

Examining the Effects of Monetary and Non-Monetary Factors on Generation Z's Job Selection Preferences in the Hospitality Industry

Ek Tee, Ngian¹, Phan Yong Tak², Chee Hua Chin³ and Ashman Shahrudin bin Khairuddin⁴

^{1,2,3,4} School of Business and Management, University of Technology Sarawak, ³Research Associates, Centre on Technological Readiness and Innovation in Business Technopreneurship (CONTRIBUTE), University of Technology Sarawak, 96000 Sibu, Sarawak, Malaysia.

Email: chincheehua@uts.edu.my

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v12-i5/13019>

DOI:10.6007/IJARBSS/v12-i5/13019

Published Date: 01 May 2022

Abstract

Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic's onset, the tourism and hotel industries were growing at an exponential rate. Following COVID-19, it is projected that the hospitality industry would soon recover and thrive once the epidemic is contained. While there is a rising trend indicating the hospitality industry's continued growth, the hotel industry itself faces significant obstacles. One of the primary issues is a high incidence of employee turnover. Thus, the purpose of this study was to ascertain the factors influencing Generation Z, specifically final-year university students majoring in hospitality and hotel management, when it comes to selecting their first employment following graduation. Following a review of the literature, a number of significant variables were identified and conceptualized under monetary (i.e., salary and benefits) and non-monetary (i.e., working environment, career development, and employer reputation) factors in order to investigate their effect on job selection preference. A total of 239 rows of data were collected. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences and WarpPLS for Partial Least Squares – Structural Equation Modeling were used to examine the data. Salary, benefits, and employer reputation each have a significant positive effect on students' job selection preferences. Surprisingly, neither work environment nor career development were found to have a significant effect on job preference. The study's findings are likely to provide more insightful data to corporate recruiters, allowing them to obtain a better understanding of employees' worries while choosing a position in the hotel business.

Keywords: Monetary and Non-monetary Factors, Job Selection Preference, Generation Z, Expectancy Theory, PLS-SEM, Malaysia.

Introduction

In Malaysia, the hotel industry is a crucial component of any vacation destination. As Novak (2019) points out, the hotel industry is a broad group of service industry divisions that includes food and beverage, recreation, travel and tourism, lodging, and other areas of the tourism industry. The hotel business is the largest subsector within the travel and tourism industry (Singapore, 2021), accounting for around 94.6 billion in Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in 2018. (Insights, 2020). In terms of employment, the hotel business also provided around 3.6 million jobs to citizens (Department of Statistics, 2019). Prior to the outbreak of the COVID-19 epidemic, the hotel business was a significant source of revenue for the Malaysian government. Post-pandemic, the travel and hotel industries are expected to recover.

Due to the pandemic outbreak, Malaysia's labor market has become increasingly competitive as a result of the current economic crisis and accelerated digital transformation (Muhammad et al., 2019). Hotel management students face numerous challenges and barriers to deciding on a career path and finding work. Malaysia's hospitality business has experienced extraordinary growth. The hotel business is facing strong competition on a global scale. Malaysia's government, as stated in online news, has taken aggressive measures to strengthen the hotel and tourism industries (Bernama, 2017). In 2019, the number of international visitors visiting Malaysia exceeded the government's aim of RM66.14 billion, compared to the revenue target of RM61.85 billion (Abas, 2019). Having realized its enormous potential prior to COVID-19, the hotel industry is expected to continue playing a critical role in assisting the Malaysian government in achieving Malaysia's economic growth in the post-COVID-19 era.

Job preference can be defined as a graduate student's preference for one organization's job offer over another (Hamid, 2020). However, a surge in job openings may result in a high percentage of staff turnover in the hotel industry. Employee turnover, in general, refers to the number or percentage of employees who leave an organization and are replaced by new employees (Mayhew, 2019). As a result, the major issue that needs to be addressed is the hospitality industry's high personnel turnover rate. It's critical to understand why students choose one organization's job offer over another. Employers may use this information to have a better knowledge of their employees and to manage their human capital resources more efficiently, hence ensuring the company's performance efficiency (Lepak, and Snell, 2018). With the hospitality business growing at a breakneck pace, hotel managers are on the lookout for suitable individuals to fill certain positions. Numerous hotel industry companies are having difficulty finding and retaining suitable candidates. This occurs because the majority of hotel industry companies are unaware of the elements that influence which hotel management students consider most important when selecting their first job (Chan and Kuok, 2011).

Previous research indicates that extrinsic elements such as training and development, income and benefits, and work environment, as well as internal aspects such as empowerment and autonomy, work-life balance, and employer reputation, have a greater impact on undergraduate students' employment choice (Senanayake, and Gamage, 2017). Additionally, hotel management students would like to continue in the organization if they were satisfied with the pleasant working environment. By determining the most influential aspects affecting hotel management students, the hotel human resources department can alter its human resource policies to recruit and retain hotel management students. Thus, it is critical for human resource departments to understand how to recruit suitable individuals and how to convince competent candidates to accept their job offers. Expectancy theory is a

cognitive process explanation of motivation that presupposes that individuals will be driven if they feel that exerting significant effort will result in superior success, which will result in superior rewards (Vroom, 1964). Specifically, expectation theory guided the suggested study framework and attempted to meet the following objectives:

a) To examine the relationship between monetary (i.e., salary and benefits) factor on job selection preference.

b) To investigate the relationship between non-monetary (i.e., working environment, career development, and employer reputation) factor on job selection preference.

