

CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING THE EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION FROM SOME HOTEL UNITS. AN ECONOMETRICS APPROACH

Rodica Manuela GOGONEA

The Bucharest University of Economic Studies, 010374, Romania

manuela.gogonea@gmail.com

Marian ZAHARIA

Petroleum-Gas University of Ploiesti, 10068Romania

marianzaharia53@gmail.com

Abstract

The importance of job satisfaction in the results recorded in any organization producing goods or services has been highlighted and analyzed since the mid-twentieth century, being today universally accepted, even by authoritarian managers. Taking this into account, the study undertaken not about theoretical aspect, but provides a way to identify and study the factors that have an impact on job satisfaction in hotels, based on econometric methods. It is an approach that allows, as based on identification of quantitative relations, to be able to draw quality conclusions, applicable in organisational management. The paper analyzes, based on an empirical research based on questionnaires completed in a number of independent hotel units, aspects of the head-subordinate relationship, and of the attitude towards work. Of these the paper comes down to two issues. A first objective was to identify factors that contribute to increased employee satisfaction as members of the organization. The second objective was to identify derivatives of factors that contribute to the formation and characterization of the main factors considered.

Key words: *hospitality industry, hotel, management, employee satisfaction, econometric model.*

JEL Classification: *C13, C51, M14*

XIV. INTRODUCTION

The man is complex person and, in a company, he customizes at least in two categories boss and subordinate, the belonging to one or other of these being often relative. In these circumstances employee satisfaction is one of the most complex aspect of modern management (Aziri, 2011).

The companies that promote excellence consider employees as the most valuable resource trying to motivate them, to satisfy their needs both financial and moral (Cornescu, et.al. 2003).

The concerns for the study of human behavior in order to identify methods and ways to increase involvement and individual performances in the team operates, dates back to the middle of last century. In this regard we mentioned studies on: job satisfaction and professional stress (Lawler and Hall, 1970; Spector, 1986), motivation to work (Hackman and Lawler 1971) and behavior in organizations (Mullins. 1996).

Although it has passed almost half a century, job satisfaction issues continue to remain valid. In this sense of the directions of work satisfaction survey, we mention the research on gender and job satisfaction (Bender et.al. 2005, Usui, 2008, Charleton and Clain, 2012), job satisfaction and employment status

(Sutherland, 2013), job satisfaction as a measure of economic performance (Phelps and Zoega, 2013), job satisfaction and communication (Epure et.al., 2013) job satisfaction outcomes from linked employer–employee (Haile, 2015).

The tourism industry is an area with economic and social implications up to rural areas (Babuc and Balacescu, 2012), the production is characterized by specificity and diversity, and where, is necessary a flexible management (Staciu and Hapenciu, 2009), adaptable to production place of touristic product . In these circumstances, the human resource is prioritized in every aspect of service due to the specific activities carried out involving continuous communication with the client (Tatarusanu, 2009).

A feature in the tourism industry is that employers prefer, and are moving toward the young workforce (Roman et al, 2008) due to their ability to communicate with tourists. On the other hand there may be some failures in dealing with bosses who may belong to older generations.

However, taking into account that the quality of products and services in the hospitality industry depend significantly on the quality of human resource, the management role is to stimulate quality work to “encourage it by motivation, education as well as with the possibility of career advancement” (Herman, 2015). Last but not least, quality work in tourism is

intrinsically linked to the existence and use of specific software that mediate the relationship with customers (Tiliuta and Condratov, 2014) increasing employee performance. The exponential development of IT & C, pressures on human resources in tourism which is also an argument for finding ways of creating a high level of employee satisfaction in the hospitality industry, implicit in hotels.

Based on these considerations, the paper aims to identify some aspect, directions for action, leading to the strengthening of relations between employees and different hierarchical levels, to provide quality services, to respond fully and to high quality standards to the requirements of tourists, given that "a happy employee will provide a high quality service".

XV. OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

A prime objective of the research was to highlight the findings on satisfaction or dissatisfaction of their employees, as employees of establishments. For this, together with the direct question on employee satisfaction levels, were still formulated four questions on level of satisfaction at work, relationship with manager, opportunities for advancement and stability of the job. These are:

- Q1. What is your level of satisfaction as a hotel employee?
- Q2. What is your level of satisfaction on the work that you are doing?
- Q3. How do you assess the quality of the relationship manager-employed?
- Q4. What is your opinion on the possibilities of advancement?
- Q5. What is your opinion on the stability of the job?

