

# Research on the Work Engagement of Hospitality Industry Staff from the Perspective of Tourism Management Informatization

Peiyong WU<sup>1, a</sup>, Yixing JIN<sup>2, b\*</sup>, Lin CHENG<sup>3, c</sup>, Yingda WANG<sup>4, d</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Tourism, Huangshan University Huangshan City, Anhui Province, 245021, China

<sup>2</sup>Department of Tourism, Huangshan University Huangshan City, Anhui Province, 245021, China

<sup>3</sup>Department of Tourism, Huangshan University Huangshan City, Anhui Province, 245021, China

<sup>4</sup>Department of Tourism, Huangshan University Huangshan City, Anhui Province, 245021, China

**Abstract**—With the development of information technology, the Internet and informatization have brought huge changes in tourism management. As the pillar industry of the tourism, the hospitality industry, are facing new requirements for transformation and optimization. How to retain talents and how to make talents willing to work are two important issues that hotels need to pay attention to in practice. Through a self-report questionnaire survey of 325 employees from hospitality industry, this paper use SPSS and AMOS tools to analyze the influencing factors of performance evaluation fairness (employee voice) and the employees's work engagement, and constructs the impact mechanism model of them, meanwhile aim to give some helpful suggestions on indigenous research, and can probably enrich the informatization application in tourism management and innovation.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

With the stable development of industrialization and social economy, the tourism industry is gradually entering the era of tourism 4.0, and technological innovation has become the fundamental driving force for the industry transformation. Technological innovation has improved the technological content of tourism products, established a new tourism management model centered on tourist satisfaction, and realized the intelligence, automation and specialization of service facilities for tourism enterprises and promoted the networking and branding of tourism enterprise marketing. Especially in recent years, the rise of smart tourism represented by the widespread application of information technology has brought more convenience and comfort to tourists.

Facing the requirements of transformation and optimization in the new era of tourism, for the hospitality industry, the most fundamental thing is the optimization of human resource management based on the Internet technology background, so as to consolidate its core competitiveness. Performance evaluation, as a core content of human resource management activities, has a pivotal impact on the development of the organization and employees (Pichler, Varma and Michel, 2016) <sup>[1]</sup>. However, the effectiveness of performance evaluation in corporate practice has not been fully reflected. Many employees are dissatisfied with the evaluation system, or

even repulsive. If things go on like this, it will also have a negative impact on the employees' future work performance (Sweetman and Luthans, 2010) <sup>[2]</sup>. Gallup's recent survey results show that most employees in all types of organizations around the world are not fully engaged in their work (Bakker, Demerouti and Sanz-Vergel, 2014) <sup>[3]</sup>.

Employee voice in performance evaluation is a specific manifestation of organization procedural justice, which largely affects employees' recognition and satisfaction with the performance evaluation process and superiors, and also plays an important role in predicting the subsequent work status and behavior of employees. Therefore, this study starts from the employee voice in the context of performance evaluation, and discuss the relationship among employee voice, performance evaluation satisfaction and employee work engagement. Through the research, we hope to provide some feasible suggestions on the improvement of the hospitality enterprises performance evaluation system and the enhancement of employee work engagement.

## 2 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES

**Procedural justice theory.** Employee voice in performance evaluation is actually a specific manifestation of procedural fairness and an attempt by the organization to improve employees' sense of fairness. Procedural fairness is considered by many scholars as the

