

https://dspace.org/

Desired employee value proposition attributes by generation Y hospitality students in South Africa.

Rossouw, Carla

2014-07-31
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/15093

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

Desired employee value proposition attributes by generation Y hospitality students in South Africa

Carla Rossouw

A research report submitted to the Faculty of Commerce, Law and Management, University of the Witwatersrand, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Business Administration

Johannesburg, 2014

ABSTRACT

Generation Y represents an increasing percentage of today's workforce, with employment needs and expectations very different from any other generational cohort. The hospitality industry in particular faces a major challenge in attracting qualified talent from the Generation Y cohort. It is imperative that hospitality organisations assess their attraction and retention strategies to ensure a sustainable, talented workforce. This research identifies and ranks attributes of an employee value proposition desired by Generation Y hospitality students.

A survey, consisting of 28 employee value proposition attributes, was presented to Generation Y hospitality students to partially rank order their 10 most preferred attributes. The Shotgun Stochastic Parameter Estimation Algorithm, a quantitative analysis, was used to compare the attributes and to identify significant attributes that represents a set of core attributes of an employee value proposition for the hospitality industry.

The findings indicate that Respect is the most important attribute for Generation Y hospitality students. In addition, Future Career Opportunities, Compensation, Ethics, Development Opportunities, Empowerment, and Co-Worker Qualities are also considered as significant attributes for an employee value proposition. Although these results are not wholly consistent with the results from similar studies, it is reflective of the nature of employment within the hospitality industry.

DECLARATION

I, Carla Rossouw, declare that this research report is my own work except as indicated in the references and acknowledgements. It is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Business Administration in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in this or any other university.

Carla Rossouw

Signed at ……

On the …….. day of …… 2014

DEDICATION

This research report is dedicated to my mother, Maretha Rossouw, in gratitude for her unconditional love, support and encouragement while I pursued the MBA.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my appreciation to my Supervisor, Conrad Viedge, for his guidance throughout the research process. With patience he provided the support and insight needed to complete my research.

I would like to thank Anthony Stacey for allowing me to use the Shotgun Stochastic Parameter Estimation Algorithm and assisting me with the statistical analysis of my data. I would also like to thank Jennifer Croll for her proof reading services and advice.

I am grateful to Carolyn McDougall (International Hotel School), Mr & Mrs Martin (Swiss Hotel School), and Susina Jooste (Private Hotel School) for providing me access to the hospitality students. In addition I would like to thank the participants of the panel and the students for their invaluable participation in this research, especially the two focus groups who shared their thoughts and insights with zeal.

I wish to extend a special thanks to my MBA study group: Sameer Jooma, Andrew Drummond, Robert Larkan, and Shalendra Pillay. We did it!

Last but certainly not least, my family and friends, thank you for helping me carry the load. Maretha Rossouw, Andre Van Wyk and Yolandé Rossouw, thank you for your on-going love, support and encouragement. Jansie Bruwer, thank you for constantly reassuring me of my abilities. Annelise Nienaber, thank you for enthusiastically uplifting my spirits when I felt I could not take another step.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION ..... **III**

DEDICATION ..... **IV**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... **V**

TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... **VI**

LIST OF TABLES ..... **IX**

LIST OF FIGURES ..... **XI**

1 CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION **1**

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY 1
1.2 CONTEXT OF THE STUDY 1
1.3 PROBLEM STATEMENT 4
1.3.1 MAIN PROBLEM 4
1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY 4
1.5 DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY 7
1.6 DEFINITION OF TERMS 7
1.7 ASSUMPTIONS 8

2 CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW **9**

2.1 INTRODUCTION 9
2.2 EMPLOYEE VALUE PROPOSITION 10
2.2.1 EMPLOYEE VALUE PROPOSITION DEFINED 10
2.2.2 THE IMPORTANCE OF AN EMPLOYEE VALUE PROPOSITION 11
2.2.3 ATTRIBUTES OF AN EMPLOYEE VALUE PROPOSITION 13
2.3 GENERATION Y 18
2.3.1 GENERATIONAL THEORY 18
2.3.2 CHARACTERISTICS OF GENERATION Y 20
2.3.4 PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS OF CAREERS IN HOSPITALITY 27
2.4 RESEARCH QUESTION 29
2.5 CONCLUSION OF LITERATURE REVIEW 29

3 CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY **31**

3.1 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY /PARADIGM 31

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN 32
3.3 POPULATION AND SAMPLE 36
3.3.1 POPULATION 36
3.3.2 SAMPLE AND SAMPLING METHOD 36
3.4 THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT 38
3.5 PROCEDURE FOR DATA COLLECTION 38
3.6 DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION 39
3.7 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY 39
3.8 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY 40
3.8.1 EXTERNAL VALIDITY 40
3.8.2 INTERNAL VALIDITY 40
3.8.3 RELIABILITY 41

4 CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION OF RESULTS 42

4.1 INTRODUCTION 42
4.2 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS 42
4.2.1 PILOT GROUP 42
4.2.2 PANEL OF EXPERTS 43
4.2.3 SOUTH AFRICAN GEN Y HOSPITALITY STUDENTS 44
4.3 RESULTS PERTAINING TO THE PILOT STUDY GROUP 48
4.4 RESULTS PERTAINING TO THE PANEL OF EXPERTS 49
4.5 RESULTS PERTAINING TO SOUTH AFRICAN GEN Y HOSPITALITY STUDENTS 52
4.5.1 ANALYSIS OF SURVEY RESULTS 53
4.6 SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS 59

5 CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS 61

5.1 INTRODUCTION 61
5.2 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS 61
5.3 DISCUSSION PERTAINING TO SIGNIFICANT EVP ATTRIBUTES 62
5.3.1 RESPECT 65
5.3.2 FUTURE CAREER OPPORTUNITIES 68
5.3.3 COMPENSATION 71
5.3.4 ETHICS 72
5.3.5 DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES 74
5.3.6 EMPOWERMENT 75
5.3.7 CO-WORKER QUALITY 76
5.3.8 REMAINING ATTRIBUTES 77
5.4 CONCLUSION 77

6 CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 79

6.1 INTRODUCTION 79
6.2 CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY 79
6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS 81
6.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 83

REFERENCES **85**

APPENDIX A **93**

LETTER TO THE PANEL OF EXPERTS 93
COMPREHENSIVE LIST OF ATTRIBUTES 94

APPENDIX B **98**

VALIDATED LIST OF EVP ATTRIBUTES 98

APPENDIX C **101**

EMPLOYEE VALUE PROPOSITION SURVEY PROVIDED TO GEN Y HOSPITALITY STUDENTS 101

APPENDIX D **108**

CONSISTENCY MATRIX 108

APPENDIX E **111**

POPULATION STATISTICS 111

APPENDIX F **113**

GENERATIONAL STATISTICS (ADAPTED FROM STATISTICS SOUTH AFRICA, 2011) 113

APPENDIX G **114**

PROFILE OF HOSPITALITY EXPERTS 114

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Dimensions and Definitions of Employee Value Proposition Attributes (Corporate Leadership Council, 2006b) 14

Table 2: Generations in Different Countries (Halse & Mallinson, 2009) 19

Table 3: Differences between selected generations (Pendergast, 2009) 19

Table 4: Generation Y's Hot buttons (Dorsey, 2010, pp. 59-61)..... 26

Table 5: Profile of respondents 37

Table 6: Geographical Response Rate 47

Table 7: Responses from Panel of Experts 50

Table 8: Additional EVP Attributes 51

Table 9: Alphabetical Standardised Results of Gen Y Hospitality Students for EVP Attributes 58

Table 10: Most Desired EVP Attributes by Gen Y Hospitality Students..... 60

Table 11: Rank-Ordered Standardised Results of Gen Y Hospitality Students for EVP Attributes 62

Table 12: Comparison of Core Attributes 65

Table 13: Seven Core EVP Attributes by Gen Y Hospitality Students..... 78

Table 14: Validated List of EVP attributes 98

Table 15: Consistency Matrix 109

Table 16: Population by Age Group, 2011 (Adapted from Stats SA)..... 111

Table 17: Generational Population 113

Table 18: Generations at Working Age (15 - 64) 113

Table 19: Panel of Experts Demographics 114

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Organisational Attractiveness 12

Figure 2: Generational Population 21

Figure 3: Generations at working Age (15 - 64) 21

Figure 4: Steps in the Proposed Research Study (Adapted from Rajha (2012) 33

Figure 5: Pilot Study Group Demographics 43

Figure 6: Panel of Experts Demographics 44

Figure 7: Total Sample Size 45

Figure 8: Response Distribution by Hotel School 46

Figure 9: Demographic Distribution of Respondents 47

Figure 10: Attributes Ranked as Most Desirable by Number of Respondents 53

Figure 11: Ranking of the 28 EVP attributes 55

Figure 12: T-Value Distribution Curve 57

Figure 13: Dimensional Composition of Core EVP Attributes 74

Figure 14: Population by Age Group, 2011 (Adapted from Stats SA) 112

1 CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this research was to identify and then rank the attributes that Generation Y (Gen Y) students desire in an employee value proposition (EVP) in the South African hospitality industry.

1.2 Context of the study

For the first time in history, four markedly different generations meet in the workforce (Dorsey, 2010; Macon & Artley, 2009). The South African workforce consists of a mixture of the Silents, Boomers, Generation X (Gen X), and Generation Y (Gen Y) (Codrington & Grant-Marshall, 2012) each of which has its own unique work attitudes (Davidson, McPhail, & Barry, 2011) and needs and expectations of an ideal work environment (Spiro, 2006). Different generational approaches have a significant impact on the workplace and as a result organisations are faced with a particular challenge to bridge the gaps between the needs and expectations each of these generations have of the work environment (Spiro, 2006).

This is particularly evident in the hospitality industry in that the industry's service orientation relies greatly on the performance of work teams to ensure quality is maintained (Davidson et al., 2011; Solnet & Hood, 2008). Much like its counterpart, the Boomers, Gen Y represents a major presence and is gradually accounting for a greater percentage of the workforce (Davidson et al., 2011; Erickson, 2008; Gursoy, Maier, & Chi, 2008; Hershatter & Epstein, 2010). This new generation infiltrating the workforce brings with it unique, but challenging characteristics that confuses and irritates older generations (Codrington & Grant-Marshall, 2012). Words such as "impatient, desensitised, disengaged, sceptical, disrespectful, bluntly expressive, adaptable, innovative, efficient, resilient, tolerant and committed" (E. Chester, 2002, as cited in Codrington & Grant-Marshall, 2012) have been used to describe this uncanny generation. The battle of the generations is not the only challenge that the hospitality industry faces. Gen Y's unique characteristics, coupled with the

perception this generation has of the industry, significantly influences the attractiveness of the industry and the retention of these employees within the industry (Chacko, Williams, & Schaffer, 2012).

> The increasing sophistication of well-travelled customers and the burgeoning young demographic known as Generation Y constitute major environmental forces that are beyond the lodging industry's immediate control. Generation Y will form the bulk of new hires who, by the nature of their drastic differences in work values and lifestyles, will not be attracted to hotels as they are currently operated
>
> (Chacko et al., 2012)

The hospitality industry is seen as one of the fastest growing industries in the world (International Labour Organization, 2010; Sparks & Bradley, 1994) and plays a vital role in South Africa (CATHSSETA, 2012; Pienaar & Willemse, 2008). The travel and tourism industry generated $35 billion (8.6%) of South Africa's GDP and sustained 1.2 million jobs (9% of employment) in 2011 – for every job directly created in the tourism sector, one additional job is indirectly created. The travel and tourism industry furthermore expanded 200% between 1990 and 2011, and is forecast to further expand at 4.2% per annum over the next decade World Travel & Tourism Council (2012). Despite slowing growth caused by the financial crisis in 2008, Price Waterhouse Cooper (2012) estimates that South Africa's hospitality industry is expected to show a strong increase in growth between 2012 and 2016.

Hospitality is widely known as the cordial reception of guests (Dorobanţu & Nistoreanu, 2012). This definition guides the essence and varying nature of the industry. For the purpose of this study, the scope of the hospitality industry, hereafter referred to as the hotel industry, is limited to any business that provides "short stay accommodation for visitors and other travellers", where "some units may provide only accommodation while others provide a combination of accommodation, meals and/or recreational facilities" (Lehohla, 2012).

Characterised by its service orientation and dynamic, ever-changing nature, the hotel industry caters for the needs of local and international guests (International Labour Organization, 2010). The hotel industry provides intangible services throughout the year and is often referred to as a 24/7 industry. To the bystander the industry is associated with a glamorous lifestyle that offers opportunities to live the 'high-life'

and to mingle with celebrities. Behind closed doors, it is known as a labour-intensive industry, characterised with long, unsociable working hours and shift work, associated with servitude and inferiority, and extremely stressful and demanding situations (International Labour Organization, 2010; M.Riley, A. Ladkin, & E.Szivas, 2002, as cited in Solnet & Hood, 2008). The negative perception of the industry, coupled with 'emotional labour' results in higher levels of stress and turnover, and lower levels of satisfaction (A.R. Hochschild, 1983 and A. Pizam, 2004, as cited in Pienaar & Willemse, 2008). Solnet, Hood, and Barron (2008) suggest the biggest challenge in the industry is its innate dependence on people and even though great emphasis is placed on people, the majority of hospitality operators see their employees as transient resources, easily replaceable with minimal effect on the business (Manson, 2012).

Like its global counterparts, the South African hospitality industry is dominated by local and multi-national hotel groups (International Labour Organization, 2010) such as Accor, Best Western, Hilton, Hyatt, Legacy, Orient Express, Protea/Marriott, Rezidor, Southern Sun/Tsogo Sun, Starwood, Sun International, and Three Cities. Coupled with the service orientation of the industry, the size and scope of these organisations emphasise the need for motivated, trained and qualified employees to provide quality service, as promised to current and potential customers (Barron, 2008; International Labour Organization, 2010). Kusluvan and Kusluvan (2000) note that the importance of well-educated, well-trained, skilled, enthusiastic and committed employees is necessary in any service industry; more so the hospitality industry. They argue that services in the hospitality industry rely on employees' performance and are consumed in a face-to-face exchange. Kusluvan and Kusluvan (2000) summarise by stating customer satisfaction is driven by behaviours, attitudes and performance of employees. In order for these organisations to retain competitive advantage in the global environment, they need to adopt ways of attracting the desired candidates for this high-touch service industry (Barron, 2008; Kusluvan & Kusluvan, 2000).

In their research to establish whether a formal qualification fast tracks hospitality graduate's careers to management roles, Harper, Brown, and Irvine (2005) discovered that the changing nature of the hotel industry underpins the need for

highly skilled professionals who are trained in both the skills required for the industry and management aptitude. Hotel schools around South Africa are educating and grooming graduates to fulfil the industry employment requirements. With formal qualifications, entry level employees are equipped with prospects of developing and growing within the hospitality industry. Large hotel groups see these graduates as desirable candidates because of their education, and more so, because of the quality of education and reputation of the institution they have attended.

Although formal qualifications provide graduates with a fast-track path to management, research has shown very few hospitality graduates embark on a career in the hotel industry, and the attraction and retention of quality Gen Y employees is becoming a great challenge (Barron, 2008; Kandasamy & Ancheri, 2009). As a result of the demanding characteristics of the new generation entering the hotel workforce and the labour-intensive nature of the industry, it is vital for hotels to bridge the gap between the employee-employer expectations. Hotel organisations need to develop and invest in an employee value proposition (EVP) that will match the employment requirements of both the industry and Gen Y.

Based on the notion that a gap exists between the desired and actual EVP offerings, this study is an extension of research conducted by Rajha (2012) and Bhoola (2013) to identify critical desired attributes for an EVP in various contexts.

1.3 Problem statement

1.3.1 Main problem

The main problem of the proposed research was to investigate attributes that Generation Y hospitality students are looking for in a desirable Employee Value Proposition.

1.4 Significance of the study

The study fills a gap in that literature is limited on effective EVPs within the South African hospitality industry.

Together with demographic change, globalisation and technological innovation, the changing profile of the emerging labour force is changing the way that organisations are looking at attraction, recruitment and retention (Barron, 2008; Davidson et al., 2011; Dorsey, 2010; M. Guthridge, Komm, & Lawson, 2008; Watson, 2008). Firstly, demographically the workforce is shifting. While the developed world faces falling birth rates and increasing retirements, the emerging markets sits with an excess of young talent with a lack of experience (M. Guthridge et al., 2008; International Labour Organization, 2010). Secondly, the economic crisis is a factor of globalisation that has impacted the hotel industry the most. Not only is there significant changes in the market, but consumers have also changed their behaviour (International Labour Organization, 2010; Sorin & Mihaela, 2011). Thirdly, technology has become invaluable to the hotel industry in that it "streamlines processes and connects people", and has an impact on how the hotel industry hires employees, (International Labour Organization, 2010; Squires, 2008). Lastly, four distinct generations are competing for the same positions within organisations and in the face of promotions, merit is overcoming longevity (Gursoy et al., 2008; Johnson & Lopes, 2008).

Front-line employees are the first, and often the only, contact guests have with a hotel (Tjan, 2012). These employees' perceptions about and attitudes toward the organisation has a direct impact on the profitability of the operation (Magnini & Uysal, 2011). Based on this notion, the hotel industry resonates with the mantra 'a happy employee is a good employee' and there is a widespread belief among hospitality managers that job satisfaction has a significant impact on job performance (Lee, Nam, Park, & Lee, 2006). R. Hoppock (as cited in Aziri, 2011; Scott, Swortzel, & Taylor, 2005; Tsai, Cheng, & Chang, 2010) defines job satisfaction as any physical, mental or environmental circumstance that supports true happiness within one's job. This definition encompasses every aspect that has a positive or negative impact on an employee's experience in the workplace and demonstrates a match between an employee's personal values and the organisational values (Scott et al., 2005).

The Gen Y cohort has employment needs that are very different to the needs of the generations before them (Luscombe, Lewis, & Biggs, 2013; Spiro, 2006), and has the potential to change the industry as we know it. They value a reward set made up

of modularity in workload, flexible work arrangements, social responsibility opportunities, progressive work environments and mentoring programmes.

While the hotel industry offers an exciting, ever-changing working environment, it does not meet the employment needs of the emerging labour force. South Africa's emerging labour force is classified as Gen Y, born between 1990 and 2005 (G. Codrington & S. Marshal, as cited in Robyn, 2012). In contrast to their predecessors, Gen Y appreciates company fit and career growth as more important than money, and places greater emphasis on work-life balance. They also value the freedom to be creative and innovative and thrive in a flexible working environment (Davidson et al., 2011; Gilburg, 2008; Reisenwitz & Iyer, 2009). The hotel industry, on the other hand, is characterised as being physical and stressful labour coupled with long working hours and poor remuneration (Watson, 2008). It is also underpinned by strict policies, procedures and management systems designed to deliver exceptional service and ensure exceeded expectations around the clock.

