



University of Stavanger

Norwegian School of Hotel Management, NHS

University of
Stavanger

International Hotel and Tourism Management

MHRHOV – Master thesis

Retaining talented employees in the hotel industry in Stavanger: An interview-based qualitative research

Author:

Jedarm Park

Advisor:

Tone Therese Linge

MHRHOV

Foreword

According to Boxall & Purcell (2003) the skills, abilities and the knowledge that an employee possesses is seen as a crucial factor for why an organization can succeed in terms of competitive advantage. With these skills, abilities and knowledge further defining what a talented employee is (Luthans et. al., 2004), an essential part of operating an organization of this reason lies in retaining and managing talents efficiently. But although talent management therefore is in many organizations' interest there is however a lack of clarity when it comes to the definition of talent management (Lewis & Heckman, 2006). But by acknowledging the importance of a talented employee and on what that employee can contribute with the importance is to be able to manage talents in an efficient way. Although talent management is seen as a supporting factor for an organization to achieve its overall objectives (Cappelli, 2008), this shows the crucial of managing and retaining employees as they're seen an important contributor for an organization to achieve its goals and objectives. As there has been some researches done around retaining talents, many of them have been conducted on a quantitative context and in the context of U.S organizations. Of this reason I wanted to research on what different managers in the hospitality industry in Stavanger, Norway are doing in retaining talents. By looking deeper into the managers' subjective perspectives in retaining and managing talents, I also wanted find out how this could be perceived by the employees that was being employed under these managers.

In the end I want to thank my advisor Tone Therese Linge for all the help and support on the road to complete this research paper. Further I want to thank all the participating managers and employees for giving their time to participate in the interviews and therefore making it possible for me to do this research.

MHRHOV

Abstract

The aim of this research is to go deeper into what managers in three different organizations in the hotel industry in Stavanger are doing in retaining talented employees. With the literature reviews as a basis this research will therefore look into different manager's subjective perspectives and their measures in retaining the talented employees that belongs to their respective organization.

As this research is a qualitative study the data was gathered by conducting interviews. The sample size was eight in total distributed on three organizations, and where the participants consisted of four leaders and four employees within the hotel industry in Stavanger. The findings of this research shows that in the effort of retaining employees the managers are focusing on developing the employees' skills and abilities, this through tasks and challenges in their daily workday. However, the main challenge in retaining talented employees, this according to all the managers in all three organizations, seems to lie in the fact that the salary are too low. In addition to this a further challenge lies in each of the three organizations being located in Stavanger and in the oil industry, which is seen as a great contributor for employees in the hotel industry being attracted to a higher salary. But when it comes to the employees themselves their greatest motivational factor for staying in an organization seems to lie in having the opportunity to grow and develop.

The limitations for this research lies in the uneven number of participants, this in terms of the number of participating employees interviewed in the tree organizations but also in the participating managers and their distribution of roles within the organization. But considering that a conclusion must be drawn out from between the perspective of the managers compared to the perspective of the employees, this also show that these two perspectives doesn't always go well together.

Table of contents

1.0 Introduction.....	6
1.1 Background	6
2.0 Theoretical framework.....	8
2.1 Literature review	8
2.1.1 Turnover	10
2.1.2 The hospitality workforce.....	11
2.1.3 Talented employees	12
2.1.4 Leadership	14
2.1.5 Talent management	15
2.1.6 Feedback.....	17
2.1.7 HR in hospitality industry	18
2.1.8 Sourcing talented employees.....	19
2.1.9 Strategies in retaining valuable employees	21
3.0 Methodology	26
3.1 Descriptive research.....	28
3.2 Qualitative method	29
3.3 Interview	30
3.3.1 A semi-structured interview	32
3.4 Ethics.....	33
3.5 Conducting interview	36
3.5.1 Sample	37
3.5.2 Reliability and validity	39
3.5.3 Data analysis.....	43
3.5.4 Sample presentation.....	46
4.0 Findings.....	49
4.1 Findings Organization A:.....	49
4.2 Findings Organization B:	67
4.3 Findings Organization C:	77
5.0 Discussion	92
5.1 Organization A	92
5.2 Organization B	100
5.3 Organization C	107
5.4 Organization A, B and C.....	115

MHRHOV

6.0 Conclusion	135
6.1 Theoretical implications.....	135
6.2 Management implications	137
6.3 Limitations	140
6.4 Further recommendations.....	143
7.0 References.....	145
8.0 Appendix.....	150
8.1 Interview form (managers).....	150
8.2 Interview form (employees).....	154

MHRHOV

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background

In today's society organizations are more depended on the human resources and being aware of the essential role employees are having in an organization. The reason is because some of the essential contributions to why organizations are gaining competitive advantages is located in being able to have employees with skills, abilities and knowledge (Boxall & Purcell, 2003).

But although there is a bigger focus on the importance of having valuable employees in an organization, it turns out that turnover is a big challenge and a problem in an organization (Lockyer, 2007). Further, turnover is especially considered as a huge problem within the hotel industry, where the general number of employees in the hospitality industry are higher than other industries, this according to Wood (referred in Hoque, 2000). To retain employees in the organization in the hotel industry, and especially those of the employees that are seen as valuable, it is therefore important with an effective management on how to retain talented employees.

With this in mind the purpose of this research is about looking into what the managers in three of the main hotel chains here in Stavanger are doing considering managing talents in their organization.

In this context this paper will go deeper into how valuable employees are being retained and managed, this in terms of each of the managers' subjective perspective. The reason for why it is important to conduct this research is because as there are many researches about talent management and about retention in organizations in general there's a lack of researches concerning how these theories applies to the real life of an organization, and this especially in a Norwegian context.

But although talent management seems to be an important part of managing an

MHRHOV

organization the definition of “talent management” might not have the clarity that many might think. This shows to Lewis & Heckman (2006) stating that there is a lack of clarity in literature reviews of what talent management actually is when it comes to the definition of it, the scope of it and the goals behind talent management. In addition to that the turnover rate is much higher in the hospitality industry compared to others (Hinken & Tracey, referred in Lockyer, 2007), it is therefore important to go deeper into what specific measures the hospitality industry are doing in retaining talented employees. This research will therefore contribute to a deeper knowledge and understanding on how human resources are being managed in a much smaller sector of the hospitality industry, the Stavanger region, and in addition to gain a better understanding on different measures in managing and retaining talented employees in different organizations.

As mentioned the data collected are from the three main hotel chains in, which will remain anonymous. The method of this research paper is a qualitative research, this with the basis in interviews on three levels in each organization: the manager, the middle manager, and at last the employee. The reason for conducting three interviews of different levels in each organization is to first look into the policies and their specific measures in retaining valuable employees, this by interviewing the managers and middle managers and gain a manager’s perspective. Further interviews with the employees will be taken, this to gain a perspective on their reasons and motivations for staying, or leaving.

MHRHOV

With this research objective to identify what leaders in the hotel industry are doing in retaining talented employees, this shows to this paper's research questions:

A (The managers)

- What are the manager's perception of a talent, on being a good leader, and on how one can best retain talents in an organization in general?
- How does this influence the way the organization and its employees is being managed?

B (The employees)

- What are the important factors for wanting to stay in an organization?
- What are their perception of how the organization is being managed?

2.0 Theoretical framework

2.1 Literature review

According to Malhotra (referred in Whicker & Andrews, 2004) the knowledge that employees possesses are the most essential for an organizational competitive advantage. The challenge therefore lies in exploiting this knowledge in an organization, this according to Saint and Wallace (referred in Whicker & Andrews, 2004). With a possibility that employees with valuable knowledge and talent might leave an organization for another, which results in the employees bringing with them their talent and knowledge, the importance not only lies in managing employees in a way that the knowledge and talents possessed can be used as competitive advantage. It is also important in being a «learning organization» that motivates talented employees in sharing their talent and knowledge in return of nurturing the employee skills (Thite, 2004).

MHRHOV

In today's society's where services and products are more depended upon human skills and knowledge due to a higher demand and awareness on products and services among the consumers the importance in skilled employees and the essential in human resources can be shown in what they can contribute to their organization resulting in how the organization performs externally. According to Barney (referred in Barney & Wright, 1997) competitive advantage is provided by three basic resources; physical capital resources, organizational capital resources, and human capital resources, where this paper is going to focus on this last of the three resources. With the society being more based on skills and knowledge Barney and Wright (1997) further refers to a development towards a greater focus on the human resources in an organization and on how the employees as a resource are being managed. Although essential, managing talents seems to have an ongoing curse considering failures and dysfunctionality in properly getting a hold on managing human resources in organizations, this according to Cappelli (2008). Cappelli (*ibid*) further brings out organizations in the U.S. as an example where the issue lies in organizations being staggered between having a surplus of talents and to a shortcoming of talents. As this has become a repeating circle this shows the importance of an effective human resource management. But the organizational practices of how to manage an organization internally that one is familiar with today was already in focus as early as in 1950s. But since the 1950s the time has changed in a way that employees back then were in a manner bound to that firm, this in terms of going from one job to another was seen as a failure, which resulted in firms being highly depended on developing talented employees within their own firm. Although an organization first of all exists to make a profit and achieving their overall goals, today's highly competitive market and customer's high demands has led organizations to move from the classical «fordism» of mass production to rather adapt

MHRHOV

to the shifting demands in the market, this through the capability of human resources. As this shows that managing human resources can be seen as a secondary objective that exists just to achieve an organization's overall goals, it does not make it less important and essential. With talent management being a supporting factor in achieving an organization's overall objectives this at the same time shows the crucial role the skills and knowledge of employees are having in adding values to their organization (Cappelli, *ibid*).

2.1.1 Turnover

Going back to Cappelli (*ibid*) referring to the 1950s and on how the culture in an organization consisted of «lifetime employees» resulting in developing talents from within, this might also to an extent reflect how organizations are functioning today considering turnover. Turnover is seen as a big problem due to the major costs resulting from turnover and in hiring new employees (Lockyer, 2007). According to the United States Department of Labor's estimation of replacing a lost employee due to turnover in the hotel industry shows that it costs a company one third of an annual salary of a new-hired employee (Tanke, 2001, referred in Lockyer, 2007). Further it shows that there tends to be a large amount of employee in the hotel industry leaving an organization for another (Hinkin & Tracey, 2000, referred in Lockyer, 2007). This has become a big issue considering that this results in a reduction in the quality of service in the hospitality industry and at the hotels (Lockyer, 2007; Walsh & Taylor, 2007), and not least because this industry is highly depended on people in terms of employees. Especially in the hotel industry the level of turnover in terms of labor employees and managerial employees are general higher than in other industries (Wood, 1992, referred in Hoque, 2000, Yam & Raybould, 2011). However, the context of managing human resources today does not lie in the concern of employees leaving an organization for

MHRHOV

another nor the major turnover cost if they would leave the organization, but rather in the problem of turnover itself. Some of the reasons for the high level of turnover in the hospitality industry and especially in the front office is because of the demand for flexibility due to an 24/7 operation, and on the entry level where the skills required are not that high (Milman & Ricci, Taylor & Finley, referred in Yam & Raybould, 2011). At a more general level the differences in employees staying or leaving all comes to the working conditions, the payment and the opportunities of development compared with the effort the employees are putting in (Allen, 2008). As turnover becomes a challenge in the hospitality industry, attracting and retaining the resources of talented employees can not be replaced that easily, because the right employees possesses the power to contribute an organization to gain competitive advantage.