From them it was investigated a relationship between satisfaction as an employee (ES), work satisfaction (WS), quality of the relationship with your manager (QM), advancement opportunities(AO) and job stability (JS), the relationship researched being described by econometric model:

$$y = \alpha + \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \cdot x_i + \varepsilon \quad (1)$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ is a constant, $\beta_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $i = \overline{1, n}$ are the parameters of factorial variables (x_i), y is the dependent variable (the result) and $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ quantifies the influence of residues.

The second objective of the research was to identify how job satisfaction is influenced by how it is organized and evaluated. For the assessment the factors that influence job satisfactions of employees were formulated the following questions:

- Q2.1. What is your degree of satisfaction on workload?
- Q2.2. How do you assess the relationship between wages and performance?

- Q2.3. What is your degree of satisfaction on salary?
- Q2.4. What is your degree of satisfaction about the benefits?
- Q2.5. How do you evaluate the collaboration with other departments?

From them, were generated the variables: satisfaction workload (WL) relationship between wages and performance (WP), satisfaction on salary (SS), benefits satisfaction (BS), and collaboration with other departments (AD). In view of these was tested a pattern as (1) to describe the relationship between them (considered independent variables - predictors) and the dependent variable WS (work satisfaction).

To test the statistical significance of the models (1) The methodology used was ANOVA and Fisher test, and for the testing of statistical significance of the model parameters (x_i) was used t-test (student). Null hypotheses are:

- H01: the influence of factorial variables (predictors) on the variable result does not differ significantly from the influence of residual (ε).
- H02: the influence of factorial variables x_k (predictors) on the variable result does not differ significantly from 0.

For checking and identifying, in the data series, of extreme and influential cases, was analyzed the values of statistics Std.Residual and Stud.Residual, respectively Cook's distance (Labar, 2008); the null hypothesis are:

- H03: the stability of the model (1) is not significantly influenced by the extreme cases.
- H04: in the series of data does not exist influential cases.

To test the existence of colinearity between x_i factorial variables (predictors) and result variable were determined Tolerance and VIF statistics. The condition of rejecting the collinearity hypothesis is that the values of Tolerance, for each predictor (x_i) to satisfy the relationship:

$$Tolerance > 1 - Adjusted_R_Square. \quad (2)$$

For determination of the minimum number of respondents (N - sample size) have been used the relation $N = 50 + 8 \cdot IVN$, where IVN represents the independent variable number (Popa, 2010). In the case of the first object, INV = 4, and for the second objective INV = 5. In the survey conducted, the number of respondents was 96, number that fulfills the above conditions.

Both the statistical hypothesis testing, and in drawing conclusions was used Confidence Level 95% ($\alpha=0.05$).

XVI. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To fulfill the first objective of the research, namely, how the satisfaction as an employee of hotel (ES), is influenced by the work satisfaction (WS), the quality of the relationship with your manager (QM), the advancement opportunities (AO) and the job stability (JS) it was used a linear model of the form:

$$ES = a + b_1WS + b_2QM + b_3AO + b_4JS + \varepsilon \quad (3)$$

where $a \in R$ is a constant estimator of $\alpha \in R$, $b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4 \in R$ are the estimators of $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4$.

The results obtained from the test of the model (2) using ANOVA are summarized in Table no. 1. As can be seen, as $Sig. = 0.000 < 0.05$, the model is statistically valid. The values of correlation coefficient ($R = 0.866$) and the coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.751$) shows that the four predictors (WS, QM, AO, JS) estimates well the values of resultative variable (ES).

Table no. 1: Summary of results from testing model (3) using ANOVA

Model Summary ^b					
R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate		
0.866 ^a	0.751	0.740	0.600		
ANOVA ^b					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	98.714	4	21.678	68.519	0.000 ^a
Residual	32.776	91	0.360		
Total	131.490	95			

^a Predictors: (Constant), WS, QM, AO, JS

^b Dependent variable: ES

Source: own elaboration using SPSS

The data presented in Table no. 1 gives only a first evaluation of statistical significance of the model (2). Validation of its structure involves statistical significance testing for regression coefficients corresponding to the predictors b_k . The results are shown in Table no. 2. With the exception of the constant (a) which is not statistically valid ($Sig.=0.770 > 0.05$), but which, in this research, it has no practical significance, all estimators (b_k) are statistically significant.