Many hotel companies, such as Marriott, Hilton, Hyatt and Ritz Carlton, are realising the value of human capital, and see human resources as a vital contributor to the success of the establishment (Gursoy et al., 2008). This is a concept deep seeded in Marriott's management philosophy. The cornerstone of these values and beliefs are a true concern for their employees.

The gap between what the South African hospitality industry currently has to offer and the characteristics of Gen Y necessitates the need to redefine the EVP for the South African hospitality industry. Hospitality students were chosen as a study group as they are the new, emerging generation entering the hospitality workforce.

The study will provide guidance to South African hospitality organisations on how to attract, recruit and retain Gen Y hospitality students. Using the results of this study, hospitality organisations will be able to leverage a competitive EVP that will enable these organisations to retain quality Gen Y employees. Furthermore, based on the results of this study, South African hotel schools will be better equipped to educate and groom hospitality students for a career in the hospitality industry.

1.5 Delimitations of the study

- The proposed research will focus on accommodation and not the broader scope of the hospitality industry;
- Generation Y hospitality students will be the focus of the study. For the purpose of this study, students in their second and third year of study will be used. Not only do these students at least have some practical experience within the industry, they are also nearing the end of their studies and are about to seek employment within the hospitality industry; and
- For the sake of convenience, the researcher will work predominantly through the International Hotel School (IHS) as well as other hotel schools in Johannesburg.

1.6 Definition of terms

The following definitions have been used in the proposed research:

Employer Brand (EB): The tangible and intangible attributes of the employment experience (Edwards, 2009).

Employee Value Proposition: A set of attributes that the labour market and employees perceive as the value they gain through employment in the organisation (Corporate Leadership Council, 2006b).

Generation Y: Gen Y, also known as the Millennial Generations, Net Generation, Echo Boomers, and iGeneration, is classified as individuals born between 1990 and 2005 (G. Codrington & S. Marshall, as cited in Robyn, 2012)

Hospitality Industry: Any business that provides short-stay accommodation, with or without meals and/or recreational facilities for visitors and other travellers (Lehohla, 2012)

1.7 Assumptions

The following assumptions are made:

- Respondents will respond honestly to the questionnaire
- Respondents will sufficiently understand the concept of EVP

2 CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Hotels are slowly changing their management practice to adapt to global trends. This is a long process, dragged out by reluctance to change and the structured, hierarchical nature of the hospitality industry. An area that is often overlooked or neglected, which is also an important factor to consider whilst changing these practices, is the change occurring in labour force demographics (Solnet & Hood, 2008).

These demographic changes in the labour force are having both a positive and negative impact on the hotel industry. The labour demographic is changing from a unilateral generational environment to one that hosts various generations under the same umbrella (Dorsey, 2010; Macon & Artley, 2009). This form of generational blending and integration enhances creativity and innovation in the workplace and allows these different generations to supplement each other's strengths (Gursoy et al., 2008).

Generational blending can however also cause intergenerational problems in the workplace. The most common cause of these problems is differences in values, worldviews, ways of working, ways of talking, thinking and even ways of dressing in the workplace (Gursoy et al., 2008). As a result of slow change and intergenerational conflict within the workplace, very few hospitality students enter and remain with the industry (Barron, 2008; Kandasamy & Ancheri, 2009).

It is therefore important that hotel organisations capitalise on the changing demographic and embrace the benefits they will derive from developing an employment environment that is conducive to sustainable employment for Gen Y hospitality students.

The literature review that follows is outlined as: (1) the employee value proposition and (2) generation Y.

2.2 Employee Value Proposition

2.2.1 Employee Value Proposition Defined

The Corporate Leadership Council (2006a) defines an EVP as a “set of attributes that the labour market and employees perceive as the value they gain through employment in the organisation”. This definition implies that an organisation’s EVP derives benefits for attracting quality employees and is also crucial for retaining these employees. An EVP can therefore be interpreted as the organisational DNA that not only conveys what is unique and distinctive about an organisation and gives prospective employees a compelling reason to join the organisation, but also motivates existing employees to stay with the organisation (Harikumar, 2012).

Dell and Hickey (as cited in Tajuddin & Saufi, 2012) suggests that, from the perspective of employees, the EVP answers the question ‘what’s in it for me?’ (WIIFM) and highlights the present and future benefits employees will derive should they join or stay with the organisation. Minchington (2013) elaborates the WIIFM question by stating that an organisation’s EVP helps an employee answer several questions: Why should I join the organisation? Why should I stay with the organisation? Why should I give my best? Why should I recommend the organisation as an employer and business? Why should I re-join the organisation?

McKinsey & Co (2001) propose that a winning EVP helps attract and retain scarce talent in the organisation by providing exciting work to employees, creating a great company brand image, paying them well, and offering them growth and development opportunities. Similarly, Lau (2009) suggests that a strong EVP not only attracts, motivates and retains scarce talent in a highly competitive market, but also shapes and enhances “the organisation’s vision, culture, work practices, management style and growth opportunities” in the eyes of the public. Hill and Tande (2006) suggest the need for an EVP that states why the total work experience at the organisation is superior to that at to other organisations.

2.2.2 The Importance of an Employee Value Proposition

McKinsey and Company launched the study “the war for talent” in 1998 that originated as a result of the difficulty for large organisations to attract and retain critical talent within a highly competitive global market. The study’s findings implied that organisation can win the war for talent only if they purposefully fight for talent. The study suggests the following four elements in order to win the war for talent (Chambers, Foulon, Handfield-Jones, Hankin, & Michaels, 1998):

- Ensure talent management becomes a critical priority within the organisation
- Generate and continually improve an EVP
- Establish procedures for recruiting critical talent
- Develop the recruited talent

The Corporate Leadership Council (2006b) identifies three quantifiable benefits of an effective EVP. An effective EVP not only enables organisations to improve the attraction of top talent within the labour market, but also provide organisations with the ability to improve employee commitment significantly, as well as capitalise on a reduction in labour cost – especially when attracting new talent. In order to achieve attractiveness, organisations need to align their EVP to priorities and attributes that are important to the talent. According to the Corporate Leadership Council (2006b) there are three factors that determine whether an organisation’s EVP is attractive to the labour market. Figure 1: Organisational Attractiveness illustrates the composition of an organisation’s attractiveness to the talent segment. The alignment of an organisation’s EVP to the talent’s preferred attributes account for 77% of attractiveness, while a favourable impression (13%) of, and the organisation’s score (10%) on the EVP attributes, account for the remaining aspects of attractiveness.




Figure 1: Organisational Attractiveness

The Corporate Leadership Council (2006b) suggests an EVP composed of attributes that promote attraction and commitment can assist organisations in driving performance and retention more effectively. Commitment not only leads to greater performance but also higher retention rates. The impact of commitment on performance is based on the "10:6:2" performance rule which states that every 10% improvement in commitment can increase an employee's efforts by 6%, which can improve an employee's performance by 2%. The impact of commitment on retention is measured by the "10:9" retention rule that suggests for every 10% improvement in commitment there is a decrease of 9% in an employee's probability of departure.

In addition to attractiveness and commitment, the Corporate Leadership Council (2006b) indicates that organisations with effective EVPs can reduce their compensation premium (base pay) required to attract new candidates by up to 10%. The Corporate Leadership Council's study further indicates that, although compensation is an important attribute of an effective EVP, it is not main driver of attraction.

Organisations should also be cautious when developing an EVP. Building a strong EVP can fail due to the incorrect attributes, lack of differentiation and failure to

deliver on the EVP. It is vital for organisations to rigorously investigate critical attraction and retention elements that make up their unique EVP, gear it toward the talent segment they wish to attract and effectively communicate the EVP to these talent segments. In addition to identifying the correct attributes and effectively communicating the EVP to the desired talent segment, organisations need to deliver on the promise made within the EVP.

In order to create a winning EVP, Chambers et al. (1998) suggest an organisation should tailor its employer brand (EB) – the face it represents to the world – to attract and retain the talent it seeks. In addition, building an EB allows the organisation to provide a unique employment experience, create value, and in turn target specific, critical talent segments (Backhaus & Tikoo, 2004; Edwards, 2009). Edwards (2009) furthermore suggests for the organisation to differentiate its EB, it needs to clarify its EVP.

Developing and refining an EVP is also becoming an important source of competitive advantage. An organisation can no longer only depend on its product and service offering to differentiate itself. Job product, underpinned by a strong EB, enables organisations to attract the highest calibre employees. Coupled with a superior EVP, these organisations are able to motivate and retain critical talent in order to maximise operational efficiencies (Berthon, Ewing, & Hah, 2005; Chambers et al., 1998). In order to retain talent at different levels, M Guthridge and Emily (2008) argue that multiple EVPs should be tailored for a variety of talent segments.

2.2.3 Attributes of an Employee Value Proposition

In a research study conducted to establish how organisations can leverage their EVP to drive attraction and employee commitment, the Corporate Leadership Council (2006b) identified, categorised and defined a set of 39 attributes underpinning the perceived value gained through employment. These attributes were consolidated from a list of 200 characteristics based on their similarity, distinctiveness, universality, and overall rateability. The list of 39 attributes were then categorised into five distinct dimensions (The Rewards, The Opportunity, The Organisation, The Work, and The People) which forms the basis for a model against which organisations can measure their EVP. Table 1: Dimensions and Definitions of

Employee Value Proposition Attributes (Corporate Leadership Council, 2006b) is a representation of the 39 EVP attributes and definitions, categorised by the five EVP dimensions.

Table 1: Dimensions and Definitions of Employee Value Proposition Attributes (Corporate Leadership Council, 2006b)

DIMENSIONS	ATTRIBUTE'S NAME	DEFINITION
REWARDS	**Compensation**	The competitiveness of the job's financial compensation package
	Health Benefits	The comprehensiveness of the organisation's health benefits
	Retirement Benefits	The comprehensiveness of the organisation's retirement benefits
	Vacation	The amount of holiday/vacation time that employees earn annually
OPPORTUNITY	**Development Opportunities**	The developmental/educational opportunities provided by the job and organisation
	Future Career Opportunities	The future career opportunities provided by the organisation
	Meritocracy	Whether or not employees are rewarded and promoted on the basis of their achievements
	Organisational Growth Rate	The growth rate of the organisation's business
	Organisational Stability	The level of stability of the organisation and the job

DIMENSIONS	ATTRIBUTE'S NAME	DEFINITION
ORGANIZATION	**Customer Reputation**	The reputation of the clients and customers served in performing the job
	Diversity	The organisation's level of commitment to having a diverse workforce
	Empowerment	The level of involvement employees have in decisions that affect their job and career
	Environmental Responsibility	The organisation's level of commitment to environmental health and sustainability
	Ethics	The organisation's commitment to ethics and integrity
	"Great Employer" Recognition	Whether or not the organisation's reputation as an employer has been recognised by a third-party organisation
	Formal/Informal Work Environment	Whether the work environment is formal or informal
	Industry	The desirability of the organisation's industry to the respondent
	Market Position	The competitive position the organisation holds in its market(s)
	Organisation Size	The size of the organisation's workforce
	Product Brand Awareness	The level of awareness in the market place for the products' brand

DIMENSIONS	ATTRIBUTE'S NAME	DEFINITION
	Product Quality	The organisation's product or service quality reputation
	Respect	The degree of respect that the organisation shows employees
	Risk Taking	The amount of risk that the organisation encourages employees to take
	Social Responsibility	The organisation's level of commitment to social responsibility (e.g. community service, philanthropy)
	Technology Level	The extent to which the organisation invests in modern technology and equipment
WORK	**Business Travel**	The amount of out-of-town business travel required by the job
	Innovation	The opportunity provided by the job to work on innovative, "leading edge" projects
	Job Impact	The level of impact the job has on outcomes
	Job–Interests Alignment	Whether the job responsibilities match the respondent's interests
	Location	The geographic location of the job that the organisation is offering
	Recognition	The amount of recognition provided to employees by the organisation

DIMENSIONS	ATTRIBUTE'S NAME	DEFINITION
	Work–Life Balance	The extent to which the job allows employees to balance their work and their other interests
PEOPLE	**Camaraderie**	Whether working for the organisation provides opportunities to socialise with other employees
	Collegial Work Environment	Whether the work environment is team-oriented and collaborative
	Co-worker Quality	The quality of the co-workers in the organisation
	Manager Quality	The quality of the organisation's managers
	People Management	The organisation's reputation for managing people
	Senior Leadership Reputation	The quality of the organisation's senior leadership

The Corporate Leadership Council (2006b)'s study derived a core EVP that organisations can rely on to provide a significant portion of an effective EVP. The core EVP, representing all major talent segments and geographies, comprises seven attributes that drive attraction and commitment, including compensation, stability, development opportunities, future career opportunities, respect, manager quality, and collegial work environment.

2.3 Generation Y

2.3.1 Generational Theory

The concept of generational theory is a phenomenon that has been prevalent throughout history, more widely identifiable throughout the stages in the life-cycle of human beings – infancy, youth, middle and old age (Pendergast, 2010). Codrington and Grant-Marshall (2012) define a generation as a group of people, born at about the same time, and who share experiences and exhibits a shared worldview. They suggest a generational cycle is about 20 years and is characterised by life-changing events that brand and label generations for living in that specific era. They further suggest that generational theory is based on two primary assumptions: the socialisation hypothesis and the social constructivist theory. The socialisation hypothesis is based on the notion that socialisation during childhood and early teenage years informs the values of adults, and that these values remain relatively stable throughout life. The social constructivist theory suggests that social interactions construct reality, and has a significant impact on perceptions.

Codrington and Grant-Marshall (2012)'s definition of a generation is similar to that of Dorsey (2010), however, Dorsey makes a distinction that a generation is a segment of a geographically linked population. He further explains that differences exist in perspectives of generations between counties as well as cities and towns within countries.

Little consensus exists among researchers about generational time spans (Codrington & Grant-Marshall, 2012; Pendergast, 2010). It is important to note that although the United States of America (USA) is at the forefront of generational theory, generational time spans differ between countries (Robyn, 2012). Van Der Walt and Du Plessis (2010) argue that South Africa differs by as much as fifteen years from the USA, and in order to highlight these differences, Halse and Mallinson (2009) illustrated a comparison by Codrington and Grant-Marshall (2004) of generations in different countries, as shown in Table 2: Generations in Different Countries (Halse & Mallinson, 2009). In addition, Halse and Mallinson (2009) suggest that it is not certain yet at which point to end the Gen Y time span.

Table 2: Generations in Different Countries (Halse & Mallinson, 2009)

Generation	South Africa	USA	Europe/UK	Japan
GIs	1900 – 1929	1900 – 1923	1900 – 1918	1900 - 1925
Silents	1930 – 1949	1923 – 1942	1918 – 1945	1925 – 1945
Boomers	1950 – 1969	1943 – 1962	1946 – 1965	1946 - 1965
Generation X	1970 – 1989	1963 – 1983	1966 – 1984	1966 – 1985
Generation Y	1990 – 2007…	1984 – 2007…	1985 – 2007…	1986 – 2007…

Throughout their lifespan, each generation accumulates a set of values and beliefs that influences their behaviours. Although similarities exist among generations, differences in their characteristics remain significant (Pendergast, 2010). Table 3: Differences between selected generations (Pendergast, 2009) represents a comparison of the typical values and beliefs fostered by the Boomers, Gen X and Gen Y (Pendergast, 2009).

Table 3: Differences between selected generations (Pendergast, 2009)

Factors	Baby Boomer	Generation X	Generation Y
Beliefs and values	Work ethic	Variety Freedom	Lifestyle Fun
Motivations	Advancement Responsibility	Individuality	Self-discovery Relational
Decision making	Authority Brand loyalty	Experts Information Brand switchers	Friends Little brand loyalty
Earning and spending	Conservative Pay upfront	Credit savvy Confident Investors	Uncertain spenders Short term wants Credit dependent

Factors	Baby Boomer	Generation X	Generation Y
Learning styles	Auditory Content-driven Monologue	Auditory or visual dialogue	Visual Kinaesthetic Multi-sensory
Marketing and communication	Mass	Descriptive Direct	Participative Viral Through friends
Training environment	Classroom style Formal Quiet atmosphere	Round-table style Planned Relaxed ambience	Unstructured Interactive
Management and leadership	Control Authority Analysers	Cooperation Competency Doers	Consensus Creativity Feelers

2.3.2 Characteristics of Generation Y

For the purpose of this study, Gen Y, also known as the Millennial Generations, Net Generation, Echo Boomers, and iGeneration, is classified as “individuals born between 1990 and 2005” (Codrington & Grant-Marshall, 2004). Gen Y, currently representing the largest generation in South Africa (Smith, 2010), accounts for approximately 31% of the total South African population, and 16% of the population at legal working age.

Figure 2: Generational Population and Figure 3: Generations at working Age (15 - 64) provide graphical illustrations of the population breakdown by generation and generations at working age respectively, as depicted in APPENDIX E and APPENDIX F.




Figure 2: Generational Population




Figure 3: Generations at working Age (15 - 64)

Gen Y is known to be technologically literate or Tech-Savvy, self-reliant, independent, self-confident, optimistic, and always looking for instant rewards. They have a low tolerance for boredom and value interaction. They are characterised as multi-taskers who want to be praised for efforts rather than results. Long-term for them is 12 months. Due to their involvement with family decisions and staying at home longer than any other generation, they want their opinion to be heard and expect to be shown respect (Solnet & Hood, 2008). Although they have been raised in an affluent environment (money is no real concern), external uncertainties, such as terrorism, environmental shocks, and economic breakdowns, are a reality.

At work, Gen Y is more demanding as new employees and unafraid of expressing their opinions. They seek responsibility from early in their career and demand constant feedback. They are determined, goal-driven, success-driven, and entrepreneurial. They have a sense of social responsibility and want to make a contribution to something worthwhile (Smith, 2010).

Deloitte (2009) identifies four findings from their generational research. Firstly, Gen Y is a generation that, unlike others, is confident in a time of instability. Secondly, opportunity is seen as more important than job security. Thirdly, Gen Y seeks responsibility from a very early stage in their time with a company, and lastly, Gen Y, contradictory to its preceding generation, trusts superiors and are keen to work with and learn from them.

Spiro (2006) maintains that Gen Y is highly sought after in the job market, but their unique characteristics pose a great challenge to managers and employers to effectively incorporate this generation into the workplace. Amongst their unique characteristics, Spiro (2006) identifies five characteristics that can be both beneficial and challenging at the same time. Gen Y has very high expectations of their employers and seek managers who are not only fair, but also engaged in their professional development. Gen Y places great emphasis on continuous learning and seek out challenges. It is imperative for managers to allow this generation to take ownership and control of challenging projects in order to keep them engaged in the workplace. Gen Y appreciates goals and tight milestones that encourage ownership of tasks. They also desire to make an immediate impact in the workplace and seek

out gratification and opportunities to excel. Furthermore, this generation views work-life balance and flexibility as important factors that drive attraction and commitment.