2.1.2 The hospitality workforce

But with that said, who is it that represents the workforce in the hospitality business? With the workforce in the hotel industry having a high proportion of women, young and/or casual workers, students and part-time employee (Wood, 1997, referred in Nickson, 2007) the hospitality industry in UK in 2003 had a higher proportion part-time employees (52 %) compared to other industries (25 %), this according to HtF (2003). Further the workforce with an education in the hospitality industry is also lower compared to other industries where the workforces has a higher number of education within their respective fields (People 1st, 2006). Considering low education among the hotel industry this can at the same time give a wrong picture, or as Lockyer (2007) states as an oversimplification. The reason is because according to Lockyer (*ibid*) there is a correlation between the educational level of the local population and on the pool of employees a hotel can hire from. As hospitality leaders at the same time recognize that even though developing a talent pool of high quality is depended on training and

MHRHOV

education, the opportunity to gain a professional development of the workforce is only offered in 67% of the hospitality industry in the U.S. (University of Phoenix, & American Hotel & Lodging Educational Institute, 2012).

Considering retaining employees in an organization, and more specifically valuable employees, Nickson (2007) refers to two factors that increases employees' motivation and commitment: a workplace that allows for involvement and engagement regarding their own experience as an employee, and having the opportunity to influence and a say in matters of managerial decision-making.

2.1.3 Talented employees

The concept and the description of a talent seems to have a variety of definitions where one definition doesn't seem to be less valid compared to other definitions. However, when it comes to a talented employee in an organizational setting a various authors seems to agree on some characteristics that repeats itself or having a common thread, even though the concept and the definition of a talent can be slightly different. For instance talented employees in a knowledge-based organization, an organization strongly influenced by employees' skills and ability, is defined as those who through their human- and social capital are adding essential values to his/her organization (Gavin, Edmondson & Gino, 2008, Conner & Prahalad, 1996, Dess & Shaw, 2001). In other words an employee is being talented because of his/her human capital of abilities, skills, experience and knowledge, and due to their social capital of social skills and abilities to create relationships of trust and by then develop a network in the organization (Luthans et. al., 2004).

As one is increasingly depended on human knowledge and skills the importance of having skilled employees is as mentioned seen as a major contribution for an

MHRHOV

organization's competitive advantage (Barney, 1991, Boxall, 1996, Boxall & Purcell, 2003). In other words talented employees are being «labeled» as talents because of their ability and knowledge to affect the organizational culture and by being more than just an employee. But as knowledge that is being possessed by an employee can make them become a valuable employee it is at the same time difficult to capture and keep knowledge in an organization, this because knowledge is portable (Boyle, 2013b).

Groysberg (referred in Oldroyd & Morris, 2012) further refers to that talents are employees who are performing superiorly in relation to others and are therefore clearly visible in the labor market. On a resource-based view this therefore results in some employees naturally becoming more valuable than others in an organization (Becker & Huselid, referred in Oldroyd & Morris, 2012). Of this reason the challenge lies in both communicating how employees fits in an organization strategy (Boyle, 2013a), and also on which factors to look for when identifying talents or potential talents when it comes to their role in the future of the organization (Silzer & Church, 2009).

But with this said, talent can also be aimed beyond the individual level, where McDonnell et. al. (2010) and their definition of a talent is divided into two groups. The first one is talented employees where their use of skills and knowledge displays a clear contribution for why organizational objectives is being reached, which makes the employees a valuable resource. The second one is about that as there is a number of employees who stands out from the average due to their performances, they will become potentials for future key roles strategically in an organization. Silzer and Dowell's (referred in Silzer & Church, 2009) view of talents are a bit similar in a way that they further suggest that the term «talent» is divided into an individual level and on a group level in an organization. On the individual level talent is based on what an

MHRHOV

individual can accomplish and contribute to their organization through what they possess of skills, abilities and knowledge. On the group level talent is defined as skills, abilities and knowledge leading to a pool of employees being skilled in some specific areas. According to Allen (2008) it is therefore important to have in mind the importance of preparing employees in roles they not are in possession at current time. The reason is because even if they are a very skilled employees who performs in an organization it does not mean they will naturally become a good manager.

Enz (2010) therefore states the essential in the strategic aspect human resource management, this considering that as labor in most hospitality organizations are the greatest cost the way the human resources are being managed is essential for gaining competitive advantage.

2.1.4 Leadership

According to Daft (2011) leadership is defined as a relationship based on influence between leaders and followers where they intend to change the organization to best reflect their shared purposes. Leadership therefore consists of six key elements:

- The *influence* people, in this case leaders and followers, have on each other and how changes in the organization is reflected through the shared values between leaders and followers.
- Leadership is not about maintaining what already is in an organization but to always wanting to *change* an organization for the better.
- This shared view among leader and followers to change the organization therefore reflects a *purpose* of what they desire to become in the future.
- Leadership is a process involving people resulting in a leader must know how to be an example but to also be able to *follow* others.
- Leadership is therefore about having all of the organization members knowing

MHRHOV

the *intention* of change and by each of them being responsible for this goal.

- Leadership is shared among the leader and the followers, meaning that everyone must have the passion and engagement to take the organization to the next level.

As the world is constantly changing so does the concept and the different paradigms of leadership. Daft (*ibid*) draws out shift in leadership paradigms like going from stability to crisis management, from control to empowerment, from being a hero taking all the credit to being a humble leader sharing the credit, from being self-centered to being high-ethical driven, from competition to collaboration, and from being uniformity to being diverse. In today's modern society leadership is therefore based on being able to use human skills. But the concepts of *leadership* and *management* is something that can easily be mixed and be used as the same thing. But Daft (*ibid*) states there is a difference in these two terms. As mentioned earlier leadership is a relationship where the intention lies in influencing each other to change the organization. Management on the other hand is referred as the specific actions of planning, staffing, organizing, directing and controlling the resources of an organization to achieve the overall goals. With other words, as leadership is about creating core values and culture of the organization leading to their vision, management is about the specific actions the organizations are making to achieve their missions.

2.1.5 Talent management

But then what is talent management? In this context talent management is according to Chugh & Bhatnagar (2006) and Hughes & Rog (2008) defined as a HR approaching process that concerns with recruiting and retaining talents and their growth through managing careers, role expectations, planning replacement, identifying the gaps in talents, and on the relation it has to the organization, where this paper will leave out recruitment and rather focus on talent management and the context in talented

MHRHOV

employees that is already a part of an organization. As mentioned earlier the challenges in talent management lies in communicating how employees fits in an organizational strategy (Boyle, 2013a), this with which factors to look for when identifying talents when it comes to the future of an organization (Silzer & Church, 2009). However, in order to exploit the skills and abilities of talents Chambers et. al. (1998) states the importance of a shared mindset at all levels of an organization on how to manage talents. In other words there must be an open communication at all levels where there is room to state your opinion in the meeting rooms. But for this to be in place Enz (2010) states that an organization is depended on a leadership that has the skills and ability to be aware of the range of the human resources they have in the organization and what they are capable of achieving with these resources as this is correlated with how effective the organization's strategy is. By then being more than a "boss", by being a leader that facilitates for a learning environment this can become a contributor in harnessing the skills, ability and the potential in employees. But for this to take place Enz (*ibid*) states the importance of supporting and helping employees in knowing the business and the environment their organization is in, this in terms of knowing what the customer wants, knowing what the next move of the competitors can be, and on solving a problem or a challenge in the most efficient way.

In maximizing an organizational strategy considering retainment the HR is therefore about effective management to the human resources in an organization, and especially to those of the human resources that adds value, and where the use of feedback is essential (Boyle, 2013a).

This can also further relate to Lewis & Heckman (2006) defining talent management in three different perspectives: 1) the human resource practices of recruitment,

MHRHOV

development and managing careers, 2) the talent pools of always ensuring a continuous of flow of employees working in the organization overall, and 3) managing talents based on either high performance and high potential or a talent in general.

2.1.6 Feedback

The essential in the use of feedback is shown in how Enz (2010) is referring feedback as a factor that is a part of the organization's history in a way that feedback from actions and measures done in the organization can be something employees can learn and improve from or something that can be an obstacle in further developing oneself in an organization. In other words feedback is a term used when the aim is to support individual learning through evaluating and communicating (Kunich & Lester, referred in Daft, 2011). However, there are some challenges and problems when it comes to feedback, especially when it comes to that people find it difficult to both give and receive negative feedback, and when it comes to some organizations only using feedback for annual evaluating times, this according to Cannon & Witherspoon (referred in Daft, 2011). To be an effective leader it is therefore important to give feedback on a regular basis regardless of the feedback being positive, negative or constructive. Giving feedback on the spot especially in a situation where an employee have accomplished or are doing a difficult task is essential, this so the employee know where he/she stands and on knowing which areas to improve. What the leader therefore must consider when it comes to feedback is to give feedback as soon as possible rather than an annual review, this to either correct or reinforce a behavior or an action. Further a feedback must be used solely based on the performance and on how to improve the performance and not based on the person. At last the feedback must be specific to be effective (Cannon & Witherspoon, referred in Daft, 2011).

MHRHOV

2.1.7 HR in hospitality industry

In managing human resources in hotels that is part of a chain Shamir (referred in Hoque, 2000) suggests that the HRM strategy approach are more likely to be sophisticated and formal in these kind of organizations, this regardless of there being a proper HR department at the hotel unit or if HR is a part of one's job title. The reason lies in each of the individual hotel units having the opportunity of being more efficient because of an environment giving more flexibility and consistency in moving staff around within their chain. However, for a hotel chain to be that flexible Hoque (*ibid*) further states the importance of having a proper HRM in the hotels considering monitoring skills training and on the functioning of a flexible environment. However, on a unit level the impact and influence from the head office considering the HRM approach is depended on the size of the hotel chain. Although the hotel chains that this paper is going to focus on are seen as big chains in a Norwegian scale, they are more likely to fit into the term of a small chain, this considering Hoque's (2000) definition of a small chain having a quantity of around 13 hotels. So when further referring to Hoque (*ibid*) considering HR practices and policies at small chains each hotel is rather flexible on how the personnel manager at the unit level is introducing HR practices. The reason is because in small hotel chains the level of hierarchy is small leading to that as there is a minimum of directions from the head office on how to approach and implement practices this results in becoming depended on the personnel manager. It is therefore the personnel manager's responsibility on the unit level to develop and tailor HR practices to best fit the context they are in. But when it comes to strategies and practices of HRM there are two practices that must be mentioned, the best practice and best fit. According to Nickson (2007) best practice is an HRM approach that is based on that the practices of HRM are universal and therefore in theory fits all organizations regardless of what kind of organization it is. In other words this is a general approach that is based on a

MHRHOV

mindset that a specific way of practicing SHRM can be used in organizations regardless of them being in the same market. Best fit on the other hand is an approach based on adapting and tailoring the HR strategy more to the specific organization and the market they are in. The strategy of best fit, this based on Hoque's (2000) description on the HR approach in small hotel chains in mind, seems therefore to be the most appropriate approach in this paper. However, in creating HR strategies Enz (2010) states that training, reward and benefits are three factors that are forming these strategies, and where the skills and abilities of the employees are then influencing how the future HR strategies will be.