\*Corresponding author: <sup>a</sup>E-mail address: wupeiyong@hsu.edu.cn

<sup>b\*</sup>Corresponding author e-mail address: jinyixing@hsu.edu.cn

<sup>c</sup>E-mail address: chenglin@hsu.edu.cn

<sup>d</sup>E-mail address: wangyingda@hsu.edu.cn

most core value of organizational fairness (Vermunt and Steensma, 2016)<sup>[4]</sup>. The group value model proposed by Lind and Tyler (1988)<sup>[5]</sup>, and they believe that employees pay more attention to whether their membership in the organization is respected. Based on this, employee voice is considered a way to improve the satisfaction of the evaluation process. As a free way of communication, employees can express their opinions and suggestions to directly or indirectly improve the function of themselves or the organization (Feldman, 2012)<sup>[6]</sup>. The implicit premise is that the organization or manager will have reference and feedback on the content of employees' speeches, rather than just providing opportunities to speak (Jiao L, Zou Z and Wu H, 2016)<sup>[7]</sup>. By summarizing and sorting out the literature, in this study, the definition of employee voice in performance evaluation is defined as: In the process of performance evaluation, employees explain their work behaviors to the evaluator and provide performance facts, can discuss performance face-to-face with the evaluator, can question the results of the evaluation or make suggestions on the performance evaluation process, and can express opinions on issues during the optimization and upgrade process.

**Social exchange theory.** As a relatively mature theory in the field of social psychology and management, social exchange theory provides the most basic perspective for organizational behavior research (Cropanzano, Anthony and Daniels, 2017)<sup>[8]</sup>. Based on this theory, this study believes that employees' evaluation satisfaction during the performance evaluation process and subsequent work input are based on social exchange theory. Employees perceive the affirmation of performance and themselves, they will reward and exchange with more positive attitudes and behaviors.

## 2.1 Employee voice and work engagement

The theory of organizational justice points out that when employees have a higher sense of organizational justice, they will be more motivated to work. This enthusiasm will be significantly reflected in work performance. Only when they feel fair can individuals be more willing to contribute to the organization. Strom, Sears and Kelly (2014)<sup>[9]</sup> pointed out that organizational justice has a significant positive impact on employee work engagement in their research on employee work engagement. Liu Jinbo and Wang Lanyun pointed out in their research on the fairness effect of performance appraisal can significantly predict the behavior of employees, and has a significant positive impact on employees's work engagement.

Magner and Staley (2014)<sup>[10]</sup> believe that employee voice reflects the organization's respect for the assessees, which will enable employees to generate more organizational recognition and value recognition, thus combining personal development with organizational development as a reward for respect for the organization, they will be more dedicated to work. In addition, in the current hospitality industry, young employees have gradually become the main force. They have a stronger

sense of participation in the organization and have higher enthusiasm. The value expression carried by the right to speak is the embodiment of this demand, which satisfies the need to realize employee respect and self-worth (Robbins, Summers and Miller, 2000)<sup>[11]</sup>. Therefore, this research proposes hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Employee voice in performance evaluation positively affects employees' work engagement.

## 2.2 The mediating role of performance evaluation satisfaction

The empirical research of Lira (2014)<sup>[12]</sup> pointed out that fairness in the performance evaluation process will significantly affect employees' evaluation satisfaction. Employee voice in the performance evaluation process is a concrete manifestation of fairness. Employees can express their opinions and ideas during the performance evaluation process, making the evaluation actions have a respectful and friendly atmosphere, which will significantly affect the direct evaluation experience of employees. Therefore, this research proposes hypotheses:

Hypothesis 2: Employee voice in performance evaluation positively affects employees' evaluation satisfaction.

Employees' evaluation satisfaction is an important indicator in human resource management activities. It can effectively predict employee behavior and which is a direct response of employees to performance evaluation. An indirect response is that they will be more willing to pay in the organization, which is also a manifestation of social exchange. Therefore, this study believes employee voice directly affects evaluation satisfaction, and evaluation satisfaction as an attitude variable will have an impact on the employee's work engagement. Consequently, this research makes reasonable inferences:

Hypothesis 3: Performance evaluation satisfaction mediates the relationship between employee voice and employee work engagement.