Literature Review and Hypotheses Development

Job Selection Preference

Job selection preference, as described by Iacovou, Shirland, and Thompson (2004), refers to graduate students who prefer one organization's job offer over another. The most critical factor to evaluate is why students chose a particular employment over another (Baliyan and Baliyan, 2016). A job decision is a complex process that is best understood by breaking it down into its two primary components, preference and career. According to Hewitt (2010), job selection factors might be intrinsic, extrinsic, or a combination of the two. Additionally, the researcher indicated that the majority of work selection decisions are influenced by the family element. For the remainder of his or her life, the job selection decision has an effect on the individual's personality, life, and accomplishments (Reddy and Rajaram, 2015). Job selection is one of the most critical decisions an individual will make throughout their lives. This is because this decision will mark one of the most pivotal moments of our lives and will determine our future social standing. Authors Dimaki, Kaminioti, Kostaki, Psarakis, and Tsourti, (2005) elaborated on the three components of work choice, namely the function of employment, employment, and economic growth separation. In addition, an individual's expectations, social life, and ambitions are all taken into account when undergraduate students make a series of decisions. Students should be aware of the field's current advances, possible opportunities, and challenges (Ahmed et al., 2017).

According to Bundy and Norris (2011), the current economic climate has influenced graduates to become more money-oriented, self-interested, and desirous of power while selecting a job. As a result, students' employment preferences are influenced by their expectation of a future vocation that will suit their needs and desires. As per Price (2009), important retention aspects and recruitment methods are critical for understanding an individual's employment decision. Thus, human resource departments must ascertain what factors undergraduate students value most in job selection and devise strategies for getting their job offers acknowledged by competent candidates (Michaels et al., 2001). As a result of employing a competent and knowledgeable candidate, an organization's employee turnover rate will reduce (Novick et al., 2005), recruitment costs will fall (Evers et al., 2005), and job productivity will increase.

Salary and Benefits

Salary is referred to the compensation that employers pay employees in exchange for their work. Salary is the remuneration received on a daily, weekly, monthly, or piecemeal basis (On et al., 2013). It consists of both incentives and dividends. On the other hand, benefits are defined as indirect compensation and non-monetary compensation provided to employees (Merhar, 2020). Benefits are a component of the organization's total compensation package and are not included in pay for hours worked. Health insurance, paid

sick leave, paid vacation, and flexible work hours are just a few of the advantages available. According to James et al (2009), the most essential component in attracting and recruiting people is salary and benefits. According to previous research (e.g., Ankudinov, 2015; Chatzopoulou, 2015), financial considerations such as pension, salary, and perks are the most attractive elements influencing employees' job selection choices. A company that offers appealing benefits in addition to a competitive compensation has a greater chance of attracting new grads (Ramlall, 2003). Job productivity will increase if employees are satisfied with the compensation and benefits supplied by firms (James et al., 2009). This suggests that if employees are satisfied with their income and benefits, they have little motivation to seek employment with other businesses. As a result, this can aid in increasing work satisfaction, retaining people, and indirectly lowering an organization's turnover rate.

Salary is an extrinsic factor that influences students' initial job choice (Ghani, Said, Nasir, and Jusoff, 2008) and enhances students' commitment to a business (Winter, 2007). This is further reinforced by Mahony et al (2006), who performed research into the determinants influencing employment choice at sports management schools in the United States of America. To collect primary data, a questionnaire survey was distributed to 428 university teachers working in sport management schools. The study's findings indicate that income was the most influential factor in determining a respondent's readiness to accept a job position and likelihood of abandoning their existing employment. This demonstrates that the student views salary as a critical component of their career path (Chao and Gardner, 2007).

Salary is the most significant aspect in the current economic climate since it provides financial security, a better standard of living, and wellbeing. As Malaysia's standard of living has risen considerably in recent years, young graduates are looking for jobs that offer them a greater salary in order to afford today's high cost of living (Chao and Gartner, 2007). As a result, it may result in an increase in the high turnover rate in a variety of industries. As a result, income becomes their primary consideration when selecting a job. Employers had to give a salary and benefits package to entice new graduates to work hard and remain loyal to their firm. The following hypothesis was developed based on the aforementioned literature review:

H1: There is a significant and positive relationship between salary and benefits on job selection preference in the hotel industry.

Working Environment

The term "working environment" refers to the physical environment of a workplace that promotes employee growth, security, and goal attainment (Salunke, 2015). Work-life balance, safety, relationships with coworkers, and motivation are all components of the working environment. Thus, the researcher added, maintaining a healthy work environment is the most effective strategy to promote job satisfaction, productivity, and retention. Employees rated a supportive work environment as the most significant component of their employment, according to (Mcgraw et al., 2012). Employees, regardless of their current jobs, require a healthy work environment. According to Robbins (2001); Jones (1999), employees may feel unsatisfied as a result of a hostile work environment.

The work environment has a considerable impact on job satisfaction (Lee, 2006). When a business is able to provide a pleasant work environment, employee productivity is likely to increase. However, the working environment can become stressful if employees are subjected to occupational stressors such as working overtime or in physically demanding conditions (Ho and Chan, 2000). The workplace environment has a significant impact on

employee stress levels and job satisfaction (Devi and Rani, 2016). Employees are more likely to stay with an organization for a longer period of time if they work in a comfortable environment, which indirectly results in increased job satisfaction among employees. Employees can perform at their best when they work in a positive work environment. As a result, the firm should foster a positive work environment in order to boost employee happiness and productivity.