2.1.8 Sourcing talented employees

Considering sourcing out certain types of talents and potentials that is wanted for an organization the type of employees wanted depends on the type of organization and hence the qualities of the employees (Chambers et. al., 1998). Of this reason an organization must not only be specific in types of qualities in employees they prefer, but also develop training program and managing talents in a way that the qualities possessed can become a contributing factor for an organization gaining success. According to Silzer & Church and Silzer & Dowell (referred in Silzer & Church, 2009) organizations has for the last 15 years started to focus more on the issue of identifying and developing talents for an organization in the long run, this because of organizations facing a challenge in a shortage of qualified candidates fitting into an organization. Of this reason identifying potential talents has been a more significant part of an organization, this with the crucial part of identifying talents in an early stage in career and giving them an opportunity of having a wider role. But with this Silzer & Church (2009) further states that the purpose of identifying potential talents at such an early stage lies in having them prepared to future organization positions and roles, positions

MHRHOV

and roles that can at present time be unknown or not yet defined. Of this reason a potential talent's individual skill and ability is not based on them taking up a specific role in the organization for now, which can also be a challenge. The characteristics in identifying potential talents is therefore specified in their human- and social capital, and also in their team work spirit, being able to be proactive, their learning potential, leadership skills and their negotiation skills (Conner, 2000; Lombardo & Eichinger, 2000; Pepermans et al, 2003, referred in Govaerts et al., 2011).

Chambers et. al. (1998) further suggests four slightly different talent pools that organizations seeks to attract: «Go with a winner», «Big risk, big reward», «Save the world», and «Lifestyle». And although slightly different, Chambers et. al. (1998) refers to all four of them having the basis in the importance of culture and values.

- «Go with a winner»: the executives seeks growth and advancement
- «Big risk, big reward»: the executives values employee's career advancement over organization's overall success
- «Save the world»: the executives more focused on exciting challenges and missions that inspires, rather than personal development
- «Lifestyle»: the executives are more focused on flexibility regarding personal lifestyle rather than employees' excitement and the growth of the organization.

Chambers et. al. (*ibid*) states with this that considering sourcing out certain type of talents that is wanted for an organization, the more successful organizations are able to focus on one particular talent pool and not by applying to some part of the four pools. It therefore seems that what distinguishes potentially talented employees from others lies in the skills and the ability they have to really make an influence in an organization. The

MHRHOV

reason for a talent becoming a valuable asset for an organization seems therefore to lie in their natural abilities of doing skills well, and/or by being well-experienced through acquiring their knowledge and skills. With this in mind the importance therefore lies in the essential role of human resource management in sourcing and succession planning of valuable employees, and especially having a manager who can get people to make decisions together, this by having the best fitted person in the most appropriate positions.

2.1.9 Strategies in retaining valuable employees

The purpose of retention can be seen in Frank et. al. (2004) and their definition of that retaining talents are done with the purpose of achieving business objectives. Retaining talented employees can of this reason be seen as strategic actions taken for the purpose of achieving current organizational objectives, and especially for the future. To retain talents Chambers et. al. (1998) further mentions «a winning employee value proposition», meaning that for an organization to appeal to the employees they want to keep the organization's product and brand must be tailored in such way that it appeals to the employees. More closely this appeal is about the authenticity on how the organization is represented both externally and internally in the organizational culture and its values (Chambers et. al., 1998, Ready et. al., 2008). In other words the intrinsic rewards of job challenge, involvement and task variety, and the extrinsic rewards of employee learning, development and performance-related pay is crucial in employees job satisfaction and on them staying (Allen, 2008; Hausknecht, Rodda & Howard, 2009; Walsh & Taylor, 2007). The importance of employee involvement and engagement is further shown in that engaged employees are five times more likely to stay in an organization compared to those who are less engaged (Ramsay, 2006).

MHRHOV

According to Gibbons (referred in Hughes & Rog, 2008) the top drivers leading to employee engagement are:

- A management that cares about the employees
- The employee feelings of being a part of the organization and the feeling of contribute to the organization's objectives
- The opportunity to advance in career and in their skills
- The value of relationships in the organization towards colleagues and manager

In addition to this money is further mentioned in a way that to retain talents one must pay what it takes, meaning that there should not be any limit to the cost of retaining talents as this is seen as an «investment» on the future success of a company.

However, considering the factors that makes employees stay in an organization in general Allen (2008) especially mentions the word *connections* as an important contribution for why employees are staying in organization. This connection is referred as the relationships that is being created with others, this by developing relationships with employees on and off job that will contribute to people staying. Here Allen (*ibid*) suggests three types of connections that are contributors for staying: links, fit and sacrifice. Links is about the relationships that one creates with others in the organization, like mentors and co-workers. Fit is about the extent of how compatible one feels about their job and the organization. The last one, sacrifice, is about the consequences and the sacrifices one have to make if leaving their job, this in terms of relationships with others, working environment, and the potential in financial reward. This however shows that retaining employees and especially valuable employees lies in the strategic HR management of the human resources of not only approaching the employees as resources to gain competitive advantage in the organization, but also

MHRHOV

considering the human aspect of the importance in creating a culture of communication. When it comes to the organization and on how to develop and train the employees Nickson (2007) divides this into several levels, from the bigger company perspective and all the way down to the individual level. On the company level training and developing is seen in a stage where there is an unified agreement overall in the company on how training should be approached and achieved, and that this is in correlation with the units considering if it is operational. On the unit level the focus is more narrowed down to ensuring that there is a development plan leading to that training takes place and that this is being monitored. The next level is down to team level, a stage where the importance lies in team building through motivating and performing. The last level of training and developing is on the individual level where this is a stage with the focus on improving their motivation and performance by improving their attitudes, skills and knowledge. As this is a part of defining their organizational culture this level is also about improving their discipline and behavior, and by this be given the opportunity of career advancement.

Considering retention of employees in organizations in general it therefore shows that employees who is being given the opportunity of training has a greater possibility of staying in the organization compared to those who does not receive training, this according to Allen (2008). This opportunity of getting training is therefore weighted heavily in an employee feeling the opportunity to grow and therefore the reasons to stay. With this in mind Walker (referred in Govaerts et al., 2011) further mentions seven factors in retaining talents: work challenge, learning opportunities, having their performance and capabilities recognized, the importance in a good communication in the organization, a work-life balance that is good, and a good relationship with other

MHRHOV

employees.

The importance of letting employees learn and develop themselves by putting them in work assignments they are not necessarily prepared for and by letting them use their skills to overcome challenges or learn by gaining new skills they did not have are shown as a strong contribution to why employees are staying (Chambers et al., 1998; Echols, 2007, referred in Govaerts et al., 2011).

The importance of giving the employees the feeling and the opportunity to grow by putting employees in these kind of situations are therefore important factors on how challenges, works that is meaningful, and the advancement opportunities has on employees staying and increasing their commitment towards the organization (Birt, et al., referred in Govaerts et al., 2011; Walsh & Taylor, 2007). However, according to Walsh & Taylor (2007) the strongest drive for employees being committed to their organization lies in those who are most committed when facing challenging tasks and work and therefore performs with high level. The reason is because they identifies themselves with the organization and their job, which makes it more natural to be committed. As this shows the importance of giving employees the opportunity to grow by training and learning Govaerts et. al. (2011) distinguishes between two types of approaches in training: the gap approach and the appreciative approach. As the first approach, gap approach, are more based on a training approach because there is a need of training due to a lack of skills, the second approach of training are aimed towards developing skills and talents, this for the organization to gain competitive advantage. The appreciative approach is therefore a management view of seeing values in the human resources and seeing the importance in using employees actively through their skills in achieving organizational objectives, which seems to be main factors in retaining employees.

MHRHOV

However Steel et. al. (referred in Hausknecht, Rodda & Howard, 2009) states the importance in tailoring the strategies of training to fit specific talented groups or to the specific employee rather than adapting an universal strategy. In implementing policies regarding managing talents Hughes & Rog (2008) therefore states that the different approaches of HR practices must be based on the strategies either being aimed at employees in general or against a specific group. But for HR practices in managing talents to be implemented in all levels of the organization Morton (referred in Hughes & Rog, 2008) states that this is depended on the commitment and the drive from the CEO to make this a priority, this to change the mindset and the culture of the organization. However, Morton's (referred in Hughes & Rog, 2008) view on the party responsible for talent management is further not directly aimed at the HR department. Talent management and its strategic approach is rather based on having a clear plan that can be effectively implemented, and where the outcome of the results are beneficial in a way that this strategy can be shared in the rest of the organization. The HR's responsibility in this context therefore lies in making sure that the process of implementing it to other areas in the organization is happening effectively, this through policies and practices.

Further a study shows that when it comes to a talented employee he/her are more likely to stay in an organization the higher up in the job level or the hierarchy the person is in (Hausknecht, Rodda & Howard, 2009). The reason lies in the opportunity to further advance, the relationships developed, their commitment and satisfaction with the organization and its prestige. As those of the employees that are lower in the organization, like hourly workers, are more likely to stay based on the extrinsic rewards, those higher up in the organization are more likely to stay due to prestige of the organization and advancing themselves. But creating HR strategies in retaining talents it

MHRHOV

was mentioned earlier about the concern also lying in the benefits and rewards, this according to Enz (2010). When it comes to the workforce in the hospitality industry Demody et. al. (referred in Deery, 2008) states that those who are more likely to be motivated and staying in the organization are those of the employees who are being paid by the hour. The reason for this lies in the benefits of the incentive paying programs in form of mentor programs, a flexible work and cash bonuses.

However, to be in an organizational environment where the employees has the opportunity to develop by exploring oneself in «uncharted waters», the question of retaining talents first of all lies in the importance of an strong organizational culture (Ready et. al., 2008). This organizational culture is shown where there is a commitment towards the employees in terms of career advancement and growth, something that is depended on a strong leadership.

3.0 Methodology

A research study is a process that goes through several stages (Perkins, 2013):

- 1) Defining the research objective/problem because there is a lack of knowledge or info in this area.
- 2) Planning a research design, this by first researching on secondary data to gather evidence supporting your arguments.
- 3) Planning a sample, and justifying why the specific sample have been chosen.
- 4) Collecting data, this through designing interviews etc.
- 5) Analyzing the data.
- 6) Presenting the data in written form by.

According to Neuman (2009) the research is a process done to get as close to the truth as possible. The reason is because as knowledge never can be perfect because it is accumulating over time, the best way of gaining knowledge is therefore done by doing

MHRHOV

research. A research is in other words based on a conclusion gaining more knowledge or information and where the reason for conducting a research lies in not knowing much about a specific theme, topic or a field. The outcome of a research therefore lies in trying to find an answer to what you are questioning, this by systematically gathering empirical evidence and by processing this information. By then using this as evidence in interpreting on how this can be related to what you are researching about, it is important to know that a research are only leading to gaining new knowledge and insight, and not resulting in an absolute conclusion. As Neuman (*ibid*) further states that a good research does not conclude with a final conclusion but are rather leading to further questions, a good research is depended on the researcher being able to think critical. This critical thinking is about being able to not arrive at the quickest and easiest answer, but to look at a research question from several point of views and by looking at all aspects possible with an open mind. Neuman (*ibid*) distinguishes the purpose of a research into four categories: exploring an issue because it is new/unknown; describing in depth an issue; explaining why a situation occurs in specific ways; and about evaluating if something works.