Table no. 2: The regression coefficients of the model^a (3)

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Std. Coeff	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
(Cst.)	a	-0.025	0.084		-0.293	0.770	-0.191	0.142
WS	b ₁	0.223	0.100	0.174	2.242	0.027	0.025	0.421
QM	b ₂	0.287	0.056	0.307	5.097	0.000	0.175	0.399
AO	b ₃	0.287	0.052	0.351	5.476	0.000	0.183	0.391
JS	b ₄	0.366	0.082	0.371	4.469	0.000	0.203	0.529

^a Dependent variable: ES

Source: own elaboration using SPSS

Taking into account the values of the parameters shown in Table no. 2, the model (3) has the form:

$$ES = -0.025 + 0.223WS + 0.287QM + 0.287AO + 0.366JS + \varepsilon \quad (4)$$

This relationship shapes the changes of the predictors influence on the variable ES. For instance an increase with a conventional unit of "work satisfaction" (WS), provided that all other predictors (factors) remain constant, increase "the satisfaction as an employee of hotel" with a value in the range [0.025, 0.421] units.

But for how best draw conclusions from the model (4) it is necessary on the one hand the analysis of its stability, and on the other hand testing of collinearity.

The model stability was verified by testing the existence of influential cases and cases extreme. The existence of extreme cases is indicated by the values of Std.Residual and Stud.Residual (Table no. 3). The existence of limits of the ranges of the two indicators, in absolute value, which are greater than 2 but less than 3 means that the data series are extreme cases. For this model were identified the value greater then 2 but less than 3 for the respondents 42, 43, 45 and 58. However, given that their share in total respondents is 4.16% < 5.0% (Field, 2000) follows that the model (4) is stable.

Table no. 3: Residuals Statistics^a

	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev	N
Residual	-1.505	1.657	0.000	0.587	96
Std. Residual	-2.508	2.761	0.000	0.979	96
Stud. Residual	-2.553	2.970	-0.002	1.014	96
Cook's Distance	0.000	0.277	0.015	0.035	96

^a Dependent variable: ES

Source: own elaboration using SPSS

For test the existence of influence cases was used the values of Cook's distance. Given that the minimum and maximum values of Cook's distance are much smaller than 1, follows that in the series of data there is no influence cases (Labär, 2008).

Regarding the colinearity testing, the results are presented in Table 4. Given that all values of Tolerance satisfy the condition 2 ($Tolerance > 1 - 0.740 = 0.260$), follows that for all four variables the hypothesis of colinearity is rejected

In conclusion the model (4) and its regression coefficients (b_k) are statistically significant for 95% Confidence Level, the regression equation is stable and between ES and predictors (WS, QM, AO, JS) there is no collinearity relations.

How predictors (WS, QM, AO, JS) influence the satisfaction as a hotel employee (ES) is highlighted by the values of Pearson correlation

coefficients (r), by the values of partial correlation coefficients (r_p), respectively, semi- partial (r_{sp}).

Table no. 4 Standardized Coefficients, Correlations and Collinearity Statistics for model (4)

Variables	Std. Coff	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
	Beta	Zero-order (r)	Partial (r_p)	Part (r_{sp})	Tolerance	VIF
WS	0.174	0.610	0.229	0.117	0.455	2.197
QM	0.307	0.522	0.471	0.267	0.756	1.324
AO	0.351	0.575	0.498	0.287	0.666	1.502
JS	0.371	0.760	0.424	0.234	0.397	2.521

Source: Own elaboration using SPSS

Taking into account by the values of Pearson correlation coefficients follows that bilateral correlation, the highest intensity, is between ES and JS, followed by correlations between ES and AO, respectively QM.

On the other hand, the most conclusive information on each predictor influences the variable ES are highlighted by the values of the determination coefficients corresponding to each predictor (r_{sp}^2). They highlighted that the biggest influence on ES has AO, 8.21% of its variation is due variation of AO. Also, a relatively similar (7.12%) is exercised by QM. Regarding WS and JS, their influences are lower, 5.47% for JS, and 1.34% for WS.