According to Naharuddin and Sadegi (2013), the physical working environment consists of equipment, lighting, ventilation, devices, and temperature control, as well as the space in which workers conduct their activities. Additionally, Pitaloka and Sofia (2014) noted that work atmosphere is comprised of the following components: layout, culture, code of behavior, workplace location, and communication. Indeed, the work environment is comprised of the size and equipment necessary for employees to accomplish their duties, their relationships with coworkers, the corporate culture, communication, the elements that inspire an employee to work for a particular organization, and strategies for hazard management (Chandrasekar, 2011). Employees are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs when they believe their company values them. As a result, the work environment must foster an environment in which employees feel valued and appreciated, like their jobs, take pride in their work, and are able to reach their full potential. The following hypothesis was developed based on the aforementioned literature review:

H2: There is a positive and significant relationship between working environment on job selection preference in the hotel industry.

Career Development

Career development is the process of selecting a job, developing talents, and progressing along a career path. It is a process that involves assessing an individual's personality, abilities, interests, and capabilities in order to choose the most suited career path (Mckay, 2020). It is concerned with how businesses provide opportunities for employee progress and promotion. Career development can assist employees in determining their professional preferences and strengths, as well as in developing their own skills and following career pathways. Career development comprises developing a systematic plan for evaluating employees' job performance and identifying prospective career prospects for them, as well as developing and implementing a variety of training programmes to prepare them for a higher-level role (Agba, 2010).

Training can improve an employee's efficiency and output, as well as indirectly raise job satisfaction. This is further supported by a study conducted by Jones (2006), which asserted that training has a considerable effect on job performance. It is vital to have staff that are professionally trained and equipped in labor-intensive sectors such as hotel service, as this sector is heavily reliant on labor to complete tasks (Chand, and Katou, 2007). The training programme benefits both businesses and their employees because it improves the employee's job performance and increases the employee's knowledge about their job. Rowden (2005) claimed that skilled employees are more equipped to address the needs of their clientele. It will surely aid in increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of the firm.

Career development in an organization entailed an examination of the various elements that interacted to generate available personnel (Moore, 2011). According to Kreisman (2002), career development is a critical aspect in attracting people because skill development opportunities and career progression are "key attractors" for businesses. Career development programmes can assist employees in enhancing their talents and soft skills, thereby attracting

competent personnel and keeping them from leaving the company over time (Kirk et al., 2000). An organization that provides training to its employees will see a decrease in employee turnover (Royalty, 1996). When a company fails to recognize an employee's objectives and need for expansion, "career advancement" becomes a primary cause for leaving. As a result, firms and human resource departments must place a premium on personnel development in order to improve administrative management and keep pace with quickly changing environmental requirements. The following hypothesis was developed based on the aforementioned literature review:

H3: There is a significant and positive relationship between career developments on job selection preference in the hotel industry.

Employer Reputation

Employer reputation is defined as a perceptual image formed by the organization's previous acts and future vision, which reflects the organization's overall desirability to a variety of stakeholders (Fombrun, 1996). Kennedy (1977) discussed how an employer's reputation and image are synonymous. The researcher suggested that establishing an employer's reputation, whether for a business or a product, can take years. A reputation is the image and symbol of a business that is owned by either internal or external personnel, or both (Clardy, 2005). Employers' reputations are critical when it comes to attracting and recruiting suitable people (Dogl, and Holtbrugge, 2013). Employers' reputations are critical in winning the talent "war" and attracting qualified and skilled employees (Baum, and Kabst, 2013). As perceived by recent graduates, job hopefuls are more enticed to choose a company with a well-known employer credibility. Puncheva-Michelotti (2018) corroborated this by stating that there is a considerable association between an employer's reputation and job selection preferences.

Employer reputation is composed of two components: what the employer has done and what the employer has said (On et al., 2013). Employer reputation management success is contingent upon an awareness of and adherence to the link between the two components. Organizations that successfully manage employee credibility first identify the type of reputation they wish to have and then aggressively market that reputation to all interested parties. A positive employer reputation will influence existing employees' behavior and motivate them to contribute to the organization's success. As a result, this contributes to increasing the efficiency of the current staff while also cutting the cost of recruitment (Hepburn, 2005). The following hypothesis was developed based on the aforementioned literature review:

H4: There is a significant and positive relationship between employer reputations on job selection preference in the hotel industry.

Based on a review of the literature, the following conceptual framework was presented (see Figure 1).




Figure 1: Conceptual Framework

Methodology

This study collected data quantitatively by distributing online questionnaires between October and December 2021; more precisely, a non-probability sampling method - purposive sampling technique was used to select respondents. The respondent must be a student at their final year and attached with any of the higher institutions residing in Kuching, Sarawak but must be taking the hospitality or hotel management programme. Twenty items were adapted from prior research (e.g., Mcgaha, 2005; Hewitt, 2010) and adapted to the Malaysian context in total (see Appendix A). On a seven-point Likert scale, respondents were asked to rate their agreement with the statements (ranging from 1 for strongly disagree to 7 for strongly agree). To determine the minimum sample size, the G*Power software was used. A minimum sample size of 129 is recommended for evaluating the developed research model by conducting an a priori power analysis with a medium effect size, a significance level of 0.05, and a power of 0.95. 151 of the 200 distributions were returned, a response rate of 75.5 percent. The response rate of 75.5 percent indicates that no response error, as it exceeds the recommended response rate of 70%. (Nulty 2008).

