032	-.0254**	-.0197*	-.068	0.101	0.109	-.0152	0.134	0.135
(8) Training Hours								-	.253**	0.138	-.0055	-.020	-.0091	-.0011	0.063	-.045	.194*	.228*	0.049	0.083	.252**
(9) Training Follow-up									-	.281**	0.168	0.159	0.162	-.0099	-.0173	-.097	.332**	.362***	0.171	-.001	.351***
(10) Job Recognition										-	.351***	.384***	.349***	-.0076	-.017	-.216*	0.118	0.085	-.190*	0.131	.387***
(11) Career Exploration											-	.313**	.320**	-.0034	-.0169	-.043	0.053	0.078	0.001	-.011	.234*
(12) Pay-for-Performance												-	.326**	-.0105	-.215*	-.308**	0.130	0.137	-.230*	.220*	.455***
(13) Job Responsibility													-	-.0132	-.220*	-.193*	0.130	0.169	-.064	0.110	.293**
(14) Health Insurance														-	.239*	.371***	.350***	.352***	.269**	-.078	-.042
(15) Paid Vacation															-	.411***	0.137	0.136	.231*	-.191*	-.011
(16) Paid Sick Leave																-	0.108	0.120	.336***	-.0142	.294**
(17) Retire (Employee)																	-	.877***	.190*	0.106	.202*
(18) Retire (Employer)																		-	.234*	0.066	.232*
(19) Worker's Comp																			-	-.0171	-.039
(20) Job Satisfaction																				-	.295**
(21) Job Commitment																					-

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$. Spearman Correlations are reported between all variables except two dichotomous items, which are Phi Correlations.

Table 4

Free Entry Multiple Regression of Training Methods, Follow-up Training, and Hours of Training on Training Satisfaction.

Variable	β	t	R^2	F
Lecture Style	-0.101	-0.894	0.372	4.302***
Shadowing	0.276	2.145*		
On-the-Job Training	0.356	2.809**		
Scenarios	0.054	0.448		
Employment Tests	0.175	1.633		
Skill Tests	0.047	0.420		
Hours of Training	-0.124	-1.165		
Follow-up Training	0.004	0.037		

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$. β = Beta, the standardized regression coefficient.

Table 5

Hierarchical Multiple Regression of Benefits on Job Commitment Controlling for Job Satisfaction.

Step	Variable	β	t	R^2	ΔR^2	F
1	Job Satisfaction	0.380	4.461***	0.144	-	19.899***
2	Job Satisfaction	0.322	3.928***	0.308	0.163	7.112***
	Health Insurance	0.012	0.136			
	Paid Vacation	-0.031	-0.347			
	Paid Sick Leave	-0.321	-3.437**			
	Retirement (Employee)	-0.020	-0.119			
	Retirement (Employer)	0.296	1.783			
	Worker's Compensation	0.103	1.186			

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$. β = Beta, the standardized regression coefficient.

significant ($R^2 = 0.144, F(1, 118) = 19.899, p < 0.001$). The next step produced a significant increase in R^2 , which demonstrated that benefits were additional significant predictors of job commitment ($\Delta R^2 = 0.163, F(7, 112) = 7.112, p < .001$). Combined, 30.8% ($R^2 = 0.308$: Large Effect; $R^2_{adj} = 0.264$; Cohen, 1988) of the variance in job commitment was accounted for by the benefits predictors controlling for job satisfaction. Paid sick leave ($\beta = -0.321, p = .001$), including job satisfaction ($p = .001$), were significant predictors of job commitment. Specifically, respondents who indicated having paid-sick leave benefits were less likely to commit to their jobs (see Table 5).

5.3.3.9. (H3) hierarchical multiple regression – incentives. In the first step, R^2 was significant ($R^2 = 0.182, F(1, 97) = 21.511, p < .001$). The next step produced a significant increase in R^2 , which demonstrated that incentives were additional significant predictors of job commitment ($\Delta R^2 = 0.310, F(5, 93) = 17.981, p < .001$). Combined, 49.2% ($R^2 = 0.492$: Large Effect; $R^2_{adj} = 0.464$; Cohen, 1988) of the variance in job commitment was accounted for by the predictors. Pay-for-performance and job recognition, including the covariate job satisfaction ($p = 0.001$), were significant predictors of job commitment. The strongest predictor was satisfaction with pay-for-performance ($\beta = 0.354, p < .001$) followed by satisfaction with job recognition ($\beta = 0.233, p = .014$). These results suggest that respondents who are increasingly satisfied with different incentives are more likely to commit to their jobs. Specifically, respondents that had higher levels of satisfaction with pay-for-performance and job recognition incentives (i.e., with pay-for-performance as the most influential incentive), indicated a stronger commitment to their jobs (see Table 6).

