

HOSPITALITY STUDENTS' PERCEPTION ON THE CHOICE OF HOTELS AS WORKPLACES: EMPLOYER ATTRACTIVENESS DIMENSIONS

Irene Hanna H. Sihombing¹, I Nyoman Wagindra Andika²,

¹ Correspondence Author, Program Studi Magister Terapan Pariwisata, Politeknik Pariwisata Bali, Bali, Indonesia

² Author, Pengelolaan Perhotelan, Politeknik Pariwisata Bali, Bali, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the perceptions of students regarding the attributes of hotel attractiveness as a place to work based on their gender and study program. As well as to find factors that become employee attractiveness for job seekers in the hospitality sector. Data analysis was conducted using mean score and Principal Component Analysis (PCA). There were 158 respondents who were 8th semester students majoring in hospitality. The attractiveness of hotels in the hospitality industry for hospitality students in finding a job is quality management, a fun and encouraging work environment, good relationships with coworkers, work that increases and develops self-confidence, supportive coworkers, honest and fair hotels, work that enhances career experience, job security, and work-life balance initiatives. There are no differences in the perceptions of hospitality students on the choice of hotel as a place to work based on gender and major / study program. Employer attractiveness attributes consist of corporate social responsibility, work experience, work environment, psychological rewards, emotional connection, company advantages, employee rewards, and relationships.

Keyword: Hospitality Student, Hotels, Employer Branding, Employer Attractiveness.

1. Introduction

The brand attractiveness of hotels as a workplace is an important factor for potential employees in the hospitality industry. Research has shown that successful management of preferred attributes of employer brand attractiveness provides appropriate benefits for hotels (Ognjanović, 2021). Developing an employer brand is strongly encouraged in hotel companies, as it is one of the factors that can improve workforce performance (Ognjanović, 2020). Employee perceptions of employers' creativity and innovation also play a role in employer attractiveness and branding in tourism and hospitality (Ek Styvén et al., 2022). Personality traits and work experience of potential applicants can influence their preferences regarding the hotels' profiles as an employer (Bellou et al., 2018). Creating an employment brand strategy can attract and retain employees in luxury boutique hotels and international resorts (Marks, 2012). Finally, understanding what makes hospitality employers attractive to Gen Z can provide insights into motivational structures that can help with employer branding and talent attraction (Kapuściński et al., 2022). The hospitality sector has increasingly challenging recruitment issues compared to other sectors. The sector is also associated with long working hours that make it difficult for workers to adjust to a social life, the use of casual workers, uncertain career development support, and low pay and frequent delays (George et al., 2020). It was also found that there is a worrying new trend, where workers in the hospitality industry usually end up leaving the industry completely (Zopiatis et al., 2018).

Despite the issue of high employee turnover rates in the hospitality industry, some researchers (Richardson, 2009) reported that many hotel managers have not shown enough effort to keep hospitality graduates motivated to stay in the industry, such as by lacking career planning and advancement opportunities, and often viewing them as cheap labor as the hospitality sector is one of the lowest paid industries (Casado-Díaz & Simón, 2016). Such poor practices are known to negatively impact the process of attracting and retaining hospitality graduates and employees (Brown et al., 2016). Poor practices in the industry have been reported in various countries (Zopiatis et al., 2018). In Uganda, for example, the majority of hospitality graduates and workers leave the industry for other more promising sectors (Otengei et al., 2017). This affect loyalty to the industry, making it potentially difficult for individuals to pursue and develop a career in the hotel management profession (Barron, 2008). This is unfortunate, given that hospitality and hospitality students essentially receive an education tailored to the needs of the industry, which should make them an important supply of skilled labor for employers.

The brand of a workplace in the hospitality industry is something that hospitality students and graduates consider in their job search. The labor market's interest in a hotel group can be a competitive advantage, especially if the hotel is able to be the most desirable to the market as a place to work. This makes them more flexible in finding the talent they want. Luxury & Upper Upscale hotels are associated with being large, offering expensive products, and operating with great facilities. Characteristics like these open up opportunities for them to provide attractions, such as providing higher pay, good work culture, career paths, and so on. These attributes play a role in shaping job seekers' perceptions of hotels as places to work. Employer brand focuses on communicating the elements that make a company attractive as a workplace (Broek, 2015). The more a place to work is perceived as attractive by potential employees, the stronger the organization's brand equity (Berthon et al., 2005). Hotels need to identify the attributes that make them attractive. As a concept that precedes employer brand, employer attractiveness is key in achieving competitive advantage (Tanwar & Prasad, 2016). Attractiveness is a perception, which will be formed differently among segments of the labor market (Morocco & Uncles, 2009). Workers with many years of work experience in the hospitality industry and hospitality students who have just graduated certainly have different perceptions of employer attractiveness. Hospitality students are promising labor candidates so it is necessary to have a workplace that is attractive to hospitality students.

The hospitality industry has a number of challenges that are common to find as a place to work. A high turnover culture and other recruitment issues are identified as problems that employers in the hospitality industry must address (Baum, 2019). The highly seasonal nature of the hospitality industry has led the majority of companies to operate with very few permanent workers in their composition, while additional part-time workers are hired during the high season (Zopiatis et al., 2014). This makes it difficult for workers in the hospitality industry to attain job security (Chalkiti & Sigala, 2010). The sector is also associated with long working hours that make it difficult for workers to fit into social life, the use of casual labor, uncertain career development support, and low and often delayed pay (George et al., 2020).

Despite the issue of high employee turnover in the hospitality industry, a number of researchers reported that many hotel managers have not shown sufficient effort to keep hospitality graduates motivated to stay in the industry (Richardson, 2009). Such poor practices are known to negatively impact the process of attracting and retaining hospitality graduates and employees (Brown et al., 2016). Poor practices in the industry have been reported in various countries (Zopiatis et al., 2018). In Uganda, for example, the majority of hospitality graduates and workers leave the industry for other more promising sectors (Otengei et al., 2017). This is unfortunate, given that hospitality and hospitality students essentially receive an education that is customized to the needs of the industry in question, which would make them an important supply of skilled labor for employers.

Therefore, it is important for hotel companies to respond to the phenomena described above. Companies around the world have systematically developed their reputational image by applying marketing principles to employee recruitment and retention (Arachchige & Robertson, 2011). This has led to a model known as employer branding, a concept of making a company a desirable place to work (Biswas & Suar, 2013). Numerous studies emphasize that companies that conduct employer branding effectively have a competitive advantage over other companies, which helps in satisfying and retaining employees (Renaud et al., 2016; Sokro, 2012).

Similar to brands aimed at customers, employer brands make perceptions the primary focus. Prospective employees' perceptions of the characteristics of a job and organization have a significant role in attracting employees (Ahmad et al., 2020). Organizations need to recognize the image they present to potential employees to clearly present themselves to the labor market in order to attract the most suitable applicants (Arachchige & Robertson, 2011). On

the other hand, job applicants need early signals from companies of their characteristics as employers to reduce information asymmetry in the employee search process (Wang, 2013), allowing them to have realistic perceptions. One approach that companies can apply in branding themselves as employers is by involving a segmentation process towards the labor market they are targeting (Moroko & Uncles, 2009), as applied to the consumer market. This segmentation is then utilized as the basis for developing an employer brand as a tool in the recruitment process. Hospitality students and graduates are a promising segment of the workforce for the hospitality industry. The majority of hospitality student education is focused on producing graduates who are ready to enter the industry as entry-level managers (Hertzman et al., 2015). In addition to the specialized knowledge, hospitality education generally requires students to complete an on-the-job training program in the hospitality industry, especially in hotels, which allows them to obtain work experience prior to graduating.