Prior to conducting the measurement and structural analysis, a series of preliminary analyses using the Statistical Package for Social Science 23.0 were conducted to rule out missing values and straight lining. 11 sets of data were discarded during the process, but the remaining 140 were used to assess the measurement model's fitness and test hypotheses. The study used the recommended 5000-bootstrap procedure to analyse the data using a partial least squares structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) approach (Hair, Sarstedt, Ringle, and Gudergan, 2018). The PLS-SEM estimation procedure was carried out using the WarpPLS software (see Figure 1). WarpPLS was determined to be the more appropriate software for analysing the developed research model because it incorporates both true composites and standard error of the mean (SEM) factors.

Findings

Assessment of the Measurement Model

A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to determine the reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity of the proposed research model. As Gefen, Straub, and Boudreau (2000) recommend, the item loading must be more than 0.50. The composite reliability (CR) method was used to determine the internal consistency of the construct. Hair, Ringle, and Sarstedt (2011) advocated a cut-off point of 0.70 or greater for CR to be considered "moderate." Subsequently, the constructs were evaluated using the average variance explained (AVE) approach. Bagozzi and Yi (1988) consider AVE values of 0.5 and greater to be acceptable. The researcher examined the measuring model utilising the aforementioned criteria and resulted to satisfactory conclusions (see Table 1). The final iteration values for loading, CR, and AVE of the respective constructs are listed in Table 1. Additionally, Table 1 included details about the discriminant validity of the constructs. The square root of AVE is indeed greater than the values of the other correlations to the right and below. As a result, convergent and discriminant validity are established. The coefficient of determination for job selection preference (R²) was 0.342, indicating a moderate model explaining more than 34.2 percent of the variance (Cohen, 1988).

Table 1

The Results of Measurement Model and Discriminant Validity of Constructs

		Results of Measurement Model (Final Iteration)			Discriminant Validity of Constructs				
Model Construct	Item(s)	Loading	CR	AVE	Sand B	WE	CD	ER	JSP
Salary and Benefits (SandB)	SandB_1	0.737	0.771	0.529	0.727				
	SandB_2	0.694							
	SandB_3	0.749							
	SandB_4	Omitted							
Working Environment (WE)	WE_1	0.713	0.832	0.624	0.569	0.790			
	WE_2	0.845							
	WE_3	0.807							
	WE_4	Omitted							
Career Development (CD)	CD_1	0.737	0.759	0.513	0.462	0.523	0.716		
	CD_2	Omitted							
	CD_3	0.685							
	CD_4	0.725							
Employer Reputation (ER)	ER_1	0.665	0.769	0.526	0.436	0.290	0.609	0.725	
	ER_2	Omitted							
	ER_3								
	ER_4	0.755							

		0.753							
Job Selection Preference (JSP)	JSP_1	0.665	0.80	0.58	0.405	0.27	0.44	0.46	0.764
	JSP_2	Omitted	7	4		4	4	2	
	JSP_3	d							
	JSP_4	0.755 0.861							
Note: Items SandB_4, WE_4, CD_2, ER_2, and JSP_2 were deleted due to low loadings.					Note: Diagonals represent the square root of the average variance extracted (AVE) while the other entries represent the correlation.				

Assessment of the Structural Model

The remaining hypotheses were tested by assessing the inner (structural) model's p-values, t-values, and standardised coefficient beta values. The findings of the hypotheses testing are summarised in Table 2 and Figure 2. The t result for one-tailed hypothesis testing should be greater than 1.645 ($p < 0.05$) or 2.33 ($p < 0.01$). Two of the four direct hypotheses proposed and evaluated were supported by the statistical analysis. Salary and benefits as well as employer reputation were found positively and significantly influencing job selection preference. Surprisingly, two of the non-monetary factors (i.e., working environment and career development) were found no significant relationship with job selection preference. As a result, the statistical analysis supported H1 and H4, but not H2 and H3. The Q2 values for job selection preference was set to 0.342 to demonstrate the model's predictive validity, in accordance with Hair, Hult, Ringle, and Sarstedt (2016)'s recommendation that a Q2 value more than zero is significant.

Table 2

Path Coefficients and Hypotheses Testing

H	Relationship	Standard Beta	P-value	t-value	Decision	VIF	f ²
H 1	Salary and Benefits → Job Selection Preference	0.187	0.011	2.304*	Supported	1.281	0.076
H 2	Working Environment → Job Selection Preference	-0.099	0.115	-1.203	Not Supported	1.233	0.033
H 3	Career Development → Job Selection Preference	0.129	0.060	1.567	Not Supported	1.177	0.059
H 4	Employer Reputation → Job Selection Preference	0.292	<0.001	3.700**	Supported	1.269	0.139

Note: $p < 0.01^{**} = t > 2.33$; $p < 0.05 = t > 1.645^*$ (H = Hypothesis)