5.3.3.10. (H4) hierarchical multiple regression – training satisfaction. In the first step, R^2 was significant ($R^2 = 0.144, F(1, 118) = 19.899, p < 0.001$). The next step produced a significant increase in R^2 , which demonstrated that training satisfaction was an additional significant predictor of job commitment ($\Delta R^2 = 0.044, F(2,$

Table 6
Hierarchical Multiple Regression of Incentives on Job Commitment Controlling for Job Satisfaction.

Step	Variable	β	t	R^2	ΔR^2	F
1	Job Satisfaction	0.426	4.638***	0.182	–	21.511***
2	Job Satisfaction	0.281	3.595**	0.492	0.310	17.981***
	Job Recognition	0.233	2.502*			
	Career Exploration	0.093	1.089			
	Pay-for-Performance	0.354	3.617***			
	Job Responsibility	0.009	0.103			

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$. β = Beta, the standardized regression coefficient.

Table 7
Hierarchical Multiple Regression of Training Satisfaction on Job Commitment Controlling for Job Satisfaction.

Step	Variable	B	t	R^2	ΔR^2	F
1	Job Satisfaction	0.380	4.461***	0.144	–	19.899***
2	Job Satisfaction	0.324	3.756***	0.188	0.044	13.565***
	Training Satisfaction	0.217	2.517*			

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$. β = Beta, the standardized regression coefficient.

117) = 13.565, $p < .001$). Combined, 18.8% ($R^2 = 0.188$: Large Effect; $R^2_{adj} = 0.174$; Cohen, 1988) of the variance in job commitment was accounted for by the predictors. Training satisfaction, including the covariate job satisfaction ($p = .001$), were significant predictors of job commitment. That is, satisfaction with training ($\beta = 0.217$, $p = .013$) was a significant and positive predictor of job commitment. These results suggest that respondents who are highly-satisfied with their training are more likely to commit to their jobs (see Table 7).

6. Conclusions & discussion

The research objectives of this study were two-fold: (a) to determine the impact of training method, length of training, and follow-up training received by part-time employees on training satisfaction, and (b) to determine the impact of benefits and incentives received, and training satisfaction on job commitment. Knowledge of training methods, incentives, and benefits that are perceived as being most valuable for part-time employees can help lodging properties make effective resource allocation decisions.

This study adds to the sparse literature on the link between part-time employment and organizational commitment in the hospitality industry (Johanson and Cho, 2009) and specifically in the lodging industry in the U.S. This exploratory study is the first to link benefits and training received by part-time employees and job commitment, specifically in the lodging industry segment. In addition, this study sheds light on benefits and incentives received by part-time hotel employees and its relationship to job commitment. The first conclusion of this study, partly addressing the first research objective, was that satisfaction with two training methods, on-the-job training and job shadowing, significantly and positively impacted overall training satisfaction. Based on the feedback offered by hotel managers in Norway, Furunes (2005) also found that one-to-one training methods (e.g. on-the-job training or shadowing) were perceived to be the best across five of six training objectives included in the study. Tyler (2008) recommended job shadowing as a useful method to generate employee interest and engagement; in addition, the trainees get to observe the company from a different perspective, which may give them a broader perspective of the company.

Trainees are generally more satisfied with the training when their preferred training method is used (Schmidt, 2007). One-on-one training

methods can be used for associated advantages of cost (Slattery et al., 2006) and relevance of training content as it costs a “fraction of, or no cost at all,” and the employees get to perform the actual job related tasks (Martin et al., 2014). This method also enables the employees to demonstrate their competence and skills immediately while a trainer can determine whether the employee has the required level of competence (Martin et al., 2014).