Employer brand focuses on communicating the elements that make a company attractive as a workplace (Broek, 2015). The more a workplace is perceived as attractive by potential employees, the stronger the organization's brand equity (Berthon et al., 2005). Hence, hotels have previously needed to identify the elements that make them attractive. As a concept that precedes employer brand, employer attractiveness is key in gaining competitive advantage (Tanwar & Prasad, 2016).

A number of generic scales to measure employer attractiveness, which can be applied to many organizations, have been developed from various studies (Arachchige & Robertson, 2011; Berthon et al., 2005; Minh Ha et al., 2021; Puri, 2018). A measurement scale like this can be used by hotels that need to know what attributes are most important to job seekers, becoming an important tool in creating a powerful employer branding strategy. Consequently, the measurement scale used must be able to facilitate the need for information related to employer attractiveness, so that the company's employer branding strategy is based on established data and is relevant to current industry changes.

At present, the hospitality students belong to Generation Z (born in 1995-2009), in which the newer generation of workers is expected to have different preferences from workers in the older generation (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008). The cultural environment is also an important element that influences the perceptions of prospective employees regarding whether an employer it is a good or bad place to work (Ognjanović, 2021). There are still few studies that examine Generation Z's career perceptions in the hospitality industry (Goh & Lee, 2018), particularly hospitality students with cultural backgrounds in Bali, Indonesia. The prominence of hospitality students as potential employees for the hospitality industry with appropriate work experience and academic knowledge, as well as the existing gaps in the literature, indicate the importance of conducting a study on hospitality students to understand their interest in the choice of hotels as a place to work.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Perception

Perception is the process of organization, identification, and interpretation of sensory information to represent and understand the information presented or the environment (Schacter et al., 2011). Perception is not only a passive reception of existing signals, but is also influenced by learning, memory, expectations, and attention from the recipient (Bernstein, 2010).

The differences that exist in a person's characteristics allow differences in perceptions to arise. An attribute that is considered attractive to one group may not necessarily be attractive to another. For example, the attributes of hotels in the hospitality industry that are considered attractive to a hospitality student who has just graduated may be different when compared to someone who has had a professional career in the same industry for many years.

2.2 Signaling Theory

Signaling Theory was first proposed by Spence (1978). This theory indicates that job applicants are influenced by any information related to the attributes of the organization, and perceive it as a signal (Younis & Hammad, 2021). This information can be obtained in a number of ways, both at the individual and organizational levels (Celani & Singh, 2011). Examples of individually acquired information include information obtained through interviews, or word of mouth, while job advertisements are examples of information at the organizational level (Younis & Hammad, 2021).

Without the necessary information, a job seeker may create an inaccurate picture based on the signals he or she processes and derives from his or her own interpretations (Celani & Singh, 2011). Companies must consider the context of the information they disseminate, the source of the information as well as its credibility to be an attractive employer and to build a good image as an employer (Kashive & Khanna, 2017). Job seekers are motivated to

search for various available information about the employer with the aim of forming an accurate perception of the organization, as well as assessing whether the job is a good place to work (Younis & Hammad, 2021).

2.3 Employer Branding

The concept of employer brand was first defined by Ambler & Barrow (1996) as "the package of functional, economic and psychological benefits provided by employment, and identified with the employing company". Employer brand has a focus on communicating the elements that make a company attractive as an employer (Broek, 2015). This concept is a concept derived from marketing literature (Ahmad et al., 2020), where conventional brands are usually aimed at consumers of the products/services sold by the company. The conventional branding is used to distinguish groups of people, places, and companies, while employer branding is used to separate one company from another (Broek, 2015). This suggests that employer brand can be used as a framework for companies to examine their image as a place to work, and differentiate themselves against competitors.

The concept of employer branding has the same characteristics as consumer and corporate brands, i.e. the brand should be recognizable, relevant, shareable and unique (Moroko & Uncles, 2009). Ambler & Barrow (1996) also added that employer brand has personality and can be positioned like a product brand. Employer brand as a corporate image has an audience of internal (employees) and external (prospective employees) (Saini & Jawahar, 2019). Therefore, the employer brand must be consistent with that personality as witnessed by other parts of the business network and employees (Broek, 2015).

Moroko & Uncles (2009) propose that the market for prospective employees should be segmented, and then this segmentation is used as the basis for developing an employer brand. Segmentation is necessary because each segment has characteristics that will also form different perspectives. This is important for employers to realize so that they can position themselves well according to the characteristics of the targeted prospective employees.

2.4 Employer Attractiveness

Employer attractiveness is defined as the benefits that potential employees imagine and see when working for a particular organization (Berthon et al., 2005). Attributes of the job and organization can also be attractive to potential employees. Understanding the job and organizational attributes that determine employer attractiveness is critical as a first step in creating an employer brand that is effective in recruiting and retaining employees (Arachchige & Robertson, 2013).

Employer attractiveness is the degree to which potential and current employees perceive the organization's competitive advantage (Nguyen et al., 2021). Employer attractiveness can create long-term and sustainable advantages for companies (Jiang & Iles, 2011). Companies that are considered attractive can benefit from a good reputation and competent candidates in their applicant pool.

2.5 The Employer Attractiveness Scale

The study done by Berthon et al. (2005) is considered as the starting point of trying to determine the dimensions of employer attractiveness. The study resulted in the Employer Attractiveness (EmpAt) scale, which is also considered the most popular and most cited work in the domain of employer attractiveness scale development. The EmpAt scale has been widely used in various international studies, showing good reliability (Reis & Braga, 2016).

The EmpAt scale was established more than two decades ago, which leaves room for testing in relation to the present. Changes in technology, urbanization, aspirations, industry, and globalization create many new mindsets in prospective employees, so the scale of employer attractiveness is important to study (Puri, 2018). As a result, a number of previous studies sought to evaluate and review the scale (Arachchige & Robertson, 2011; Minh Ha et al., 2021; Puri, 2018).

Arachchige & Robertson's (2011) research was the only one that continued to use all the original indicators from Berthon et al. (2005) by adding 7 new items through a literature review. The new items added are "profitable company", "large company", "product or service type", "quality management", "honest and fair", and "gives personal respect". The modified EmpAt scale was then tested consisting of 32 final indicators and obtained an alpha coefficient of 0.903.

2.6 Work-Life Balance as a New Factor of Employer Attractiveness

Barron (2008) points out that the hospitality industry contains long and uncertain working hours, great pressure and workload, work shifts that are unfriendly to social life. In addition to often causing emotional exhaustion Wong & Wang (2009), such work environments make it difficult for workers to find opportunities to socialize or engage in other activities outside of work. This includes spending time with family and running the household.

Dundas (2008) defines work-life balance as the proper management of one's paid work with other important activities such as those related to family, community, volunteer work, personal development, and recreation. Unfulfilled work-life balance can have adverse consequences such as increasing the risk of health complications, stress-related disorders, poor absenteeism, low retention rates, and indirectly negatively affecting company success (Davis, 2020; Karkoulou et al., 2016; Yu, 2014).

The health crisis that occurred during the Covid-19 pandemic has made people pay more attention to health and hygiene, which also increases the need for a healthy work environment culture (Vyas, 2022). Not only in the hospitality industry, offering work-life balance benefits, in general, is expected to make employers more attractive to potential employees (Firfiray & Mayo, 2017). Abdou et al. (2022) advised managers in the hospitality industry to undertake various initiatives to bring work-life balance to workers. This makes work-life balance necessary to be taken into account in measuring the employer attractiveness of companies in general, and specifically has a higher urgency when discussing employers in the hospitality industry such as hospitality.