The design of a research and its approach is further depended on the research question, its topic and the empirical data gathered. This is then resulting in what kind of technique you will use to gather data. But Neuman (*ibid*) further states the importance in choosing a collection technique that fits to the research question, where one must be aware of the variety of techniques in research and what the strengths and the limitations of each techniques are. When conducting a research there are two different methods that are used: quantitative and qualitative, where the quantitative method of conduction a study is based on numbers in form of experiments, surveys and questionnaires, while a qualitative method is based on using words in form of interviews or focus groups. In

MHRHOV

other words the differences in the two methods is based on basing a research on the quantity of numbers or by expressing the research through the quality of words.

In choosing which method to use there have according to Kvale (1996) been views on that quantitative method are more relevant in social science than qualitative. The reason is because we live in a world where solid proof in terms of numbers is needed to be a reliable source of information. But this perspective has been changed considering both quantitative and qualitative method in a way that the utility of each one is depended on how they best can respond to a research question. So as quantitative research is relying more onto numbers in trying to find results one has the opportunity to go deeper into the human situation with qualitative method.

3.1 Descriptive research

Because this paper is looking deeper into specific measures the management are doing in retaining talents this paper will be under the category of “describing in depth an issue” of Neuman’s (2009) four categories, where a descriptive research with qualitative method seems most appropriate.

As descriptive research is about presenting data and details that has been gathered from specific situations (Neuman, *ibid*), this approach will best give a close answer to this research question. The reason is because this paper will go deeper into three different organizations and on people’s subjective and personal perceptions, characteristics, feelings, reasons and perspectives on a matter and on how they might act according to these factors in terms of management and employee behavior, where a qualitative research is the best way of understanding and looking into these factors (Punch, 2005).

3.2 Qualitative method

The research objective of this paper is about going deeper into what kind of measures the managers at three different hotels in Stavanger are doing in retaining talented. From before there are several researches done in trying to find an answer to this, this by looking into a various retaining strategies and approaches from the management's point of view. Some examples of these studies are "Talent management, work-life balance and retention strategies" by Margaret Deery from 2008, "Talent management: A strategy for improving employee recruitment, retention and engagement within hospitality organizations" by Hughes & Rog from 2008, "Developing In-House Careers and Retaining Management Talent: What Hospitality Professionals Want from Their Jobs" by Walsh & Taylor from 2007, and many more. However, many of these studies has been based on the hospitality business in the context of the U.S, this in addition to being quantitative studies that have been aiming to find out "*what are...?*" or "*which are...?*". Of this reason the question on how the hotel industry are retaining talents are very generalized and in addition to being compared to how organizations in the U.S are functioning, where the issue of how to run an organization can be different from other parts of the world. In addition to studies being focusing on the U.S. many of the studies have been using a quantitative method with a sample size of several hundreds of employees across the industry providing less knowledge beyond the individual's deeper perspectives on retaining. With the background of this paper going in to how to retain talented employees in the hotel industry, this in a Norwegian and Stavanger context, the most appropriate approach to this matter are therefore with a qualitative approach. The reason is because although it is important to use quantitative method to find out which attributes or factors both the employees and the management are seeing as more valuable in the context of talent management and on skills, abilities etc., it is also important to go deeper into those answers and find out "*why are...?*" and

MHRHOV

“*how come...?*”. This can be shown to Rubin & Rubin (2005) stating that a quantitative method based on numbers are not telling the whole picture of a research objective and are therefore limiting. This is because the collected data are losing much of its depth because the research is only based on interpreting numbers, where learning is based on finding answers to why things are as it is.

3.3 Interview

As written earlier this paper is going deeper into people’s perception, characteristics, feelings, reasons and perspectives in terms of how managers are retaining talents, and where Punch (2005) states that in qualitative research conducting interviews is seen as a good way of looking deeper into human perceptions and meanings. As interview in addition is one of the main tools for collecting data in qualitative research, the types of interviews are different depended on the purpose of the research. But what qualitative interviews are having in common is that it is a unique conversation between the researcher and the interviewee in a way that the interviewee shares experiences and understandings, which leads the interview to be subjective (Rubin & Rubin, 2005).

As this research fits in the terms of what Rubin & Rubin (*ibid*) further states as an organizational-culture research, where the aim is to look deeper into specific organizations, the interview is based on the interviewer acting more as an active listener giving the interviewee room to express their opinions.

Considering the six stages of a research process by Perkins (2013) that was mentioned earlier under the heading “Methodology”, this can be seen as a research process that is very general and can therefore suit both a quantitative- and a qualitative research method. For the purpose of a qualitative research using interviews Kvale (1996)

MHRHOV

suggests a research process of seven stages that is, although very similar to the research process already mentioned, more tailored to a qualitative research:

- 1) To formulate and describe the purpose of this research. Here the research objective is being formulated by analyzing the theories in the field to gain pre-knowledge of the topic, and then to become familiar to the different interviewing techniques.
- 2) To plan the research design by being prepared with the required knowledge on the field. This stage is in other words where you prepare how you are intending to collect the data in terms the interview technique and the sample.
- 3) To conduct the interviews, this with the ethical aspects that concerns around the interview. This paper will go deeper into this issue later.
- 4) To transcribe the interview to analyze it, this where the method of typing the recorded interview being more reliable for later analysis than relying solely on your memory from the interview. Here the interviewer has to take the environment of where the interview is taking place into consideration, where recording the interview is depended on a room with minimal background noise and where one can clearly hear both the interviewer's- and the interviewee's voice.
- 5) To analyze the material by deciding which method to use. Here there is five approaches to consider:
 - a. Categorization of meaning, focusing on differences between categories
 - b. Condensation of meaning, a complex approach focusing on analyzing how natural meanings are being interpreted by individuals
 - c. Structuring of meaning through narratives, focusing on an interview analysis being narrative in terms of building/continuing an interview

based on what has been said.

- d. Interpretation of meaning, focusing on that the interviewer are interpreting interviews based on having a perspective on the research objectives, and basing the interviews based on the interpretation of this “pre-knowledge”.
 - e. Ad hoc methods for generating meaning, focusing on using different techniques in analyzing depended on the interview material.
- 6) To determine the generalization, reliability and the validity of the interview outcome. More closely this is about analyzing if the results are consistent in terms of the resulting being the same if the interviews was conducted with other participants. Further this stage is looking into if a research paper actually was researching what it was intended to do, or if it has a slightly misleading.
 - 7) This last stage is about putting the findings into readable words, this in addition to being scientific and ethical.

3.3.1 A semi-structured interview

For this research the semi- structured interview seemed most appropriate in obtaining data on specific topics based on the interviewee’s perspective, and on how this affects how hotels are retaining talented employees. The reason is because to collect data for this research the importance of the interview outcome lies in obtaining answers to some specific topics and giving the interviewees the room to answer this as they prefer at the same time. According to Rubin & Rubin (2005) an interview that is semi-structured is based on narrowing questions down to more specific ones based on what has been answered on earlier questions, where the structure of the earlier questions is relied on being broad and general about a topic, this to have a foundation for questions later. Further the elements of a semi-structured interview is based on being able to

MHRHOV

prepare suggested or planned questions beforehand, this to ensure that the interview covers the necessary topics of the research, and where the structure of this approach can at the same time be seen as an “open” conversation giving the opportunity to follow up answers and questions if needed (Kvale, 1996).

As the interview questions is further based on general and open questions at the beginning where the basis of their answers lies in their knowledge and perspective of the topic, this will also lead to also affecting their answers at the more specific interview questions later in the interview.

However, when conducting the interview where the interaction is based on a dialogue or a conversation, it is important for the interviewer to establish an environment where the interviewee feels safe leading to them being able to talk freely. The best way of doing this is by asking open questions reducing the psychological control that you as an interviewer are having and giving the interviewee the opportunity to speak about what is important to them (Silverman, 2004).

In this research I will therefore use semi-structured interview by having preparing questions surrounding the topics that needs to be covered, this by starting off with general questions as a foundation for their subjective perspective. In this type of interview the questions after the general ones will relate more to how the scientific literature and secondary data that has been collected on this topic can be compared to the participants’ subjective perspectives. The purpose of doing this lies in making their subjective and their pre-knowledge based answers more explicit (Flick, 2006).

3.4 Ethics

When it comes to ethics Punch (2005) states that as ethical issues both involves in quantitative and qualitative researches because it involves gathering information from- and about people, the issues are more sensitive in qualitative studies. The reason is

MHRHOV

because unlike quantitative research a qualitative research has the opportunity to go even deeper into the aspects of people's personal lives in terms of writing about people's sensitive or intimate matters. The awareness of ethical issues in research further involves all the stages in a research process, from start to end (Punch, 2005; Kvale, 1996):

- Beside of a research paper being scientific the ethical issues also involves the question of how this can improve the situations people who are being investigated.
- The interview subjects must also be informed about the research purpose, and therefore the reason for conducting the interviews. It is also important to consider how much details of the research design that should be provided, where this may affect the subject.
- Further confidentiality and anonymity needs to be clarified as this is essential in terms of keeping private data that can identify the subject, where the interviewer has a moral responsibility.
- When it comes to transcribing and analyzing the interviews the ethical issues are in the statements by the subjects and on the extent of how critically this statement should be analyzed and interpreted.
- Considering reporting the collected data the researcher's responsibility lies in the consequences of reporting the interviews in terms of the subject itself and on the organization the person belongs in.

In the case of this qualitative research going deeper into the interview subject's perceptions, I as a researcher, do therefore have a moral obligation to act ethical, where the most essential factor of being ethical lies in the integrity you have as a person

MHRHOV

(Neuman, 2011).

Before the interviews took place the interviewees was informed through mail about the purpose of conducting this research and hence the reason for conducting the interview, this so the interviewee could be informed about the purpose of why I as a researcher was going deeper into this topic. However, when informing the interviewees about the purpose of the research and the interviews the awareness of not giving too much information about my research objectives was taken into consideration, as this could in a directly or indirectly matter affect how the interviewees would respond during the interviews. Further it was specified that the interviewee would be kept anonymous, where being anonymous and this especially considering interviewing the employees, seemed to be strongly correlated to being able to participate in the interview with a bigger “ease” and by being able to speak more honestly and speak by heart. The interviewees was therefore being notified that the aim of their answers to the interview questions was not based on them giving a “right” or “wrong” answer, but on rather giving an honest answer based on themselves as a person, and that this would not in any manner be portrayed negatively in the research paper. The participants was also being notified and I was also getting their permission of the interviews being recorded with a recording device for the interviews, and that the purpose of recording the interview lied in easier analyzing the interviews and only that, and that the audio file would be deleted after use. As all this was informed through mail as mentioned earlier, this was also repeated verbally to each interviewee right before the interview took place.