A second conclusion reached based on this study’s results to address the first research objective was that training length and whether or not follow-up training was received did not impact overall training satisfaction. These findings contrasted those of Schmidt’s (2007) study of full-time employees in customer service where the time spent in training was found to be significantly related to training satisfaction. Although not based on the results of this study, Green (2011) recommended a comprehensive, ongoing training program to ensure that the training initiative continues to achieve the organizational goals. Follow-up training sessions for employees continually evaluates if the basic values of empowerment are still in place (Green, 2011).

Another conclusion of this study, partly addressing the second research objective was that only two incentives were found to predict job commitment; pay for performance and job recognition. La Lopa et al. (2000) also recommended the use of pay for performance incentives in the foodservice segment. Inman and Enz (1995) advised that the hospitality industry should base wage differentials on knowledge and skills; findings echoed in this study. Chalmers et al. (2005) framework for assessing quality part-time work in Australia also included wages, employment benefits, and employment security. Partially similar to the findings of this study, Kim et al. (2005) recommended that employers should recognize employees’ work efforts with cash incentives, awards, recognition, and job promotion in order to enhance employees’ job satisfaction and hence organizational commitment. However, their study was conducted in a context with full-time restaurant employees. In the context of events planning, Chan (2015) agreed that part-time employees “need more care and recognition” for their efforts.

Also addressing the second research objective, many respondents in the study mentioned that they did not receive any benefits. Research indicates this to be a common practice in the hospitality industry (Bardoel et al., 2007; Burgess and Baird, 2003; Kusluvan, 2003; Pocock, 2003; Lam and Zhang, 2003; Woods, 1999). A study conducted in a global hospitality company with over 100,000 employees and labor costs accounting for about 40% of the company’s revenues disclosed greater organizational commitment among the employees who participated in benefit programs (Gross and Friedman, 2004). The majority of the employees in this study were ‘hourly workers’ (Gross and Friedman, 2004). The inclusion of proper benefit packages is important for organizational performance and reduction of turnover (Namasivayam et al. 2007).

The only benefit that was found to impact job commitment in this study was paid sick leave; however, the impact was negative. This could be because the vast majority of the respondents (75%) indicated that they did not receive paid sick leave but desired it. This finding is contradicted by Hill (2013) who noted a negative relation between paid sick leave and intention to leave among the service-sector employees, including hospitality. The author found a 25% decline in job separation in the case where paid sick leave was offered. Hospitality employees operate in challenging and stressful work conditions and thus have greater wellness needs. Offering paid sick leaves symbolizes an organization’s commitment towards the employees, which further strengthens the work performance and commitment among the employees (Zhang et al., 2014).

The final conclusion of this study addressing the second research objective was that satisfaction with training significantly impacted job commitment. It is well-known that hospitality organizations are reluctant to spend money on training part-time employees because they feel that these employees are not committed to their organization (Chow et al., 2007). However, it may very well be the lack of training,

among other factors such as inadequate or non-existent benefits and incentives that contribute to high turnover rates among part-time hospitality employees, specifically those in hotels. For example, Davies et al. (2001) in their study of hospitality employees, including part-time employees in Western Australia studied the impact of three human resource functions (performance appraisal, salary and benefit strategies, and training and development initiatives) on job performance and turnover, and found that only training and development was positively related to improvement in quality and productivity, along with reduced turnover of employees.

Limited training may lead not only to high staff turnover, but also to other workplace issues, aggravating turnover (Poulston, 2008). Large hospitality businesses are noted to have lower turnover rates than smaller establishments (Woods, 1997). A possible explanation offered by Carbery et al. (2003) suggested that larger hotels are likely to invest significantly more in training and career development plans. A recent study by Chan (2015) also confirmed that training positively influenced job satisfaction and commitment among part-time workers. The author interviewed part-time event management practitioners and recommended ongoing training to help part-time staff members increase their knowledge and skills for career advancement, as this could, in turn, create loyalty to the service organization.