Figure 2: Research Model with Path Coefficient and P-values

Discussion

Two of the four direct hypotheses investigated, notably H1 (salary and benefits), were found to be supported (employer reputation). Salary and benefits had a positive and substantial effect on job selection preference ($\beta = 0.187$; $p = 0.011$; $t = 2.304^*$), showing that hypothesis 1 was supported. This finding is consistent with previous research (Ghani et al., 2008; Mahony et al., 2006) that indicated a positive association between working environment and job selection preference. This is also corroborated by Ankudinov, (2015) and Chatzopoulou, (2015), who explain that financial considerations such as pension, income, and perks are the most attractive when it comes to influencing employees' job selection choices. A company that offers appealing benefits in addition to a competitive compensation has a greater chance of attracting new grads. Job productivity will increase if employees are satisfied with the compensation and benefits supplied by firms. This suggests that if employees are satisfied with their income and benefits, they have little motivation to seek employment with other businesses. As a result, this can aid in increasing work satisfaction, retaining people, and indirectly lowering an organization's turnover rate.

The subsequent study of Hypothesis 2 found that working environment did not have a significant positive effect on job selection preference ($\beta = -0.099$; $p = 0.115$; $t = -1.203$), indicating that hypothesis 2 was not supported. This finding contradicts previous research conducted by Hamid (2020), and Ramasamy, Yeung, and Yuan (2008), which established a favourable association between working environment and job selection preference. This unexpected conclusion may be explained by the fact that the current study focuses on hotel management students at UCSI University. Additionally, the study by Iacovou et al. (2004) indicated that respondents' experience had an effect on employment elements such as company reputation, job flexibility, and work culture (e.g., graduate students and undergraduate). Undergraduate students placed a higher premium on organisation repute, but graduate students placed a higher premium on work flexibility and organisational culture. These findings corroborated the findings of the current study. As a result, they do not view this as a significant factor in determining their employment preference. Even if undergraduate students of hotel management did not completely disregard this issue, there was some attention, but it was not significant.

The examination of Hypothesis 3 found that career growth had no statistically significant positive effect on job selection preference ($\beta = 0.129$; $p = 0.060$; $t = 1.567$), indicating that hypothesis 3 was not supported. This finding contradicts previous research by Demagalhaes et al (2011), which established a favourable association between career growth and job selection preference. In current day of globalisation, when the majority of businesses are expanding abroad, hotel management careers are growing in popularity throughout the world. This has resulted in several opportunities for hotel management students to work in various nations. As a result, the majority of respondents expressed anxiety about their potential employer's capacity to provide appropriate training and development programmes that will enable them to continue preparing and improving their knowledge of the hotel business in order to compete in the international market. Thus, regardless of whether individuals remain with the same organization or leave, it is widely recognised that 'employability security' is more important than 'employment security' in the future (Bernstrøm et al., 2018).

The research of Hypothesis 4 demonstrated a significant positive effect of employer reputation on job selection preference ($\beta = 0.292$; $p < 0.001$; $t = 3.700^{**}$), indicating that hypothesis 4 was supported. The finding is consistent with previous research conducted by Liu, Thomas, and Zhang (2010), which established a favourable association between employer reputation and job selection preference. If job searchers believe a company has a good reputation, they will associate themselves with it in order to increase their self-esteem. Working for a prestigious organisation may reflect a person's character and ability more than working for a small, less prestigious organisation. Having esteemed former employers may provide individuals an advantage in negotiating more favourable employment arrangements with subsequent employers. As a result, hotel management students may prefer to work for a respected firm with a good market reputation over pursuing a position with a high starting wage. According to Montgomery and Ramus's (2007) study, respondents (MBAs) were willing to forego pay and benefits in exchange for a position with a respected organisation that cares about natural communities and the environment. Dutta and Punnose (2010) further reinforce this, stating that hotel management graduates will choose long-term growth potential above immediate income and benefits when picking their first position.

Conclusion, Implications and Limitations

In summary, two major elements influence generation Z's job selection preferences: monetary and non-monetary factors. According to empirical findings, income and benefits are the primary monetary considerations for hotel management students when determining job selection decisions. On the other hand, only employer reputation was determined to be the most important non-monetary factor impacting job selection preference among Generation Z in Sarawak, out of the three non-monetary factors studied. From a theoretical standpoint, this study lays the groundwork for future academics interested in the hotel business to conduct additional research into the factors influencing job selection preferences among hotel management. Previous empirical study on this subject has mostly been undertaken on accounting students and in other countries, and so their relevance and implications do not sufficiently reflect the factors influencing career selection choices among hotel management students. Thus, this study, which was done in Malaysia, can serve as a reference for future researchers interested in examining the factors affecting job selection preferences among hotel management students in the hotel business while generating new views and theoretical frameworks.

The findings of this study have practical consequences for hotel management students, hotel managers, corporate recruiters, and other interested parties in Malaysia. Our findings will also assist Malaysian hotel sector associations such as the Malaysian Association of Hotels (MAH). These parties would be wise to focus on things that are considered vital (compensation and benefits, as well as employer reputation) when addressing their individual issues. For instance, firms should place a higher premium on high compensation and incentives in order to recruit more qualified hotel management students who are more concerned with advancement compensation. Additionally, they can enhance their organization's reputation by increasing their involvement in corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities and avoiding unethical commercial events and transactions.