MHRHOV

3.5 Conducting interview

When conducting an interview there are precautions to consider as an interviewer, as it was shown under the title “Ethics”. But as mentioned under the title “Interview”, an interview can not just be seen as an interview. Because of the subjectivity in qualitative research and in interviewing this is more likely to be seen as an unique conversation between the researcher and the interviewee about his/her subjective perspectives through expressing the feelings and insights of the interviewee (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). To being able to create an interviewing environment that is based on having a so-called conversation Neuman (2009) mentions the important role of the researcher to open him/herself up by talking lightly about everything and anything right before the interview begins, this to lighten the mood. By doing so one builds a basis of a positive relationship with the interviewee by building a form of trust and encourage the interviewee to open up and give them the feeling of being comfortable with the interview. This is also something that I experienced at first hand at the very first interview. Being able to lighten the mood for the interviewee is crucial considering how the rest of the interview would go and on being able to build a relationship based on trust during the short period where the interview take place. Since all the interviews took place at the respective hotels of the participants, the more specific location of the interview was either in the GM’s (General Manager) office or in an available conference room, where the need for a quiet room for ourselves lied in not being disturbed by the surroundings and other interruptions, and because of the use of a recorder.

Further as the aim of these interviews is based on wanting the interviewee’s subjective perspectives, it is important to not give leading questions but by encouraging them to answer in a natural way. But with this in mind the use of *probe* became necessary in some occasions during some of the interviews. As *probe* by Neuman (2011) is defined

MHRHOV

as a form of request to clarify an answer, whether it is to complete an answer that has been incomplete or to obtain a more specific or relevant response, there are several ways to perform this. In my case two ways of *probes* was used to clarify an incomplete answer or to obtain the relevant response needed, this was performed by either giving a couple of seconds of pause or by nodding while giving eye contact.

3.5.1 Sample

Considering sampling this is according to Punch (2005) just as important in qualitative research as it is in quantitative research. But as quantitative research has the opportunity of random sampling the sampling approach in qualitative is done with a motive and a clear reason behind when choosing the sample, a so-called “purposive sampling”. When it comes to strategies in qualitative sampling it is further underlying principles considering how this should be in line with the research objective and the research design. In other words the chosen sample must be logical compared to what the research is trying to find out. Rubin & Rubin (2005) therefore states that when choosing a sample the participants must both have knowledge and also be experienced in the area you are researching and interviewing about.

With this in mind the sample I want to test for this research is divided into two sampling groups: the manager's perspective, and in the perspective of the employees in each of the organizations. Although this research's objective of looking deeper into retaining talents is by looking specifically at what actions each of the GMs are doing in retaining and managing employees in the organizations, one might tend to only focus on just the leaders and on what they are doing. But for this research objective it seems to be just as important to also gain an understanding by looking into the viewpoint of the employees as well. The reason is because although this research is first of all based on the leaders

MHRHOV

and their management, this management is at the same time being performed and meant for the purpose of the employees. Looking into the perception and the employee's point of view as well can of this reason gain a more meaningful understanding and picture on how the human resources is being managed and on how well this is actually working.

But with this in mind, the sampling plan from the beginning has been to test a population consisting of one GM, one HR manager and two employees in each of the three organizations I am looking into. The reason behind this sampling plan has been to going deeper into what specific actions the GM are doing in retaining talented employees, this in addition to also get a closer insight of the HR manager regarding retaining talents and on how they are being monitored, this as the HR manager's professional relationship with the employees might be on a different level than the GM. By also, as mentioned, interviewing the employees the purpose has been to gain a deeper and meaningful knowledge on actions to retain talents and to which extent this can be perceived by the employees.

But since this research is taking place in real life unpredictable factors can take place, which has been the case for this research. First of all, of all the three organizations only one hotel had a HR manager in place, while in the other two organizations the role of the HR was implemented in the position of the GM. This has resulted in the actual sample of managers consisting of three GMs overall, and only one HR manager. As hotels are hierarchical structured it was therefore taken into consideration to also include managers belonging to different departments in the organizations, but this was excluded. As this research is looking into two main parties, the managers and the employees, this would have made the research more comprehensive as this would have

MHRHOV

resulted in the need to include samples of employees belonging to each departments as well.

Second, of the three organizations only one was able to have two employees available for the interview, while the two other organizations only had one employee each for disposition. The reason for only being able to interview one employee each in the other two organizations was because they became acute ill on the day the interview was going to take place. As it was quite a challenge to contact and not least arrange interviews with the GMs as well, due to a busy schedule, it made it difficult to rearrange interviews to gain one extra employee each in the two organizations.

Of this reason my plan was therefore to extend the sample from three to four organizations. But as an interview appointment with the GM and employees at the fourth hotel was made, the manager at this fourth organization had to cancel the interview because of illness in her family. In addition to being difficult to arrange meetings with organizations in general the cancelation of the fourth organization's manager on indefinite period resulted in this research paper ending up with a total sample of eight participants divided into three organizations:

- **Organization A:** *One* GM, *one* HR manager, and *one* employee.
- **Organization B:** *One* GM, and *one* employee.
- **Organization C:** *One* GM, and *two* employees.

The naming of the organizations according to letters will be explained under "Findings".

3.5.2 Reliability and validity

According to Punch (2005) reliability and validity are used as criterias in assessing the quality of a research. Neuman (2011) further states that reliability and validity are used in establishing credibility of a research that let us come closer to an

MHRHOV

ideal truth, where a “perfect” research is impossible to achieve. As reliability means consistency it is defined as if a research result would end up with the same conclusion if repeated or under similar settings. Validity on the other hand is if a research is measuring what it was supposed to measure. But as quantitative and qualitative research are different in their approach, so is the principles of reliability and validity in qualitative research (Neuman *ibid*).

In this context *reliability* and its consistency is based on the observations conducted, in this case through interviews, and that the way we observe is consistence over time. This means that how you are measuring does not vary no matter how often you are measuring nor the approach (Neuman, 2009). But at the same time the challenge of reliability lies in that we do not have any control over the fact that subjects and relationships can change over time. The same matters for the researcher when gathering data in a way that each individual are different leading to using different measures, and this with changes over time results in finding different, yet unique results that are difficult to repeat. In qualitative research reliability is therefore about taking into consideration the fact that the interaction with other people can become a growing relationship, meaning that the way you are interacting with others can change over time (Neuman, *ibid*). This means that reliability in the context of qualitative research lies in observing and measuring consistently and thoughtfully, this leading to the research being dependable.

The sample for this research is as mentioned consisting of different leaders in three different organizations in the hotel industry, as well as employees belonging to each of the organizations. When it comes to reliability in this research the results can increase reliability if the research was to be conducted in another setting with other

MHRHOV

organizations. The reason is because even though conducting a research with a sample that only concerns three organizations, the fact that the three organizations are within the same market industry but belonging to different chains increases its reliability. In addition to this the concepts and terms used in this paper to find answer to the objective has in some way been researched on, but in different settings. This only shows that the terms and concepts that is correlated to organizations and the hotel industry are not unfamiliar to the organizations this paper is looking deeper into.

Considering *validity* in qualitative research this is based on how authentic and “true” a research is compared to the real life and on how well the research can give a reflection of the real world (Neuman, 2009, 2011). To be as valid as possible the research statements must be shown to that there could be other conclusions out there, but that the statements of this research is yet being a strong statement. Further the empirical statements by the research is valid if it can be supported by several empirical data, and if the researcher can find a connection between the empirical data gathered. But with this Neuman (2009) further states that the emphasis on the validness of a research is not necessarily about the attempt of matching a concept to the real world. It is rather about trying to get the perspective and views of the people studied compared to the social life. In other words the validity lies in the effort of being able to present to others the perspective of your research sample. Validity is further divided into an internal and external validity (Neuman, *ibid*). As internal validity is about factors in your research design that can affect what the purpose of conducting a study was in the first place, this can more closely be explained as being able to sort out and eliminate potential threats in your research design that may affect your conclusion of the research objective and its result. External validity on the other hand is about being able to

MHRHOV

generalize your findings and make it applicable to the real world.

In this research paper the foundation has lied in the key concepts of theories that concerns organizations in general, but by also looking deeper into secondary data that is relevant under the topic of management in the hotel industry. As the findings in this research paper is depended on the interview samples, the questions for the interview was developed with the theoretical background and by then forming the questions to best answer this research objective.

When it comes to the generalization of the findings in this paper one can say that the limitation of generalizing findings in a qualitative study already lies in the sample selection compared to quantitative studies, this because as quantitative research has the opportunity of a random sample this is not the case in qualitative research. This is because as mentioned under the heading "Sample" the motive and the reason for choosing the chosen sample is clear and with a reasoning in qualitative research, a term that Punch (2005) calls a "purposive sampling". But with this said, the findings in this research paper can be generalized within a particular area: in an organizational setting, and more specifically within the hotel industry. As qualitative research is based on assuming that there are areas in the real world that can be measured qualitatively (Neuman, 2011), this can only mean that qualitative studies of this reason can be generalized to a certain extent, and within an certain area.

The findings in this research can therefore be generalized in the context of organizations and under the circumstances that concerns managing the human resources within organizations, and especially in the hotel industry. As this paper is addressing important topics on the importance of retaining valuable employees, this is a topic that is in focus in large portions of organizations overall where the human resources constitutes the

MHRHOV

organization.

3.5.3 Data analysis

In analyzing qualitative data Miles & Huberman (referred in Punch, 2005) distinguishes this into a process of three stages: to *reduce* gathered data without losing valuable information nor to strip it from its context, to *display* the data in an organized way, and to draw and verify conclusions out of the data. According to Punch (2005) and Neuman (2011) the use of *coding* is central when it comes to analyzing qualitative data. More specifically coding is a process where you organize the gathered data into various categories and labels, this to give the gathered data a meaning or a value. By doing this one can more effectively discover patterns, this by being able to go deeper into each “label” by looking at the raw data in a bigger perspective through the labels rather than focusing on the details.

As this becomes a basis for the further analysis, the further analysis therefore lies in going more specific and deeper into each label (Punch, *ibid*). Neuman (*ibid*) divides the coding into three stages:

- Open coding: This is the first step where you put the collected data into categories or codes and by then examining them by looking for important terms or themes.
- Axial coding: The next step is then to focus more on the categories than the data itself, this by comparing categories to find connections and links between them. In this stage one gets a closer understanding of which categories that can be more relevant than others.
- Selective coding: The last step is to go back to previous codes that has been made, this to find data that will support the categories that already has been developed.

MHRHOV

When analyzing and coding the organizations this will be done by focusing on each of the organizations individually and then by looking at the three organizations all together. The reason is because as this research has some participants that not only belongs to one and the same organization the interview answers given will at the same time be different from individual to individual, but also from which organization they come from. Considering giving a basis of same topics that covers all the organizations seems nearly impossible, as all the organizations and its people are individuals with their own perspectives, it therefore seems reasonable and not least easier to look into each organizations individually considering coding and then by looking at it in a bigger perspective.

When it comes to the findings of the interviews this will therefore be organized individually based on each of the organizations, by coding them separately and by then go through the three organizations all together. The reason for this is therefore to create keywords that addresses the interviewee's specific answers, this to summarize the important sentences of an interview answer and to emphasize on specific words of significance that might have been mentioned. The discussion part that will come after will also follow the same procedure by discussing each of the organizations separately and get a greater extent of focus on the whole outcome of the interviewee's answers, and by then comparing it with all of the three organization.