In a study of Gen Y's experiences and perceptions of careers in hospitality management, (Barron, Maxwell, Broadbridge, & Ogden, 2007) identified the potential for conflict between Gen Y's work-related preferences, attitudes and the reality of the contemporary hospitality industry. Dorsey (2010, pp. 17-26) reinforces this notion by explaining ten reasons for the way in which Gen Y think and act in the workplace:

- Gen Y has no expectation of lifetime employment. They are the only generation that has never expected to work for one employer for their entire career. This is due to the importance of organizational fit and the ease with which they will leave an organization if there is disconnect. To Gen Y, loyalty does not equate to organizational tenure. Loyalty rather refers to effort; including how hard they have worked while at an organization.

- Gen Y has a feeling of entitlement along with high expectations. The parenting philosophy with which Gen Y was raised taught this generation that they can have whatever they want, whenever they want it.

- Gen Y's have a hunger for instant gratification and tangible outcomes. In an era of instant living, Gen Y is accustomed to instant results. As a result, they have little patience, short attention spans, and seek ongoing progress throughout life. This does however translate in Gen Y being outcome driven and more project-oriented, rather than job-description focused.

- In comparison to other generations, Gen Y has a new (different) relationship with technology and communication. Over the years, technology has become an extension of Gen Y and this makes them tech-dependent, rather than tech-savvy. As a result, Gen Y seeks instant information all the time.

- Because Gen Y grew up during a period of unprecedented multiculturalism, they have a higher tolerance for diversity. Although this comfort with different races and ethnicities can lead to unintentionally offending older generations, it is a major benefit within the workplace.

- Entrepreneurship is a motivating vision embedded in Gen Y. More than financial gain and the glamour of being 'Entrepreneur of the Year', Gen Y seeks control; control over their schedules and a chance to do something they are passionate about.

- 'Instant' is deep-seated in every fibre of their being. After the first day on the job, Gen Y knows whether they will stay with a company or leave quicker than they have entered.

- Gen Y seeks continuous feedback. They want to know that they exist.

- Gen Y is lacking real-world expertise. This is due to a focus on academic education and subsequently entering the labour market at an older age than the preceding generations.

- Gen Y places greater emphasis on their lifestyle and values time spent outside of work. This directly elevates the importance of social and recreational aspects of their lives.

2.3.3 Desired Employee Value Proposition Attributes

In his book, Y-Size Your Business, Dorsey (2010) shows how quality Gen Y employees can not only give organisations an immediate competitive advantage, but also position businesses for long-term growth. Dorsey sees quality Gen Y as individuals with the mind-set, skill set, and career potential to satisfactorily complete tasks involved in their job (Dorsey, 2010, p. 55). He further suggests that Gen Y is cost effective to employ, bring a timely skill set to the workplace, and want to make a difference in the organisation from day one. However, the Gen Y cohort has employment needs very different to the needs of the generations before them (Luscombe et al., 2013; Spiro, 2006).

Codrington and Grant-Marshall (2012) suggest Gen Y knows they can make a contribution and they understand their value to the company. This has led to Gen Y being very picky about opportunities in the workplace. They also note that Gen Y is looking for tangible reward and expect to be paid for their talent and output rather than position and title. Gen Y subsequently changes jobs not for money, but to gain

more skills. Gen Y thrives when working in diverse teams and expects to be empowered and included in decision making. Gen Y enjoys individual autonomy and good working relationships. Reward for Gen Y has a different meaning than any other generation. For the Silent generation having a job is the reward; Boomers want recognition, while disposable income and status is very important to them; and Gen X values freedom as reward for a job well done. Gen Y looks for instant reward such as lifestyle awards, social responsibility, and grand and social celebrations. For Gen Y, the focus around reward should be fun rather than expensive (Codrington & Grant-Marshall, 2012). Gen Y wants instant feedback about their performance and seeks information about the future, not only in relation to their own progression but also the next steps for the company. They look at the bigger picture and want to know that they are contributing to something worthwhile. Gen Y is accustomed to balancing every aspect of their lives and work is no different. They see their job as just another activity and demand flexibility, balance and fun at the workplace.

Hershatter and Epstein (2010) suggest important factors Gen Y looks for in a workplace. As a result of their relationship with technology, Gen Y looks for immediacy and information that is readily available. They want to engage technology to solve problems; they desire involvement in content creation; and expect continual interaction. This generation relies on equitable systems that are structured and that assure reward and recognition. Clarity and detail are of utmost importance and they seek employment in organisations with “centralised decision-making, clearly defined responsibilities and formalised procedures”. In addition, Hershatter and Epstein (2010) note that Gen Y demands feedback and constant reassurance, a career path with clearly defined succession, a work-life balance, job security, a good working environment, flexibility and loyalty in the form of professional development and training.

Typically Gen Y looks for an employer that will fit their lifestyle, personality and priorities. They see personal fit within the company and the opportunity to be challenged as more important than monetary benefit. Gen Y wants to work in an environment where superiors see them as individuals, stretch them to grow every day, and expect them to contribute immediately. They look for companies with strong ethics and a compelling mission that coincides with their values (Dorsey, 2010, pp.

58-59). Furthermore, Gen Y expects to enjoy their job, wants to work for a caring and sensitive company, and is concerned about fairness, tolerance, equity and the environment (Broadbridge, Maxwell, & Ogden, 2007; Szamosi, 2006).

In addition to what Gen Y is looking for in employers, Dorsey (2010, pp. 59-61) identifies ten "hot buttons" that instantly connect them with prospective employers - Table 4: Generation Y's Hot buttons (Dorsey, 2010, pp. 59-61):

Table 4: Generation Y's Hot buttons (Dorsey, 2010, pp. 59-61)

Hot Buttons	Description
Fun:	Gen Y wants a fun, enjoyable environment to work in, even at the craziest time of the day
Challenge:	Gen Y is looking for challenges that will test their abilities, resilience, and develop their skills
Creativity:	Gen Y wants to know that they are given the space and trust to be creative at work – "to colour outside the lines – ideally on the outside of the policies and procedures manual"
Opportunity:	Gen Y has big expectations about their future, especially career growth (to the top) in the organisation
Ethics:	Gen Y wants to see the ethics, values and principles of organisational leaders in a real situation
Entrepreneurship:	Gen Y wants to take ownership on the job
Lifestyle:	Gen Y is interested in how the organisation supports a Gen Y friendly lifestyle; even more so when the pay is less than expected
Diversity:	Gen Y wants to see how the organisation embraces all types of diversity – this will allow them to bring their 'whole self' to work

Hot Buttons	Description
Technology:	Gen Y wants to use, and wants organisations to use, technology. They want to be at the forefront of testing new technology; they expect the organisation to make information and people available to them via technology
Mission:	Gen Y wants the organisation to describe the "why" behind the business and how progress is measured toward that mission.

2.3.4 Perceptions and Expectations of Careers in Hospitality

Hospitality is one of the fastest growing sectors in the South African economy (CATHSSETA, 2012). The Culture, Arts, Tourism, Hospitality, Sport Sector Education and Training Authority (CATHSSETA) (CATHSSETA, 2012) describes the hospitality industry as an exciting industry that is diverse in nature and provides numerous advancement opportunities. A long-term, prosperous career in the hotel industry however is not perceived with high regard. The perception of the industry is underpinned by characteristics such as low-paying jobs; poor work conditions; labour intensive; long, unsocial working hours; and many more (Barron et al., 2007; Kusluvan & Kusluvan, 2000). Various studies have been conducted to establish hospitality graduates' overall perception of the hotel industry (Barron et al., 2007; Cairncross & Buultjens, 2007; Kawana-Brown, 2007; Kusluvan & Kusluvan, 2000; Richardson, 2010).

Kusluvan and Kusluvan (2000) found in their study that undergraduate students view hotel jobs as interesting, not boring and worth doing. In addition, they are always learning new things and are left with a feeling of being free. The undergraduate students indicated negative perceptions such as stressful, exhausting work; long hours; lack of job stability as a result of seasonality; and a negative impact on family life. They also noted that a career in the hotel industry impacted negatively on their social status in that it is not seen as a respected and prestigious career. They are of the opinion that promotion opportunities are not satisfactory, not handled fairly, difficult, unsystematic and not based on merit. In addition, managerial opportunities

are limited. Undergraduates also have a poor perception of their managers. They feel that managers do not value their employees; do not make an effort in gaining commitment from their employees; do not delegate authority; do not value suggestions made by employees; do not let employees participate in decisions that affect their jobs; do not behave fairly; and do not make an effort towards their employees' job satisfaction.

Barron et al. (2007) suggest a positive perception that Gen Y has of work in the hospitality industry. They found consensus that the industry is exciting, is enjoyable in nature, offers prospects of career opportunities, and provides interesting experiences. They also found a negative view of the industry. Gen Y is of the perception that the industry offer poor compensation and unsociable hours. Gen Y indicated that interactions with customers and management make them feel undervalued and they are often not rewarded properly.

Cairncross and Buultjens (2007) highlight the nature of the hotel industry as being master-servant. This notion is strengthened by the findings in their study that Gen Y perceives the industry to be low-paying and anti-social with a lack of job security and poor treatment from employers.

Research indicates that Gen Y is looking for future career opportunities that fast-track their careers into managerial positions, with more responsibility (Barron et al., 2007). Cairncross and Buultjens (2007) found that this generation is looking for an environment that promotes comradeship and interaction. Gen Y also wants to see the steps in place that will enable them to progress on the career ladder.

In a study about Gen Y's expectations of industry placements, Kawana-Brown (2007) found that Gen Y looks for jobs where they are given the autonomy to try out ideas, especially in relation to improving hotel operations. Gen Y wants to learn about management, they seek feedback about the development of their capabilities and they want to be acknowledged for good work. In addition, Gen Y wants to receive fair financial reward in relation to their output on the job and they want opportunities for promotion.

Richardson (2009) and Brown (2011) derived similar results for career expectations in their respective studies regarding hospitality graduate students' expectation of a

career in the industry. Both authors found that graduate students regard an enjoyable career and a pleasant work environment as most important in pursuing a career in hospitality. Further results from Richardson's (2009) study showed that high paying jobs, job security, getting along with colleagues and promotion prospects ranked from third to sixth in terms of importance. In contrast, Brown's (2011) study showed promotion prospects as ranking third, responsibility as fourth, and getting along with colleagues as ranking fifth.

2.4 Research Question

The main problem of the proposed research is to identify and then rank the attributes that Generation Y hospitality students desire in an employee value proposition in the South African hospitality industry.

The research question can be formally phrased as:

What are the most desirable EVP characteristics for hospitality students in the hotel industry in South Africa?

2.5 Conclusion of Literature Review

Changing employee demographics, globalisation, labour shortages and industry growth has had a significant impact on the dynamics within the hospitality industry, and M. Linehan (as cited in Manson, 2012) suggest that a good, sustainable organisation is one that, by treating its people well, is able to reduce turnover and motivate its workforce. It is therefore important that hospitality operations base their employment strategies on the understanding of employee attitudes, motivations and behaviours (Solnet et al., 2008).

An employee's perception and attitude towards working in the hospitality industry underpins his/her commitment to the industry (Richardson, 2010), and can have a significant impact on "absenteeism, turnover, deviant behaviour, and quality and quantity of work" (Josiam et al., 2008). G. Maxwell & S. Quail (2002, as cited in Solnet et al., 2008) maintain current human resources practices undervalues the employee, which can lead to lower levels of commitment. In their research, Solnet et

al. (2008) highlights the difficulties of attracting and retaining high-quality employees that can fulfil the requirements of a demanding, service career, and also suggest the hospitality industry focuses on the characteristics of Gen Y in order to shape successful employment strategies in future.

Hospitality organisations in South Africa have the opportunity to capitalise on the unique characteristics of the Gen Y labour force. By their sheer nature, the “hot buttons”, as described by Dorsey (2010), coincides with the exhilarating nature of the hospitality industry and hospitality organisations are at a great advantage to use these characteristics to create an employment experience that will match the nature of Gen Y, and develop an EVP that will enhance the attraction and retention of critical talent within the industry.

The literature review indicates that although the Gen Y mimics a lot of the characteristics of the hospitality industry, a critical gap exist between the employment expectations of Gen Y and the employment offering from hospitality organisations. Developing a suitable EVP will allow hospitality organisations to attract and retain Gen Y hospitality students and thereby capitalise on this generation’s loyalty.

The Corporate Leadership Council (2006b) suggests by building and delivering a competitive EVP organisations can attract and retain critical talent. Defining an EVP should begin with the seven “core” attributes and the EVP should be strategically aligned. In addition, the EVP should be customised to address geographic variation.

The literature review identified a list of 39 attributes for an EVP that can be used as the basis for identifying core attributes suitable for an EVP geared towards Gen Y hospitality students in the South African context.

3 CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the process and methodology that was followed in order to determine the desired EVP attributes by Gen Y hospitality students. The first section is an outline of the proposed methodology to be used, followed by an explanation of the step by step process flow. Following the process flow is a description of the population, sample and sampling method, including a table representing possible respondents. Thereafter, this chapter discusses the research instrument as well as procedures for data collection. The last section in this chapter outlines validity (external and internal) and reliability as it pertains to the scope of the research.

3.1 Research methodology /paradigm

The objective of this study was to compile a partially rank-ordered list of the top ten attributes, framing an EVP that South African Gen Y hospitality students' desire.

The study comprised three parts:

- The study firstly required a panel of hospitality experts to review and validate a comprehensive list of employee value proposition attributes. The list of attributes were provided to the panel in the form of a survey and allowed the panel to add any additional attributes that were not included in the list of attributes.
- Secondly, the study used the validated list of attributes and afforded Gen Y hospitality students the opportunity to partially rank-order their preferred, top-10 attributes.

The research methodology suggested for this study was quantitative in nature. Neuman (1997) suggests quantitative research relies on assumptions from the positivist approach. For positivists reality is objective and testing aims to understand and expand the predictability of theoretical occurrences (Myers, 1997). Cresswell (2003) defines a quantitative approach as "one in which the investigator primarily uses post-positivist claims for developing knowledge, employs strategies of inquiry such as experiments and surveys, and collects data on predetermined instruments that yield statistical data". Similarly, Kalof, Dan, and Dietz (2008) suggest that data

collected by surveys, asking respondents the same set of questions, are predominantly used in quantitative approaches. The research corresponded with the quantitative approach in that it aimed to understand and develop an EVP for Gen Y students in the South African hospitality industry.

For the purpose of this research a survey was used as the primary research instrument. Kitchenham and Pfleeger (2008) note that surveys are the most commonly used, comprehensive research method for collecting information.

The research approach required a panel of experts to review and validate a comprehensive list of 39 EVP attributes derived from literature. The validated list of 28 attributes was then distributed to Gen Y hospitality students to select their top ten EVP attributes and rank the 10 attributes in order of preference. Preference ranking is a technique used to identify shared preferences amongst a population where individuals are required to select preferences and then rank the selected preferences in order of importance (Keller, 2010). The use of preference ranking in this study enabled the researcher to identify preferred attributes that are commonly shared amongst Gen Y hospitality students. It also initiated discussion for the possible compilation of an EVP geared to Gen Y in the hospitality industry.

3.2 Research Design

The proposed research is a replication study and extension of research conducted by Rajha (2012) and Bhoola (2013) to identify critical, desired attributes for an EVP in various contexts. The research design used by Rajha (2012) will be adapted to suit the nature of this proposed research.

Figure 4: Steps in the Proposed Research Study (Adapted from Rajha (2012) illustrates steps that will be followed in the proposed research. The section that follows provides an outline of these six steps:




Figure 4: Steps in the Proposed Research Study (Adapted from Rajha (2012)

Step 1: Pilot Study

Kitchenham and Pfleeger (2008) note that pre-testing in the form of a pilot study is conducted to assess the reliability and validity of the research instruments by following the same processes as what would be followed in the survey, but with a smaller sample. Reliability focusses on the reproduction of survey data and the extent of measurement error, while validity refers to the extent to which the instrument measures what it is supposed to measure.

The purpose of a pilot study in this research was to establish whether students understood the process of completing the survey and also to validate whether the survey would generate accurate responses from the students. A comprehensive list of EVP attributes, as identified in the literature was distributed to a sample of 20 hospitality students from the Swiss Hotel School. The sample was asked to partially rank their top 10 preferences for an EVP.

Step 2: Panel of Experts

For this part of the study, the researcher selected a panel of experts, consisting of General Managers, Executive Managers, Human Resources and educators from the hotel industry. Industry experts on the panel members were selected based on their experience in the hospitality industry and their experience working with Gen Y employees. Academics from various hotel schools were also selected for their insight into Gen Y students and graduates. The panel of hotel experts were asked to validate and supplement the comprehensive list of attributes of an EVP. The sample letter and comprehensive list of attributes provided to the panel of hotel experts is provided in APPENDIX A

Step 3: Development of the List of Attributes

Input from members of the panel of experts was considered and consolidated in order to compile the final list of attributes as presented in Table 14: Validated List of EVP attributes (APPENDIX B). During this phase of the research the comprehensive list of 39 attributes were reduced to a refined list of 28 attributes. This list was used as a survey that was distributed to hospitality students to partially rank their preferences of a desirable EVP.

Step 4: Partial Rank Ordering of Attributes

The validated and refined list of 28 EVP attributes was used as the final research instrument in this study. Hospitality students, from various geographical and demographical backgrounds, was presented with the survey and asked to firstly select their top-ten EVP attributes and then to partially rank these preferences, where 1 indicated most important and 10 indicated least important.

Step 5: Application of Shotgun Stochastic Parameter Estimation Algorithm

Stacey (2006) suggests an algorithmic approach to estimate underlying parameters of fully or partially rank ordered survey items rather than rigorous analysis through the application of parametric statistics. This approach, referred to as the Shotgun Stochastic Parameter Estimation Algorithm, is essentially Bayesian in nature and estimates the population means and standard deviations of the number of survey

items, in which “successive guesses at the optimal solution are scattered randomly around the prevailing best estimate of the population parameters” (Stacey, 2006). Furthermore, Stacey (2006) explains the algorithmic flow has been developed as a macro in Microsoft Excel which was used in this research.

Step 6: Analysis and interpretation

In order to determine standardised means, this study applied the shotgun stochastic parameter estimation algorithm to statistically analyse the partially rank ordered data. The statistical results were interpreted to provide useful meaning to the data.

Stacey (2006) notes intrinsic advantages of using rank ordering of survey items: not only is it intuitive for respondents, but it is also independent of response scales. This approach reduces respondent fatigue while retaining a high degree of analytical rigour.

Focus Groups

Subsequent to the research being conducted, data being analysed and the seven core EVP attributes being compared to studies conducted by the Corporate Leadership Council (2006b), Rajha (2012), and Bhoola (2013), the researcher identified some anomalies in the results of this study. These anomalies supported the need to elaborate on and clarify the responses provided by Gen Y hospitality students in the main study.

R. Krueger and M. Casey (2009, as cited in Franz, 2011) define focus groups as structured and facilitated group discussions in a neutral environment, enabling the researcher to obtain perceptions on a specified topic of interest. The researcher is able to collect data from several participants at the same time; provide guidance to ensure discussions stay on track; encourage engagement; capitalise on the richness of data obtained from a group’s interaction; and explore and clarify views of the participants (Franz, 2011; Kitzinger, 1995; Sagoe, 2012).