It must be emphasized, however, that, as a whole, the predictors influence on ES is 74.0%, while 26% of modifying of ES, is due to other factors. The intervals in which the changes of factors values determines the modification “Satisfaction as a hotel employee” are $b_1 \in [0.025, 0.421]$ for “Level of satisfaction at work”, $b_2 \in [0.175, 0.399]$ for “Quality of manager-employee relationship”, $b_3 \in [0.183, 0.391]$ for “Opportunities for advancement”, respectively $b_4 \in [0.203, 0.529]$ for “Job satbility”.

To fulfill the second objective of the research, identifying the factors that influence job satisfaction, they were processed and analyzed answers to the questions Q2.1-Q2.5.

Results from testing these assumptions are shown in Table no. 5. Following the t-test (Student) 2-tailed, for questions Q2.2 (relationship between salaries and performance) and Q2.4 (satisfaction with benefits), statistics of test has the value 0.128, respectively, 0.509, much higher than the significance level ($\alpha=0.05$) and therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. In these circumstances, the variables WP and BS, can not be predictors for the dependent variable WS (level of satisfaction at work) and will not be considered.

For the other three variables (WL, SS, AD) null hypothesis are rejected because all values of Sig. (2-tailed) are lower than the level of significance

($\alpha=0.05$). Also, all the values of Lower and Upper, for each of them have the same sign. Accordingly the following alternative hypotheses are accepted: $H_1 : \mu_{WL} \neq 0$ (The level of satisfaction on workload differs significantly from indifference), $H_1 : \mu_{SS} \neq 0$ (The attitude of employees towards their wages differ significantly from indifference), și $H_1 : \mu_{AD} \neq 0$ (Employees attitude towards the collaboration with other departments differ significantly from indifference).

Table no. 5: Statistical significance testing of the averages of answers Q2.1-Q2.5 using t-test

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
WL	3.443	95	0.001	0.365	0.15	0.57
WP	1.534	95	0.128	-0.156	-0.36	0.05
SS	5.589	95	0.000	-0.583	-0.79	-0.38
BS	0.662	95	0.509	-0.073	-0.29	0.15
AD	7.626	95	0.000	0.563	0.42	0.71

Source: Own elaboration using SPSS

For variables WS, SS and AD the average values are 0.36, -0.58 and 0.56. Analyzing these values follows that answers to the question Q2.3 points out that employees are dissatisfied with the level of wages. Such dissatisfaction may negatively influence job satisfaction and commitment of employees towards the hotel.

In light of the above, for the second objective of the study, the model (1) has the form:

$$WS = a_1 + b_{11}WL + b_{12}SS + b_{13}AD + \varepsilon \quad (5)$$

where $a \in R$ is a constant estimator of $\alpha \in R$, $b_1, b_2, b_3 \in R$ are estimators of the parameters $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3$ of factorial variables WL, SS and AD.

Table no. 6: Model Summary^b and ANOVA^b for the model (5)

Model Summary ^b						
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate		
1	0.946	0.894	0.891	0.267		
ANOVA ^b						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	55.287	3	18.429	529.007	.000 ^a
	Residual	6.546	92	0.071		
	Total	61.833	95			

^a Predictors: (Constant), WL, SS, AD

^b Dependent variable: WS

Source: Own elaboration using SPSS

Testing the existence of a functional connection, by form (5), between the dependent variable WS and independent variables WL, SS and

AD was performed with ANOVA methodology (Table no. 6). Since the Sig. = 0.000 < 0.05, the model (5) is statistically valid. The values of correlation coefficient (R=0.946) and of the coefficient of determination (R²=0.894) looks as the predictors WL, SS and WS estimate well the resultant variable AD.

Taking this into account, they were determined the values and the confidence intervals for the regression coefficients of the model (5) for “The level of satisfaction at work”. The obtained results are presented in Table no. 7. The values of all estimators (b₁₁, b₁₂, b₁₃) are statistically significant, all values of “Sig” are much lower than the level of significance (α=0.05).