7. Managerial implications

Given that this study found on-the-job training and job shadowing to significantly predict satisfaction with training among part-time employees, it is strongly recommended that lodging managers adopt these methods. On-the-job training with one-on-one instruction and shadowing can be effectively used to train part-time front office, housekeeping, or food & beverage employees about their duties and responsibilities directly from a trainer. When designing an on-the-job training program, managers can use the ADDIE method suggested by Molenda (2003). Steps include: assessing the training needs specific to the position and property; designing the on-the-job program; developing appropriate methods, and allocation of resources; and implementing and evaluating the training program. On-the-job training can be structured or unstructured (Jacobs and Jones, 1995). If unstructured training is utilized, new employees learn largely by trial and error and suggestions from experienced workers. Managers should be cautious with the selection of experienced workers who serve as a guide as they may be unable to articulate proper procedures and as a result, may pass along bad work habits. Structured on-the-job training, on the other hand, involves designing a program to teach new knowledge and skills to workers, keeping in mind the end goal of successful task completion.

The trainer can be a shift manager or an existing employee designated as trainer. Because the effectiveness of on-the-job training depends on the trainer (Conrade et al., 1994), training should be conducted by professional or designated trainers. Train-the-trainer programs may be instituted for those deemed promotable and rewards such as higher pay, bonuses, or other incentives could be offered to trainers.

In the event job shadowing is implemented, the person being shadowed could take on the role of a mentor and coach who motivates trainees, offers regular feedback, and evaluates the pros and cons of the trainee's performance. If a company does not already have an orientation program, implementing such a program is recommended to make new employees more familiar with the company, thus potentially aiding the transition process.

Although this study did not find that training length or follow-up training impacted training satisfaction among part-time employees, with the hospitality industry constantly changing, training should technically be "never-ending" as Putra (2004) and Clark (1991) described. Once the training is completed, reaction to the training should be measured at the conclusion of the training session and again, after a

reasonable period of time (whether that be a 60-, 90-, 180-day period depending on the actual job). Following determination of reaction to the training program, it is necessary to test the knowledge skills and abilities learned. This can be done by administering quizzes, utilizing case analysis, or using demonstration techniques such as the job replica method. Once testing is complete, it is essential to learn if the training led to exhibition of desired behaviors by the employees. This can be accomplished by peers and supervisors observing workplace behavior. The last step would be to determine if the exhibition of these behaviors led to a positive impact of the bottom line (Kirkpatrick, 1998).

Pay for performance significantly impacted an employee's job satisfaction in this study. After results of performance measurement are presented to management, higher pay can then be awarded to those employees who have been noted as high performers. In order to prevent any internal biases, an outside organization may be hired to evaluate employees' performance. Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory of motivation states that there is a link between employee performance and rewards. However, managers should be cautious in creating rewards that motivates different employees while also achieving organizational outcomes. In other words, managers should devise distinctive pay plans based on their motivational appeals to various groups of employees. For example, a cash bonus program could be instituted for housekeeping employees who pass inspections. The executive housekeeper could select one room for each housekeeping employee on a weekly basis and then conduct the inspection with the employee. The employee will pay more attention to detail while cleaning all the rooms because they will not know in which room or when the inspection will occur. Front desk agents may be motivated by a commission-based incentive depending on the number of upgrades sold in any given week. Contests could also be incorporated. Once pay-for-performance programs are designed, it is crucial to communicate the details of the program to all department employees.

The other incentive found to positively impact job commitment in this study was job recognition. Thus, hotels must develop a service reward environment that recognizes, values, and rewards the employees for their work, in order to create greater job satisfaction and commitment. The recognition does not necessarily have to be monetary as a simple note of appreciation can motivate part-time hotel employees. Managers can occasionally assign tasks with more responsibility to part-time employees in order to get them more involved and to improve organizational commitment by appropriately recognizing their potential. Other forms of recognition that may be implemented include spot bonuses and employee-of-the-month programs.

Offering benefits for part-time employees could positively impact job satisfaction and overall commitment to the job (Lee et al., 2015). However, majority of respondents in this study indicated that they did not receive benefits. Employers should understand that even though part-time employees may work limited hours, their worth is not limited. Because sick leave, specifically, was found to negatively impact job commitment, it is strongly recommended that employers consider offering this benefit. Particularly for those employees who work with food and beverages or in customer-contact jobs, the risk of getting co-workers and guests sick is high.

This study found that if an employee stated that their satisfaction level was low with training, their overall intent to stay decreased. If managers adopt training methods that do impact training satisfaction, as discussed above, they could see an improvement in job commitment.