Although each of the interviewees' answer are subjective and where every answer are therefore in that sense unique, the content of their answers still has a red thread. The way the findings are being discussed is therefore having the basis in the research questions:

MHRHOV

A (The managers)

- What are the manager's perception of a talent, on being a good leader, and on how one can best retain talents in an organization in general?
- How does this influence the way the organization and its employees is being managed?

B (The employees)

- What are the important factors for wanting to stay in an organization?
- What are their perception of how the organization is being managed?

The way these codes will be presented is by presenting the actual quotes that is of significance from each of the interviewee of the organization and where their current position will be revealed, this to easier get a picture of the answers. When speaking of significant quotes there are in addition impossible that all the interview transcriptions is relevant data. So even though several quotations does come from the same interviewee irrelevant answers will be removed by using “(...)”, this to end a sentence and at the same time start a new one that is of relevance. But with this said the use of “(...)” not only refers to getting rid of irrelevant answers that might have been said in one and the same question, but this can also be used to link answers that can come from several questions as some of the answers might overlap with each other.

But as mentioned earlier their names and their belonging organizations will be kept anonymous. The quotes will be presented in one column. Below each quotation the specific keywords with given numbers will stand below, where the given numbers with the keywords can be traced back to the specific sentences in the quotations, which also will be numbered.

MHRHOV

3.5.4 Sample presentation

When it comes to presenting the interview findings of this research this will be done individually and within each organization. As mentioned under “Ethics” all the participants and their belonging organizations is being held anonymously, where the importance of stating that the participants is being held anonymous lies in the aim of getting an honest answer as possible about their viewpoints under the interview process. As shown earlier under “Sample” each of the organizations will be called for Organization A, Organization B, and Organization C, where the letters only represents the order of when the interviews with each organization was conducted. But with the organization’s name being held anonymously their actual job title will be presented as it is for the purpose of this paper.

However, choosing exactly these three organizations were not randomly selected, but with an intention. The background of choosing these three organizations, with each of the organizations belonging to different hotel chains, has been lying in criteria and intentions to make this research objective and being as representable as possible within their market and industry. The criteria for choosing exactly these three organizations has therefore been based on these factors:

- That each of the organizations belongs to a hotel chain of significance in the Stavanger hotel industry.
- That each of the organizations and its belonging chains is well represented in terms of the quantity of other hotel businesses in their specific chains and within the specific region of Rogaland district
- That each of the specific organizations for the purpose of this paper are reasonably similar in their sizes in terms of their capacities

MHRHOV

Further all the interviews took place in the time period of March 10th to March 26th of 2014. When it comes to the duration of the interviews the average time was different from the managers and the employees. While the interviews with all the managers had an average time of 40 minutes the average time of all the employees was just below 20 minutes. As the reason for the time difference was in the interview structure and its questions, the reason might also have been in the manager's ability to better formulate words while reflecting on the interview questions and therefore better to speak for themselves than the employees.

Organization A:

(*One GM, one HR manager, and one employee*)

The GM at this hotel is a 36 year old male with formal education in culinary certificate. His previous experiences before this current position as a GM has been in the position of head chef in several countries in Europe, and then GM at Iceland, but also in two hotels in Norway. The current position as a GM has been possessed since 2011.

The HR manager at the hotel is a 32 year old female, a current position that she has had for over a year. She has a bachelor degree from Switzerland in Hotel management, and some courses in Personal development- and management in an university in Norway. Her previous work experiences has been receptionist, booking, and course- and conference responsible in hotels in Norway. In her current position as a HR manager her responsibility areas are distributed on three different hotels within the same chain and within the area of Stavanger.

MHRHOV

The male employee is a 27 year old male, with a current position as a course- and meeting responsible. He has been employed at this organization for 1 ½ year, while his previous work experiences has been team leader at a hotel restaurant and a restaurant manager at a hotel in Cyprus. His former education is a bachelor degree from Cyprus in Hospitality- and hotel management.

Organization B:

(*One* GM, and *one* employee)

The GM at this hotel is a female with an age of 45. She has been the GM here since 2011, where her previous work experiences also has been in the same chain but with the responsible for sales and marketing. Educational she has a Bachelor degree in Hotel- and administration.

The employee in this hotel is a 19 year old female with the current position as a receptionist trainee, where she has been a receptionist here for almost three years. Considering her background she specialized in sales, service and tourism from high school.

Organization C:

(*One* GM, and *two* employees)

The GM is a 43 year old male with a Bachelor degree in Hotel- and. As he has been the GM at this hotel for two years, his previous experiences has been Operations manager and Conference manager at another chain.

MHRHOV

Both of the employees has a current position as Conference coordinator, in which the employees are 26 year old male and a 28 year old female.

The male employee has a Bachelor degree in Economics- and administration, and besides of being in this current position for two years he has not any other particular work experiences.

The female employee has a Bachelor degree in Tourism management, and has been employed here for 1 ½ year. From before she has worked within other hotels and chains as receptionist and in conference.

4.0 Findings

As mentioned the findings of the interviews will be dealt with separately, in other words within each organization. Even though the interviewees and their belonging organization is kept anonymous, their position will as mentioned be known, this with the purpose of this paper's objective.

After the quotations of each of the interviewees in every organization a short summary will be in place under the findings of each participants, this to get a better understanding when looking at the quotations. The findings will further be presented in the same order as the sample was presented, this by starting with the GM and taking the hierarchical way down.

4.1 Findings Organization A:

GM:

The values of a talent

¹*Everyone is a talent, but there is a difference between talents when it comes to how they are performing their tasks at work, on what kind of passion they have and not least what kind of vision and goals they have. Those who are clear on the concepts are those who can succeed, to develop themselves, and can therefore be seen as a talent (...).*

MHRHOV

Human resources is a HR concept, and it is about focusing on employees at all levels. ²(...) everyone is also a resource but they are also in different stages in life and career. The secret is therefore to create a workplace that fits all. ³A leader must therefore make sure that employees have goals to reach regarding their level (...).

¹Talent correlated with passion, vision and goals. ²Appreciation. ³Striving for a goal.

Depended on human knowledge

¹Being a good leader is to succeed through your employees. A hotel is a human industry where you can't do anything alone, you are depended on others. As a leader you can only succeed by pulling in the same direction as the other employees, you must lead through them. ²You must have a great human knowledge, a "drive", a goal to succeed. Human knowledge, to lead through my own set of values is highly appreciated. All hotels are different and must be managed differently compared to the employees and its culture on the hotel. (...). Here one is required to be honest and by managing through what you are actually saying, that you show great human knowledge at all levels (...).

¹Teamwork. ²Human knowledge creates the fundamental basis.

Flat organizational structure

(...). ¹Here there is a very good relationship between the bottom-line employees and the upper management, and that is some of the things that comes out clearly. (...) The organizational culture is therefore very positive, based on what I just said. (...) The distance between the upper management and the employees is very short, where the communication therefore becomes more direct and where quicker decisions can be made.

¹Flat structure creating positive relationships.

MHRHOV

Communicating in an flat-structured organization

Daily feedback is being used at the workplace. Otherwise we have performance reviews two times per year by going through personal development and goals, and on daily duties and how they are being performed. What we are doing on daily basis is happening through daily meetings, so we do have a fine balance between continuous communications and feedback and more yearly-based (...). ¹Feedback is also given mostly based on something that has been performed, if it is negative or positive. It is tied to an achievement of something that has been achieved (...). So if for example the reception achieves additional sales or if they don't achieve it but yet are doing what we have agreed on, a way of communicating and giving feedback can be by giving a simple "high-five" and a "good job", or by giving feedback there and then if something works/don't work.

¹Feedback correlated to performance and achievements.

A proactive leadership with a focus on performance

¹My way of managing has not changed since when I first came here, but I definitely think that I have learned something new along the way. Some may have noticed that the focus around proactive leadership has been more visible especially from last year. To lead through performances has become a much greater focus than before. It has been a bit unfamiliar, especially for those who has been working here for a longer time, to be measured so much on performance. This clearly shows leadership. The reason for a much greater focus on performances and proactive leadership from last year is first of all because we got systems that made it possible to focus more on it, and because I took some courses that led to me putting these systems at this hotel (...). ²To develop the employee's competencies I'm first of all setting goals, at least to those who I managed

MHRHOV

directly, which are the department managers. They get goals- and development plans making it possible for a continuously growth. Not least I'm ensuring that they are attending courses that is being provided and by also influence them to take further education (...). So my job and responsibility is to ensure that our employees are growing and gets the opportunity to grow, and that's the thing that has created the success for our chain particularly (...). So what I am doing especially is to look at where they are strong or weak, which way to go further, what is it that is important for the hotel and the company, and to find the factors that can satisfy the further growth. This is because everyone is in different stages in life, where some of the department managers are 50 years old and are having no plans to find something else to do nor having other career goals. But still you have you have to make them grow in some kind of way, this to create interest around the position. That's where the trick is.

¹To a proactive leadership and focus on performance. ²Growth through goals.

Challenges considering turnover

We have turnover like any other. ¹The challenge is to have a smooth continuity in the workforce, because it takes time to train employees, specifically those who "faces the customers". For them a long training process is required because they are the one who the customers must relate to. Not least turnover requires a lots of training that again creates a less effective organization (...). ²Everything therefore starts with recruitments, that the recruitment is properly done and that we can hire people with the right professional knowledge to the job they are performing (...). The most important thing is that the employees has a good background of knowledge and competence (...).

³*But first of all the hard fact lies in salary, that turnover considering among those of the employees are usually those who are young and often moves and that is also one of the*

MHRHOV

biggest challenges considering those who has a talent (...). I think it is a lot about creating good framework for the employee. There are many triggers, salary isn't everything but it costs to attract talented employees (...). You have to show that you can create success because that attracts and pulls people, but also a good environment, that you have satisfied guests. – because a “happy” house creates good employees.

¹Crucial with a balance in the workforce. ²Recruitment dependent. ³Salary and future investment.

Summary:

According to the GM at Organization A the organizational structure is flat, meaning that the distance between the upper management and the front-line employees are short, this in terms of communicating with each other. With this in mind the way of communicating with each other are fairly balanced between daily meetings and on yearly performance reviews. The GM further believes in the intention of feedback being based on something that has been performed and/or achieved, which leads to the way of managing the employees: through proactive leadership and through performance measurement. The Manager specifies the importance in making employees grow and develop through creating goals and by actually giving them the opportunity to do that, which the Manager also specifies as the success of this chain. As the Manager states the challenge in turnover lies in the recruitment and in hiring employees with the right professional knowledge and competency, the biggest challenge lies in the salary, this because attracting and retaining talented employees is something that costs money.

MHRHOV

HR Manager:

Being a talent is about understanding

¹*Being a talent is about having a package and by being able to understand, this to do your job effective. One must know computers, to understand economics and to understand organizations and how their works, but also to show good understanding for different types of people and their behavior and to have the ability to adapt yourself. ²This because whatever which function you are in it's very much about being able to respond to other people and to give them a good experience more than being concerned about yourself. It may sound banal and simple, but it's a pretty rare package. But to also understand/realize how to allocate time, to understand things and tasks that can wait and what cannot wait. When speaking of talents in our system we're talking a lot about types of people and characteristics. But we do need, depending on the position, a set of competencies that comes from education etc. But it is first of all about being good in interpersonal relationships and time control that is decisive.*

¹Talent is a package with the fundamental in understanding. ²Human knowledge.