As with any study, this one has a number of limitations. The first drawback is that this study's primary data were gathered through a survey technique involving questionnaires. This method of data collection has a few limitations. It is possible that some responders misconstrued or misunderstood the questions. Additionally, they may gloss over some of the questions or state the truth out of exhaustion. As a result, the responses provided may be less accurate and dependable, resulting in disappointing research findings. The current study examined undergraduate students majoring in hotel management in Malaysian universities. As a result, the conclusions of this study may have no application or may be limited to companies, organizations, and associations other than those in the hotel management industry. Additionally, the findings may not be applicable to those residing outside of Malaysia due to environmental and cultural differences.

In future investigations, researchers may employ a more productive data collection technique or approach. For instance, structured interview sessions could be used to elicit replies from pre-selected respondents. With this strategy, any misunderstanding can be instantly resolved by the interviewer, and question omissions are less likely. Potential researchers who are interested in a relevant study topic may wish to target undergraduate students from a variety of fields and courses in order to benefit a broader audience. Additionally, the factors affecting undergraduate students' career selection choices can be evaluated in a comparative context, allowing for contributions to the research to transcend geographical and cultural boundaries.

Acknowledgement

This study is supported by the University of Technology Sarawak.

References

- Agba, A. M., Ogaboh, F. N., & Ushie, E. M. (2010). Career Development and Employee Commitment in Industrial Organisations in Calabar, Nigeria retrieved August 25, 2011, from <http://scihub.org/AJSIR/PDF/2010/2/AJSIR1-2-105-114.pdf>
- Ahmed, K. A., Sharif, N., & Ahmad, N. (2017). Factors Influencing Students' Career Choices: Empirical Evidence from Business Students, *Journal of Southeast Asian Research*, 2017, 1-15.
- Ankudinov, A., Lebedev, O., & Sachenkov, A. (2015). Empirical Analysis of Job Satisfaction Determinants in Russia, *Asian Social Science*, 11(4), 117-125.
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the Evaluation of Structural Equation Models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 16, 74-94.

- Baliyan, P. S., & Baliyan, S. P. (2016). Employment Preference of Undergraduate Accounting Students in Botswana: Perceptual Analysis of Practitioners and Students. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 11(12), 271-282.
- Baum, M., & Kabst, R. (2013). How to Attract Applications in The Atlantic Versus the Asia-Pacific Region? A Cross-National Analysis on China, India, Germany, Hungary. *Journal of World Business*, 48(2), 175-185.
- Bernamea. (2017). Tourism Sector to Maintain Position as 3rd Largest Contributor to Economy. Retrieved from New Straits Times:
<https://www.nst.com.my/news/nation/2017/09/284233/tourism-sectormaintain-position-3rd-largest-contributor-economy>
- Bernstrøm, V. H., Drange, I., & Mamelund, S-E. (2018). Employability as an Alternative to Job Security. *Personnel Review*, 48(1), 234-248.
- Bundy, P., & Norris, D. (2011). What Accounting Students Consider Important in the Job Selection Process. *Journal of Applied Business Research (JABR)*, 8(2), 1-6.
- Chandrasekar, K. (2011). Workplace Environment and Its Impact Organizational Performance in Public Sector organizations. *International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business Systems*, 1(1), 1-19.
- Chan, S. H., & Kuok, O. M. (2011). A Study of Human Resources Recruitment, Selection, and Retention Issues in the Hospitality and Tourism Industry in Macau. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality and Tourism*, 10(4), 421-441.
- Chand, M., & Katou, A. A. (2007). The Impact of HRM Practices on Organisational Performance in the Indian Hotel Industry. *Employee Relations*, 29(6), 576-594.
- Chao, G. T., & Gardner, P. D. (2007). Important Characteristics of Early Career Jobs: What Do Young Adults Want? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 11(1), 24-36.
- Chatzopoulou, M., Vlachvei, A., & Monovasilis, T. (2015). Employee's Motivation and Satisfaction in Light of Economic Recession: Evidence of Grevena Prefecture-Greece. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 24, 136-145.
- Clardy, A. (2005). Reputation, Goodwill, and Loss: Entering the Employee Training Audit Equation. *Human Resource Development Review*, 4 (3), 279-304.
- Cohen, E. (1988). Authenticity and commoditization in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15(2), 371-386.
- Demagalhaes, R., Wilde, H., & Fitzgerald, L. R. (2011). Factors Affecting Accounting Students' Employment Choices: A Comparison of Students' and Practitioners' Views. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, 11(2), 32-40.
- Department of Statistics. (2019). Retrieved from DOSM:
https://www.dosm.gov.my/v1/index.php?r=column/cthemedByCat&cat=326&bul_id=dVlqNEdXc2pxa3Ria2lIVU42R29sZz09&menu_id=b0pIV1E3RW40VVRTUkZocEhyZ1pLUT09
- Devi, K. R., & Rani, S. S. (2016). The Impact of Organizational Role Stress and Work Family Conflict: Diagnosis Sources of Difficulty at Work Place and Job Satisfaction among Women in IT Sector, Chennai, Tamil Nadu. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 219, 214-220.
- Dimaki, K., Kaminioti, O., Kostaki, A., Psarakis, S., & Tsourti, Z. (2005). Educational and Occupational Preferences of High School Students in Greece. *Education and Training*, 47(6), 432-446.
- Dogl, C., & Holtbrugge, D. (2013). Corporate Environmental Responsibility, Employer Reputation and Employee Commitment: An Empirical Study in Developed and Emerging