3. Methods

3.1 Sampling

The sample of this study consisted of 158 eighth semester students of the Hospitality Department with a Diploma 4 (D4) equivalent study program at the Bali Tourism Polytechnic. Within one Hospitality Department, there are two study programs, namely the Hospitality Management (HM) study program and the Hospitality Accounting Management (HAM) study program. There are a total of 118 HM students and 58 HAM students. The sample has the characteristics of having academic knowledge specific to the hospitality industry and having on-the-job internship experience in hotels for two times six months as work experience. In addition, these hospitality students were in the eighth semester of their study program and expected to graduate in less than six months, during which they were actively considering their future career prospects. These characteristics are believed to form an ideal group to add to the understanding of the attributes that attract hospitality graduates to seek employment in the hospitality industry.

3.2 Data Collection

Data was collected by distributing a questionnaire consisting of two parts. The first part consists of 32 items derived from the employer attractiveness scale that has been modified by Arachchige & Robertson (2011). In addition, in the literature study conducted, a new indicator that was not included in the scale was identified and added, namely "Work-life balance initiatives", bringing the total to 33 items. The items were rated on a Likert scale with a score of 1-7, where the higher the score, the more important the item is to hospitality students, and vice versa.

The second part of the questionnaire contained questions aimed at collecting respondents' personal data as well as segmenting hospitality students, namely gender and study program. The questionnaire was delivered using Bahasa Indonesia, where adjustments to word choice were made so that the questions could be more easily understood by respondents and adapted to the context of choosing a hotel as a workplace choice.

3.3 Data Analysis

Descriptive statistical analysis was used to identify the attractiveness of hotels in the hospitality industry that are most significant in attracting hospitality students in seeking employment. Mean values were obtained for each of the 33 items in the first part of the questionnaire to identify the attributes that attract potential employees, namely hospitality students. Then, all items were divided equally into three groups of attributes, with the discussion focused only on the Most Preferred Attributes group and the Least Preferred Attributes group.

In addition, the means of the segment groups by gender and by study program were calculated. In each segment, the correlation coefficient of each group was measured to determine the size of the preference difference between the groups. If a low correlation is shown, it is concluded that there is a significant difference in preference between the two groups, so the difference needs to be elaborated.

Finally, Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was used to further refine the information obtained from the hospitality student respondents and identify the dimensions of employer attractiveness in the context of the hospitality industry. This was done mainly due to the addition of a new indicator "Work-life balance initiatives" on the measurement scale, which needs to be determined how this indicator is positioned against the previous existing indicators

4.RESULTS

4.1 Hotel Attribute Preferences in General

The alpha coefficient of the original 32 items used in the study done by Arachchige (2011) was reported to be 0.903. After the addition of new indicator, with the total of 33 items, the questionnaire generated the alpha coefficient of 0.926. This is above the acceptable level of 0.7, showing that the instrument is reliable.

Table 1 demonstrates the mean score of each item of the employer attractiveness questionnaire. Calculations are made on the answers of respondents, where the higher the mean score, the more important the item is for hospitality students in determining the hotel as a place to work. All items are then sorted based on the mean score obtained, then the Most Preferred Attribute and Least Preferred Attribute item groups are presented in Table 2.

Table 1. Mean Score of Hotel Attributes Items

Item Code	Item Statement	Mean
EA1	I prefer to work in a hotel with a large property.	6.09
EA2	I prefer to work at a hotel that I recognized through advertisements and other media.	5.59
EA3	I prefer to work in a hotel by first learning about the types of products and/or services offered.	6.06
EA4	I prefer to work in a high-profit hotel.	6.59
EA5	I prefer to work in a hotel that has high quality products and services	6.49
EA6	I prefer to work in a hotel with quality management.	6.87
EA7	I prefer to work in a hotel with an above-average base salary.	6.39
EA8	I prefer to work in a hotel with attractive compensation.	6.43
EA9	I prefer to work in a hotel that has job security.	6.75
EA10	I prefer to work in a hotel that could serve as a stepping stone for future employment.	6.30
EA11	I prefer to work in a hotel that has good promotion opportunities.	6.53
EA12	I prefer to work in a hotel that gives me the opportunity to apply what I learned in college.	5.94
EA13	I prefer to work in a hotel that gives me the opportunity to teach others what I have learned.	6.08
EA14	I prefer to work in a hotel that gives back to the community and its environment.	6.08
EA15	I prefer to work in a hotel where I could have a sense of acceptance and belonging.	6.69
EA16	I prefer to work in a hotel with a happy working environment.	6.84
EA17	I prefer to work in a hotel that gives me recognition/appreciation from management.	6.59
EA18	I prefer to work in a hotel that is known for being fair and honest.	6.77
EA19	I prefer to work in a customer-oriented hotel.	6.27
EA20	I prefer to work in a hotel where I maintain good relationships with my coworkers.	6.80
EA21	I prefer to work in a hotel by maintaining a good relationship with my superiors.	6.68
EA22	I prefer to work in a hotel with supportive and encouraging coworkers.	6.78
EA23	I prefer to work in a hotel that gave me confidence.	6.79
EA24	I prefer to work in a hotel that promotes my self-esteem.	6.79
EA25	I prefer to work in hotels that provide career-enhancing experiences.	6.76
EA26	I prefer to work in an innovative hotel with forward-thinking working practices.	6.56
EA27	I prefer to work in a hotel that values and utilizes the creativity of its workers.	6.61

Item Code	Item Statement	Mean
EA28	I prefer to work in hotels that provide innovative products and services.	6.38
EA29	I prefer to work in a hotel that provides a broad/inter-departmental experience.	6.45
EA30	I prefer to work in a hotel with an exciting work environment.	6.68
EA31	I prefer to work in a hotel with a fun work environment.	6.75
EA32	I prefer to work in a hotel that gives me respect from my family and friends.	6.03
EA33	I prefer to work in a hotel that offers work-life balance initiatives.	6.72

Table 2. Most-Preferred and Least-Preferred Hotel Attributes

Most-Preferred Attributes (In descending order by mean score)		Least-Preferred Attributes (In ascending order by mean score)	
Item Code	Hotel Attributes	Item Code	Hotel Attributes
EA6	Quality management	EA2	Well-Known Company
EA16	Happy environment	EA12	Can Use University Knowledge
EA20	Good relationship with colleagues	EA32	Gives Personal Respect
EA24	Promotes self-esteem	EA3	Product or Service Type
EA23	Develops confidence	EA13	Can Teach Others University Knowledge
EA22	Supportive colleagues	EA14	Socially Responsible
EA18	Honest and fair	EA1	Large Company
EA25	Gaining career experience	EA19	Customer-Oriented
EA31	Fun environment	EA10	Future Opportunities
EA9	Job Security	EA28	Innovative Products
EA33	Work-life balance initiatives	EA7	Above Average Salary

Based on Table 1, it can be seen that all items on the questionnaire show relatively high mean scores. The questionnaire item with the highest value is EA6 with a mean of 6.87, which represents the "Quality management" indicator. Meanwhile, the lowest value is obtained by EA2 with a mean of 5.59, which represents the "Well-Known Company" indicator.

Based on Table 2, it has been identified several other most-preferred attributes and least-preferred attributes. The newly proposed indicator, "Work-life balance initiatives" (Abdou dkk., 2022; Firfiray & Mayo, 2017; Vyas, 2022), was in fact included in the Most-Preferred group.

4.2 Hotel Attribute Preferences Based on Hospitality Student Segmentation

The hospitality students were segmented based on their gender and study program. The mean scores of each questionnaire item were calculated and correlated between groups based on these segmentations. The correlation of the mean scores of hotel attributes by segmentation can be seen in Table 3 and Table 4.