Being a leader is about understanding

We have different kind of leaders and managers, and we need different abilities depended on which department one is managing. ¹But I think the common feature here is also about being able and capable to understand your employees just as one must understand your guests. To be that person who understands how to “merge” the economic aspect of it and to understand the society and trends, this to know what to sell. ²To sum up people who operates effectively, and at the same time have the ability to have the bird's eye and good understanding of economics. But again, back to the understanding on how to allocate time in a good way. Efficiency is also becoming more

MHRHOV

and more important, to have many facets to play on.

¹Human knowledge of understanding. ²A range of abilities.

Old vs. new generation

It has been some changes in a short time the last couple of years in this chain. ¹It is very much about the generation that I belong to is very impatient, that we want things to happen very quickly. And then we have another generation in the more upper-management positions per today that not necessarily are moving around. ²So we see that if we don't have something to offer in form of courses and development or some other form of path that everyone can be a part of that makes them see that they don't have a future here, we lose them. So it's crucial to have good middle management programs and to make sure that the job represents something more than just a workplace – a place where one has the opportunity to meet interesting people so one in a way can be stimulated all the time. So for the new and young segment, typically those we recruit and see the potential in, that is the person we want develop and envision a future leadership position. That is one part of it, ³but another segment of talented people is my generation of newly established, maybe parents of small children etc. who may want a slightly different focus in a period but who still represents valuable competence but who balances the organization with this. (...) but it's these two groups that we notice that we must take into account. While the one generation must be stimulated through training, courses, to be seen, to be lifted and to be appreciated, the other one must be allowed to have the focus slightly somewhere else but by working more effectively and to get that trust from the employer that the job is getting done although you might not see that person as much in a period.

¹Different demands in generations. ²Young and restless generation. ³Generation of

MHRHOV

newly established.

A flat organizational culture

¹*The organizational culture here is flat, extremely (...). The manager has almost always come in with a lot of momentum and commitment and that really rubs off. And a director is never better than their department leaders and here it is close between the manager and the department leaders and downwards the organization and it is in general an “open door” policy (...).²Feeling good is about feeling safe, so that it is not set unreasonable demands to you but in a way that something is still required from you. To know that you must make an effort sometimes to gain something from the other end, to have a nice and clean wardrobe and to know that you are getting good food – completely banal things but I think that is about a good workplace, that isn’t just about producing and going home. And to know feel that you, regardless of which function you have, are contributing so the hotel can achieve its goals. And having good communicating relationship, that you can sit and eat lunch with the manager even if your job is to change the light bulbs – that is what characterizes the culture here. It gets visible considering people who are providing and those who aren’t, this creates a culture where people want to contribute.*

¹An open culture of togetherness. ²A positive culture

Communication through consultative thinking process

¹*My role is first of all consultative, so that it is the department leaders who has the direct personal responsibility. (...). I give feedback all the time, but first of all on thought processes a leader or an employee have done considering how to “attack” their task, which is a privileged role. I often use a coaching approach on what they think they*

MHRHOV

can achieve by using the strategy they have chosen, to ask how they could have done things differently if they have found themselves in a situation because they have handled things like this or that. So I feel like I am not giving a lot of specific feedbacks, my job is to initiate thought processes, which in a way can be seen as giving feedback (...). The things I do is through two half days a week, or by mail and phone. So the more formal review is twice a year (...).²I think that, on basis of feelings, that feedback occurs rapidly, that things are being taken care of immediately if something is wrong. It's pretty rare that someone are doing their job very unsatisfying without it being pointed out (...). But the leaders and the officials has specific objectives for the year and are working towards both economics, employee satisfaction and customer satisfaction. We are constantly looking at several parameters of things going smoothly or not, and when I am talking about feedback etc., then it is often about the objectives we are working towards at any given time.³I feel that I have great influence in the work of retaining and developing talents, but not because I'm making a decision but because I'm initiating thinking processes, an indirectly way of influencing (...). I don't necessarily say what I mean deep down, but I represent how the employees can experience things. Simply a various of thought processes and perspectives than the manager's in the front line (...).

¹Consultative communication. ²Need for quick feedbacks. ³People's representative.

HR resources causing limitations

¹*It may be convenient to mention that before I came in April there was more HR resources in Stavanger, so all of the three hotels has experienced getting less HR-resources than they have been used to (...). Here at Organization A there are operative leaders with a more supervisor-approach and a more supervisor-like leader role which means that you simply don't have time or the capacity to get into many of those things*

MHRHOV

that they usually are used to getting help from me from. The change we have seen over time is that one must adapt and in a greater extent trust your own judgments or by getting guidance but by having to solve the “battle” yourself (...). We are in a change, and our business has been strongly efficient (...). But I think there are someone who miss more HR competencies on the level it was before, and I understand that. It isn't a change that I wanted to represent.² And hopefully when they are being used to this and have faced all the processes once they will become stronger and more independent and learn from it. So in the long term one might say that they will become stronger, that they increase their competencies, but it might be unpleasant in a period (...).

¹Less HR resources causing self-reliance. ²For the better in the long term.

Retaining and developing employees through training and courses

¹*We have some who are specifically very good at something and not that good on other things. It always becomes a calculation, at least if the things that aren't that good is so bad that it becomes a problem, but isn't usually that (...). If it's about competency we have to try to give competency and training to adjust it, but it is so depended on performance, job execution and on what kind of voice you have in the working environment- if you are a positive ambassador or if you are the total opposite who spreads bad atmosphere (...).*

²*But we are complying to a staging program from the central. The first stage is a course package that all the employees are going through, a “yes I can” course about the company's service philosophy which is about attitude, behavior (...), a lot of the company's culture (...). Then we have the second stage, if the employee has advanced to become supervisor. We have a package of courses to make them more prepared for this position, like E learning and etc. The higher up in the organization you come, from*

MHRHOV

employee to supervisor to department leader and to GM etc., the more tailored courses and training you get. (...), and it's on the performance appraisal that these things come up: "What must be done for you to do your job better/effective, or to take the next step to take more responsibility?" (...). ³It depends on whom it applies to, but it is about finding out what people are good at. So already at the interview situation we are trying to map the motivation for choosing to work at a hotel, the choice of study/education, to look at the CV, just trying to understand the person. We try to use the competency that they have and to combine work and training (...).

¹Calculation of the positive vs. the negative. ²Courses tailoring your needs. ³Mapping employees from the recruiting stage.

Turnover, a crucial obstacle

¹*Yes, we have always accepted that we are a workplace with relatively high turnover. What we may see is that we have slightly higher turnover than we want in certain departments and slightly lower than we want in others. So that in a "perfect world" we would have had higher turnover in the most "heaviest" positions, like those who are cleaning rooms because that is a work a body only can handle for a couple of years. Even though we invest in ergonomic courses, are working in pairs etc. it is a challenging job because no one can benefit from doing this in many years, but there it is a low turnover. But when we look at the receptionists, those who are in course- and conference, sales etc. there are a much higher turnover than we want. Especially here at Organization A where there is a high proportion of regular guests that appreciates being seen and recognized, so that when the turnover gets so high that we can't maintain it then we have a problem. ²So the thing with turnover is complex, but the turnover where we lose talents because we can't offer the positions that they want or*

MHRHOV

because it isn't happening quick enough is of course very sad. For then we usually have invested a lot in that person until a certain point and yet it didn't hold. So that is too bad and bitter.

¹Unbalanced turnover. ²A sort of waste of turnover.

Maintaining the internal quality

(...). ¹Since the hotel business is as it is with tops and bottoms we have the permanent staff with the permanent positions that represent the normal operation, and then we have the extra staff etc. (...). So we are rarely losing "everyone" at the same time so that we also lose the potential for a good training, because much lies in ensuring good training despite a high turnover. ²I think that we can manage the highest turnover just fine, but it takes time to be fond of a hotel, and that is something that we recognize in how engaged the employees are in the operation and in how willingly they back up each other in a case of disease etc., and it is in these cases we can see if a person wishes the hotel to go well and are willing to be there for the hotel. Here at Organization A there is a strong association, there are many who have been working there for a while and that affects the culture there, that the hotel goes first. But that may be the main difference between those who have been there for a while and those who haven't. And it takes time to establish care, a bit like living in a rented apartment and an owned apartment- if you have rented the apartment you may be concerned in having the place nice and clean but you may not paint the wall.

¹Balanced work staff. ²Caring is a long term process.

MHRHOV

All about the money

¹We experience more often than we wish for that the crucial lies in that they feel they have too bad conditions and too low salary, this in combination of that the position they want for a higher salary is not available within a time period. And then we see too often that the resignation comes before we have managed to talk about it, that they have reached their career goal and met their salary claims at a competitor – if one has gone that far then it is difficult to pull them back again (...). ²We are trying to make the organization bigger by thinking that we are a workplace that reaches beyond these doors. And we are trying to encourage people to come to us before they go that far (...). If the crucial factor lies in 20- 30 000 NOK more per year and we don't have the opportunity to meet this they aren't motivated enough of the other factors, like learning potential, development etc., but this is of course depended on which level you are in at the organization. ³We have never been into opposing if a person have come to that decision, so we use very little energy on bringing them back again. And that may be the culture in this company, that no one is irreplaceable. If someone wants to leave then we let them go, and we will be attractive enough to bring in a new talent.

¹Hard time satisfying. ²To think in a bigger perspective. ³"Let it go".

A temporary workplace for further career advancement

Keeping the right employees is a challenge. ¹What I experience in greater extent is that among the employees who are good at interpersonal relationships and are "people smart" and "street smart" there are more and more who has a three year of education in their backpack, and a lot of the private sector; besides of engineering and economy, can be learned. ²So what we see is that they are attractive on the market and are being recruited quickly if they make themselves available. So it is the fact that we represent a

MHRHOV

low-skilled and low-paid business that generates and raise attractive people. It is difficult for us to compete considering terms and conditions like working hour, weekend, night, shifts and stress, especially in this region. We also see that they need exactly the same competency at the oil rigs as they do in the hotel industry because they are supposed to live as they would do on a hotel (...). We see that our people are desired and where the hotel industry is a springboard out to the market. ³And even if there are many who chooses the education that you have, the meeting with the working life is that it takes time to be acknowledged for your education. You must fight against among unskilled in a few years before you reach a pointed level, but then it stops for those who has no education and it goes quickly for those who are skilled and with an education. But it's hard to say to a new-educated with full of ideas and who wants things to happen immediately. They often fall for the temptation to leave, which is a shame.

¹Knowledge and skills can be learned. ²In possession of attractive workforce. ³Takes time to see the effort of education.