8. Future research

Due to the exploratory nature of research related to part-time employees in the lodging industry, there is scope for studying factors that affect this group's job commitment in a larger geographic scale. It is possible that employee responses could vary based on geographic location, particularly in countries outside of the US. While the focus of this research was to study the role of training, incentives, and benefits

received by part-time hotel employees on job commitment, it is possible that other factors including relationship with supervisors, availability of mentors, job enrichment opportunities, and opportunities to meet social needs of employees could particularly impact commitment among part-time employees. Given the frustration with hotels' unwillingness to participate in research, future research involving part-time employees could adopt a qualitative approach such as the use of focus groups, to gain an in-depth understanding of benefits and incentives that would be most desirable for this group and the reasons for the choices made.

Results of this study indicated that little to no benefits were offered in hotels for part-time employees. A possible reason for this may be the timing of data collection; the hotel segment was still recovering from a recession. However, as the lodging industry continues to recover with higher occupancy rates and average daily rates, an empirical research study could be designed to determine hotels' reasons for not offering incentives and benefits for part-time employees (Cho, 2010).

References

- Bardeel, E., Morgan, L., Santos, C., 2007. 'Quality' part-time work in Australian organizations: implications for HRD. *Human Resour. Dev. Int.* 10 (3), 281–299. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13678860701515307>.
- Barrows, C.W., 2000. An exploratory study of food and beverage training in private clubs. *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manage.* 12 (3), 190–197. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09596110010320751>.
- Becker, G., 1964. *Human Capital*, 2nd ed. Columbia University Press, New York, NY.
- Burgess, J., Baird, M., 2003. Employment entitlements: development, access, flexibility and protection. *Aust. Bull. Labour* 29 (1), 1.
- Cajner, T., Mawhirter, D., Nekarda, C., Ratner, D., 2014. Why Is Involuntary Part-Time Work Elevated? Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Retrieved from <http://www.federalreserve.gov/econresdata/notes/feds-notes/2014/why-is-involuntary-part-time-work-elevated-20140414.html> (2014, April 14).
- Carbery, R., Garavan, T.N., O'Brien, F., McDonnell, J., 2003. Predicting hotel managers' turnover cognitions. *J. Manage. Psychol.* 18 (7), 649–679. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683940310502377>.
- CareerBuilder, 2015. Thirty-six Percent of Employers Plan to Hire Full-time, Permanent Employees in the New Year. CareerBuilder's annual forecast finds (Retrieved from <http://www.careerbuilder.co.in/share/aboutus/pressreleasesdetail.aspx?sd=1%2F1%2F2015&id=pr860&ed=12%2F31%2F2015>).
- Chalmers, J., Campbell, I., Charlesworth, S., 2005. Part-time work and caring responsibilities in Australia: towards an assessment of job quality. *Labour & Industry. J. Soc. Econ. Relat. Work* 15 (3), 41–66. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10301763.2005.10669317>.
- Chan, G., 2015. Part-time event management employee expected quality of work life. *Int. J. Bus. Manage.* 10 (5). <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v10n5p233>.
- Cheng-Hua, R., Shyh-Jer, C., Shih-Chien, F., 2009. Employment modes, high-performance work practices, and organizational performance in the hospitality industry. *Cornell Hosp. Q.* 50 (4), 413–431. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1938965509348580>.
- Chew, J., Chan, C.C.A., 2008. Human resource practices, organizational commitment and intention to stay. *Int. J. Manpow.* 29 (6), 503–522. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437720810904194>.
- Chiang, C.-F., Back, K.-B., Canter, D.D., 2005. The impact of employee training on job satisfaction and intention to stay in the hotel industry. *J. Human Resour. Hosp. Tour.* 4 (2), 99–118. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J171v04n02_06.