- Economies. *The International Journal of Human Resources Management*, 26(2), 1739-1762.
- Dutta, A., & Punnose, E. M. (2010). Factors Affecting Choice of First Employer: A Study of Indian Management Graduates. *Global Business Review*, 11(3), 435-448.
- Evers, A., Anderson, N., & Smit-Voskuijl, O. (2005). *Handbook of Personnel Selection*. Boston, MA: Blackwell Publish.
- Fombrun, C. J. (1996). *Reputation: Realizing the Value from the Corporate Image*. Boston MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Gefen, D., Straub, D., & Boudreau, M. C. (2000). Structural Equation Modeling and Regression: Guidelines for Research Practice. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 4(7), 1-77.
- Ghani, E. K., Said, J., Nasir, N. M., & Jusoff, K. (2008). The 21st Century Accounting Career from The Perspective of The Malaysia University Students. *Asian Social Science*, 4(8), 73-83.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2016). *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) (2nd Ed.)*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a Silver Bullet. *Journal Marketing Theory and Practice*, 19(2), 139-151.
- Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M. & Gudergan, S. P. (2018). *Advanced Issues in Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Hamid, M. A. (2020). Job Selection Preferences: What Do Young Adults Want? *Global Business and Management Research*, 12(4), 459-490.
- Hepburn, S. (2005). Creating a Winning Employer Reputation, *Strategic HR Review*, 4(4), 20-23.
- Hewitt, J. (2010). Factors Influencing Career Choice. *Career Development Quarterly*, 8(1), 29-43.
- Ho, S. S. M., & Chan, S. Y. (2000). Desired Attributes of Public Accounting Firms in The Job Selection Process: An Empirical Examination of Accounting Graduates' Perceptions. *Accounting Education*, 9(4), 315-327.
- Iacovou, C. L., Shirland, L., & Thompson, R. L. (2004). Job Selection Preferences of Business Students. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 20(1), 87-98.
- Insights, E. (2017, March 12). Hospitality Industry: All Your Questions Answered. Retrieved from hospitalityinsights: <https://hospitalityinsights.ehl.edu/hospitality-industry>
- James, H. D., Janice, C. M., Shaun, M. P., & Brian, M. (2009). Employee Benefits: Literature Review and Emerging Issues. *Human Resource Management Review*, 19, 86-103.
- Jones, A. P. (1999). Indoor Air Quality and Health. *Atmospheric Environment*, 33(28), 4535-4564.
- Jones, M. (2006). Which is a Better Predictor of Job Performance: Job Satisfaction or Life Satisfaction? *Institute of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 15(6), 20-25.
- Kennedy, S. H. (1977). Nurturing Corporate Images: Total Communication or Ego Trip? *European Journal of Marketing*, 11(3), 120-64.
- Kirk, J. J., Downey, B., Duckett, S., & Woody, C. (2000). Name Your Career Development Intervention. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 12(5), 205-217.
- Kreisman, B. J. (2002) Insights into Employee Motivation, Commitment and Retention. Retrieved August 25, 2011, from <http://www.ascenfrewards.com/static/resources/papers/employeecommitment.pdf>
- Lee, S. Y. (2006). Expectations of Employees Toward the Workplace and Environmental Satisfaction. *Facilities*, 24(9/10), 343-53.

- Lepak, D. P., & Snell, S. A. (2018). The Human Resource Architecture: Toward A Theory of Human Capital Allocation and Development. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(1), 31-48.
- Liu, X., Thomas, S., & Zhang, L. (2010). College Quality, Earnings, and Job Satisfaction: Evidence from Recent College Graduates. *Journal of Labor Research*, 31(2), 183–201.
- Mahony, D. F., Mondello, M., Hums, M. A., & Judd, M. (2006). Recruitment and Retaining Sport Management Faculty: Factors Affecting Job Choice. *Journal of Sport Management*, 20, 414-430.
- Mayhew, R. (2019). Employee Turnover Definitions & Calculations. Retrieved from Small Business: <https://smallbusiness.chron.com/employee-turnoverdefinitions-calculations-11611.html>
- McGaha, S. T. (2005). Career choices and factors influencing career change among Oklahoma State University Agricultural Communications graduates. Master Thesis, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma.
- Mcgraw, K., Popp, J. S., Dixon, B. L., & Newton, D. J. (2012). Factors Influencing Job Choice among Agricultural Economics Professionals. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics*, 44(2), 251-265.
- MCKAY, D. R. (2020, August 4). The Balance. Retrieved from What Is Career Development? <https://www.thebalancecareers.com/what-is-careerdevelopment-525496>
- Merhar, C. (2020). Small Business 101 - The Definition of Employee Benefits. Retrieved from peoplekeep: <https://www.peoplekeep.com/blog/small-business-101-the-definition-ofemployee-benefits>
- Michaels, E., Handfield-Jones, H., & Axelrod, B. (2001). *The War for Talent*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Montgomery, D. B., & Ramus (2003). Corporate Social Responsibility Reputation Effect on MBA Job Choice. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 34, 69-72.
- Moore, K. M. (2011). Variables of Workplace Deviance: An Examination of The Effects of Personality, Age, Family Responsibility, and Job Security. Master Thesis. California State University, Fullerton.
- Muhammad, M. Z., Char, A. K., Yasoa, M. B., & Hassan, Z. (2019). Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) Competing in The Global Business Environment: A Case of Malaysia. *International Business Research*, 3(1), 66-75.
- Naharuddin, N. M., & Sadegi M. (2013). Factors of Workplace Environment that Affect Employees Performance: A Case Study of Miyazu Malaysia, *International Journal of Independent Research and Studies*, 2(2), 66-78.
- Novak, P. (2017). What Are The 4 Segments of The Hospitality Industry? Hospitalitynet. Retrieved July 24, 2019, from <https://www.hospitalitynet.org/opinion/4082318.html>
- Novick, L. E., Morrow, C. B., & Mays, G. P. (2005). Public Health Administration: Principles for Population-Based Management. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett Publishers.
- Nulty, D. D. (2008). The Adequacy of Response Rates to Online and Paper Survey: What can be Done? *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(3), 301-314.
- On, C. H., Keong, H., Choo, H., Khor P., Ching, N., & Vei, N. (2013). Factors Affecting Job Selection Preferences of Accounting Students in Malaysian Universities. *International Journal of Independent Research and Studies*, 2(2), 66-78.
- Pitaloka, E., & Sofia, I. P. (2014). The Effect of Work Environment, Job Satisfaction, Organization Commitment on OCB of Internal Auditors. *International Journal of Business, Economics and Law*, 5(2), 10-18.