Table 3. Mean Score Correlation of Hotel Attributes Preference Based on Gender

Statistic	Gender	
	Male	Female
Mean	6.4247	6.5341

Standard Deviation	0.3265	0.3233
Pearson Correlation	0.905	

Table 4. Mean Score Correlation of Hotel Attributes Preference Based on Study Program

Statistic	Study Program	
	HM	HAM
Mean	6,4763	6,5152
Standard Deviation	0,3317	0,3106
Pearson Correlation	0,892	

Based on Tables 3 & 4, we can observe the Pearson correlation for each segment. The mean score between the male and female hospitality student groups has a correlation score of 0.905. Meanwhile, it can be seen that the Pearson Correlation between the mean scores of the Hospitality Management (HM) and Hospitality Accounting Management (HAM) student groups is 0.892. Both of them showed a very high correlation, which indicates that the differences in preferences that occur in hospitality students based on gender segmentation and study programs are very small or insignificant. Thus, the differences are concluded not to be elaborated.

4.3 Principal Component Analysis Dimensi Employer Attractiveness

The addition of "Work-life balance initiatives" as a new indicator to the measurement scale established by Arachchige (2011), raises the interest to examine the employer attractiveness scale. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was used to reduce the dimensionality of the data, determine the new dimensions of employer attractiveness and how each indicator is positioned on the existing dimensions. PCA was performed with Equamax rotation with the condition of extracting factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. The results of PCA are shown in Tables 5 and 6.

Table 5. Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	9,145	27,712	27,712	9,145	27,712	27,712	2,770	8,392	8,392
2	2,568	7,781	35,493	2,568	7,781	35,493	2,671	8,095	16,487
3	2,188	6,631	42,123	2,188	6,631	42,123	2,522	7,643	24,130
4	1,627	4,930	47,053	1,627	4,930	47,053	2,499	7,574	31,704
5	1,397	4,233	51,286	1,397	4,233	51,286	2,302	6,975	38,679
6	1,307	3,959	55,246	1,307	3,959	55,246	2,257	6,839	45,518
7	1,155	3,501	58,747	1,155	3,501	58,747	2,233	6,768	52,286
8	1,118	3,389	62,136	1,118	3,389	62,136	2,213	6,708	58,993
9	1,103	3,342	65,478	1,103	3,342	65,478	2,140	6,485	65,478

Table 6. Rotated Component Matrix

	Component								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
EA12	0,797	0,164	0,137	0,168	0,062	0,095	-0,027	0,015	-0,005
EA13	0,795	0,156	0,044	0,045	0,211	0,020	0,152	0,047	0,096
EA14	0,660	0,067	0,174	0,020	0,325	0,046	0,211	-0,002	0,017
EA19	0,502	0,275	-0,095	-0,098	-0,091	0,226	0,150	0,292	0,320
EA29	0,142	0,737	0,228	0,095	-0,026	0,082	0,132	0,187	0,157
EA26	0,221	0,603	0,148	0,079	0,346	0,206	0,116	0,201	0,182
EA25	0,143	0,597	0,069	0,270	0,430	0,078	0,224	-0,065	0,188
EA27	0,219	0,561	0,335	0,339	0,148	0,076	0,038	0,303	-0,028
EA28	0,394	0,507	0,224	-0,051	0,084	0,240	0,068	0,303	0,007
EA30	0,022	0,196	0,784	0,127	-0,012	0,088	0,078	0,090	0,130
EA16	0,104	0,032	0,721	0,211	0,125	0,033	-0,017	-0,087	0,067
EA31	0,107	0,230	0,710	0,097	0,236	-0,014	0,096	0,147	0,200
EA24	-0,024	0,201	0,130	0,750	0,095	0,170	0,088	0,075	-0,011
EA22	0,045	0,000	0,394	0,633	0,084	0,049	0,040	0,080	0,255
EA23	0,199	0,033	0,150	0,560	0,443	0,095	0,080	0,039	0,227
EA17	0,091	0,113	0,049	0,067	0,827	0,039	0,021	0,129	0,063
EA15	0,197	0,079	0,334	0,413	0,538	-0,076	0,017	0,029	0,191
EA3	0,157	0,245	0,127	-0,125	0,039	0,697	0,065	-0,195	-0,081
EA9	0,104	0,118	-0,023	0,331	0,312	0,607	0,125	0,121	0,256
EA6	-0,074	-0,006	0,018	0,240	-0,116	0,587	-0,015	0,232	0,196
EA1	0,055	0,091	0,045	0,026	0,009	-0,074	0,826	0,062	0,095
EA8	0,020	0,062	-0,069	0,037	0,111	0,514	0,591	0,243	-0,024
EA5	0,077	0,251	0,066	-0,012	-0,040	0,368	0,517	0,071	0,369
EA2	0,352	0,129	0,060	0,212	0,219	0,081	0,443	-0,179	-0,441
EA4	0,244	-0,226	0,120	0,048	0,173	0,314	0,405	0,333	0,338
EA10	-0,128	0,288	-0,081	0,024	0,154	0,077	0,072	0,621	0,055
EA33	0,034	0,086	0,174	0,160	-0,074	-0,100	0,389	0,610	0,054
EA11	0,246	0,305	0,053	0,278	0,122	0,229	-0,038	0,510	0,165

	Component								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
EA32	0,200	-0,043	0,270	-0,265	0,374	0,198	0,059	0,458	-0,138
EA7	0,102	-0,112	-0,004	0,117	0,285	0,405	0,379	0,414	0,139
EA18	-0,007	0,311	0,160	-0,071	0,247	0,187	0,124	-0,197	0,659
EA20	0,012	-0,046	0,187	0,390	0,098	0,042	0,142	0,118	0,644
EA21	0,218	0,199	0,233	0,395	0,094	0,024	0,074	0,158	0,481
Note: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Equamax with Kaiser Normalization (Rotation converged in 21 iterations).									

Based on Table 5, it is shown that the updated employer attractiveness scale has 9 dimensions that explain about 65% of the variance. Table 6 shows the correlation value of each item with each PC. The item will be loaded on the PC that has the strongest correlation with the item for the dimension to be interpreted.

Employer attractiveness indicators were then included in each PC. Modification of the measuring scale is done to add a new indicator, where most of the naming of the old indicators continues to use the naming set by Arachchige & Robertson (2011). The composition of the measuring scale consisting of 9 PCs and each indicator is described in Table 7 as follows.

Table 7. Principal Component and Indicators of Employer Attractiveness

PC1	PC2	PC3	PC4	PC5	PC6	PC7	PC8	PC9
Apply Tertiary Institution Knowledge	Offers Range of Experience	Exciting Environment	Promotes Self-Esteem	Appreciation from Management	Product or Service Type	Large Company	Future Opportunities	Honest and Fair
Share Tertiary Institution Knowledge	Innovative	Happy Environment	Supportive Colleagues	Acceptance and Belonging	Job Security	Attractive Compensation Package	Work Life Balance Initiatives	Good Relationship with Colleagues
Socially Responsible	Gaining Career Experience	Fun Environment	Develops Confidence		Quality Management	High Quality Products	Good Promotion Opportunities	Good Relationship with Superiors
Customer-Oriented	Values Creativity					Well-Known Company	Gives Personal Respect	
	Innovative Products					Profitable Company	Above Average Salary	

The grouping of indicators is then completed by labeling each PC by adjusting the indicator construct contained in it. The updated employer attractiveness measurement scale has the following dimensions:

PC1: Corporate Social Responsibility

PC2: Work Experience
 PC3: Work Environment
 PC4: Psychological Rewards
 PC5: Emotional Connection
 PC6: Job Structure
 PC7: Company Advantages
 PC8: Employee Rewards
 PC9: Relationships

5. Discussion

5.1 Hospitality Student Hotel Attribute Preferences

Hospitality students in Bali show interest in the non-material attractiveness of hotels. Great interest is shown towards hotels that have quality management. This is a valuable finding for hotels, as effective management is an important contributor not only to the success of hospitality companies (Liang et al., 2017; Shum et al., 2018), but also in attracting potential employees. Moreover, hospitality students in the majority will join the labor market as line-level employees. Managers who supervise line-level employees interact daily with their subordinates (Mistry et al., 2022), where employee engagement is highly dependent on the managers in place (Fuller & Shikoloff, 2016).