# 3 RESEARCH METHODS

## 3.1 Sample and Procedure

We collected survey data from hotel employees in Nanjing, Changsha, and Huangshan, a total of 430 questionnaires were distributed, 368 copies were recovered, and 325 unqualified questionnaires were screened out and the effective recovery rate was 75.6%. Among them, 147 were males (45.2%) and 178 women (54.8%). There are 120 employees (36.9%) aged 18-25, 128 employees (39.4%) aged 26-35, 60 employees (18.5%) aged 36-45, and 17 employees aged 46 and over (5.2%). According to the education division, level of education are more concentrated in undergraduate, there are 173 employees, 53.2% of the total. According to the length of service division, 1-5 accounted for 22.3%, and it is the majority part. The Likert 6 point scale

questionnaire used to reduce the tendency to fill in a questionnaire answered by the intermediate set of values.

### 3.2 Measures

• **Employee voice scale.** Using Korsgaard & Roberson (1995)<sup>[13]</sup> employee voice Scale. A total of eight key questions (e.g., "have the opportunity to the competent recommend different ways to complete their work." "I had the opportunity to state their thoughts and feelings to the competent performance evaluation in the meeting.")

• **Work Engagement Scale.** Using Schaufeli (2017) streamlined 17-items work engagement scale that they had previously developed and got a simplified version of the scale with only 9-items<sup>[14]</sup>, mainly including energy, dedication, focus on three dimensions. There are three items in the vitality dimension, three items in the dedication dimension, and three items in the focused dimension. (e.g., "At work, I can feel that I am very energetic," "I am very keen to work and full of passion," "When I work, I will forget everything around me.")

• **Performance Evaluation Satisfaction Scale.** Using the employee performance evaluation satisfaction scale compiled by Liao Jianqiao (2010)<sup>[15]</sup>, there are four key questions. (e.g., "I'm accepted and satisfied with the results of my recent performance evaluation," "My objectives are clear," "Performance evaluation is built around my work the core to carry out.")

## 4 EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

### 4.1 Reliability and Validity Analysis

In order to ensure compliance with the standard data analysis, we used SPSS19.0, AMOS21.0 to do reliability and validity analysis before implementing the statistical analysis of the data in this study. From the results of confirmatory factor analysis, the fitting index of the main variable measurement model is as follows:  $\chi^2/df=2.459$ , RMSEA=0.069, TLI=0.884, CFI=0.902, IFI=0.903. The goodness of fit is within the critical range, indicating that the fitting relationship between the measured model and the data is better. The Cronbach alpha coefficient and the comprehensive reliability coefficient were all greater than the minimum critical standard 0.7(Cronbach's  $\alpha$  of Employee voice is 0.939, Cronbach's  $\alpha$  of Performance evaluation satisfaction is 0.784, Cronbach's  $\alpha$  of Employee voice Work engagement is 0.890), and the measurement reliability was test.

### 4.2 Descriptive statistics and correlation coefficients

This study uses Pearson correlation analysis method to perform correlation analysis on each variable. In this survey, the average number of employee voice, satisfaction with performance evaluation, and work engagement is above 4. Research data show that there is a significant correlation ( $p < 0.01$ ) between the employee

voice, satisfaction with performance evaluation, and work engagement. The specific analysis results are shown in Table 1.

TABLE I. Descriptive Statistics And Correlation Coefficients

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Gender	1.55	.939						
2. Age	1.90	.838	-.073					
3. Education	2.74	.729	-.087	-.131*				
4. Years of working	2.56	1.341	.117*	.450**	-.085			
5. Employee voice	4.23	1.107	-.150**	.065	-.020	.104		
6. PE satisfaction	4.33	.998	.035	.059	-.110*	.216**	.564**	
7. Work engagement	4.34	.895	-.121*	.107	.026	.087	.590**	.483**

Notes: \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$

### 4.3 Regression analysis

For the research hypothesis, this study uses the hierarchical regression method to test, and the results of the test are summarized as shown in Table 2.

In Table 2, model 1<sup>b</sup>, assessment of satisfaction of voice has a significant positive effect ( $\beta = 0.475$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), and the results support the hypothesis 2. Model 2<sup>b</sup> shows that the employee voice has a significant positive impact on the work engagement ( $\beta = 0.582$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). The results support the hypothesis 1.