- Cho, S., Johnason, M.M., 2008. Organizational citizenship behavior and employee performance: a moderating effect of work status in restaurant employees. *J. Hosp. Tour. Res.* 32 (3), 307–326. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1096348008317390>.
- Cho, S.M., 2010. Hotel Feasibility in the Recessionary Economy of 2010: A Case Study in Reno, Nevada. (Doctoral Dissertation) Retrieved from <http://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations/4>.
- Choi, Y., Dickson, D.R., 2010. A case study into the benefits of management training programs: impacts on hotel employee turnover and satisfaction level. *J. Human Resour. Hosp. Tour.* 9 (1), 103–116. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15332840903336499>.
- Chow, C.W., Haddad, K., Singh, G., 2007. Human resource management, job satisfaction, morale, optimism, and turnover. *Int. J. Hosp. Tour. Adm.* 8 (2), 73–88. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J149v08n02_04.
- Clark, M., 1991. Training for tradition. *Cornell Hotel Restaur. Adm. Q.* 31 (4), 46–51.
- Cohen, J., 1988. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd ed. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Conrade, G., Woods, R., Ninemeier, J., 1994. Training in the US lodging industry: perception and reality. *Cornell Hotel Restaur. Adm. Q.* 35 (5), 16–21. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/001088049403500511>.
- Cunningham, G.B., Mahoney, K., 2004. Self-efficacy of part-time employees in university athletics: the influence of organizational commitment, valence of training, and training motivation. *J. Sport Manage.* 18 (1), 59–73.
- Davidson, P., 2014. Some Businesses Use Part-time to Meet Health Law. Today, USA (2014, December 30) Retrieved from <http://www.usatoday.com/story/money/business/2014/12/30/health-law-impact/21067751/>.
- Davies, D., Taylor, R., Savery, L., 2001. The role of appraisal, remuneration and training in improving staff relations in the Western Australian accommodation industry: a comparative study. *J. Eur. Ind. Train.* 25 (7), 366–373. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000005837>.
- DiPietro, R.B., McLeod, B., 2012. Perceived work status and turnover intentions of casual-dining restaurant employees. *Hosp. Review* 29 (2), 70–77.
- Doeringhaus, H.L., Feldman, D.C., 1993. Employee benefit packages for part-time workers. *Benefits Q.* 9 (2), 72–82.
- Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, U.S., 2010. High Growth Industry Profile: Hospitality. (Retrieved from http://www.doleta.gov/brg/indprof/hospitality_profile.cfm).
- Enz, C.A., 2001. What keeps you up at night? Key issues of concern for lodging managers. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 42 (2), 38–45.
- Enz, C., Inman, C., 1992. A comparison of attitudes and work practices of part-time and full-time workers in the food service industry. In: Annual International Council on Hotel Restaurant and Institutional Education Conference Proceedings. Washington, DC: ICHRIE. pp. 19–21.
- Farrell, D., 2005. What's the ROI of training programs? *Lodging Hospitality* 61 (70), 46.
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.G., Buchner, A., 2007. G*Power 3: a flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behav. Res. Methods* 39, 175–191.
- Faulkner, B., Patiar, A., 1997. Workplace induced stress among operational staff in the hotel industry. *Int. J. Hosp. Manage.* 16 (1), 99–117. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0278-4319\(96\)00053-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0278-4319(96)00053-9).
- Furunes, T., 2005. Training paradox in the hotel industry. *Scand. J. Hosp. Tour.* 5 (3), 231–248. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15022250510014372>.
- Gautam, A.M., 2005. The Challenge of Hotel Employee Turnover. (Retrieved from <http://www.hvs.com/article/1522/knowledge-flighththe-challenge-of-hotel-employee-turnover/>).
- Green, A.J., 2011. Hospitality Training: Do Learning Styles Matter? (Doctoral Dissertation) Retrieved from <http://dspace.unm.edu/bitstream/handle/1928/12879/AliGreen%20Final.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>.