Interest is also shown in hotels that are able to provide job security for hospitality students. This is important for hotels to realize, where one of the recruitment problems that occur in the hospitality industry is the difficulty for workers to get job security (Chalkiti & Sigala, 2010). Just like hospitality students in Bali, Polish hospitality students also showed interest in job security (Grobelna, 2017). This interest in job security indicates that hospitality students want a permanent job when working in a hotel. Hotel employees who have permanent contracts feel greater job security and show a stronger commitment to the hotel where they work (Salem et al., 2021).

The work environment is a big concern for hospitality students in Bali today in choosing a hotel as a place to work. They prioritize hotels with a fun and uplifting workplace. They also want a hotel that behaves as an honest and fair employer. Similar interest is shown by Polish and Spanish hospitality students who want good working conditions (Grobelna, 2017). Happy individuals are more likely to engage in attitudes and behaviors conducive to better organizational outcomes (Abdullah et al., 2016; Fisher, 2010; Roche & Rolley, 2011). When employees feel happy at work and see their work environment as enjoyable, it creates a pleasant work environment (Salas-Vallina et al., 2017). The findings of this study indicate the importance for hotels to create a pleasant work environment to attract hospitality students.

Along with the workplace, it is also important for hospitality students in Bali to maintain good relationships with their coworkers in the hotel. In addition, coworkers who are supportive of them are also attractive to hospitality students. Hospitality students in the United States also show high attention to relationships between workers (Kim et al., 2010). Coworker support is one of the fundamental social supports that employees expect in the workplace (Ladd & Henry, 2000; Li & Liu, 2019; Loi et al., 2014). Supportive coworkers are able to provide not only help with work tasks, but also socio-emotional support such as caring and empathy (Nugent & Abolafia, 2006; Rousseau et al., 2009), which is attractive for hospitality students to choose a hotel to work in.

The psychological benefits that Balinese hospitality students get from working in a hotel are highly prioritized. They prioritize hotels that are able to improve and develop their self-confidence. Employees with higher self-confidence are believed to have higher self-esteem, psychological well-being, optimism towards goals, positive response to failure, and other adaptive attitudes and behaviors (Baranik et al., 2008). Employees who feel trusted have greater confidence in doing their jobs (Ma et al., 2021). Simpler organizational structures, high self-control, and more straightforward organizational systems can be a source of employee confidence (Gardner, 2020; Lau et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2016; Pierce & Gardner, 2004). Hotels should be workplaces that are able to provide the conditions necessary to create a job that increases the confidence of prospective employees.

Hospitality students in Bali are also concerned with hotels being able to enhance their career experience. Although related to career development, this is different from the appeal of hotels to provide promotional opportunities, as hospitality and tourism management students in the United States show a high interest in this (Kim et al., 2010). This suggests that hospitality students prioritize the work experience gained, which then plays a role in their career progression. A number of studies indicate the importance of specific and practical knowledge, tacit knowledge, acquired internally that is only possible to acquire as a hospitality employee progresses in their career (Baum, 2015; Cassel et al., 2018; Duncan et al., 2013). This attraction needs to be considered by hotels as uncertain

career development support has become a common recruitment issue in the hospitality industry (Casado-Díaz & Simón, 2016; George et al., 2020).

Work-life balance is shown to influence the perceptions of hospitality students in Bali in choosing hotels as a place to work, as indicated by previous research (Abdou et al., 2022; Firfiray & Mayo, 2017; Vyas, 2022). Hotels that offer work-life balance initiatives are favored by hospitality students in Bali. This is in line with previous indications that Gen Z, the current generation of hospitality students, place importance on flexibility in work and a balance between their lives inside and outside of work (Benítez-Márquez et al., 2022). However, this is in contrast to Richardson & Butler (2012) study of tourism and hospitality students in Malaysia which indicated that students consider work-life balance as less important. Nevertheless, the novelty of this research indicates the need for hotels to pay more attention to work-life balance, which is also a common recruitment problem in the hospitality industry (Barron, 2008; George et al., 2020; Hofmann & Stokburger-Sauer, 2017; Moyeenudin, 2020).

Based on the discussion above, it can be seen that there are a number of similarities and differences in the preferences of attributes prioritized between Balinese hospitality students and hospitality students of other nationalities. The similarities found are in terms of job security and good working environment conditions (Grobelna, 2017), as well as good relationships between workers (Kim et al., 2010). Meanwhile, differences were found in terms of work-life balance (Richardson & Butler, 2012). A number of matches were also found between recruitment issues in the hospitality industry that often occur with the attributes that hospitality students in Bali desire from working for a hotel. These include job security (Chalkiti & Sigala, 2010; George et al., 2020), career development (George et al., 2020), and work-life balance (Barron, 2008; George et al., 2020; Hofmann & Stokburger-Sauer, 2017; Moyeenudin, 2020).

5.2 The Least-Preferred Hotel Attributes

When hospitality students' ratings of all attributes are considered, it can be seen that hospitality students rated all attributes relatively highly. This may indicate a leniency bias, where there is a tendency for hospitality students to be lenient in all their assessments resulting in relatively high mean scores across hotel attributes (Wetzel et al., 2016). However, it cannot be denied that there are attributes that perform lower than other attributes.

Hotel attributes that show the advantages of the company such as the hotel is famous and is a large company are not prioritized by hospitality students in Bali. When they are faced with the choice to work for a hotel, and the hotel is rated only based on its size and stars as in a classic employer rating survey (Hsu & Hildebrand, 2019), hospitality students strongly prioritize working in a hotel with the highest stars. However, when faced with various other hotel attributes, the size of the hotel and its popularity were found to be among the least prioritized attributes. In addition, the type of product or service and the innovation of the product provided by the hotel are not prioritized by hospitality students in Bali in choosing a hotel as a place to work.

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) of hotels is also less prioritized by hospitality students in Bali. The hospitality business always prioritizes customer orientation (Xu et al., 2020), as applied to customer-centric CSR (Rashid et al., 2013). In this study, customer orientation was the least prioritized attribute in the context of choosing a hotel as a place to work. This may indicate that hospitality students consider customer orientation as something that is naturally present in a hotel, and not a significant differentiator to determine one hotel is better than another as a place to work. Meanwhile, from an employee-centric perspective, hospitality students also do not prioritize whether their work in hotels is in accordance with the education they have undertaken. Formal theoretical education is not seen as particularly beneficial in a hospitality career, especially in the early stages of that career (Baum, 2015; Cassel et al., 2018; Duncan et al., 2013) where they are not yet involved in higher-level work such as management-level decision-making.

While hotel jobs that boost confidence are prioritized by hospitality students in Bali, they are less concerned with whether the job brings respect from those around them. This indicates that the confidence desired by the students arises from within the job itself. This attribute is believed to be related to the social status gained from hospitality work. Hospitality work is considered a low social status occupation (Mohsin & Lengler, 2015), including in Eastern Europe (Pizam, 2007). However, countries with developing economies consider job opportunities in hospitality companies as high status jobs, due to the lack of job opportunities in the service industry with high compensation (Haldorai et al., 2019).