A method according to Baron and Kenny, there are three main conditions for testing the mediating effect. In Model 2<sup>c</sup>, after adding the mediating variables, the employee voice still has a significant predictive effect on work engagement, but the predicted value is reduced (in model2<sup>b</sup>,  $\beta = 0.582$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , in model 2<sup>c</sup>, the  $\beta = 0.443$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Therefore, the evaluation satisfaction part mediates the relationship between voice and work engagement, Hypothesis 3 is supported.

TABLE II. Results Of Hierarchical Regression

Variables	PE Satisfaction		Work Engagement		
	Model1 <sup>a</sup>	Model1 <sup>b</sup>	Model2 <sup>a</sup>	Model2 <sup>b</sup>	Model2 <sup>c</sup>
Gender	.006	.086	-.105	-.019	-.041
Age	-.049	-.045	.058	.062	.073
Education	-.130*	-.097*	.003	.038	.063
Years of working	.187	.161*	.017	-.010	-.051
Employee voice		0.475***		.582***	.443***
PE Satisfaction					.254***
R <sup>2</sup>	.096	.371	.048	.358	.399
Adjust R <sup>2</sup>	.078	.357	.029	.343	.383
F value	5.278***	24.994***	2.52*	23.619***	24.490***
$\Delta R^2$	-	.275	-	.310	.041

Notes: \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$

## 5 RESEARCH CONCLUSIONS

This study examines the relationship among employee voice, evaluation satisfaction, and work engagement, and the results show that: (1) Employee voice in PE process is significantly positive for work engagement and individual's satisfaction with performance evaluation; (2) Performance evaluation satisfaction has a partially mediating role in the relationship between the employee voice and work engagement. This study is discussed from both theoretical and practical significance based on the findings.

The theoretical level is mainly reflected in two aspects: (1) Enriches the research on the effect of voice in the field of organizational justice. There are few literatures on the impact of this form of procedural justice on employments' attitudes and behaviors from the perspective of voice, especially in the discussion of human resources in the hospitality industry (Moon, 2017) [16]. (2) The indicator of employee response was refined. Among the social context factors of performance evaluation, the effectiveness of performance evaluation includes three aspects: the error and bias of the assessor, the accuracy of the assessment result, and the respondent's response (Harari and Rudolph, 2016) [17]. Among them, the respondent's response includes satisfaction with performance evaluation. This study explores the satisfaction of performance as an intermediary variable, and the study is more specific.

The practical level mainly in the following three aspects: (1) Adhere to fair procedures, broaden the channels for employees to speak, and pay attention to hotel employees' participation. For the hospitality industry in the tourism 4.0 era, it is no longer a standard service, but the service design. In the highly competitive tourism industry, they can make full use of various communication methods or channels, unblock the employee voice mechanism, treat the employee in a respectful and friendly manner, and encourage employees actively participate in the practice of human resource management. (2) Pay more attention to performance evaluation, focus on employee satisfaction assessment, really make good use of talents, and encourage talents. Employees' performance evaluation satisfaction is an important indicator in human resource management activities, which can effectively predict employee behavior (Yoshitaka and Jeewhan, 2016) [18]. The higher the employee's satisfaction, the higher their job performance. Employees are satisfied with performance appraisal, which means that the evidence provided by the organization's performance appraisal system for a series of activities, such as salary, promotion and training is reasonable, and the satisfaction of performance appraisal is the direct response of the staff to the performance appraisal, and then the staff will be more willing working in the organization brings higher performance to the organization.

So as managers, they should apply the voice effect in specific situations (such as performance evaluation, services training), to allow employees to participate more in organizational construction and attach importance to emotional support for employees. At the same time, the

organization needs to take the evaluation environmental into consideration, and focus on the truly service-oriented design.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported by the Science Foundation of Anhui Educational Committee (Grant NO. SK2016A0883 & SKHS2019B12), the Scientific Foundation of tourism talents training demonstration base in Anhui Province (Grant NO. YYRCYB1706), the Talent Startup Project of Huangshan university (Grant NO. 2015xskq002) and the Talent Startup Project of Huangshan university (Grant NO. 2015xskq002), Scientific Research Platform (Grant NO. kypt201815).