Table no. 7. The regression coefficients of the model^a (5)

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Std. Coeff	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
a ₁	0.312	0.045		6.905	0.000	0.223	0.402
b ₁₁	0.033	0.036	0.182	3.918	0.000	0.070	0.214
b ₁₂	0.003	0.033	0.216	5.061	0.000	0.103	0.235
b ₁₃	-0.013	0.047	0.699	16.782	0.000	0.688	0.873

^a. Dependent variable: WS

Source: Own elaboration using SPSS

Given the parameter values, shown in Table no. 7, the model (5) has the form:

$$WS = 0.312 + 0.033WV + 0.003SS - 0.013AD + \varepsilon \quad (6)$$

For stability testing of model (6) was checked the existence of influence cases and cases extreme that can affect its accuracy and hence the conclusions. Thus, were determined the values of the statistics Std.Residual, Stud.Residual and Cook's distance (Table no. 8). The maximum values of statistics Stud.Residual and Std.Residual signal the existence of extreme cases. These correspond to respondents 27, 29, 64 and 86 for which the values are greater than 2 but less than 3, but their share in the total number of respondents is 4.16% < 5.0%. Also, the values of Cook's distance are in the range [0.0, 0.089] being much smaller than 1. Accordingly the model (6) is stable.

Tabelul 8 Residuals Statistics^a for the model (6)

	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev	N
Residual	-0.459	0.715	0.000	0.262	96
Std. Residual	-1.855	2.679	0.000	0.984	96
Stud. Residual	-1.941	2.734	-0.002	1.010	96
Cook's Distance	0.000	0.089	0.031	0.023	96

^a. Dependent variable: WS

Source: Own elaboration using SPSS

Regarding the colinearity testing, the results are presented in Table 9. Given that all values of Tolerance satisfy the condition 2 ($Tolerance > 1 - 0.894 = 0.106$), follows that for all three variables the hypothesis of colinearity is rejected

În concluzie, modelul (5) și coeficienții de regresie (b_{1k}) sunt semnificativi din punct de vedere statistic pentru Confidence Level 95%, ecuația de regresie este stabila, iar între WS și predictor nu există relații de colinearitate.

In conclusion the model (6) and its regression coefficients (b_{1k}) are statistically significant for 95% Confidence Level, the regression equation is stable and between WS and the predictors (WL, SS and AD) there is no collinearity relations.

Tabelul 9 Standardized Coefficients, Correlations and Collinearity Statistics for the model (6)

Variables	Std. Coeff	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
	Beta	Zero-order (r)	Partial (r _p)	Part (r _{sp})	Tolerance	VIF
WL	0.182	0.707	0.378	0.133	0.532	1.881
SS	0.216	0.634	0.467	0.172	0.629	1.589
AD	0.699	0.898	0.868	0.569	0.663	1.509

Source: Own elaboration using SPSS

The intensity of the influence of the level of satisfaction on workload, the employees satisfaction towards their wages and attitude towards the collaboration with other departments on work satisfaction is evidenced by the values of the Pearson correlation coefficients (r), and, in particular, by the values of partial correlation coefficients (r_p) and semi-partial correlation coefficients (r_{sp}). The values of Pearson correlation coefficients highlight that the highest bilateral correlation, is between WS and AD, followed by SS and WL.

Taking into account the values of determination coefficients corresponding to each predictor (r_{sp}²) follows that the greatest influence on WS is exercised by AD. Thus, 32.38% of the variation of variable WS, is due to variation of variable AD, while the influences of the other two predictors (SS and WL) are much lower (2.96% and 1.77%).

On the whole, the influence of the predictors (VL, SS and AD) on the work satisfaction is 89.4%, while 10.6% of its modifying is due to other factors. The intervals in which the changes in values of predictors determine the change of values of “Work satisfaction” are b₁₁ ∈ [0.070, 0.214] for “Level of satisfaction on the volume of work”, b₁₂ ∈ [0.103, 0.235] for “Level of satisfaction on the salary” and b₁₃ ∈ [0.688, 0.873] for “Collaboration with other departments”.

XVII. CONCLUSIONS

Scientific knowledge of the behavior of employees in tourism units is one way to prevent poor performance or even failure in business. The competition in the dynamics tourism market, to which competition is very intense, requires the focusing on employee satisfaction, because the attractiveness of tourist units depends largely on the quality of services.

Quality assurance is an internal process adapted to the specific of touristic unit and which put in place a mechanism of permanent development, including improving the professional profile of employees.