One of the recruitment problems in the hospitality industry is low pay (Casado-Díaz & Simón, 2016; George et al., 2020). However, an above-average base salary is an attribute that is less prioritized by hospitality students in Bali. This is in contrast to Malaysian hospitality students (Richardson & Butler, 2012) and Polish hospitality students (Grobelna, 2017) who prioritize salary in employment. This may indicate that hospitality students look more at the overall compensation package of the hotel job, such as the service charge that is required and regulated by the Indonesian government or other forms of compensation that add to the economic value they get

from the job. Employees are given a service charge based on hotel revenue and the employee's position and title (Balasingam et al., 2020). In large and luxurious hotels in Bali, line employees can even get a service charge exceeding the amount of their basic salary. Apart from salary, hospitality students in Bali are less concerned about whether their work in a hotel can serve as a stepping stone for future career opportunities. This may indicate that when choosing a hotel as a place to work, hospitality students' considerations are more focused on a career that will be carried out only at the hotel in question.

Attributes that are less prioritized however will still be taken into account by hospitality students in choosing a hotel as a place to work. This means that hotels cannot necessarily ignore attributes other than attributes that hospitality students prioritize. Because it becomes a hotel attraction, every attribute that a hotel can offer to prospective workers still needs to be considered and adjusted to the conditions of the hotel so that the right employer branding strategy can be determined.

5.3 Segmentation and Differences in Hotel Attribute Preferences

No significant differences were observed among the attribute preferences of hospitality students at Bali Tourism Polytechnic, either by gender segmentation or study program. However, this does not mean that segmentation cannot lead to differences in hotel attribute preferences between the segment groups within it.

The adaptation of marketing literature for human resource management purposes, such as external employer branding, provides an opportunity to apply the concept of market segmentation (Backhaus, 2016). This opportunity is where employers can categorize certain job benefits to attract a specialized market of potential employees (Moroko & Uncles, 2009). Although meaningful differences in preferences were not found in this research sample, differences can be found when the results of this study are compared to previous research with different sample groups. For example, the perceptions of hospitality students in Bali and Malaysian hospitality students (Richardson & Butler, 2012) on work-life balance are opposite. Likewise with salary, the opposite perception is also shown between hospitality students in Bali and Malaysian hospitality students (Richardson & Butler, 2012) and Polish hospitality students (Grobelsna, 2017). Attribute differences are shown in the sample with differences in nationality and generation or age of the sample.

In addition to the above, it should be noted that this study only used a sample of hospitality students from one tourism college, namely Bali Tourism Polytechnic. In addition, the segmentation conducted was limited to segmentation based on gender and study programs available at the educational institution. There is a possibility of significant differences in hotel attribute preferences among hospitality students when samples are involved from a number of educational institutions at once with more detailed and varied segmentation.

5.4 Dimension Employer Attractiveness

This research identifies nine dimensions of employer attractiveness that can be used to investigate what employer attractiveness is key in targeting a segment of the workforce. This serves as an improvement to the employer attractiveness measurement scale that has been examined by previous studies, resulting in a more relevant and reliable measurement scale.

The development of the employer attractiveness scale was first started by Berthon et al. (2005) who initially established a measuring scale consisting of 25 indicators with five dimensions, namely interest value, social value, economic value, development value, and application value. Then, six years later, Arachchige & Robertson (2011) reviewed the measuring scale and produced a more complete measuring scale with 32 indicators covered by 8 dimensions, namely corporate environment, job structure, social commitment, social environment, relationships, personal growth, organizational dynamism, enjoyment. This updated scale became better because the addition of indicators made it able to capture factors that were not previously included in the measuring scale.

This study is the latest research to examine the employer attractiveness measuring scale from Arachchige & Robertson's (2011) research. Work-life balance initiatives were added as new indicators to make this measuring scale more complete. As a result, the updated measuring scale not only increased to 33 indicators, but also determined how these indicators were explained with new dimensions behind the indicators.

A total of nine dimensions were established to cover the entire measurement scale, namely corporate social responsibility, work experience, work environment, psychological rewards, emotional connection, company advantages, employee rewards, and relationships. The new dimensions are believed to explain employer attractiveness better, with more complete indicators and more accurate indicator groupings.

The findings from this study regarding the attributes that hospitality students prefer, as well as the modified measurement scale, can help hotels or other companies to strengthen their employer branding and recruitment strategies. For example, in this study where the "Psychological Rewards" dimension is the most attractive dimension for hospitality students, hotels that want to target hospitality students and graduates can focus their resources on

providing the factors in that dimension to start developing their employer branding strategy. Not only limited to the hotel and hospitality industry, the established measurement scale is believed to be utilized by companies in other industries to be applied to a wider segment of the workforce with the new employer attractiveness dimensions.

6. Conclusion

Based on the results and discussion of the research, it can be concluded that the most significant attractions of hotels in the hospitality industry in attracting hospitality students in looking for work are quality management, a pleasant and encouraging work environment, good relationships with coworkers, work that increases and develops self-confidence, supportive coworkers, honest and fair hotels, work that enhances career experience, job security, and work-life balance initiatives.

In addition, no significant differences were found in the factors of hospitality students' perceptions of hotel choice as a place to work when differentiated by gender and study program.

Finally, this study concluded with the identification of key dimensions of employer attractiveness in the context of the hospitality industry in Bali, which consist of corporate social responsibility, work experience, work environment, psychological rewards, emotional connection, company advantages, employee rewards, and relationships.

The limitation of this study is that the sample of the study only came from one university. While hospitality students at Bali Tourism Polytechnic have a high level of relevance to hotels, different preferences may be found if hospitality students are drawn from other different universities, and/or backgrounds. Therefore, this needs to be considered in generalizing the findings from the study in representing hospitality students and graduates. Furthermore, within the broader spectrum of the hospitality labor market, different perceptions from other segments such as more experienced employees on the attractiveness of hotels should be considered in crafting employer branding strategies.

7. REFERENCES

- (1) Abdou, A. H., Khalil, A. A. F., Mahmoud, H. M. E., Elsaied, M. A., & Elsaed, A. A. (2022). The Impact of Hospitality Work Environment on Employees' Turnover Intentions During COVID-19 Pandemic: The Mediating Role of Work-Family Conflict. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.890418>
- (2) Abdullah, A. G. K., Ling, Y.-L., & Peng, C. S. (2016). An exploratory analysis of happiness at workplace from Malaysian teachers perspective using performance-welfare model. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 6(6), 340–346.
- (3) Ahmad, A., Khan, M. N., & Haque, M. A. (2020). Employer Branding Aids in Enhancing Employee Attraction and Retention. *Journal of Asia-Pacific Business*, 21(1), 27–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10599231.2020.1708231>
- (4) Ambler, T., & Barrow, S. (1996). The employer brand. *Journal of Brand Management*, 4, 185–206.
- (5) Arachchige, B. J. H., & Robertson, A. (2011). Business student perceptions of a preferred employer: a study identifying determinants of Employer Branding. *IUP Journal of Brand Management*, 8(3).
- (6) Arachchige, B. J. H., & Robertson, A. (2013). Employer attractiveness: Comparative perceptions of undergraduate and postgraduate students. *Sri Lankan Journal of Human Resource Management*, 4(1), 33–48. <https://doi.org/10.4038/sljhrm.v4i1.5616>
- (7) Backhaus, K. (2016). Employer Branding Revisited. *Organization Management Journal*, 13(4), 193–201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15416518.2016.1245128>
- (8) Balasingam, A. S., Hussain, K., & Manaf, A. (2020). Industry perspectives on Malaysian hotel minimum wage issues. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*.
- (9) Baranik, L. E., Meade, A. W., Lakey, C. E., Lance, C. E., Hu, C., Hua, W., & Michalos, A. (2008). Examining the differential item functioning of the Rosenberg self-esteem scale Across eight countries 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38(7), 1867–1904.
- (10) Barron, P. (2008). Education and talent management: Implications for the hospitality industry. In *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* (Vol. 20, Issue 7, pp. 730–742). <https://doi.org/10.1108/09596110810897583>