The researcher facilitated two focus groups with Gen Y hospitality students to explain the main study rather than being a study in itself. The focus groups were conducted to establish the students’ understanding of each attribute, and why they

believe the attributes ranked in the order that this study indicated. The first group comprised eight Gen Y hospitality students who participated in the main study of this research. The second group comprised six Gen Y hospitality students that did not participate in the main study of this research. These students attended a practical block release at the time the main study was conducted. By using two focus groups, the researcher was able to establish a level of consistency relating to the perceptions of the core EVP attributes from these Gen Y hospitality students.

3.3 Population and sample

3.3.1 Population

A collection of people, sharing common characteristics or interests are referred to as a population (Kalof et al., 2008). The proposed research relied on two separate population groups. The first population consisted of industry experts. These individuals either work directly in the hotel industry as Executive Managers, Line Managers or Human Resources Managers, or as educators within the hospitality space. The second population consisted of hospitality students in their 2nd or 3rd year of study. The second population was limited to Gen Y students who were born between 1990 and 2005.

3.3.2 Sample and sampling method

The aim of the first part of the study was to conduct a pilot study with a sample (sample 2A) from the second population group (Gen Y hospitality students). A comprehensive list of attributes, in the form of an online survey presented in Table 1: Dimensions and Definitions of Employee Value Proposition Attributes (Corporate Leadership Council, 2006b), Chapter 2, was presented to the sample 2A to not only verify reliability and validity of the research instrument, but also to establish the students' understanding of the EVP concept.

For the second part of the study, a sample (Sample 1) of hospitality experts was contacted to participate in compiling the final, validated list of attributes for an EVP in the hospitality industry. The selection of these individuals was systematic and based

on prior knowledge from the researcher. Four panel members were executive managers, two members were line managers and one member was an HR manager, all from the hotel industry. In addition, one member was an owner of a hospitality establishment. The remaining two members were educators within the hospitality industry, one being a director of a hotel school and the other a senior lecturer at another hotel school. Table 19: Panel of Experts Demographics in APPENDIX G represents information pertaining to the panel of experts' profile. APPENDIX A shows the survey that was provided to the panel of experts for validation. The survey distributed to students was compiled after the panel of experts validated the EVP attributes.

For the final part of the research, the researcher obtained access to students from various hotel schools to conduct surveys to rank order attributes of an EVP for Gen Y hospitality students. This sample (sample 2B) comprised all students, at least in their second or third year of study, studying towards a hospitality qualification and was a convenience sample of 200 respondents. This sample was limited to students born between 1990 and 2005, referred to as Gen Y.

Table 5: Profile of respondents

Description of respondent type	Establishments/ Institutions
Hospitality Experts – Executive Managers, Line Managers, Human Resources Managers and Educators	- **Sun International** - **Tsogo Sun** - **Protea** - **Legacy** - **International Hotel School** - **Swiss Hotel School** - **Private Hotel School**
Gen Y Hospitality Students	- **International Hotel School** - **Swiss Hotel School** - **Private Hotel School**

3.4 The research instrument

For the purpose of this study, a survey was used as the primary research instrument. Table 1: Dimensions and Definitions of Employee Value Proposition Attributes (Corporate Leadership Council, 2006b), Chapter 2, comprises a comprehensive list of attributes as obtained in the literature review. This list, in the form of an online survey, was provided to Sample 2A as a pilot study to verify reliability and validity of the instrument and to validate the students' understanding of the EVP concept. The same list of attributes was provided to Sample 1 to validate, refine and/or expand the list of attributes. After consolidating the feedback and information obtained from Sample 1 and Sample 2A, the researcher updated the existing list of attributes and formulated the final list of 28 attributes that was distributed amongst Sample 2B.

As indicated previously, this study was a replication and extension of studies conducted by Rajha (2012) and Bhoola (2013). Subsequently, the researcher used a research instrument used by Rajha (2012), which was obtained from the Corporate Leadership Council (2006c). The survey presented to Sample 1 was a standard list of attributes and acted as a starting point from which attributes of an EVP for the hotel industry was defined. This list of attributes was established from a corporate business view point and had to be adapted and refined after the panel of experts completed the survey.

3.5 Procedure for data collection

The main method of collection was through the use of surveys. Nueman (1997), Fink (2003) and Kalof et al. (2008) note that surveys are used to establish people's beliefs, opinions, characteristics and behaviours. Surveys allow the researcher to reduce sample sizes and test a couple of hypotheses with few variables (Nueman, 1997).

In this study, the researcher followed a deductive approach to identify a comprehensive list of EVP attributes specific to the hospitality industry. The researcher contacted potential candidates to participate in the first phase of the study – panel of experts. Once participation was confirmed, a list of 39 attributes, as

defined by the Corporate Leadership Council (2006c), was provided to the panel of experts to identify attributes most suitable to the hotel industry.

Once the researcher obtained the initial survey data, the information was analysed and a refined list of 28 EVP attributes compiled as it applies to the hotel industry. An online survey, generated by using Qualtrics (2014), was produced. The survey consisted of three sections. Section 1 included control questions to verify demographic information of respondents. Section 2 presented a list of attributes with their respective definitions and allowed respondents to select their ten, most preferred attributes of an EVP. The final section populated the selected ten attributes in a list and required the respondents to rank the attributes in order of preference, “1” being most preferred and “10” least preferred. Students were asked to complete the survey by following a link to the survey as generated by Qualtrics (2014).

3.6 Data analysis and interpretation

Student surveys were analysed using a quantitative analysis as suggested by Stacey (2006). This approach, referred to as the Shotgun Stochastic Parameter estimation algorithm, estimates the population means and standard deviations of the number of survey items, in which “successive guesses at the optimal solution are scattered randomly around the prevailing best estimate of the population parameters” (Stacey, 2006). In addition, (Stacey, 2006) also notes that the algorithmic flow has been developed as a macro in Microsoft Excel, which was used in the study.

3.7 Limitations of the study

Surveys are often deemed as onerous and time-consuming instruments to complete (Stacey, 2006). The nature of this research was conducive to the use of a list of 39 attributes, obtained from literature, to be partially rank ordered. The risk was that respondents might make random selections rather than selections based on their perception.

Apart from the benefits of using rank ordered surveys, this approach is flawed in that it is sensitive to the sample size in the study.

3.8 Validity and reliability

Validity refers to the link between details of the research, the evidence and the conclusions drawn by the researcher, whilst reliability is concerned with consistency of results (Kalof et al., 2008). For a study to be valid, the research instrument needs to align to the underlying concept of the study; for a study to be reliable, the researcher needs to ensure that the research instrument will deliver the same or similar results if a respondent was asked to complete the survey multiple times (Browne & Green, 2005). For the purposes of this study, the following section outlines issues surrounding external validity, internal validity and reliability of the proposed research study.

3.8.1 External validity

Kalof et al. (2008) suggest that all experiments face possible threats due to external validity. External validity deals with the issues surrounding generalisation of findings to the larger population. Kalof et al. (2008) argue that research often require artificial circumstances that can have a negative impact on the validity of the study.

For the purposes of this research study, a panel of hospitality experts was approached to validate the comprehensive list of attributes and customise the list, as far as possible, to correspond with the characteristics of the hospitality industry. This aimed to reduce any ambiguity and relation to a more corporate list of EVP attributes. Students, at least in their second or third year of study, were asked to complete the survey. As these students already have some knowledge about the industry, their perceptions were guided by personal experience and reduced the risk of survey fatigue due to a lack of understanding.

3.8.2 Internal validity

Internal validity refers to the study “drawing appropriate conclusions from the data at hand” (Kalof et al., 2008). In other words, ensuring a link between the theoretical aspects and the research question, and that the variables measure what they were intended for.

For the purposes of this research study, the researcher conducted a pilot study with sample 2A to ensure the validity of the research instrument and the hospitality students' understanding of the concepts that underpins an EVP. Furthermore, a list of attributes (Corporate Leadership Council, 2006c) was selected which is outlined from the literature. In order to ensure that the list was conducive to the hospitality industry, a panel of hospitality experts were asked to validate and amend the list of attributes.

3.8.3 Reliability

Reliability is concerned with the consistency of results. The study is deemed reliable if similar findings were revealed after repeated applications of the research, with small error (Kalof et al., 2008). The researcher ensured reliability of the study through consistency in conducting sessions with both the panel of experts and the Gen Y hospitality students.

4 CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

This study aimed to identify attributes of an EVP desired by South African Gen Y hospitality students. This chapter outlines results derived from the research conducted. Section 4.2 of this chapter presents the demographic information pertaining to the pilot study group (Sample 2A), panel of experts (Sample 1), and South African Gen Y hospitality students (Sample 2B). Sections 4.3 – 4.5 express responses and findings from a pilot study group of 20 respondents, a panel of 10 hospitality experts, and South African Gen Y hospitality students. Section 4.6 concludes this Chapter 4 with a brief summary of the results.

Results presented in this chapter are done anonymously. Neither the pilot study group nor the sample considered for the main study was required to give their names on the surveys provided. The researcher did not deem this information as pertinent to the study. While the names of the panel of experts are known to the researcher, these are not revealed in this study. References to these respondents are made by using symbols and letters.

4.2 Demographic profile of respondents

4.2.1 Pilot group

The purpose of the pilot study was to verify the reliability and validity of the research instrument and to validate the students' understanding of the EVP concept. Qualtrics (2014) was used to generate an online survey for the pilot study. The survey included a comprehensive list of 39 EVP attributes as derived from the literature. The pilot study group was asked to partially rank order their top 10 EVP attributes, and evaluate and provide feedback on the structure and flow of the survey.

A small sample from the second population group, hospitality students, was selected to participate in the pilot study. The pilot study group (Sample 2A) was made up of 20 hospitality students, from the Swiss Hotel School. It was believed that the pilot

study group was a large enough sample in that it represented a 10% sample of Gen Y hospitality students (Sample 2B).

For ease of administering the pilot study, only one class from the Swiss Hotel School was asked to participate as the pilot study group. A basic analysis of the results from the pilot study group revealed the pilot group comprised both males (5) and females (13). In addition, seven responses were invalid and had to be removed from the results. Three respondents accepted but did not complete the study, and four respondents did not belong to the Gen Y cohort. Only thirteen responses were considered. Results are illustrated in Figure 5: Pilot Study Group Demographics.




Figure 5: Pilot Study Group Demographics

4.2.2 Panel of experts

A panel of experts was used to compile the final, validated list of attributes for an EVP in the hotel industry. From a comprehensive list of 39 EVP attributes, the panel

of experts was required to select attributes that they deemed specific to the hotel industry.

Ten individuals from the hospitality industry were selected to participate in the panel. The panel was made up of both males and females and their ages ranged from 27 to 58. These individuals were deemed representative of experts within the hospitality industry based on their tenure in the industry (between 6 and 30 years' experience), current position held (hospitality educators, front office managers, directors, and owners) and level of contact with hospitality students. Figure 6: Panel of Experts Demographics below relates to the demographic information of the panel of experts.




Figure 6: Panel of Experts Demographics

4.2.3 South African Gen Y hospitality students

The main research instrument, an online survey consisting of 28 EVP attributes, was distributed to 234 South African hospitality students, both male and female, at least

in their second or third year of study. These respondents were spread geographically across South Africa, and were associated with various hotel schools, including the International Hotel School, the Swiss Hotel School and the Private Hotel School.

Of the total 234 responses collected, 212 responses were accepted as valid and 22 responses were excluded from the results. One respondent did not accept participation in the study and eleven respondents did not complete the survey. Ten additional responses were excluded as the respondents did not form part of the Gen Y cohort at working age (16-23). Figure 7: Total Sample Size illustrates the response rate.




Figure 7: Total Sample Size

The majority of the responses collected were from students attending hotel management courses at the International Hotel School. From the 234 responses collected in total, 196 responses were from the International Hotel School, 13 from the Swiss Hotel School, 2 from the Private Hotel School and 1 from other hotel schools. The International Hotel School has three campuses situated in

Johannesburg, Durban and Cape Town. From the 196 responses collected from the International Hotel School, 51% represented the Johannesburg campus, 40% the Durban campus and 9% the Cape Town campus. These results are illustrated in Figure 8: Response Distribution by Hotel School.




Figure 8: Response Distribution by Hotel School

Although students from the International Hotel School represented 92% of Sample 2B, the sample was still considered to be geographically representative. The geographical and gender breakdown of the total sample is shown in Figure 9: Demographic Distribution of Respondents and Table 6: Geographical Response Rate

.




Figure 9: Demographic Distribution of Respondents

Table 6: Geographical Response Rate

Hotel School	Johannesburg	Durban	Cape Town
The International Hotel School	100	79	17
Swiss Hotel School	13	-	-
Private Hotel School	-	-	2
Other	1	-	-
TOTAL	**114**	**79**	**19**

4.3 Results pertaining to the pilot study group

Feedback from the pilot study group provided valuable insight and recommendations in order to improve the structure and flow of the online survey. The first recommendation was to include a **"BACK"** button on the survey that would allow participants to review and/or correct their previous responses. In order to ensure a higher completion rate of the surveys, it is important to allow participants the option to review their responses. This also prevents discontinued surveys due to the inability to revert back to previously answered questions.

The second recommendation pertained to the age categories used in the survey. It was suggested that the age categories seemed arbitrary. The survey initially only included age ranges 16 – 23 (Gen Y at working age), 24 – 29, 30 – 35, and "other" (including a field for specifying any other age), adapted from Statistics South Africa (2011). The field labelled as "other" was changed to read "36 and older". The focus of the study was specifically on Gen Y hospitality students (16 – 23) and all other ages were irrelevant.

The third recommendation was to include a control question pertaining to the year of study as the study was limited to hospitality students in their second and third year of study.

The fourth recommendation was to include a definition of each EVP attribute. Just listing the EVP attributes was deemed not sufficiently well-defined. The ambiguity around the EVP attributes could have potentially compromised the validity of the results.

The fifth recommendation related to the rank ordering section of the survey. It was suggested to combine the selection and rank ordering questions especially, due to the survey allowing respondents to select and rank less and more than 10 EVP attributes as well as allowing the respondents to finish the survey without ranking them. Both the questions for selection of EVP attributes and ranking of the selected attributes remained in the survey. The selection question was validated by preventing respondents from continuing with the survey unless they have selected exactly 10 EVP attributes. The ranking question was validated by preventing

respondents from completing the survey if they have not changed the ranking of the attributes.

4.4 Results pertaining to the panel of experts

The panel of experts was provided with the same comprehensive list of 39 EVP attributes that was distributed to the pilot study group. The panel was required to select or remove any attribute on the basis of relevance to the hospitality industry. This was achieved by indicating a tick or a cross next to the respective attributes.

Reponses received from the panel of experts were coded in order to simplify the analysis. The ticks were converted to a “1” and the crosses to a “0” and all the “1”s was totalled. Attributes that achieved a score of at least seven out of ten were selected. These attributes were considered as significant for inclusion into the main research instrument based on the notion that the researcher wanted to present a comprehensive, but refined list of attributes from which Gen Y hospitality students could select, and then rank their top ten preferred EVP attributes. Table 7: Responses from Panel of Experts presents responses from the panel of experts.

Table 7: Responses from Panel of Experts

			PANEL MEMBER'S CHOICES										
	Attribute	Definition	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Totals
1	Development Opportunities	The developmental/ educational opportunities provided by the job and organisation	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
2	Camaraderie	Whether working for the organisation provides opportunities to socialise with other employees	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
3	Organisational Stability	The level of stability of the organisation and the job	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
4	People Management	The organisation's reputation for managing people	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	9
5	Product Quality	The organisation's product or service quality reputation	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	9
6	Recognition	The amount of recognition provided to employees by the organisation	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	9
7	Respect	The degree of respect that the organisation shows employees	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	9
8	Collegial Work Environment	Whether the work environment is team-oriented and collaborative	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	8
9	Compensation	The competitiveness of the job's financial compensation package including base salary, incentives, cash recognition, premium pay, ownership and the pay process as other forms of compensation.	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	8
10	Co-worker Quality	The quality of the co-workers in the organisation	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	8
11	Environmental Responsibility	The organisation's level of commitment to environmental health and sustainability	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
12	Ethics	The organisation's commitment to ethics and integrity	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	8
13	Future Career Opportunities	The future career opportunities provided by organisation	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	8
14	Industry	The desirability of the organisation's industry to the respondent	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	8
15	Manager Quality	The quality of the organisation's managers	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	8
16	Meritocracy	Whether or not employees are rewarded and promoted based on their achievements	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	8
17	Organisational Growth Rate	The growth rate of the organisation's business	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
18	Person-organisation fit	Personal values are align with the values of the organisation to identify a fit	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
19	Customer Reputation	The reputation of the clients and customers served in performing the job	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	7
20	Empowerment	The level of involvement employees have in decisions that affect their job and career	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	7
21	Health Benefits	The comprehensiveness of the organisation's health benefits	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	7
22	Job Impact	The level of impact the job has on outcomes	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	7
23	Job–Interests Alignment	Whether the job responsibilities match your interests	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	7
24	Market Position	The competitive position the organisation holds in its market(s)	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	7
25	Product Brand Awareness	The level of awareness in the market place for the products brand	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	7
26	Retirement Benefits	The comprehensiveness of the organisation's retirement benefits	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	7
27	Senior Leadership Reputation	The quality of the organisation's senior leadership	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	7
28	Technology Level	The extent to which the organization invests in modern technology and equipment	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	7
29	"Great Employer" Recognition	Whether or not the organisation's reputation as an employer has been recognised by a third-party organisation	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	6
30	Diversity	The organisation's level of commitment to having a diverse workforce	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	6
31	Innovation	The opportunity provided by the job to work on innovative, "leading edge" projects	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	6
32	Location	The geographic location of the job that the organisation is offering	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	6
33	Organisation Size	The size of the organisation's workforce	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	5
34	Business Travel	The amount of out-of-town business travel required by the job	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	4
35	Formal/Informal Work Environment	Whether the work environment is formal or informal	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	4
36	Social Responsibility	The organisation's level of commitment to social responsibility (e.g., community service, philanthropy)	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
37	Work–Life Balance	The extent to which the job allows you to balance your work and your other interests	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
38	Vacation	The amount of holiday/vacation time that employees earn annually	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
39	Risk Taking	The amount of risk that the organisation encourages employees to take	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

In addition to the selection and removal of attributes, panel members were afforded the opportunity to add any additional attributes not presented in the original list, but still deemed important. The panel of experts suggested four additional attributes, including Company Reputation, Work Environment, Team Work and Ownership/Accountability, as shown in Table 8: Additional EVP Attributes

Table 8: Additional EVP Attributes

Panel Member	Additional Attributes by Panel of Experts		Attribute linked to
2	Company Reputation	The reputation that is portrayed to as a result of how employees are treated; often spread by employees via social media	Respect/ Manager Quality/ Senior Leadership Reputation/ Great Employer Recognition
2	Work Environment	Whether one is treated like a number or as a valuable employee (psychological contract)	Respect
5	Team Work	Streamlining processes by working efficiently with team members from other departments	Collegial Work Environment
5	Ownership/ Accountability	Accountability of actions, tasks and responsibilities	Empowerment/ Ethics

A review of the additional attributes resulted in the conclusion that these four attributes related to attributes already provided in the list of 39 EVP attributes and was subsequently excluded from the final list of attributes provided to Gen Y hospitality students.