The results achieved in this study highlights the issues of how the workload, the pay system, method of granting the benefits, cooperation between

departments, the involvement of managers in developing careers of their employees, the quality of communication between manager and employee, recognition of merit of employees by managers, opportunities for advancement and, not least, job stability contributes to the formation and development of satisfaction of employees (satisfaction as an employee of touristic establishments), are important factors in growth of the performance of touristic enterprises, taking into account, on the one hand, certain particularities which characterize them, and on the other hand, the particularities and the characteristics of entrepreneurs in other fields.

In particular, in the case of hotels surveyed, requires revision of the pay system and the system for benefits, and to create some systems, better and more mobilizing

XVIII. REFERENCES

1. Aziri, B. (2011) Job Satisfaction, A Literature Review, *Management Research and Practice*, 2011, vol. 3, issue 4, pages 77-86
2. Babucea, A.G., Balacesu, A. (2012) Social and economic aspects of tourism in the region South-West Oltenia in the period 1990-2010. *Annals of the „Constantin Brâncuși” University of Târgu Jiu, Economy Series, Issue 2/2012*, pp.34-43.
3. Bender, K., Donohue, S.M., Heywood, J. (2005) Job satisfaction and gender segregation in *Oxford Economic Papers*, 2005, vol. 57, issue 3, pages 479-496.
4. Carleton, C.J., Suzanne Clain, S. (2012) Women, Men, and Job Satisfaction, in *Eastern Economic Journal*, 2012, vol. 38, issue 3, pages 331-355
5. Epure, D.T., Ionescu A., Nancu, D. (2013) The Impact of Communication in Job Satisfaction: an Empirical Investigation within Romanian Companies, in *Economics and Applied Informatics*, 2013, issue 2, pages 71-74
6. Field, A. (2000) *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS for Windows*, SAGE Publications Ltd. London
7. Hackman, J. R., Lawler, E. (1971) Employee reactions to job characteristics, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol 55(3), pp. 259-286
8. Haile, G.,(2015) Workplace Job Satisfaction in Britain: Evidence from Linked Employer–Employee Data, *LABOUR*, 2015, vol. 29, issue 3, pages 225-242
9. Herman, S. (2015) Management of Human Resources in Tourism, *Interdisciplinary Management Research*, 2015, vol. 11, pages 180-188
10. Labar, A.V. (2008) *SPSS pentru stiințele educației*, Editura Polirom, Iași.
11. Lawler, E., Hall, D. T. (1970) Relationship of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol 54(4), pp. 305-312
12. Mullins, L.J. (1996) *Management and Organisational Behaviour*, Pitman Publishing, London.
13. Phelps, E., Zoega, G. (2013) Corporatism and job satisfaction, *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 2013, vol. 41, issue 1, pages 35-47
14. Popa, M. (2010) *Statistică pentru psihologie*, Editura Polirom, Iași
15. Roman, C., Stanciu, P., Condratov, I. (2008) Human Factor in Sustainable Tourism Between Ethics and Social Responsibility. *The AMFITEATRU ECONOMIC journal*, 2008, vol. 10, issue 23, pages 136-141
16. Spector P. (1986) Perceived Control by Employees: A Meta-Analysis of Studies Concerning Autonomy and Participation at Work, *Human Relations*, vol. 39, no. 11, pp. 1005-1016.
17. Stanciu P., Hapenciu C.V. (2009) Reability and flexibility in the quality management of tourism products, *Amfiteatru Economic*, XI(26), pp. 482-493.
18. Sutherland, J. (2013) Employment status and job satisfaction *Evidence-based HRM: A Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship*, 2013, vol. 1, issue 2, pages 187-216.
19. Tatarusanu, M. (2009) Human resource management risks in tourism, in *Analele Stiintifice ale Universitatii "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" din Iasi - Stiinte Economice*, 2009, vol. 56, pages 388-394
20. Tiliute, D.E., Condratov, I. (2012) Improving the Quality of Services in All-inclusive Resorts by Monitoring Tourists Activities, *Procedia Economics and Finance*, Volume 16, Pages 166-172
21. Usui, E. (2008) Job satisfaction and the gender composition of jobs *Economics Letters*, 2008, vol. 99, issue 1, pages 23-26