- Price, S. (2009). Future Directions for Career Choice Research in Nursing: A Discussion Paper. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 46(2), 268-276.
- Puncheva-Michelotti, P., Hudson, S., & Michelotti, M. (2018). The Role of Proximity to Local and Global Citizens in Stakeholders' Moral Recognition of Corporate Social Responsibility. *Journal of Business Research*, 88, 234–244.
- Ramasamy, B., Yeung, M., & Yuan, Y. (2008). The Role of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in Job Choice Decisions in The Greater China Region. *EU-CHINA BMT Conference Papers and Proceedings*. 1, 1-24.
- Ramlall, S. (2003). Managing Employee Retention as a Strategy for Increasing Organizational Competitiveness. *Organizational Application*, 8, 63-72.
- Reddy, G. C., & Rajaram, N. (2015). Career Aspirations and Background of Students Opting for Fashion Education Courses in India. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 176, 952-960.
- Robbins, S. P. (2001). *Essentials of Organizational Behavior (6th ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Royalty, J. (1996). The Effect of Job Turnover on The Training of Men and Women, *Industrial and Labour Relations Review*. 49(3), 506-521.
- Salunke, G. (2015). Work Environment and Its Effect on Job Satisfaction in Cooperative Sugar Factories in Maharashtra, India, Abhinav. *International Monthly Refereed Journal of Research in Management and Technology*, 4(5), 21-31.
- Senanayake, Y., & Gamage, S. K. (2017). Impact of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Factors on Organizational Performance with Special Reference to Operational Level Managers in Sri Lanka Telecom. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 19(10), 8-19.
- Singapore, W. (2021, March 10). Hotel Industry: Everything You Need to Know About Hotels! Retrieved from Revfine: <https://www.google.com/search?q=hotel+industry&hl=zh>
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Winter, P. A., Petrosko, J. M., & Rodriguez, G. (2007). Using Economic Incentives to Recruit Community College Faculty: Effects of Starting Salary and Healthcare Benefits Plan. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 31(1), 19–35.

Appendix – Constructs and Measurement Items

Construct(s)	Measurement Item(s)
Salary and Benefits	<p>SandB_1: Money has been an issue for me in choosing a career.</p> <p>SandB_2: I would choose any other occupation in which I could earn as much money.</p> <p>SandB_3: I would choose a job that will provide me an opportunity to achieve a good standard of living.</p> <p>SandB_4: I would reject a job offer if the salary is inadequate and/or the benefits do not meet my needs.</p>
Working Environment	<p>WE_1: A good work atmosphere (i.e. clean, comfortable, absence of noise) would probably influence my intention to accept an employment offer.</p> <p>WE_2: I would like to work with a good boss who is considerable and fair.</p> <p>WE_3: I would like a job where the fellow workers are pleasant, agreeable and good working companion.</p> <p>WE_4: I would reject a job offer if the working hours are too long.</p>
Career Development	<p>CD_1: I would like a job where the organization will help me achieve my work-related learning and development needs.</p> <p>CD_2: I would like a job that gives me good opportunity for promotion.</p> <p>CD_3: I would like a job that, over time, allows me to reach high-power position with considerable authority.</p> <p>CD_4: I would reject a job if there is only a little opportunity for advancement.</p>
Employer Reputation	<p>ER_1: I would select a job where the organization would probably have a reputation as being an excellent employer.</p> <p>ER_2: I would be proud to say that I work in such reputable company.</p> <p>ER_3: I would probably find this company to be a prestigious place to work in.</p> <p>ER_4: I would certainly select this company to be my future employer if there are probably many others who would like to work in this company.</p>
Job Selection Preference	<p>JSP_1: I am quite clear with my job selection preference.</p> <p>JSP_2: I have made plans about my future career path.</p> <p>JSP_3: I will accept a job after my graduation so long as my results or grades allow.</p> <p>JSP_4: I will accept a job according to its market availability.</p>