Company Reputation was defined as the reputation that is portrayed as a result of how employees are treated. This attribute was seen as closely related to the organisation's people management aspects and therefore considered as a factor of several attributes, including Respect, Manager Quality, Senior Leadership Reputation, and Great Employer Recognition.

Work Environment was defined as whether one is treated like a number or as a valuable employee and relating to the psychological contract between the organisation and the employee. The definition provided by the panel member was compared to the definitions provided in the comprehensive list of attributes. Subsequently, this suggestion was considered as closely relating to Respect.

Team work was defined as streamlining processes by working efficiently with team members from other departments, and therefore considered to fit into the definition of a Collegial Working Environment.

Ownership/Accountability was defined as the accountability of actions, tasks and responsibilities. This definition corresponded with the definitions of Empowerment and Ethics, which indicates the level of decision-making power an employee has as well as the fairness displayed by the organisation's management and leadership.

4.5 Results pertaining to South African Gen Y hospitality students

Gen Y hospitality students were asked to participate in the main study of this research. These students were selected as a result of the researcher's personal networks within the hospitality educational environment. Once the main research instrument was improved with comments from the pilot study group and adapted with the results from the panel of experts, the survey was administered to hospitality students. Their responses were collected over a period of two months via Qualtrics (2014).

The online survey required respondents to answer some demographic and control questions in order to ascertain willingness to participate, gender, age, hotel school association and year of study. From a list of 28 EVP attributes, the respondents were

asked to select their top-ten preferred EVP attributes and to partially rank these attributes in order of importance. They were required to rank their most preferred attribute as “1” and their least preferred as “10”. ***Analysis of survey results***

During the data collection process, 234 responses were collected from hospitality students attending various South African hotel schools. The raw data was reduced to 212 valid responses by means of a rigorous cleaning process. The process allowed the researcher to remove all data considered incomplete and not in compliance of the parameters of this study.

A basic analysis of the cleaned data was done to establish a snapshot of the level of desirability of each EVP attribute. For each attribute, the researcher calculated the number of respondents that indicated the respective attribute to be their most desired EVP attribute. Figure 10: Attributes Ranked as Most Desirable by Number of Respondents presents the findings from this basic analysis. The basic analysis revealed that 29 respondents indicated that respect is their most desired EVP attribute, 23 respondents indicated compensation as most desirable, and so forth.




Figure 10: Attributes Ranked as Most Desirable by Number of Respondents

Shotgun Stochastic Parameter Estimation Algorithm

Stacey (2006) suggests a successful analyses of partially ranked data is reliant on the size of the sample. He argues a larger sample best represents the population and reduces sampling error. The 212 responses were subsequently considered a large enough sample to be analysed using Stacey (2006)'s Shotgun Stochastic Parameter Estimation Algorithm.

As described by Stacey (2006), the analysis process started with initial guesses for item means and item variances. Means and variances were standardised by using an algorithmic flow that converted the means to zero and variance to one. The rank ordering of the population's responses was then numerically simulated from a very large sample, and the sum of squared errors (SSE) was calculated between the observed sample and simulated population proportions across all the preference permutations. The SSE was compared to the estimates of the item means and variances. SSE's that were less than the previously recorded minimum SSE then became the best estimate of the items' means and variances. Uniformly distributed random perturbations were introduced to the guesses of the item means and variances, which decreased in magnitude with the square root of the number of iterations carried out. Finally, the process was repeated until the SSE no longer reduced with multiple successive iterations.

Figure 11: Ranking of the 28 EVP attributes graphically represents the standardised means of 28 EVP attributes, rank-ordered by Gen Y hospitality students. From this representation it is clear that, amongst Gen Y hospitality students, respect is the most desired EVP attribute, with a standardised mean of 0.77 while industry is the least desired EVP attribute with a standardised mean of -0.52. In other words, while respect is the most important driver of attraction and has a substantial influence on Gen Y hospitality students' decision to seek employment at a specific organisation, the desirability of the organisation's industry has little to no impact on such a decision. This concurs with the results from the basic analysis that indicates that 29 respondents noted that respect is their most desired EVP attribute.




Figure 11: Ranking of the 28 EVP attributes

Hypothesis testing was applied to each standardised attribute mean and standard deviations in order to determine whether Gen Y hospitality students' preference for an attribute was significant. The two-tailed hypothesis test allowed the researcher to either accept or reject the null hypothesis or the alternate hypothesis. The null hypothesis held true where there was no significant difference between the sample attribute mean and the standardised attribute mean. In contrast, the alternate hypothesis held true where there was a significant difference between the sample attribute mean and the standardised attribute mean.

As part of the hypothesis test, t-values and p-values were calculated. T-values determine whether the means of two sample sets differ significantly (Weisstein, 2014b). A positive t-value indicates that the first mean is larger than the mean it is being compared to and a negative t-value indicates that the first mean is smaller than the mean it is being compared to (Trochim, 2006). For the purpose of this study, only positive t-values were considered appropriate in establishing desired attributes of an EVP. The t-values indicated a difference between the sample attribute mean and the standardised attribute mean.

P-values show the estimated probability of getting the same statistical results, from the same population, given that the null hypothesis is true (Weisstein, 2014a). Attributes were considered desirable where the attribute indicated a probability of less than 5%.

Figure 12: T-Value Distribution Curve graphically illustrates attributes with positive t-values and p-values of less than 0.05. Attributes that resembled these requirements indicated that significant differences between the sample attribute means and standardised attribute means existed.




Figure 12: T-Value Distribution Curve

Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected for attributes with positive t-values and p-values of less than 0.05. The standardised data, including standardised means, t-values and p-values is presented in Table 9: Alphabetical Standardised Results of Gen Y Hospitality Students. The attributes considered significant for the purpose of this study are highlighted in Table 9 and includes compensation, co-worker quality, development opportunities, empowerment, ethics, future career opportunities, and respect. These attributes have sample attribute means that are significantly different to the standardised attribute means and allow the rejection of the null hypothesis. The remaining 21 attributes that are not highlighted in Table 9 do not have significantly different sample attribute means from the standardised attribute means and subsequently allow the acceptance of the null hypothesis. These attributes were not considered in the discussion of the results.

Table 9: Alphabetical Standardised Results of Gen Y Hospitality Students for EVP Attributes

EVP Attribute	Standardised Means	t-value	p-value
Camaraderie	**-0.29**	-4.4898	0.0000
Collegial Work Environment	**0.11**	1.6872	0.0931
Compensation	**0.45**	6.8357	0.0000
Co-Worker quality	**0.13**	2.0661	0.0401
Customer Reputation	**-0.02**	-0.3593	0.7197
Development Opportunities	**0.42**	6.4679	0.0000
Empowerment	**0.40**	6.1540	0.0000
Environmental Responsibility	**0.00**	0.0137	0.9891
Ethics	**0.43**	6.5829	0.0000
Future Career Opportunities	**0.53**	8.0918	0.0000
Health Benefits	**0.10**	1.5298	0.1276
Industry	**-0.52**	-8.0120	0.0000
Job Impact	**-0.19**	-2.9181	0.0039
Job-Interests Alignment	**0.10**	1.5927	0.1127
Manager Quality	**0.10**	1.5401	0.1251
Market Position	**-0.27**	-4.1297	0.0001
Meritocracy	**-0.20**	-3.1177	0.0021

EVP Attribute	Standardised Means	t-value	p-value
Organisational Growth Rate	**-0.25**	-3.8064	0.0002
Organisational Stability	**-0.26**	-4.0181	0.0001
People Management	**0.03**	0.4694	0.6393
Person-Organisation Fit	**-0.51**	-7.8821	0.0000
Product Brand Awareness	**-0.38**	-5.8393	0.0000
Product Quality	**-0.02**	-0.3765	0.7069
Recognition	**-0.23**	-3.5329	0.0005
Respect	**0.77**	11.7826	0.0000
Retirement Benefits	**-0.01**	-0.0874	0.9304
Senior Leadership Reputation	**-0.38**	-5.8106	0.0000
Technology Level	**-0.03**	-0.4338	0.6649

4.6 Summary of the results

The results presented in this section answer the research question that investigates the EVP attributes that are most desirable for South African Gen Y hospitality students.

The analysis of the data run through the Shotgun Stochastic Estimation Algorithm indicates that South African Gen Y hospitality students have a preference for seven attributes. These attributes are presented in Table 10: Most Desired EVP Attributes by Gen Y Hospitality Students and are discussed in further detail in Chapter 5.

Table 10: Most Desired EVP Attributes by Gen Y Hospitality Students

Rank	Attributes	Definition
1	Respect	The degree of respect that the organisation shows employees
2	Future Career Opportunities	The future career opportunities provided by organisation
3	Compensation	The competitiveness of the job's financial compensation package
4	Ethics	The organisation's commitment to ethics and integrity
5	Development Opportunities	The developmental/educational opportunities provided by the job and organisation
6	Empowerment	The level of involvement employees have in decisions that affect their job and career
7	Co-Worker Quality	The quality of the co-workers in the organisation

5 CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

5.1 Introduction

Chapter 5 presents the interpretation and discussion of the survey results within the context of the literature reviewed and draws conclusions about the research question. This chapter is driven by the most desired EVP attributes from the perspective of South African Gen Y hospitality students.

Section 5.2 provides an overview of the demographic profile as discussed in Chapter 4. Section 5.3 presents seven core EVP attributes as identified and ranked by Gen Y hospitality students. The discussion explores reasons for these attributes being ranked in the order that they were and how the ranking presented here differs from the literature. Section 5.4 concludes this chapter with a summary of the core EVP attributes for South African Gen Y hospitality students.

Results from the focus group will be incorporated and represented in the following sections.

5.2 Demographic profile of respondents

The demographic profile of respondents was discussed in detail in Chapter 4 (4.2). Apart from the generational cohort parameters applied to this research, the demographical profile of respondents was not considered to have an impact on the results of this study. As a result, this section will only cover a brief summary of the demographics pertaining to this study.

The pilot study group consisted of 20 Gen Y hospitality students. From the sample, 13 responses were valid, while 7 responses had to be ignored. From the 13 valid responses, 38% (5) was male and 62% (8) was female.

The panel of experts comprised 10 individuals from the hospitality industry. 40% of the panel of experts was male (4 respondents) while 60% was female (6 respondents). Based on their age distribution, between 27 and 58, and tenure in the industry, between 6 and 30 years, these individuals were considered experts in the

industry. The panel was also made up of a variety of positions within the industry, such as hospitality educators, front office managers, directors, and owners).

For the main study, responses were collected from 234 hospitality students. 212 responses were valid and 22 invalid. Validation was based on the generation cohort of respondents and year of study. A geographical breakdown of the respondents indicated that 54% (114) of respondents were from Johannesburg, 37% (79) from Durban, and 9% (19) from Cape Town. The sample used for the main study consisted of 36% male and 64% female.

5.3 Discussion pertaining to significant EVP attributes

This research study derived seven EVP attributes desired by South African Gen Y hospitality students, as indicated in Table 11: Rank-Ordered Standardised Results of Gen Y Hospitality Students for EVP Attributes. These attributes include respect, future career opportunities, compensation, ethics, development opportunities, empowerment and co-worker quality.

Table 11: Rank-Ordered Standardised Results of Gen Y Hospitality Students for EVP Attributes

EVP Attribute	Standardised Means	t-value	p-value
Respect	**0.77**	11.7826	0.0000
Future Career Opportunities	**0.53**	8.0918	0.0000
Compensation	**0.45**	6.8357	0.0000
Ethics	**0.43**	6.5829	0.0000
Development Opportunities	**0.42**	6.4679	0.0000
Empowerment	**0.40**	6.1540	0.0000

EVP Attribute	Standardised Means	t-value	p-value
Co-Worker quality	**0.13**	2.0661	0.0401
Collegial Work Environment	**0.11**	1.6872	0.0931
Job-Interests Alignment	**0.10**	1.5927	0.1127
Manager Quality	**0.10**	1.5401	0.1251
Health Benefits	**0.10**	1.5298	0.1276
People Management	**0.03**	0.4694	0.6393
Environmental Responsibility	**0.00**	0.0137	0.9891
Retirement Benefits	**-0.01**	-0.0874	0.9304
Customer Reputation	**-0.02**	-0.3593	0.7197
Product Quality	**-0.02**	-0.3765	0.7069
Technology Level	**-0.03**	-0.4338	0.6649
Job Impact	**-0.19**	-2.9181	0.0039
Meritocracy	**-0.20**	-3.1177	0.0021
Recognition	**-0.23**	-3.5329	0.0005
Organisational Growth Rate	**-0.25**	-3.8064	0.0002
Organisational Stability	**-0.26**	-4.0181	0.0001
Market Position	**-0.27**	-4.1297	0.0001
Camaraderie	**-0.29**	-4.4898	0.0000
Senior Leadership Reputation	**-0.38**	-5.8106	0.0000

EVP Attribute	Standardised Means	t-value	p-value
Product Brand Awareness	**-0.38**	-5.8393	0.0000
Person-Organisation Fit	**-0.51**	-7.8821	0.0000
Industry	**-0.52**	-8.0120	0.0000

The Corporate Leadership Council (2006b)'s study derived a core EVP that organisations can use as the foundation for determining their own unique EVP. The core EVP, representing all major talent segments and geographies, comprises seven attributes that drive attraction and commitment, including compensation, stability, development opportunities, future career opportunities, respect, manager quality, and collegial work environment.

Rajha (2012) and Bhoola (2013) derived similar results in their respective studies. Rajha (2012) identified six attributes that constitute desired EVP attributes for South African MBA students, including compensation; job meaning, purpose and impact; future career opportunities; work-life balance; empowerment; and development opportunities. Bhoola (2013)'s findings resulted in compensation, development opportunities, future career opportunities, work-life balance, autonomy, innovation, and empowerment forming the seven core EVP attributes for Gen Y business students considering management consulting as a career.

Table 12: Comparison of Core Attributes illustrates the comparison and relationship between the core EVP attributes suggested by the Corporate Leadership Council (2006b), Rajha (2012), Bhoola (2013) and core EVP attributes desired by Gen Y hospitality students.

Table 12: Comparison of Core Attributes

Corporate Leadership Council – Core Attributes of an EVP	Rajha (2012) – Core Attributes of an EVP for MBA Students	Bhoola (2013) – Attributes of an EVP for Gen Y Business Students	Core Attributes Desired by Gen Y Hospitality Student
Compensation	Compensation	Compensation	Respect
Future Career Opportunities	Job Meaning, Purpose and Impact	Development Opportunities	Future Career Opportunities
Work-Life Balance	Future Career Opportunities	Future Career Opportunities	Compensation
Development Opportunities	Work-Life Balance	Work-Life Balance	Ethics
Organisational Stability	Empowerment	Autonomy	Development Opportunities
Manager Quality	Development Opportunities	Innovation	Empowerment
Respect		Empowerment	Co-Worker Quality

The section that follows discusses each of the significant attributes as identified by Gen Y hospitality students. In order to ensure completeness and to support thid discussions that follow, the main results of this research will be repeated in this section.

5.3.1 Respect

This study indicated that South African Gen Y hospitality students value respect the most in an EVP. The results of the survey distributed to Gen Y hospitality students, as indicated in Table 11, showed that respect was the most desired EVP attribute with a mean of 0.77. This attribute was 0.24 standard deviations away from the second desired EVP attribute, future career opportunities. Respect was considered as one of the top ten EVP attributes by 67% (141) of respondents. From the 141 respondents considering this to be an important attribute, 21% (29) ranked it as their most desired EVP attribute, 11% (16) as second, and 8% (11) as third. Of the overall

Gen Y hospitality group, 14% had ranked this as their top attribute and 26% ranked it within their top three attributes.

Respect, in the context of this study, refers to the degree of respect the organisation shows its employees (Corporate Leadership Council, 2006b).

Although respect as an EVP attribute does not reflect in the studies conducted by Rajha (2012) and Bhoola (2013), it is considered as an important, core attribute by the Corporate Leadership Council (2006b), ranking at number seven. It is therefore not surprising that respect is a core attribute, but its ranking as the most desired EVP attribute amongst Gen Y hospitality students is unexpected.

Differences in the findings of these studies may be attributed to the demographic profile and the nature of employment within the industries that these four studies are focussed on. The studies conducted by Rajha (2012) and Bhoola (2013) focused on MBA students and graduates, and business students respectively. These populations can be seen as white-collar workers, with some work experience in a corporate environment, and at least in the pursuit of a postgraduate degree. The Corporate Leadership Council (2006b) considered over 58000 respondents, from various demographic and educational backgrounds. This study considered only Gen Y hospitality students at least in their second or third year of study and these students typically have little to no work experience. The nature of work in the hospitality industry lends itself to a blue-collar environment with limited decision-making autonomy, underpinned by characteristics such as low-paying jobs; poor work conditions; labour intensive; and long, unsocial working hours (Barron et al., 2007; Kusluvan & Kusluvan, 2000).

A distinct disconnect between the nature of employment within the hotel industry and the perceptions and expectations that Gen Y has of employment within the hotel industry therefore concurs with Kusluvan and Kusluvan (2000)'s suggestion that a career in the hotel industry is not seen as a respected and prestigious career. It also strengthens the argument for respect to be considered an important EVP attribute.

Gen Y knows that they can make a contribution to and understands the impact and value that they can bring to any organisation (Codrington & Grant-Marshall, 2012; Spiro, 2006). They not only expect to be shown respect and want to know that they

exist (Dorsey, 2010; Solnet & Hood, 2008), but they also want to be involved with decision-making, take on responsibility and feel engaged at all times (Deloitte, 2009; Smith, 2010; Solnet & Hood, 2008; Spiro, 2006)

In a study conducted on respect in the workplace Henry (2011) suggests that respect in the workplace does not represent the same level of importance for everyone and it should be investigated in relation to demographic and geographic variance. Henry (2011) further implies that respect in the workplace directly relates to job satisfaction, trust in management and commitment. Similarly, Kusluvan, Kusluvan, Ilhan, and Buyruk (2010) note that respect has a direct impact on behaviours and attitudes such as job satisfaction, work motivation and empowerment. In addition, Kusluvan et al. (2010) suggest that respect is one EVP attribute that directly influences the quality of service provided by high performance service organisations, such as hotels.

Interestingly, the focus groups, comprising Gen Y hospitality students agree that respect should rank, if not first, in the top three desired EVP attributes. They are also of the opinion that in the near future, as full-time employees, their preference will change. They believe that the preference for respect changes depending on your level of employment and tenure within the industry.