- (11) Baum, T. (2015). Human resources in tourism: Still waiting for change?—A 2015 reprise. *Tourism Management*, 50, 204–212.
- (12) Baum, T. (2019). Hospitality employment 2033: A Backcasting Perspective (Invited Paper for ‘Luminaries’ Special Issue of *International Journal of Hospitality Management*). *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 76, 45–52.
- (13) Benítez-Márquez, M. D., Sánchez-Teba, E. M., Bermúdez-González, G., & Núñez-Rydman, E. S. (2022). Generation Z Within the Workforce and in the Workplace: A Bibliometric Analysis. In *Frontiers in Psychology* (Vol. 12). Frontiers Media S.A. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.736820>
- (14) Bernstein, D. (2010). *Essentials of Psychology*. Cengage Learning. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=rd77N0KsLVkC>
- (15) Berthon, P., Ewing, M., & Hah, L. L. (2005). Captivating company: dimensions of attractiveness in employer branding. *International Journal of Advertising*, 24(2), 151–172.
- (16) Biswas, M., & Suar, D. (2013). Which employees’ values matter most in the creation of employer branding? *Journal of Marketing Development and Competitiveness*, 7(1), 93–102.
- (17) Broek, M. N. ten. (2015). From employer attractiveness to employer branding: results of a mixed methods research. In Master’s Thesis . University of Twente. <http://essay.utwente.nl/66622/>
- (18) Brown, E. A., Bosselman, R. H., & Thomas, N. J. (2016). Are hospitality graduates making too many compromises? What they give up may lead to turnover. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality and Tourism*, 15(2), 133–146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2016.1084853>
- (19) Casado-Díaz, J. M., & Simón, H. (2016). Wage differences in the hospitality sector. *Tourism Management*, 52, 96–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.06.015>
- (20) Cassel, S. H., Thulemark, M., & Duncan, T. (2018). Career paths and mobility in the Swedish hospitality sector. *Tourism Geographies*, 20(1), 29–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2017.1402946>
- (21) Celani, A., & Singh, P. (2011). Signaling theory and applicant attraction outcomes. *Personnel Review*, 40(2), 222–238. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483481111106093>
- (22) Cennamo, L., & Gardner, D. (2008). Generational differences in work values, outcomes and person-organisation values fit. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(8), 891–906. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940810904385>
- (23) Chalkiti, K., & Sigala, M. (2010). Staff Turnover in The Greek Tourism Industry: A Comparison Between Insular and Peninsular Regions. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 22(3), 335–359. <https://doi.org/10.1108/0959611011035945>
- (24) Davis, S. N. (2020). The work–family interface in a gendered cultural context: Cross-national analysis of work stress. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 20(1), 53–69.
- (25) Duncan, T., Scott, D. G., & Baum, T. (2013). The mobilities of hospitality work: An exploration of issues and debates. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 41, 1–19.
- (26) Dundas, K. (2008). Work-Life Balance: There is no ‘one-size-fits-all’ solution. *Managing Matters*, 3, 7–8.
- (27) Firfiray, S., & Mayo, M. (2017). The Lure of Work-Life Benefits: Perceived Person-Organization Fit As A Mechanism Explaining Job Seeker Attraction To Organizations. *Human Resource Management*, 56(4), 629–649. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21790>
- (28) Fisher, C. D. (2010). Happiness at work. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12(4), 384–412.
- (29) Fuller, R., & Shikaloff, N. (2016). What great managers do daily? *Harvard Business Review*.
- (30) Gardner, D. G. (2020). The importance of being resilient: Psychological well-being, job autonomy, and self-esteem of organization managers. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 155, 109731.
- (31) George, C., Omuudu, O. S., & Francis, K. (2020). Employee Engagement: A Mediator Between Organizational Inducements and Industry Loyalty Among Workers in The Hospitality Industry in Uganda. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality and Tourism*, 19(2), 220–251. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2020.1702869>
- (32) Goh, E., & Lee, C. (2018). A workforce to be reckoned with: The emerging pivotal Generation Z hospitality workforce. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 73, 20–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2018.01.016>

- (33) Grobelna, A. (2017). The Perception of Job-related Motivators When Choosing a Career in the Tourism and Hospitality Industry – A Comparative Study Between Polish and Spanish Students. *International Journal of Management and Economics*, 53(2), 84–106. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijme-2017-0014>
- (34) Haldorai, K., Kim, W. G., Pillai, S. G., Park, T. (Eliot), & Balasubramanian, K. (2019). Factors affecting hotel employees' attrition and turnover: Application of pull-push-mooring framework. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 83, 46–55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.04.003>
- (35) Hertzman, J. L., Moreo, A. P., & Wiener, P. J. (2015). Career Planning Strategies and Skills of Hospitality Management Students. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality and Tourism*, 14(4), 423–443. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2015.1002071>
- (36) Hofmann, V., & Stokburger-Sauer, N. E. (2017). The impact of emotional labor on employees' work-life balance perception and commitment: A study in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 65, 47–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2017.06.003>
- (37) Hsu, O., & Hildebrand, U. (2019). YHS Employer Rankings 2019.
- (38) Jiang, T., & Iles, P. (2011). Employer-brand equity, organizational attractiveness and talent management in the Zhejiang private sector, China. *Journal of Technology Management in China*, 6(1), 97–110.
- (39) Karkoulis, S., Srour, J., & Sinan, T. (2016). A gender perspective on work-life balance, perceived stress, and locus of control. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(11), 4918–4923. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.04.053>
- (40) Kashive, N., & Khanna, V. T. (2017). Study of Early Recruitment Activities and Employer Brand Knowledge and Its Effect on Organization Attractiveness and Firm Performance. *Global Business Review*, 18(3_suppl), S172–S190. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150917693334>
- (41) Kim, B. C., McCleary, K. W., & Kaufman, T. (2010). The new generation in the industry: Hospitality/tourism students' career preferences, sources of influence and career choice factors. In *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education* (Vol. 22, Issue 3, pp. 5–11). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10963758.2010.10696979>
- (42) Ladd, D., & Henry, R. A. (2000). Helping Coworkers and helping the organization: The role of support perceptions, exchange ideology, and conscientiousness 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30(10), 2028–2049.
- (43) Lau, D. C., Lam, L. W., & Wen, S. S. (2014). Examining the effects of feeling trusted by supervisors in the workplace: A self-evaluative perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(1), 112–127.
- (44) Lee, K.-H., Choo, S.-W., & Hyun, S. S. (2016). Effects of recovery experiences on hotel employees' subjective well-being. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 52, 1–12.
- (45) Li, Y.-Q., & Liu, C.-H. (2019). The power of coworkers in service innovation: The moderating role of social interaction. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(12), 1956–1976.
- (46) Liang, T.-L., Chang, H.-F., Ko, M.-H., & Lin, C.-W. (2017). Transformational leadership and employee voices in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*.
- (47) Loi, R., Ao, O. K. Y., & Xu, A. J. (2014). Perceived organizational support and coworker support as antecedents of foreign workers' voice and psychological stress. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 36, 23–30.
- (48) Ma, E., Zhang, Y., Xu, F. Z., Wang, D., & Kim, M. (Sunny). (2021). Feeling empowered and doing good? A psychological mechanism of empowerment, self-esteem, perceived trust, and OCBs. *Tourism Management*, 87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2021.104356>
- (49) Minh Ha, N., Vinh Luan, N., & Minh Trung, N. (2021). Employer attractiveness: Measurement scale development and validation. *Chi Minh City Open University Journal of Science*, 11(1), 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.46223/HCMCOUJS>
- (50) Mistry, T. G., Hight, S. K., Okumus, F., & Terrah, A. (2022). Managers from heaven: how do hospitality employees describe good managers? *International Hospitality Review*, 36(1), 2–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ihr-09-2020-0055>
- (51) Mohsin, A., & Lengler, J. (2015). Exploring the Antecedents of Staff Turnover Within the Fast-Food Industry: The Case of Hamilton, New Zealand. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 14(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2014.904169>
- (52) Moroko, L., & Uncles, M. D. (2009). Employer branding and market segmentation. *Journal of Brand Management*, 17(3), 181–196. <https://doi.org/10.1057/bm.2009.10>