## REFERENCES

1. Pichler S, Varma A, Michel J S, et al. Leader-Member Exchange, Group- and Individual-Level Procedural Justice and Reactions to Performance Appraisals[J]. *Human Resource Management*, 2016, 55(5):871-883.
2. Sweetman D, Luthans F. "The Power of Positive Psychology: Psychological Capital and Work Engagement." *Work Engagement: A Handbook of Essential Theory and Research*. [C]. Hoboken: Taylor & Francis, 2010. 54-68.
3. Bakker A B, Demerouti E, Sanz-Vergel A I. Burnout and Work Engagement: The JD-R Approach [J]. *Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 2014, (1): 389-411.
4. Vermunt R, Steensma H. Procedural Justice[M]// *Handbook of Social Justice Theory and Research*. Springer New York, 2016:219-220.
5. Lind E A, Tyler T R. The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice[J]. *Critical Issues in Social Justice*, 1988,18(5):70-89.
6. Ng T W H, Feldman D C. Employee voice behavior: A meta-analytic test of the conservation of resources framework[J]. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 2012, 33(2): 216-234.
7. Jiao L, Zou Z, Wu H. Study on the Influence of Overall Justice Perceptions on Employee Voice Behavior: The Mediating Effect of Employees' Affect-based Trust and Cognition-based Trust in Supervisors[J]. *Jiangsu Science & Technology Information*, 2016(1):22-30.
8. Cropanzano R, Anthony E L, Daniels S R, et al. Social Exchange Theory: A Critical Review with Theoretical Remedies[J]. *Academy of Management Annals*, 2017, 11(1):1-38.
9. Strom D L, Sears K L, Kelly K M. Work Engagement: The Roles of Organizational Justice and Leadership Style in Predicting Engagement Among Employees[J]. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 2014, 21(1):71-82.
10. Magner N, Staley A B. Roles Of Instrumental And Noninstrumental Voice In Members' Reactions

- Toward Interorganizational Committees[J]. *International Journal Of Organization Theory & Behavior (Pracade)*, 2014:311-334.
11. Robbins T L, Summers T P, Miller J L, et al. Short Research Note: Using the group-value model to explain the role of noninstrumental justice in distinguishing the effects of distributive and procedural justice[J]. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 2000, 73(73):511-518.
  12. Lira M C. Satisfaction With a Performance Appraisal System in the Portuguese Public Sector: The Importance of Perceptions of Justice and Accuracy[J]. *TÉKHNE - Review of Applied Management Studies*, 2014, 12:30-37.
  13. Korsgaard M A, Roberson L. Procedural justice in performance appraisal: the role of instrumental and non-instrumental voice in performance appraisal discussions[J]. *Journal of Management*, 1995, 21(4): 657-669.
  14. Schaufeli W B. Applying the Job Demands-Resources model: A 'how to' guide to measuring and tackling work engagement and burnout[J]. *Organizational Dynamics*. 2017: 120-132.
  15. Wen Peng, Liao Jianqiao. The differential impact of different types of performance appraisal on employee appraisal response—A study from the perspective of appraisal purpose[J]. *Nankai Management Review*. 2010, 13(2): 142-150.
  16. Moon K K. Fairness at the Organizational Level: Examining the Effect of Organizational Justice Climate on Collective Turnover Rates and Organizational Performance[J]. *Public Personnel Management*, 2017, 46 (2): 118-143.
  17. Harari M B, Rudolph C W. The Effect of Rater Accountability on Performance Ratings: A Meta—Analytic Review [J]. *Human Resource Management Review*, 2016, 27 (1): 121-133.
  18. Yoshitaka Y, Jeewhan Y. A Cross—National Study of Fairness in Asia: How Perceptions of a Lack—of —Group Bias and Transparency in the Performance Evaluation System Relate to Job Satisfaction [J]. *Human Resource Management*, 2016, 55 (2): 1059-1077.