In the context of a career in the hospitality industry, the focus groups defined respect as being valued as an individual; your inputs to be appreciated; and feeling like you are important and needed in the company. Hospitality students seek organisations that show interest in them, help them learn and make them feel comfortable and at home. These students noted there is a clear bias against them and they are generally disrespected as students in the workplace where most organisations see them as lazy. They found that, as a result of the misconception that students are going to take their jobs away from them, employees within these organisations are reluctant to train them. This behaviour in turn has a negative impact on the perception that Gen Y hospitality students have of the organisations' EVP, in that it reflects the level of respect that is shown to employees within these organisations. The assumption, that Gen Y does not respect other people and authority, is contested by Gen Y hospitality students in the focus group. For them respect is not a one-sided effort; if students work hard, the organisation shows them respect and with

this respect comes more responsibility. Being respected by the organisation is also an indication that the organisation will afford these students future career opportunities.

This notion corresponds with the literature that within the hospitality industry, employees are often undervalued (Barron et al., 2007; Cairncross & Buultjens, 2007; Kusluvan & Kusluvan, 2000) and treated poorly (Cairncross & Buultjens, 2007). Kusluvan et al. (2010) propose hospitality employees complain mostly about being undervalued, unappreciated, and not being recognised, respected and rewarded in line with their efforts. Kusluvan et al. (2010) further note that hospitality employees seek a level of respect that is far greater than employees of other industries. Earle (2003) suggests although Gen Y is averse to rules and hierarchy, this cohort longs for mentoring, community, recognition and structure and has the need to be treated like partners in the workplace. Birdsall (2012) notes disparity between the understanding of different generational cohorts in relation to respect. Boomer managers believe that respect should be earned (Birdsall, 2012) and Boomers seek respect from their co-workers (Greenwood, Gibson, & Murphy Jr, 2008). In contrast Gen Y has an attitude of arriving at work with a bank of respect (Birdsall, 2012). As a result of how they were raised, to think for themselves and follow their dreams, Gen Y does not believe that an organisational position demands respect and therefore does not have automatic respect for authority (Lindquist, 2008).

5.3.2 Future Career Opportunities

While respect is considered the most valuable attribute for Gen Y hospitality students in this study, future career opportunities ranked second with an attribute mean of 0.53. Future career opportunities was considered as one of the top ten desired EVP attributes by 52% (111) of the respondents. From the 111 respondents considering this to be an important attribute, 14% (15) ranked it as their second most desired attribute and of the overall Gen Y hospitality group, 18% ranked it within their top three attributes.

The results from this study confirms the findings of the studies conducted by the Corporate Leadership Council (2006b), Rajha (2012) and Bhoola (2013). Future career opportunities ranked second in the Corporate Leadership Council (2006b)

study and third in both Rajha (2012)'s and Bhoola (2013)'s studies. In addition, the Corporate Leadership Council (2006c) shows that organisations with a positive perception of future career opportunities and respect, outperforms organisations that showcase a positive perception of compensation EVPs.

Further studies, focusing specifically on Gen Y's career expectations within the hospitality industry, indicate that future career opportunities are considered important to Gen Y hospitality students. The literature suggests that Gen Y hospitality students are specifically looking for promotion opportunities and opportunities to move into managerial positions (Barron et al., 2007; Brown, 2011; Cairncross & Buultjens, 2007; Kawana-Brown, 2007; Richardson, 2009) and seek information about the future, not only in relation to their own progression but also the next steps for the company (Codrington & Grant-Marshall, 2012). Similarly, Deloitte (2009) indicates that Gen Y seeks chances for career opportunities over compensation and job security, and Dorsey (2010) identifies future career opportunities as a hot button that will instantly connect organisations with prospective Gen Y employees.

The respondents in the focus groups stated that they want to work for organisations that can prove a culture of promotion and movement within the company. Many have seen this in the organisations where they have been placed for practical work experience. Many have also seen the opposite being true, where no career opportunities were provided to hotels, which left a negative impression of a career in the industry. They clearly indicated that, as the "fast" generation, they want immediacy. They know where they want to be and often do not care how they get there. It is all about getting there right now. They related future career opportunities to the culture of progression fostered in hotel schools. The hotel school sets clear goal posts for students: in order to progress to the next year of study, a student has to complete and pass all their academic components as well as two practical components. This is a clear picture of climbing the educational ladder from first year to third year. Due to the practical experience built into the course, coupled with responsibilities given to students during their practical experience, most students believe that the next step on the ladder is a supervisory or management position when entering the workplace as a permanent employee for the first time. This illusion is not the view of all students. Although they want the best positions, they are also

realistic and see their first career opportunity as a foot in the door. They believe if they show the organisation that they are capable, the organisation will reward them with opportunities to progress.

Dries, Pepermans, and De Kerpel (2008) suggest a generational shift in beliefs about careers where the Silent generation desired long-term security and stability, the Boomers and Gen X are making the most of the present, and Gen Y is dreaming about a future career. Barron (2008) highlights hospitality employment as not being viewed as a career and presenting limited career advancement opportunities. This conflicts with the employment needs of Gen Y hospitality students that look at future career opportunities as a vital component of an EVP. Barron (2008) suggests that the attraction and retention of hospitality students into the hospitality industry is mediocre at best. He found that 50% of hospitality students seek a career outside of hospitality and their decision, made while studying, is based on the notion that students are unable to see hospitality as a long-term career. Furthermore, a major attribute of Gen Y is their lack of commitment. Their short-term outlook, in that they are not willing to work for years to see the results, indicates that even fewer hospitality students will enter the hospitality industry (Barron, 2008). In order to capitalise on the retention of skilled and educated graduates within the hotel industry, the organisation needs to ensure that clear career paths, succession planning and future career opportunities not only form part of its EVP, but are also visible to hospitality students and prospective employees.

Rajha (2012) states that future career opportunities and develop opportunities go hand in hand. Surprisingly, development opportunities did not rank closely with future career opportunities in this study. Development opportunities ranked as the fifth most important EVP attribute and were 0.11 standard deviations away from future career opportunities. The focus group indicated that Gen Y hospitality students, who just finished studying, is more concerned with getting a job in today's economic environment than with finding an organisation that will help them pursue development opportunities. For these students, future career opportunities and development opportunities are two separate concepts. Future career opportunities are the goal whereas development opportunities are ways of reaching the goal. Their focus is mainly on the goal and they assume the development will just happen.

5.3.3 Compensation

This research indicated that South African Gen Y hospitality students ranked compensation as their third, most desired EVP attribute, with an attribute mean of 0.45. Compensation was indicated as one of the top 10 attributes by 43% (91) of respondents. From the 91 respondents considering this to be an important attribute, 20% (18) ranked it within their top three attributes.

It is important to note the difference in ranking of compensation between this study and studies conducted by the Corporate Leadership Council (2006b), Rajha (2012), and (Bhoola, 2013). The Corporate Leadership Council (2006b) identified compensation as the most desirable EVP attribute in the global labour market. Rajha (2012)'s study on EVP attributes for South African Masters in Business Administration (MBA) students concluded that compensation holds the top ranking amongst Gen Y MBA students. Similarly, Bhoola (2013)'s study also found compensation as the most desirable attribute for attraction in an EVP for Gen Y students wishing to enter the management consulting industry. These differences can be linked to the differentiation between the white-collar and blue-collar industries that these respondents come from. While the Corporate Leadership Council (2006b) considered a varied demographic profile of respondents, Rajha (2012), and (Bhoola, 2013) surveyed mainly students with some work experience, who are pursuing business qualifications and perceived to be white-collar workers. This study focused on Gen Y hospitality students who, due to the nature of hospitality work, are considered blue-collar workers.

This study contradicts the notion that Gen Y students value compensation most. As discussed above, respect ranked as the most desired EVP attribute and future career opportunities as second most desired attribute. The results in this study show that South African Gen Y hospitality students rank compensation as the third highest valued attribute, with a drop of 2 places in the literature’s ranking. This can be attributed to the perception that Gen Y hospitality students have of a career in the industry. The focus group explained that the hospitality industry is a people’s industry and people decide on a career in the industry because they enjoy it. For these students, coached, mentored and prepared for what lies ahead, have no expectation of money when they embark on their career in hospitality. They are aware that

compensation in the industry, especially at the lower levels is less than desirable. At this stage of their careers experience counts more than compensation. They would rather work for an organisation that would spend time developing their futures. They also noted that although compensation is not a big driver at the moment, it is important, and at some point it should be ranked as the most desirable attribute. Another aspect that supports their opinion of compensation is the perceived pay off of working in the hospitality industry. They argue that incentives provided by the hotels, such as petrol allowances, food allowances, etc. outweigh low compensation. They also indicated that a career in the hospitality industry affords them the opportunity to travel around the world, the ability to work in any location and more career opportunities.

The literature shows that the perception of compensation in the hospitality industry is that the industry is made up of low-paying jobs, poor compensation (Barron et al., 2007; Kusluvan & Kusluvan, 2000). This notion supports the view of hospitality students that a career in hospitality is about passion for the service industry. With unemployment in South Africa at 24.1% in the last quarter in 2013 (Lehohla, 2014), the chances of young people finding jobs are slim (Monama, 2014). It is therefore not surprising that Gen Y hospitality students are more concerned with finding a job, rather than finding the best paying job.

5.3.4 Ethics


Ethics, reflecting the organisation's commitment to ethics and integrity, ranked fourth amongst Gen Y hospitality students in this study, with an attribute mean of 0.43. It is interesting to note that there is merely a 0.02 standard deviation between compensation and ethics in this study. Ethics is seen as a particular anomaly in this study as it, interestingly, has not appeared in any of the three previously mentioned studies by the Corporate Leadership Council (2006b), Rajha (2012), and Bhoola (2013), as part of core EVPs. Only 17% of the respondents from the Corporate Leadership Council (2006b) study rated ethics within their top five EVP attributes.

While the Corporate Leadership Council (2006b) defines ethics as the organisation's commitment to ethics and integrity, Dorsey (2010) suggests that Gen Y wants to see the ethics, values and principles of organisational leaders in a real situation. He

indicates ethics as a hot button that, if present, will instantly connect Gen Y with the organisation. Gen Y looks for companies with strong ethics and a compelling mission that coincides with their values (Dorsey, 2010). Furthermore, Gen Y is concerned about fairness, tolerance, equity and the environment (Broadbridge et al., 2007; Szamosi, 2006).

Feedback from the focus group suggested that Gen Y hospitality students want to work for an organisation that has a clearly defined set of ethics. Not only should they have these ethics, they should also respect and live their ethics. They want to be proud to say that they are working for an organisation that is ethical, honest and true to their values. The values that underpin the ethics of the organisation have to align with the values of these students. Students have experienced how unethical behaviour in the workplace environment impacted on work relationships and resulted in a divide amongst racial and gender groups in the organisation. In addition, ethics relates very closely to respect for these students. It is therefore interesting to note the dimensional composition of this study's core attributes as depicted in Figure 13: Dimensional Composition of Core EVP Attributes.

Figure 13 shows the seven core EVP attributes derived in this study in relation to the dimensions of EVP attributes as depicted by The Corporate Leadership Council (2006b). Together with respect and empowerment, ethics form part of the organisation dimension, which represents 43% of the dimensional composition of the core EVP attributes. It can be said that ethics, tying back to respect in the workplace, has a valid position in the top 7 core attributes of an EVP in the hospitality industry.



The Rewards	The Opportunities	The Organisation	The Work	The People
Compensation (3)	Future Career Opportunities (2)	Respect (1)		Co-Worker Quality (7)
	Development Opportunities (5)	Ethics (4)		
		Empowerment (6)		

Figure 13: Dimensional Composition of Core EVP Attributes

5.3.5 Development Opportunities

Development opportunities, defined as the developmental and educational opportunities provided by the job and organisation, ranked fifth amongst Gen Y hospitality students in this study, with an attribute mean of 0.42 and a standard deviation of 0.01 from ethics.

A common theme threads through research relating to EVPs in that employees in general seek development opportunities. While this study ranked development opportunities at fifth, the Corporate Leadership Council (2006b) ranked it as fourth, Rajha (2012) as sixth, and Bhoola (2013) as second. Remarkable to note is that future career opportunities and development opportunities in this study are not ranked together as in Bhoola (2013)'s and therefore presents another anomaly in this study.

As mentioned before, the focus group identified that Gen Y hospitality students have an unrealistic expectation of their first job in the industry. They believe that they are going to walk into an organisation as a manager, and therefore do not view development as very important right now. They do, however, understand that development is a long-term aspect of any career and it will come with time and experience. At the present moment, these students are more concerned about finding a job.

The literature indicates that Gen Y seeks constant feedback about their performance (Codrington & Grant-Marshall, 2012) and expects the organisation to show loyalty toward them in the form of professional development and training (Hershatter & Epstein, 2010; Spiro, 2006). Gen Y's constant interaction with technology has changed the way they think about development and, in order to remain marketable in the workplace, they constantly want to enhance their professional skill (Shaw & Fairhurst, 2008). Shaw and Fairhurst (2008) further suggest Gen Y seeks challenging and meaningful assignments, opportunities to learn and grow, and leadership programmes to facilitate development.

5.3.6 Empowerment

Empowerment ranked sixth amongst Gen Y hospitality students in this study, with an attribute mean of 0.40 and a standard deviation of 0.02 from development opportunities. This ranking is somewhat in line with Rajha's (2012) and Bhoola's (2013) studies, where empowerment ranked fifth and seventh respectively. The overall rating of empowerment in the study by The Corporate Leadership Council (2006b) indicated a lower desire for empowerment. Only 15% of their respondents rated empowerment in their top five attributes.

Empowerment is defined as the level of involvement employees have in decisions that affect their job and career. The literature clearly indicates that Gen y values empowerment in the workplace and they want to get involved in decision-making from a very early stage in their career (Codrington & Grant-Marshall, 2012; Deloitte, 2009; Dorsey, 2010; Smith, 2010; Spiro, 2006).

The high value that Gen Y places on empowerment is in contradiction with the perception that Gen Y hospitality students have of organisations within the hospitality industry. The focus group noted that although empowerment is important to them, it is poorly perceived in the industry. The industry is still seen as very autocratic with a firm hierarchical structure that does not always allow for employees, especially entry level employees, to be involved with decision-making. These students believe, like development, empowerment comes with time and experience. They are of the opinion that you first need to prove yourself in the workplace before the organisation will trust your input.

5.3.7 Co-Worker Quality

This study ranked co-worker quality as the seventh most desirable EVP attribute for Gen Y hospitality students. With an attribute mean of 0.13, co-worker quality is 0.27 standard deviations from empowerment, and 0.64 standard deviations from the most desirable EVP attribute, respect. The Corporate Leadership Council (2006b) indicated that only 9% of their respondents ranked co-worker quality in their top five attributes. It is also not surprising that co-worker quality did not feature in the studies conducted by Rajha (2012) and Bhoola (2013).

The nature of the hospitality industry mitigates the ranking of co-worker quality as a core EVP attribute. Feedback from the focus group indicated that these students see co-worker quality as a person having characteristics such as a good value system, work ethic and honesty. They are aware that they will be spending 80% of their time at work and they want to work with people they can trust. They want to work with people that have the same standard of work as they do; people who are going to meet the guests' needs and expectations with the same level of urgency that they do. It is easier to work with someone that has the same standards as you do, because you are not constantly picking up their slack. They want to work for an organisation that cultivates and maintains a good reputation as a high-calibre establishment. Gen Y hospitality students believe that co-worker quality should have a higher ranking.

5.3.8 Remaining attributes

Other attributes, including collegial work environment, job-interest alignment, manager quality, health benefits, people management, and environmental responsibility, were also considered as important EVP attributes by Gen Y hospitality students. These attributes were however not considered as important for this study. These attributes had p-values that did not indicate a probability of less than 5%. Retirement benefits, customer reputation and technology level were considered unimportant and insignificant to this study.

Job impact, meritocracy, recognition, organisational growth, organisational stability, market position, camaraderie, senior leadership reputation, product brand awareness, person-organisation fit and industry were the remaining attributes that indicated significance at the 0.05 level and these attributes had the lowest standardised means, ranging between -0.19 to -0.52. These attributes were considered significantly unimportant to Gen Y hospitality students due to the negative means and probabilities of less than 5%. For the purposes of this study, these attributes were also not considered as they indicated negative t-values. In addition, these attributes were not considered desirable, as none of the literature pertinently discusses these attributes as important to Gen Y or hospitality students.

This could present an opportunity for further research in terms of associating these attributes with other key attributes that have been discussed to form themes pertaining to EVP attributes, for example, exploring the relationship between meritocracy, future career opportunities and development opportunities.

5.4 Conclusion

This section has explored the quantitative findings derived from surveys presented to Gen Y hospitality students. In addition, similarities with and differences from the literature were identified and discussed.

In summary, this study identified respect as the most desired EVP attribute by Gen Y hospitality students. Numerous other core attributes that featured prominently include: future career opportunities, compensation, ethics, development

opportunities, empowerment and co-worker quality. To answer the research question categorically, the attributes considered as the core EVP for the hospitality industry by Gen Y hospitality students are shown in Table 13: Seven Core EVP Attributes by Gen Y Hospitality Students.

Table 13: Seven Core EVP Attributes by Gen Y Hospitality Students

Attributes
Respect
Future Career Opportunities
Compensation
Ethics
Development Opportunities
Empowerment
Co-Worker Quality

Organisations should consider the degree of importance of other attributes that were not seen as drivers for attraction in this study. Such attributes as meritocracy and recognition can be regarded as drivers for commitment and loyalty in the organisation once Gen Y graduates have joined the workforce.

6 CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Introduction

This study is concluded in this chapter with a summary of the key findings from South African Gen Y hospitality students relating to the significant attributes of an EVP for the hospitality industry. The findings of this study are followed by recommendation for hospitality organisations and hotel schools across South Africa. Recommendations are provided to hospitality organisations firstly to improve the attraction of hospitality students and graduates, secondly to improve the retention of these students within the hospitality industry, and thirdly to develop a competitive and strategic EVP. Recommendations, relating to the non-core EVP attributes discovered in this study, are made to hotel schools across South Africa. Understanding these attributes will allow schools to better understand and groom their students for workplace readiness. In conclusion, suggestions for further research are made based on the scope and findings of this research.

6.2 Conclusions of the study

A gap exists in the literature identifying the key drivers of attraction for South African Gen Y hospitality students. The results of this study presented seven EVP attributes that form the core of an EVP for the hospitality industry:

- Respect
- Future Career Opportunities
- Compensation
- Ethics
- Development Opportunities
- Empowerment
- Co-Worker Quality

Respect ranked as the most desired EVP attribute amongst Gen Y hospitality students. Although respect does appear in some of the literature, it was surprising to

find respect ranking in the position it did. It is important to understand the interpretation of respect in terms of the population and sample chosen. In this study, respect was viewed as an individual and his/her inputs being valued by the organisation, and feeling important and needed. The Gen Y cohort particularly places emphasis on respect in that they want their opinions to be heard and expect respect from the onset (Solnet & Hood, 2008).

While respect is considered the most desirable EVP attribute, Gen Y hospitality students are strongly drawn to a future within an organisation. In this study the attribute future career opportunities ranked in second place. Gen Y hospitality students confirmed that they have a strong preference to work for an organisation that shows the prospects of opportunities within the organisation. A reason for ranking this attribute within the top three attributes is related to this generation's fast-track mind-set, where a formal qualification drastically impacts their career development (Harper et al., 2005).