- Gross, S.E., Friedman, H.M., 2004. Creating an effective total reward strategy: holistic approach better supports business success. *Benefits Q.* 20 (3), 7.
- Gunlu, E., Aksarayli, M., Percin, N.S., 2010. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment of hotel managers in Turkey. *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manage.* 22 (5), 693–717. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09596111011053819>.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Snyderman, B.B., 1959. *The Motivation to Work*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY.
- Hill, H.D., 2013. Paid sick leave and job stability. *Work Occup.* 40 (2), 143–173. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0730888413480893>.
- Hospitality employee turnover rose in 2014. (2015, March 11). Retrieved from <http://www.restaurant.org/News-Research/News/Hospitality-employee-turnover-rose-in-2014>.
- Inman, C., Enz, C., 1995. Shattering the myths of the part-time worker. *Cornell Hosp. Q.* 36 (5), 70–73. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/001088049503600526>.
- Jacobs, R.J., Jones, M., 1995. *Structured On-the-job Training: Developing Expertise in the Workplace*. Berrett-Koehler, San Francisco, CA.
- Johanson, M.M., Cho, S., 2009. Uncovering the link between organizational behaviors and employment status in the U.S. hotel industry. *J. Hum. Resour. Hosp. Tour.* 8 (2), 182–198. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15332840802269825>.
- Johanson, M., Woods, R.H., 1999. Participant response rates of hospitality management research projects: 1987–1997. *J. Hosp. Tour. Educ.* 11 (1), 41–44. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10963758.1999.10685221>.
- Kathman, J.M., Kathman, M.D., 2000. Training student employees for quality service. *J. Acad. Librariansh.* 26 (3), 176–182. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333\(00\)00096-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333(00)00096-3).
- Keegan, S.N., Lucas, R., 2005. Hospitality to hostility: dealing with low response rates in postal surveys. *Int. J. Hosp. Manage.* 24 (2), 157–169. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2004.06.006>.
- Kim, W.G., Leong, J.K., Lee, Y.K., 2005. Effect of service orientation on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intention of leaving in a casual dining chain restaurant. *Int. J. Hosp. Manage.* 24 (2), 171–193. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2004.05.004>.
- Kirkpatrick, D.L., 1998. *Evaluating Training Programs*. Berrett-Koehler, San Francisco, CA.
- Kusluvan, S., 2003. *Managing Employee Attitudes and Behaviors in the Tourism and Hospitality Industry*. Nova Science Publishers, New York, NY.
- La Lopa, J.M., Kavanaugh, R., Ghiselli, R., 2000. The impact of offering benefits to part-time employees on turnover rates at Indiana's quick service hamburger restaurant chains. *J. Foodserv.* 12 (4), 263–276. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-4506.2000.tb00023.x>.
- La Lopa, J.M., 1997. Commitment and turnover in resort jobs. *J. Hosp. Tour. Res.* 21 (2), 11–26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/109634809702100202>.
- Lai, P.C., Soltani, E., Baum, T., 2008. Distancing flexibility in the hotel industry: the role of employment agencies as labour suppliers. *Int. J. Hum. Res. Manage.* 19 (1), 132–152. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585190701764048>.
- Lam, T., Zhang, H.Q., 2003. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the Hong Kong fast food industry. *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manage.* 15 (4), 214–220. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/095961103104755667>.
- Lee, J.S., Back, K.J., Chan, E.S., 2015. Quality of work life and job satisfaction among frontline hotel employees: a self-determination and need satisfaction theory approach. *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manage.* 27 (5), 768–789. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-11-2013-0530>.
- Lord, F.M., Novick, M.R., 1968. *Statistical Theories of Mental Test Scores*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- Lucas, R., 1995. *Managing Employee Relations in the Hotel and Catering Industry*. Cassell