- (53) Moyeenudin, H. M. (2020). Work Life Balance to Overcome Stress in Hospitality Sector. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(5), 5686–5692. <https://doi.org/10.37200/ijpr/v24i5/pr2020275>
- (54) Nguyen, M. H., Luan, N. V., & Khoa, B. T. (2021). Employer attractiveness and employee performance: an exploratory study. *Journal of System and Management Sciences*, 11(1), 97–123.
- (55) Nugent, P. D., & Abolafia, M. Y. (2006). The creation of trust through interaction and exchange: The role of consideration in organizations. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(6), 628–650.
- (56) Ognjanović, J. (2021). Preferred attributes of employer brand attractiveness among potential employees in the hotel industry. *The European Journal of Applied Economics*, 18(2), 146–160. <https://doi.org/10.5937/ejae18-32929>
- (57) Otengei, S. O., Changha, G., Kasekende, F., & Ntayi, J. M. (2017). Vicarious Experience: A Neglected Source of Career Identity Among Indigenous Hospitality Graduates in Uganda. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education*, 29(4), 166–178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10963758.2017.1382364>
- (58) Pierce, J. L., & Gardner, D. G. (2004). Self-esteem within the work and organizational context: A review of the organization-based self-esteem literature. *Journal of Management*, 30(5), 591–622.
- (59) Pizam, A. (2007). Educating the next generation of hospitality professionals. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 26(1), 1–3. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2006.10.010>
- (60) Puri, D. (2018). Developing the Scale to Measure Employer Attractiveness. *Annals of the University Dunarea de Jos of Galati: Fascicle: I, Economics & Applied Informatics*, 24(3). <https://doi.org/10.26397/eai1584040923>
- (61) Rashid, M., Abdeljawad, I., Ngalim, S. M., & Hassan, M. K. (2013). Customer-centric corporate social responsibility: A framework for Islamic banks on ethical efficiency. *Management Research Review*, 36(4), 359–378. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01409171311314978>
- (62) Reis, G. G., & Braga, B. M. (2016). Employer attractiveness from a generation perspective: Implications for employer branding. *Revista de Administração*, 51(1), 103–116. <https://doi.org/10.5700/rausp1226>
- (63) Renaud, S., Morin, L., & Fray, A. M. (2016). What most attracts potential candidates? Innovative perks, training, or ethics? *Career Development International*, 21(6), 634–655. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-01-2016-0008>
- (64) Richardson, S. (2009). Undergraduates' perceptions of tourism and hospitality as a career choice. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(3), 382–388. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.10.006>
- (65) Richardson, S., & Butler, G. (2012). Attitudes of Malaysian Tourism and Hospitality Students' towards a Career in the Industry. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 17(3), 262–276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2011.625430>
- (66) Roche, M., & Rolley, C. (2011). Workplace wellbeing on Maungataturi Mountain: the connection between ecological restoration and workplace happiness. *Journal of Applied Business Research (JABR)*, 27(2).
- (67) Rousseau, V., Salek, S., Aubé, C., & Morin, E. M. (2009). Distributive justice, procedural justice, and psychological distress: The moderating effect of coworker support and work autonomy. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(3), 305.
- (68) Saini, G. K., & Jawahar, I. M. (2019). The influence of employer rankings, employment experience, and employee characteristics on employer branding as an employer of choice. *Career Development International*, 24(7), 636–657. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-11-2018-0290>
- (69) Salas-Vallina, A., Alegre, J., & Fernández, R. (2017). Organizational learning capability and organizational citizenship behaviour in the health sector: examining the role of happiness at work from a gender perspective. *The International Journal of Health Planning and Management*, 32(2), e137–e159.
- (70) Salem, I. E., Elbaz, A. M., Elkhwesky, Z., & Ghazi, K. M. (2021). The COVID-19 pandemic: The mitigating role of government and hotel support of hotel employees in Egypt. *Tourism Management*, 85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2021.104305>
- (71) Schacter, D. L., Gilbert, D. T., & Wegner, D. M. (2011). *Psychology* (2nd Edition). Worth. http://www.amazon.com/Psychology-Daniel-L-Schacter/dp/1429237198/ref=sr_1_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1313937150&sr=1-1
- (72) Shum, C., Gatling, A., & Shoemaker, S. (2018). A model of hospitality leadership competency for frontline and director-level managers: which competencies matter more? *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 74, 57–66.

- (73) Sokro, E. (2012). Impact of employer branding on employee attraction and retention. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 4(18), 164–173.
- (74) Spence, M. (1978). Job market signaling. In *Uncertainty in economics* (pp. 281–306). Elsevier.
- (75) Tanwar, K., & Prasad, A. (2016). The effect of employer brand dimensions on job satisfaction: gender as a moderator. *Management Decision*, 54(4), 854–886. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-08-2015-0343>
- (76) Vyas, L. (2022). “New normal” at work in a post-COVID world: work–life balance and labor markets. *Policy and Society*, 41(1), 155–167. <https://doi.org/10.1093/polsoc/puab011>
- (77) Wang, Y. (2013). Corporate reputation management: Reaching out to financial stakeholders (Issue EPS-2013-271-ORG). Erasmus Research Institute of Management.
- (78) Wetzel, E., Böhnke, J. R., & Brown, A. (2016). Response biases.
- (79) Wong, J. Y., & Wang, C. H. (2009). Emotional labor of the tour leaders: An exploratory study. *Tourism Management*, 30(2), 249–259. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2008.06.005>
- (80) Xu, S. T., Cao, Z. C., & Huo, Y. (2020). Antecedents and outcomes of emotional labour in hospitality and tourism: A meta-analysis. *Tourism Management*, 79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2020.104099>
- (81) Younis, R. A. A., & Hammad, R. (2021). Employer image, corporate image and organizational attractiveness: the moderating role of social identity consciousness. *Personnel Review*, 50(1), 244–263. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-02-2019-0058>
- (82) Yu, S. (2014). Work–life balance–work intensification and job insecurity as job stressors. *Labour & Industry: A Journal of the Social and Economic Relations of Work*, 24(3), 203–216.
- (83) Zopiatis, A., Constanti, P., & Theocharous, A. L. (2014). Job Involvement, Commitment, Satisfaction and Turnover: Evidence from Hotel Employees in Cyprus. *Tourism Management*, 41, 129–140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.09.013>
- (84) Zopiatis, A., Theocharous, A. L., & Constanti, P. (2018). Career satisfaction and future intentions in the hospitality industry: An intrinsic or an extrinsic proposition? *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality and Tourism*, 17(1), 98–120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2017.1340748>