Previous studies conducted by the Corporate Leadership Council (2006b), Rajha (2012) and Bhoola (2013) indicated that compensation is the most important driver of attraction. Although Gen Y hospitality students consider compensation to be important, they are more concerned with finding jobs in today's economic environment than finding a job that will provide them with their desired compensation. There is no misconception amongst Gen Y hospitality students that the compensation within the industry is very poor, but they mitigate poor compensation with the incentives one receives and benefits of working in the industry.

Although ethics was considered an anomaly within this study, the literature (Dorsey, 2010) suggests Gen Y seeks companies with strong ethics and is concerned with fairness, tolerance and equity. They also want to see ethics, values and principles from organisation leaders. It became clear that Gen Y hospitality students regard ethics as closely related to respect in the workplace.

The Gen Y cohort places great value on professional development. Gen Y has very high expectations of their employers and seeks managers that are engaged in their professional development (Spiro, 2006). Their assumption that the work world offers

challenges and learning opportunities often leads to Gen Y assuming that the employer is not really interested in their presence in the workforce if the employer does not meet this expectation (Reynolds, 2005).

In order to keep Gen Y employees engaged in the workplace, it is important to allow them to take ownership and control of projects. Although empowerment is perceived poorly by Gen Y hospitality students, it is still considered a driver of attraction and commitment for Gen Y hospitality students.

Co-Worker quality did not appear in any of the previous studies by the Corporate Leadership Council (2006b), Rajha (2012) or Bhoola (2013) and also does not feature as a major driver of attraction or commitment in the literature. For Gen Y hospitality students, co-worker quality has a justified ranking in the core EVP attributes due to the long hours worked in the industry and time spent with co-workers. These students prefer working with people that share their work ethic and standard of service delivery. Team work is essential in the industry and students believe that it can only be a success if there is a level of trust amongst employees.

6.3 Recommendations

The research conducted aimed to identify EVP attributes desired by South African Gen Y hospitality students. This study identified that hospitality organisations and hotel schools alike can derive benefit from a study such as this, especially with the limited research within the South African context.

This research firstly serves as the foundation of developing an EVP within the hospitality industry that is specifically geared towards Gen Y hospitality students. This generational cohort represents a major presence in the workforce and is gradually increasing in size. It is important for hospitality organisations to understand the drivers that attract these students to the industry. Secondly, in considering the low retention rate of hospitality students in the industry, a well-defined, robust EVP is essential to support the commitment these students have to the hospitality industry.

This research also serves as the foundation for organisations to establish a competitive and strategic EVP within the hospitality industry. In order to develop a

competitive and strategic EVP for the South African Hospitality industry, the researcher suggests the following steps be followed by hospitality organisations:

- Identify competitive opportunities within the hotel industry by identifying attributes that represent the organisation's current strengths, attributes that are not currently well-delivered by competitors and attributes that are not currently actively promoted by competitors
- Assess strategic alignment by identifying attributes that best support the organisation's strategic objectives and attributes that have the lowest HR investment
- Define a competitive EVP

In the current workplace environment, where four generations are hosted under one roof, it is advised that organisations establish desired EVP attributes for each of these generations and define an EVP that best matches the composition of the current workforce. It is also advised that the organisation revise their EVP on a regular basis in order to reflect changes in the workforce composition.

Non-core attributes presented in this study, while not significant at this stage, will be useful in informing the education, grooming and workplace readiness of Gen Y hospitality students. These findings and recommendations are important for hospitality organisations in that they illustrate what the future workforce considers as important drivers of attraction. It is also important for hotel schools across South Africa as it will assist these schools to produce greater employability amongst Gen Y hospitality students.

- Due to the importance of, and emphasis on, teamwork within the hotel industry, a collegial work environment is considered as important but not significant, ranking 8th in this study. A collegial work environment is closely related and perhaps impacted by co-worker quality within the hospitality industry.
- Job-interest alignment is considered as an important attribute perhaps because of the notion that a career in hospitality is chosen for the love of it. People that excel in the industry have a genuine passion for the service industry and this mitigates job-interest alignment as an important attribute.

- Manager quality and people management, although not significant, links to respect and is considered important, possibly due to the emphasis Gen Y places on learning from their superiors. This generation trusts and looks up to their superiors and is keen to learn from their superiors.

6.4 Suggestions for further research

This research focussed on identifying desired EVP attributes by Gen Y hospitality students in South Africa, with the aim of assisting hospitality organisations with the attraction of critical talent. Hotel schools can also benefit from the study in that it would assist schools to groom and prepare students for workplace readiness within the hospitality industry.

This study did not consider the desired EVP attributes by male and female Gen Y hospitality students respectively. It would be interesting to establish whether a difference exists between the desired EVP attributes by female Gen Y hospitality students and male Gen Y hospitality students. In addition, it is necessary to evaluate the desired EVP attributes of hospitality graduates that have been in the industry and workplace for 1 – 2 years after graduation.

It is important to consider the demographic profile of employees at each hospitality organisation. The hospitality workforce currently comprise four, very different generational cohorts (Dorsey, 2010; Macon & Artley, 2009). Research is required to determine the desired EVP attributes of employees, with at least 2 years permanent employment and experience within the hospitality industry.

The Corporate Leadership Council (2006b) suggests the importance of identifying EVP attributes that drive not only the attraction of new talent, but also commitment of employees within an organisation. Research is required to assess the correlation between attraction and commitment drivers in the hospitality industry.

Furthermore, research is required to establish the perception that hospitality organisations have of EVP attributes desired by students, graduates and employees. This will allow for a comparison between attributes desired by employees versus

how well the organisation's perception of its EVP matches with the desires of employees.

In summary, the following research questions can be considered for future research:

- What is the relationship between the core attributes of hospitality students and graduates with work experience?
- What are the most desirable EVP characteristics for employees in the hotel industry in South Africa?
- What is the relationship between attraction and commitment drivers within the hospitality industry?
- What is the correlation between desired EVP attributes by employees and the EVP offering by the organisation?

REFERENCES

Aziri, B. (2011). Job Satisfaction: A Literature Review. *Management Research and Practice, 3*(4), 77-88.

Backhaus, K., & Tikoo, S. (2004). Conceptualizing and researching employer branding. *Career development international, 9*(5), 501-517.

Barron, P. (2008). Education and talent management: implications for the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 20*(7), 730-742.

Barron, P., Maxwell, G., Broadbridge, A., & Ogden, S. (2007). Careers in hospitality management: Generation Y's experiences and perceptions. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 14*(2), 119-128.

Berthon, P., Ewing, M., & Hah, L. L. (2005). Captivating company: dimensions of attractiveness in employer branding. *International journal of advertising, 24*(2), 151-172.

Bhoola, K. (2013). *Attributes that Generation Y business students desire in an employee value proposition in management consulting in South Africa.* (Masters in Business Administration), University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Birdsall, R. (2012). Are You a Boomer? Understanding Gen X and Y is a challenge. *Alaska Business Monthly, 28*(1), 33-33.

Broadbridge, A. M., Maxwell, G. A., & Ogden, S. M. (2007). Students' views of retail employment–key findings from Generation Ys. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management, 35*(12), 982-992.

Brown, E. A. (2011). *Hospitality management graduates' perceptions of career factor importance and career factor experience and the relation with turnover intentions.* (Doctor of Philosophy), Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. Retrieved from http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3005&context=etd

Browne, J., & Green, J. (2005). Measurement in the social sciences. In J. Green & J. Browne (Eds.), *Principles of Social Research*. United Kingdom: Open University Press.

Cairncross, G., & Buultjens, J. (2007). Generation Y and work in the tourism and hospitality industry: problem? What problem? In P. Benckendorff, G. Moscardo & D. Pendegrast (Eds.), *Tourism and Generation Y* (pp. 143-154). United Kingdom: CAB International.

CATHSSETA. (2012). *Chamber Guide - Hospitality*. Retrieved from www.cathsseta.org.za/wp.../04/hospitality-chamber-booklet-print1.pdf.

Chacko, H. E., Williams, K., & Schaffer, J. (2012). A Conceptual framework for Attracting Generation Y to the Hotel Industry Using a Seamless Hotel Organizational Structure. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism, 11*(2), 106-122. doi: 10.1080/15332845.2012.648843

Chambers, E. G., Foulon, M., Handfield-Jones, H., Hankin, S. M., & Michaels, E. G. (1998). The war for talent. *McKinsey Quarterly*, 44-57.

Codrington, G. T., & Grant-Marshall, S. (2004). *Mind the Gap*. Rosebank: Penguin Books.

Codrington, G. T., & Grant-Marshall, S. (2012). *Mind the Gap: Own your past, know your generation, choose your future*: SA Penguin.

Corporate Leadership Council. (2006a). *Attracting and retaining critical talent segments*: Corporate Leadership Council.

Corporate Leadership Council. (2006b). Attracting and Retaining Critical Talent Segments: Building a Competitve Employee Value Proposition. No. CLC16CP2ID.

Corporate Leadership Council. (2006c). Attracting and Retaining Critical Talent Segments: Identifying Drivers of Attraction and Commitment in the Global Labor Market. No. CLC16H7961.

Cresswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Davidson, M. C., McPhail, R., & Barry, S. (2011). Hospitality HRM: past, present and the future. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 23*(4), 498-516.

Deloitte. (2009). Generation Y: Powerhouse of the Global Economy. Retrieved April, 27, 2013, from www.deliotte.com/view/en_US/us/Services/consulting/human-capital/organisation-and-talent/a90f49642dff0210VgnVCM100000ba42f00aRCRD.htm

Dorobanţu, M. R., & Nistoreanu, P. (2012). Hospitality: A Component of Romanian Rural Tourism Products. *Cactus Tourism Journal, 3*(2), 17-23.

Dorsey, J. R. (2010). *Y-Size Your Business: How gen Y employees can save you money and grow your business.* Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wliey & Sons Inc.

Dries, N., Pepermans, R., & De Kerpel, E. (2008). Exploring four generations' beliefs about career: Is “satisfied” the new “successful”? *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 23*(8), 907-928.

Earle, H. A. (2003). Building a workplace of choice: Using the work environment to attract and retain top talent. *Journal of Facilities Management, 2*(3), 244-257.

Edwards, M. R. (2009). An integrative review of employer branding and OB theory. *Personnel Review, 39*(1), 5-23.

Erickson, T. J. (2008). *Plugged in: the generation Y guide to thriving at work.* . Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business Press.

Fink, A. (2003). *The Survey Handbook* (2nd ed.). United States of America: Sage Publications, Inc.

Franz, N. K. (2011). The Unfocused Focus Group: Benefit or Bane? *Qualitative Report, 16*(5), 1380-1388.

Gilburg, D. (2008). They're Gen Y And You're Not. *CIO, 21*(8), 40-43.

Greenwood, R. A., Gibson, J. W., & Murphy Jr, E. F. (2008). An investigation of generational values in the workplace: Divergence, convergence, and implications for leadership. *ESSAY FROM THE FIELD*, 57.

Gursoy, D., Maier, T. A., & Chi, C. G. (2008). Generational differences: An examination of work values and generational gaps in the hospitality workforce. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 27*(3), 448-458.

Guthridge, M., & Emily, L. (2008). Divide and survive, Editorial, *People Management,* p. 40. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=f5h&AN=34487731&site=ehost-live

Guthridge, M., Komm, A. B., & Lawson, E. (2008). Making talent a strategic priority. *McKinsey Quarterly, 1*, 48-53.

Halse, M., & Mallinson, B. (2009). Investigating popular Internet applications as supporting e-learning technologies for teaching and learning with Generation Y. *International Journal of Education and Development using ICT, 5*(5).

Harikumar, N. (2012). Employee value Proposition - The Fundamentals. Retrieved April 1, 2013 http://www.shrmindia.org/hr-buzz/blogs/shrm-india/employee-value-proposition-%E2%80%93-fundamentals

Harper, S., Brown, C., & Irvine, W. (2005). Qualifications: a fast-track to hotel general manager?. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 17*(1), 51-64.

Henry, P. (2011). The Role of Group-Based Status in Job Satisfaction: Workplace Respect Matters More for the Stigmatized. *Social Justice Research, 24*(3), 231-238. doi: 10.1007/s11211-011-0138-3

Hershatter, A., & Epstein, M. (2010). Millennials and the world of work: An organization and management perspective. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 25*(2), 211-223.

Hill, B., & Tande, C. (2006). Total rewards: The employment value proposition. *Workspan*, 19-22.

International Labour Organization. (2010). Developments and challenges in the hospitality and tourism sector: Issues paper for discussion at the Global Dialogue Forum

for the Hotels, Catering, Tourism Sector (23–24 November 2010). Geneva: International Labour Organization.

Johnson, J. A., & Lopes, J. (2008). The Intergenerational Workforce, Revisited. *Organization Development Journal, 26*(1).

Josiam, B. M., Reynolds, J. S., Thozhur, S., Crutsinger, C., Baum, T., & Devine, F. G. (2008). Attitudes to work of generation Y students in hospitality management: A comparative analysis of students in the United States and the United Kingdom. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research, 11*(3), 295-314. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15378020802317016

Kalof, L., Dan, A., & Dietz, T. (2008). *Essentials of Social Research*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Kandasamy, I., & Ancheri, S. (2009). Hotel employees' expectations of QWL: A qualitative study. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 28*(3), 328-337. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.11.2003

Kawana-Brown, E. (2007). What do Y expect and why should we care? Generation Y's experience of industry placement. *Orion Journal of International Hotel Management*(2), 48-56.

Keller, S. (2010, 2010). Problem & Preference Ranking. Retrieved 06 February 2014, from http://www.sswm.info/category/planning-process-tools/decision-making/decision-making-tools/situation-and-problem-analys-2

Kitchenham, B., & Pfleeger, S. (2008). Personal Opinion Surveys. In F. Shull, J. Singer & D. K. Sjøberg (Eds.), *Guide to Advanced Empirical Software Engineering* (pp. 63-92): Springer London.

Kitzinger, J. (1995). Qualitative research. Introducing focus groups. *BMJ: British medical journal, 311*(7000), 299.

Kusluvan, S., & Kusluvan, Z. (2000). Perceptions and attitudes of undergraduate tourism students towards working in the tourism industry in Turkey. *Tourism Management, 21*, 251-269.

Kusluvan, S., Kusluvan, Z., Ilhan, I., & Buyruk, L. (2010). The Human Dimension A Review of Human Resources Management Issues in the Tourism and Hospitality Industry. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 51*(2), 171-214.

Lau, F. (2009). The Power of Employment Value Proposition: A Solution to Attract and Retain Talent in a Highly Competitive Labour Market. *A Manpower Whitepaper*: Manpower Service.

Lee, Y. K., Nam, J. H., Park, D. H., & Lee, K. A. (2006). What factors influence customer-oriented prosocial behavior of customer-contact employees? *Journal of Services Marketing, 20*(4), 251-264.

Lehohla, P. (2012). Standard Industrial Classification of all Economic Activities (7th ed.): Statistics South Africa.

Lehohla, P. (2014). *Quarterly Labour Force Survey, Quarter 4 2013*. Pretoria.

Lindquist, T. M. (2008). Recruiting the millennium generation: the new CPA. *The CPA Journal, 78*(8), 56-59.

Luscombe, J., Lewis, I., & Biggs, H. C. (2013). Essential elements for recruitment and retention: Generation Y. . *Education + Training, 55*(3), 272-290.

Macon, M., & Artley, J. B. (2009). Can't we all just get along? a review of the challenges and opportunities in a multigenerational workforce. *International Journal of Business Research, 9*(6).

Magnini, V., & Uysal, M. (2011). Customer service: Where the frontline is key to the bottom line. *Pamplin College of Business Magazine*.

Manson, E. (2012). Responsible Hospitlaity - The Power of Your People. Retrieved May 8, 2013 http://www.catererandhotelkeeper.co.uk/articles/14/06/2012344048/Responsible-Hospitality-The-power-of-your-people.htm

McKinsey & Co. (2001). The War for Talent: Organization and Leadership Practice. *McKinsey Quarterly, April, 2001*.

Minchington, B. (2013). Understand Your EVP. *HR Future,* 14-15.

Monama, T. (2014, 12 February). Unskilled youth hit hard by job scarcity, *Business Report*.

Nueman, W. L. (1997). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (3rd ed.). Wisconsin: Allyn and Bacon.

Pendergast, D. (2009). Generational Theory and Home Economics1: Future Proofing the Profession. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 37*(4), 504-522.

Pendergast, D. (2010). Getting to Know the Y Generation. In P. Benckendorff, G. Moscardo & D. Pendegrast (Eds.), *Tourism and Generation Y* (pp. 1-15). United Kingdom: CAB International.

Pienaar, J., & Willemse, S. A. (2008). Burnout, engagement, coping and general health of service employees in the hospitality industry. *Tourism Management, 29*(6), 1053-1063. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2008.01.006

Price Waterhouse Cooper. (2012). Unpacking Hospitality Trends. *South African Hospitality Outlook: 2012 - 2016* (2nd Annual Edition).

Qualtrics, L. (2014). Qualtrics (Version 54548). Provo, Utah, USA. Retrieved from http://www.qualtrics.com

Rajha, Y. (2012). *Attributes of the Employee Value Proposition for South African MBA students. .* (Masters in Business Adminstration), University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Reisenwitz, T. H., & Iyer, R. (2009). Differences in Generation X and Generation Y: Implications for the organization and marketers. *Marketing Management Journal, 19*(2), 91-103.

Reynolds, L. A. (2005). Communicating total rewards to the generations. *Benefits Quarterly, 21*(2).

Richardson, S. (2009). Undergraduates' perceptions of tourism and hospitality as a career choice. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 28*(3), 382-388.

Richardson, S. (2010). Generation Y's perceptions and attitudes towards a career in tourism and hospitality. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism, 9*(2), 179-199. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15332840903383855

Robyn, A. M. (2012). *Intention to quit amongst Generation Y academics at Higher Education Institutions.* Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University.

Sagoe, D. (2012). Precincts and Prospects in the Use of Focus Groups in Social and Behavioral Science Research. *Qualitative Report, 17*.

Scott, M., Swortzel, K. A., & Taylor, W. N. (2005). The relationships between selected demographic factors and the level of job satisfaction of extension agents. *Journal of Southern Agricultural Education Research, 55*(1), 102-115.

Shaw, S., & Fairhurst, D. (2008). Engaging a new generation of graduates. *Education+ Training, 50*(5), 366-378.

Smith, C. (2010). "Black to the Future" - South Africa's Gen Y. Retrieved May 1, 2013 www.tomorrowtoday.co.za/2010/03/02/"black-to-the-future"-south-africa's-gen-y/

Solnet, D., & Hood, A. (2008). Generation Y as Hospitality Employees: Framing a Research Agenda. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 15*, 59-68.

Solnet, D., Hood, A., & Barron, P. (2008). *Yet Another Challende for Hospitality Managers - Generation Y: A Literature Review and Future Research Agenda.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of 2008 International CHRIE Conference.

Sorin, B., & Mihaela, S. C. (2011). The profit target in a restauration unit. *Annals of the University of Oradea, Economic Science Series, 20*(2), 477-483.