- Publishing, London, United Kingdom.
- Lucas, R., 2002. Fragments of HRM in hospitality? Evidence from the 1998 workplace employee relations survey. *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manage.* 14 (5), 207–212. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09596110210433727>.
- Lundberg, C.C., 1994. The views of future hospitality leaders on business ethics. *Hosp. Tour. Educ.* 6 (2), 11–13. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/23298758.1994.10685563>.
- Marchington, M., Wilkinson, A., 2000. *Core Personnel and Development*, 2nd ed. Chartered Institute of Personnel & Development, London, England.
- Maroudas, L., Kyriakidou, O., Vacharis, A., 2008. Employees' motivation in the luxury hotel industry: the perceived effectiveness of human-resource practices. *Manag. Leisure* 13 (3–4), 258–271. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13606710802200969>.
- Martin, B.O., Kolomito, K., Lam, T.C., 2014. Training methods a review and analysis. *Hum. Resour. Dev. Rev.* 13 (1), 11–35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1534484313497947>.
- Molenda, M., 2003. In search of the elusive ADDIE model. *Perform. Improv.* 42 (5), 34–37. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pfi.4930420508>.
- Monk, D., Ryding, D., 2007. Service quality and training: a pilot study. *Br. Food J.* 109 (8), 627–636. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00070700710772417>.
- Namasivayam, K., Miao, L., Zhao, X., 2007. An investigation of the relationships between compensation practices and firm performance in the US hotel industry. *Int. J. Hosp. Manage.* 26 (3), 574–587. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2006.05.001>.
- Ozturk, A.B., Hancer, M., Im, J.Y., 2014. Job characteristics, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment for hotel workers in Turkey. *J. Int. J. Hosp. Manage.* 23 (3), 294–313. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2013.796866>.
- Pocock, B., 2003. *The Work/Life Collision: What Work Is Doing to Australians and What to Do About It?* Federation Press, Leichhardt, Australia.
- Poulston, J., 2008. Hospitality workplace problems and poor training: a close relationship. *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manage.* 20 (4), 412–427. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09596110810873525>.
- Putra, A., 2004. Evaluating training programs: an exploratory study of transfer of learning on the job at Hotel A and Hotel B, Sydney, Australia. *J. Hosp. Tour. Manage.* 11 (1), 77–87.
- Rakicevik, G., Miladinovski, S., Strezoska, J., 2008. Lifelong learning in restaurant business. *Tour. Hosp. Manage.* 14 (1), 105–114.
- Schmidt, S.W., 2007. The relationship between satisfaction with workplace training and overall job satisfaction. *Hum. Resour. Dev. Q.* 18 (4), 481–498. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.1216>.
- Shamim, A., 2013. *Important of Training in Hotel Industry: A Case Study of Hilton Hotel, Cyprus* (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:651957/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.
- Slattery, J.P., Selvarajan, T.T., Anderson, J.E., 2006. Influences of new employee development practices on temporary employee work-related attitudes. *Hum. Resour. Dev. Q.* 17 (3), 279–303. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.1175>.
- Sobaih, A.E., Coleman, P., Ritchie, C., Jones, E., 2008. Part-time employees and service quality in the UK restaurant sector. *Hosp. Rev.* 10 (4), 63–69.
- Sobaih, A.E., Coleman, P., Ritchie, C., Jones, E., 2011. Part-time restaurant employee perceptions of management practices: an empirical investigation. *Service Ind. J.* 31 (11), 1749–1768. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2011.573659>.
- Sobaih, A.E., 2011. Half-job-half training? Management perceptions of part-time employee training in the hospitality industry. *J. Hum. Resour. Hosp. Tour.* 10 (4), 400–420. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2011.588563>.
- Stamper, C.L., Van Dyne, L., 2003. Organizational citizenship: a comparison between part-time and full-time service employees. *Cornell Hotel Restaur. Adm. Q.* 44 (1), 33–42. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0010-8804\(03\)90044-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0010-8804(03)90044-9).
- Timiraos, N., 2014. Elevated level of part-time employment: post-recession norm? (2014, November 12) Retrieved from <http://www.wsj.com/articles/post-recession-legacy-elevated-level-of-part-time-employment-1415808672>. The Wall Street Journal.
- Tyler, K., 2018. 15 ways to train on the job. *HR Mag.* 53 (9), 105–108 (2008, September 1).
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013. *How Long Do Workers Stay with the Same Employer?* (Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/careeroutlook/2013/spring/ochart.pdf>).
- Vroom, V.H., 1964. *Work and Motivation*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Wesley, R.S., Skip, S., 1999. Training and its impact on organizational commitment among lodging employees. *J. Hosp. Tour. Res.* 23 (2), 176–194. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/109634809902300205>.
- Woods, R.H., 1997. *Managing Hospitality Human Resources*, 2nd ed. Hotel & Lodging Association, Lansing, MI: American.
- Woods, R.H., 1999. Predicting is difficult, especially about the future: human resources in the new millennium. *Int. J. Hosp. Manage.* 18 (4), 443–456. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0278-4319\(99\)00048-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0278-4319(99)00048-1).
- Zhang, T.C., Kandampully, J., Choi, H.Y., 2014. The role of employee wellness programme in the hospitality industry: a review of concepts, research, and practice. *Res. Hosp. Manage.* 4 (1/2), 1–10.