Sparks, B., & Bradley, G. (1994). Understanding attituudes towards graduates: a marketing perspective. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 13*(3), 233 - 245.

Spiro, C. (2006). Generation Y in the Workplace. *Defense AT&l, 16*, 19.

Squires, M. (2008). Technology changes lodging workforce. *Lodging Hospitality, 64*(16), 89-94.

Stacey, A. G. (2006). Estimating the Means and Standard Deviations of Rank Ordered Survey Items. *Management Dynamics, 15*(3), 26-35.

Statistics South Africa. (2011). *Mid-year population estimates*. (P0302). Pretoria, South Africa: Statistics South Africa.

Szamosi, L. T. (2006). Just what are tomorrow's SME employees looking for? *Education+ Training, 48*(8/9), 654-665.

Tajuddin, D., & Saufi, R. A. (2012). *A preliminary study of the validity of talent management practices, talent brand strategy and employee value proposition in the Malaysian banking industry*. Paper presented at the 3rd International Conference on Business and Economic Research (3rd ICBER 2013) Proceeding, Golden Flower Hotel, Bandung, Indonesia.

Tjan, A. K. (2012). Listen to Your Frontline Employees. Retrieved from http://blogs.hbr.org/2012/04/listen-to-your-frontline-emplo/

Trochim, W. M. K. (2006). The T-Test. *The Research Methods Knowledge Base.* Retrieved 22 March 2014, from http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/stat_t.php

Tsai, M.-C., Cheng, C.-C., & Chang, Y.-Y. (2010). Drivers of hospitality industry employees' job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job performance. *Afr. J. Bus. Manage, 4*(18), 4118-4134.

Van Der Walt, S., & Du Plessis, T. (2010). Leveraging multi-generational workforce values in interactive information societies. *SA Journal of Information Management, 12*(1), 7 pages. doi: 10.4102/sajim.v12i1.441

Watson, S. (2008). Where are we now? A review of management development issues in the hospitality and tourism sector: implications for talent management. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 20*(7), 758-780.

Weisstein, E. W. (2014a). "P-Value" From MathWorld - A Wolfram Web Resource. . Retrieved 23 March, 2014, from http://mathworld.wolfram.com/P-Value.html

Weisstein, E. W. (2014b). "Paired t-Test" from MathWorld - A Wolfram Web Resource. Retrieved 22 March 2014, from http://mathworld.wolfram.com/Pairedt-Test.html

World Travel & Tourism Council. (2012). Benchmarking Travel & Tourism in South Africa: How does Travel & Tourism compare to other sectors?. *Summary of Findings, April 2012*.

APPENDIX A

Letter to the panel of experts

Good day Sir/Madam,

Thank you for agreeing to contribute to this research study. The survey should not take longer than 20 minutes. Your contributions will be anonymous; neither your name nor your company name will be linked to any statements or comments made.

The research aims to identify a comprehensive list of attributes, comprising an appealing Employee Value Proposition, that are preferred by Generation Y hospitality students. This will be achieved by drawing on your experiences, specifically in the areas of talent and human capital management, employee value proposition and human resource best practices. For the purpose of this research, an employee value proposition is defined as "a set of attributes that the labour market and employees perceive as the value they gain through employment in the organisation" (Corporate Leadership Corporate Leadership Council, 2006c)

Please feel free to raise any new or different attributes which you feel are applicable to you as this is an important part of the research. Please, also bear in mind that it is important to focus on how things actually happen in your environment, even if this may be different from formal company guidelines.

I would like to note that the information provided in the survey will be in the public domain once the research report is completed; however, your name will not be linked to any information shared in the survey.

Instructions:

Please review the list of employee value proposition attributes below in context of the Hospitality Industry. Mark the applicable attributes with a √ and attributes that are not relevant with an X. The list also allows for additions of attributes that are not mentioned on the list.

Comprehensive list of attributes

Please insert a mark in the **Choice** column to indicate your selection based on the legend below:

Legend:

Description	Mark
Applicable	√
Not Applicable	X
New – additional attributes not included in the current list must be written in at the bottom of the list. Please include the attribute name and definition.	N

Attribute Name	Definition	Choice
Business Travel	The amount of out-of-town business travel required by the job	
Camaraderie	Whether working for the organisation provides opportunities to socialise with other employees	
Collegial Work Environment	Whether the work environment is team-oriented and collaborative	
Compensation	The competitiveness of the job's financial compensation package including base salary, incentives, cash recognition, premium pay, ownership and the pay process as other forms of compensation.	
Co-worker Quality	The quality of the co-workers in the organisation	
Customer Reputation	The reputation of the clients and customers served in performing the job	

Development Opportunities	The developmental/educational opportunities provided by the job and organisation
Diversity	The organisation's level of commitment to having a diverse workforce
Empowerment	The level of involvement employees have in decisions that affect their job and career
Environmental Responsibility	The organisation's level of commitment to environmental health and sustainability
Ethics	The organisation's commitment to ethics and integrity
Formal/Informal Work Environment	Whether the work environment is formal or informal
Future Career Opportunities	The future career opportunities provided by organisation
"Great Employer" Recognition	Whether or not the organisation's reputation as an employer has been recognised by a third-party organisation
Health Benefits	The comprehensiveness of the organisation's health benefits
Industry	The desirability of the organisation's industry to the respondent
Innovation	The opportunity provided by the job to work on innovative, "leading edge" projects
Job–Interests Alignment	Whether the job responsibilities match your interests
Job Impact	The level of impact the job has on outcomes
Location	The geographic location of the job that the organisation is offering

Manager Quality	The quality of the organisation's managers
Market Position	The competitive position the organisation holds in its market(s)
Meritocracy	Whether or not employees are rewarded and promoted based on their achievements
Organisational Growth Rate	The growth rate of the organisation's business
Organisation Size	The size of the organisation's workforce
Organisational Stability	The level of stability of the organisation and the job
People Management	The organisation's reputation for managing people
Person-organisation fit	Personal values are align with the values of the organisation to identify a fit
Product Brand Awareness	The level of awareness in the market place for the products brand
Product Quality	The organisation's product or service quality reputation
Recognition	The amount of recognition provided to employees by the organisation
Respect	The degree of respect that the organisation shows employees
Retirement Benefits	The comprehensiveness of the organisation's retirement benefits
Risk Taking	The amount of risk that the organisation encourages employees to take
Senior Leadership Reputation	The quality of the organisation's senior leadership

Social Responsibility	The organisation's level of commitment to social responsibility (e.g., community service, philanthropy)
Technology Level	The extent to which the organization invests in modern technology and equipment
Vacation	The amount of holiday/vacation time that employees earn annually
Work–Life Balance	The extent to which the job allows you to balance your work and your other interests
<<Add new attributes here>>	
<<Add new attributes here>>	
<<Add new attributes here>>	

APPENDIX B

Validated list of EVP attributes

Table 14: Validated List of EVP attributes

Attribute Name	Definition
Camaraderie	Whether working for the organisation provides opportunities to socialise with other employees
Collegial Work Environment	Whether the work environment is team-oriented and collaborative
Compensation	The competitiveness of the job's financial compensation package including base salary, incentives, cash recognition, premium pay, ownership and the pay process as other forms of compensation.
Co-worker Quality	The quality of the co-workers in the organisation
Customer Reputation	The reputation of the clients and customers served in performing the job
Development Opportunities	The developmental/educational opportunities provided by the job and organisation
Empowerment	The level of involvement employees have in decisions that affect their job and career
Environmental Responsibility	The organisation's level of commitment to environmental health and sustainability
Ethics	The organisation's commitment to ethics and integrity
Future Career	The future career opportunities provided by organisation

Opportunities	
Health Benefits	The comprehensiveness of the organisation's health benefits
Industry	The desirability of the organisation's industry to the respondent
Job Impact	The level of impact the job has on outcomes
Job–Interests Alignment	Whether the job responsibilities match your interests
Manager Quality	The quality of the organisation's managers
Market Position	The competitive position the organisation holds in its market(s)
Meritocracy	Whether or not employees are rewarded and promoted based on their achievements
Organisational Growth Rate	The growth rate of the organisation's business
Organisational Stability	The level of stability of the organisation and the job
People Management	The organisation's reputation for managing people
Person-organisation fit	Personal values are align with the values of the organisation to identify a fit
Product Brand Awareness	The level of awareness in the market place for the products brand
Product Quality	The organisation's product or service quality reputation
Recognition	The amount of recognition provided to employees by the organisation

Respect	The degree of respect that the organisation shows employees
Retirement Benefits	The comprehensiveness of the organisation's retirement benefits
Senior Leadership Reputation	The quality of the organisation's senior leadership
Technology Level	The extent to which the organization invests in modern technology and equipment

APPENDIX C

Employee Value Proposition Survey provided to Gen Y Hospitality Students

Dear student,

I am currently conducting research in completion of a Master in Business Administration Degree. I would greatly appreciate your assistance in completing the survey below as part of the pilot study of my research. Please take a moment to complete this survey of 8 questions which aims to identify attributes of an employee value proposition (EVP) that generation Y hospitality students find appealing. For the purpose of this survey, an employee value propositions is defined as a "set of attributes that the labour market and employees perceive as the value they gain through employment in the organisation". The survey will take about 5 minutes to complete. There are no risks relative to participate in this study and participation is voluntary. You may withdraw from the study at any time for any reason. Confidentiality will be observed throughout the entire process and surveys will be concealed. No one other that the primary researcher (Carla Rossouw) and my supervisor (Mr Conrad Viedge, Senior Lecturer and Head of MBA at Wits Business School) will have access to it. The data collected will be stored in the HIPPA-compliant Qualtrics (2014) secure database until it has been deleted by the primary researcher. As your time is valuable, I would like to thank you in advance for participating in this research. If you have any questions regarding your rights as research participants or want to provide any feedback, please feel free to contact the primary researcher, Carla Rossouw directly on carla.rossouw@gmail.com.

○ Accept

○ Cancel

What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

What is your current age?

- 16 - 23
- 24 - 29
- 30 - 35
- 36 and older

Which hotel school are you currently attending?

- The International
- The Swiss Hotel School
- The Private Hotel School
- Other (Please specify):

***** Which campus are you currently studying at?**

- Sandton
- Durban
- Cape Town

What year of study are you currently in?

○ 1st Year

○ 2nd Year

○ 3rd Year

Instructions for completing this question:

The list provided below represents possible attributes of an employee value proposition. Please select 10 attributes that you believe is important for an employee value proposition.

	Attribute and Definition
☐	Camaraderie - Whether working for the organisation provides opportunities to socialise with other employees
☐	Collegial Work Environment - Whether the work environment is team-oriented and collaborative
☐	Compensation - The competitiveness of the job's financial compensation package including base salary, incentives, cash recognition, premium pay, ownership and the pay process as other forms of compensation.
☐	Co-Worker quality - The quality of the co-workers in the organisation
☐	Customer Reputation - The reputation of the clients and customers served in performing the job
☐	Development Opportunities - The developmental/educational opportunities provided by the job and organisation
☐	Empowerment - The level of involvement employees have in decisions that affect their job and career

☐	Environmental Responsibility - The organisation's level of commitment to environmental health and sustainability
☐	Ethics - The organisation's commitment to ethics and integrity
☐	Future Career Opportunities - The future career opportunities provided by organisation
☐	Health Benefits - The comprehensiveness of the organisation's health benefits
☐	Industry - The desirability of the organisation's industry to the respondent
☐	Job-Interests Alignment - Whether the job responsibilities match your interests
☐	Job Impact - The level of impact the job has on outcomes
☐	Manager Quality - The quality of the organisation's managers
☐	Market Position - The competitive position the organisation holds in its market(s)
☐	Meritocracy - Whether or not employees are rewarded and promoted based on their achievements
☐	Organisational Growth Rate - The growth rate of the organisation's business
☐	Organisational Stability - The level of stability of the organisation and the job
☐	People Management - The organisation's reputation for managing people
☐	Person-Organisation Fit - Personal values are align with the values of the organisation to identify a fit
☐	Product Brand Awareness - The level of awareness in the market place for the products brand
☐	Product Quality - The organisation's product or service quality reputation

☐	Recognition - The amount of recognition provided to employees by the organisation
☐	Respect - The degree of respect that the organisation shows employees
☐	Retirement Benefits - The comprehensiveness of the organisation's retirement benefits
☐	Senior Leadership Reputation - The quality of the organisation's senior leadership
☐	Technology Level - The extent to which the organization invests in modern technology and equipment

Instructions for completing this question:

Please rank your preferred employee value proposition attributes so that it reflects a ranking between 1 and 10 with (1) being your most preferred and (10) being your least preferred attribute. In order to rank the attributes, drag and drop each attribute in the relevant order. You will note that as you move the attributes up and down in the required sequence, the ranking is automatically adjusted.

» Camaraderie - Whether working for the organisation provides opportunities to socialise with other employees

» Collegial Work Environment - Whether the work environment is team-oriented and collaborative

» Compensation - The competitiveness of the job's financial compensation package including base salary, incentives, cash recognition, premium pay, ownership and the pay process as other forms of compensation.

» Co-Worker quality - The quality of the co-workers in the organisation

» Customer Reputation - The reputation of the clients and customers served in performing the job

» Development Opportunities - The developmental/educational opportunities provided by the job and organisation

» Empowerment - The level of involvement employees have in decisions that affect their job and career

» Environmental Responsibility - The organisation's level of commitment to environmental health and sustainability

» Ethics - The organisation's commitment to ethics and integrity

» Future Career Opportunities - The future career opportunities provided by organisation

» Health Benefits - The comprehensiveness of the organisation's health benefits

» Industry - The desirability of the organisation's industry to the respondent

» Job-Interests Alignment - Whether the job responsibilities match your interests

» Job Impact - The level of impact the job has on outcomes

» Manager Quality - The quality of the organisation's managers

» Market Position - The competitive position the organisation holds in its market(s)

» Meritocracy - Whether or not employees are rewarded and promoted based on their achievements

» Organisational Growth Rate - The growth rate of the organisation's business

» Organisational Stability - The level of stability of the organisation and the job

» People Management - The organisation's reputation for managing people

» Person-Organisation Fit - Personal values are align with the values of the organisation to identify a fit

» Product Brand Awareness - The level of awareness in the market place for the products brand

» Product Quality - The organisation’s product or service quality reputation

» Recognition - The amount of recognition provided to employees by the organisation

» Respect - The degree of respect that the organisation shows employees

» Retirement Benefits - The comprehensiveness of the organisation’s retirement benefits

» Senior Leadership Reputation - The quality of the organisation’s senior leadership

» Technology Level - The extent to which the organization invests in modern technology and equipment

APPENDIX D

Consistency matrix

Table 15: Consistency Matrix

The main problem of the proposed research is to investigate attributes that Generation Y hospitality students are looking for in a desirable Employee Value Proposition					
Topic	**Literature Review**	**Hypotheses or Propositions or Research questions**	**Source of data**	**Type of data**	**Analysis**
Employee Value Proposition	(Backhaus & Tikoo, 2004; Barron, 2008; Berthon et al., 2005; Chambers et al., 1998; Corporate Leadership Council, 2006a, 2006b, 2006c; Edwards, 2009; Harikumar, 2012; Hill & Tande, 2006; Lau, 2009; McKinsey & Co, 2001; Minchington, 2013; Tajuddin & Saufi, 2012)	What are the most desirable EVP characteristics for hospitality students in the hotel industry in South Africa?	The Corporate Leadership Council's list of 38 attributes of an EVP will be used as a survey for the panel of experts for validation.	Ordinal	
Generation Y	(Codrington & Grant-Marshall, 2004, 2012; Dorsey, 2010; Halse & Mallinson, 2009; Manson, 2012; Pienaar & Willemse, 2008; Price Waterhouse Cooper, 2012; Smith, 2010; Solnet & Hood, 2008; Solnet et al., 2008; Sparks & Bradley, 1994; Van Der Walt & Du Plessis, 2010; World Travel & Tourism Council, 2012)		The consolidated and refined list of attributes, obtained from the panel of experts, will be used as a survey to obtain information regarding attributes desired in an EVP for the hospitality industry	Ordinal	

The main problem of the proposed research is to investigate attributes that Generation Y hospitality students are looking for in a desirable Employee Value Proposition					
Topic	**Literature Review**	**Hypotheses or Propositions or Research questions**	**Source of data**	**Type of data**	**Analysis**
The Hospitality Industry	(Deloitte, 2009; Price Waterhouse Cooper, 2012; World Travel & Tourism Council, 2012)	What are the most desirable EVP characteristics for hospitality students in the hotel industry in South Africa?	The consolidated and refined list of attributes, obtained from the panel of experts, will be used as a survey to obtain information regarding attributes desired in an EVP for the hospitality industry	Ordinal	

APPENDIX E

Population statistics

Table 16: Population by Age Group, 2011 (Adapted from Stats SA)

Age Group	Population by Age Group	% of Total Population	Age Group	Population by Age Group	% of Total Population
0 – 4	5 189 528	10%	**45 – 49**	2 244 582	4%
4 – 9	5 304 049	10%	**50 – 54**	2 038 531	4%
10 – 14	5 318 691	11%	**55 – 59**	1 673 269	3%
15 – 19	5 175 448	10%	**60 – 64**	1 351 303	3%
20 – 24	4 900 375	10%	**65 – 69**	988 699	2%
25 – 29	4 598 176	9%	**70 – 74**	715 115	1%
30 – 34	4 040 751	8%	**75 – 79**	460 975	1%
35 – 39	3 600 167	7%	**80+**	374 166	1%
40 – 44	2 612 932	5 %			
Total Population: 50 586 757			**Population at Working Age (15 – 64):** 32 235 534		




Figure 14: Population by Age Group, 2011 (Adapted from Stats SA)

APPENDIX F

Generational statistics (Adapted from Statistics South Africa, 2011)

Table 17: Generational Population

Generation	Age Group	Generational Population	% of Total Population
GIs	80+	374 166	1%
Silents	60 – 79	3 516 092	7%
Boomers	40 – 59	8 569 314	17%
Gen X	20 – 39	17 139 469	34%
Gen Y	5 – 19	15 798 188	31%
Gen I	0 – 4	5 189 528	16%
Total Population: 50 586 757			

Table 18: Generations at Working Age (15 - 64)

Generation	Working Age Range	Total at Working Age	% of Total Population at Working Age
Gen Y	15 – 19	5 175 448	16%
Gen X	20 – 39	17 139 469	53%
Boomers	40 – 59	8 569 314	37%
Silents	60 - 64	1 351 303	4%
Total Population at Working Age: 32 235 534			

APPENDIX G

Profile of Hospitality Experts

Table 19: Panel of Experts Demographics

Respondent	Gender	Age	Position Held
1	Female	35	Front Office Manager
2	Male	45	Managing Director
3	Male	31	Sales & Marketing Director
4	Female	29	Senior Lecturer
5	Male	27	Front Office Manager
6	Female	58	Director/Lecturer
7	Female	32	Owner
8	Female	28	HR Manager
9	Male	38	General Manager
10	Female	39	Rooms Division Manager