Important to invest in a person

I think there are a lots of talents out there and I think that when we are recruiting a person that we want to build and when the positions have been taken, because one doesn't want to "high achievers" in the same department, we will be able to satisfy that person enough to stay in those two years we need him here, or by aiming a bit lower on a less talented person. ¹If we are to recruit a talent who wants something I think one must in a greater extent think of recruiting to our chain in general than just this hotel, so that we already at the employment phase can settle if the person wants to develop within the chain. ²I think we must think a bit bigger than just ourselves. Even if we need a good middle manager right now we don't get it within those two years if the person

MHRHOV

doesn't have the prospect of becoming department leader in the chain. The goal is rather that we have developed a good leader within two years.

¹To map the employee from the beginning. ²To think long-term.

Summary:

According to the HR Manager the culture in this organization is very flat leading to a good communication throughout the organization. For the HR Manager especially, the communication mainly occurs through consultative thinking process, but where there has been some limitations in the HR resources available for the past time. In addition this hotel has a supervisor-approach leading to not have enough time or capacity for most of the HR activities. Further the employees are already mapped from the recruitment stage in terms of their motivations, this for a better developing process for the employee. However a greater account of the different generations in the workforce must be taken, especially the generation of young and restless and those who are newly established, and the importance in satisfying their needs.

However, the main challenge in retaining employees comes down to too bad conditions and the low salary, which leads to the person leaving for another company before sitting down and talking about it. The low salary also make the employees let themselves be available for the market, making the hotel business only being a temporary workplace for further career development, especially in this region where one through the oil industry can make more money in shorter period.

Employee (male)– Meetings and conference responsible:

The importance in an learning and expressing environment

The importance for me when it comes to a workplace is that I already know the

MHRHOV

organization and their culture, the types of people and the environment is important. ¹*This also leads to the important factors of being able to develop myself in competency, in skills and in knowledge (...).* ²*A good leader is a well-communicated person, a person of the employees. A person who the employees can communicate well with, and who are flexible in expressing people's opinion. Because when the employees are working under the leader it is important with communication and in expressing their feelings and their needs in the work. So what they ask for needs to be answered, either if the answer not necessarily are right. But this can make the employees feel more comfortable and confident, and this relationship that a leader creates is important.*

¹Being able to grow. ²A people's person by expressing feelings.

Old-fashioned structure resulting in disappointing expectations

¹*The expectations of myself and the hotel has been high, this first of all because of the chain and its reputation. But when I first came here the expectations was turned a little bit down, because when I was inside I was a little disappointed in the internal infrastructure of the hotel because of the hotel being a little old.* ²*So the computer system and how to run a hotel is a little old-fashioned. This makes it difficult to develop yourself and being innovative because of the routines and traditions that has been implemented through the years (...). So from what I have been said the expectations has been met with some disappointment (...).*

¹Disappointing expectations. ²Old-fashioned organization

A non-inclusive working environment

The organization is not so inclusive to employees, this considering that the organization is very cultural when it comes to all the nationalities that are working here. The

MHRHOV

obstacle might lie in the language, and rather than English being an acceptable language Norwegian seems to be more acceptable. ²*The different departments in the hotel are not very strong connected when it comes to communication and relationship with each other. This is shown in the different departments not having enough knowledge for each other, leading to not being able to answer questions that is related to others (...).* ³*To feel inclusive in an organization you need something more than money because money you get anyway, but the psychologic through positive feedback is what motivates me. But it is difficult to get feedback here from the management because I'm not sure how they communicate here.*

¹Norwegian as more preferable. ²Lack of knowledge between departments. ³Inclusive about positive communication.

An organization with a non-effective communication

¹*There has been a new manager and the new manager has been difficult to see in the daily working life when working "on the floor". I think it is because the hotel is a bit old-traditional in its system and structure with employees who has been working here for many years. But my expectations was a management who cares about the employees and by showing this, and where the communication was well (...). But the management needs to be working there and by being there among the employees on the floor, this to get feedback from them and by asking caring questions. But in my years I don't feel the communication has been good (...).* ²*Most of the time the Manager use to leave a little bit earlier so it isn't time to get feedback on your performance. To say these things one has to stay at the end and until the end one has to wait, and by leaving earlier one cannot evaluate. But sometimes feedback is given, but daily feedback does not happen often enough. The yearly evaluating meetings with employees are also meant to happen*

MHRHOV

around every three weeks, and also once yearly in formal settings, but the meetings that is supposed to happen every three or four weeks are not predetermined (...).

¹New manager leading to lack of communication. ²A leader is about being present.

Difficulties in developing yourself

The manager could be better in the way of improving the communication amongst the employees and also between the levels. Getting feedback also, and take action if something is bad or good. ¹Because every day is based on communication. So this makes it difficult to develop yourself here (...). ²One thing I miss is that the management can not find out who is more important and valuable as an employee here than others. As a leader you need to know who your key staff is, so first of all the management needs to be more aware of and figure out who the more important employees are. So the change must happen in the “top” to begin with (...).

They should show more appreciation, or maybe give more job and tasks to do. Because they only if one could work only when they are in need. This affects your comfortable in the hotel.

¹Everyday based on communication. ²Difficulties in recognizing talents.

Wanting to leave the organization

¹I feel the rate of turnover is high, I think because a lots of the employees has some of the same perspectives as I have; the lack of communication, the lack of appearance, and the lack of appreciation (...). Yes, the things I have just told you are some of the reasons for wanting to leave here.

¹High turnover rate based on similar perspectives.

MHRHOV

Summary:

The employee states that it is crucial to be in a learning and expressing working environment where the manager can understand the employees' feelings. However, according to the employee the organization is very old-fashioned when it comes to the routines, the traditions of running a hotel, and in the state of mind of people working there. Despite the organization being cultural it is not inclusive in a way that Norwegian being more appreciated, and in the lack of knowledge between the departments. The difficulties in communicating is also shown in an absent manager leading to a lack of feedback and lack of caring for the employees. This has also led in difficulties in developing oneself because the manager doesn't distinguish between those who might be more valuable. So according to the employee the main challenge in staying in the organization and in growing in the organization is a very ineffective communication with an old-structured organization, the lack of appearance and the lack of appreciation.

4.2 Findings Organization B:**GM:****A talent is all about the passion and “smiling from your heart”**

(...). I strongly believe that you can be incredible good at something if you want to and if you have glimpse in your eyes and “smiling from your heart” (...). So a talent is really those who wants and are willing to work hard and doesn't just come to work for pay. ¹I think that if you got the passion for something then you can be extremely good. If you don't have passion you can be good, but not extremely good. You can walk a certain distance, but you can't complete the last part if you don't have passion about it (...). When I took over here I summoned all the employees to a meeting and told that within next year we're going to be the “Best hotel of the year” in this chain. To do that we

MHRHOV

must work hard and everyone must have passion for it and the desire to achieve this goal, and it's going to be hard and burdensome. So those who didn't want this was told to get out from here. That led to losing two leaders and ten other employees. They were good but didn't have the desire to be the best, and that requires some sacrifice. So when they left we hired employees who really wanted to achieve this goal, and then we became the "Best hotel of the year" in 2012. This only shows that if you want then you can achieve anything, but everyone must have the desire when you work as a team, if not it's not possible (...). ²There is a terrific expression in "Front line is the bottom line". That is important and it's about that within leadership one must be able to see that it is the people who means everything (...). Because the guests doesn't care about new interior design, they care about the experience they get, and that is created by the employees (...).

¹Passion to succeed. ²An experience is created through people.

A leader is about being clear and specific on exactly what you want

¹I think it is extremely important to be targeted and to know what you want with your leadership. I think it's extremely important to be clear and distinct in setting clear and distinct goals. And I also think that it's important to see the employees both in relation to what they are good at and what they aren't good at and to be honest about it so we can improve ourselves, because no one is perfect (...).

²And I have a bit experience that men have the tendency to hire people who are like themselves, because then you are in the comfort zone because you are with people who are just like you. I have a great energy and drive and very targeted, I only look at the goal and want to achieve it (...).

If I'd hire people in my leader group who is just like me then it would have been great

MHRHOV

and fantastic, but the business would have been ruined. Because I need people who can pull me down, who asks questions and has objections and who see things from a different perspective (...). So to put together a team and to see that you can work with several kinds of people and to appreciate everyone and to make them work together I think it's important for a leader. To set an example.

¹To know what you want. ²Important with a diverse workforce.

Values expressing a caring environment

¹Reliability is very important, that the employees feels that what you are telling others to do and what we are supposed be is reflected in me as well (...). ²But I also think that you must take time to be caring (...). To understand if someone has a difficult time, to give a hug and a rose or a bottle of wine I think is a concern that many appreciates here (...). Essentially it is a great environment, we're having a good time and many of the guests says that when they come in they can lower their shoulders because of the warmth here. And that is created by the employees (...). Of course when there are so many different people working here there will always be some situations where you can be irritated, frustrated etc., but we solve because we know each other well and we have the space to work things out (...). I think this means everything, and especially now (...).

¹Important to act out what you say. ²To being able to understand one another.

The best place to work!

(...). ¹We care about other things as well than just running a hotel both considering health and what people eat, training, considering environment etc. ²Those things means a lot to young people, and all those things makes people wanting to work here. It is a struggle for labor, and especially in this region, and I experience that we are one of

MHRHOV

those who are the first choice in our business in this region because we are a hotel that is being taken care of by the owner. People know this is a good place to work, and that is important. So you get the best out of people (...).

³*We don't necessarily take the base in how you are doing at school, but there are incredibly many talents that can have some holes in their CV but that still has a great potential to succeed and that has that competitiveness and that "smiles from the heart". I think it is important to see them and giving them an opportunity, and when you first do that it will be a huge loyalty and they will choose to continue in our chain. For us it is about being the most attractive and the best workplace where there is opportunities to develop and to continue working with those we have trained – not necessarily in this hotel but within our chain.*

¹Being more than just a workplace. ²An attractive place to work. ³One's potential not defined in education.

The importance in giving the opportunity to develop

¹*It is about how you are doing and on how we can make a good working environment (...). And then it is the opportunity to develop, that the people here feel that they have the possibility to move further if they make an effort. ²There are many here who has ambition (...). And I do see with a lump in my stomach how many who has been developed by me and are ready to move on (...). You lift and support people up and forward, and they will then eventually disappear (...).*

¹Good environment important for development. ²Good people eventually leaves.

MHRHOV

Challenges in keeping the workforce

(...). I think that when someone is leaving it gives the opportunity to gain new talents, and that's how I want to see it. ¹In some departments it is of course more challenging than others, especially in the kitchen, where the recruitment process for this work is too bad. Because for the last 5-8 years the young chefs would rather work in a la carté restaurants or in competitions. ²This in addition to that we have the North Sea that attracts many who wants to earn good salary and at the same time work a short amount of time (...). But this is essentially what the responsibility of a leader is: to recruit and to develop good employees, and that is how it is supposed to be (...).

The salary level has also increased in the industry and in the region, but there are a lots of high salaries in this region and we have lost quite a few employees to estate and oil that we rather would have kept, but that rather want to work less. People with families don't want to work weekends or nights etc., and especially combined with salary it becomes a challenge. So it is important with a good working environment, and that it is a pulsating and vibrant industry. It is important to emphasize this in our industry.

¹Hotel restaurant not attractive enough for a chef. ²Salary pulls employees out of the hotel business.

Easier to give compliments than giving negative feedback

(...). Some leaders and people are easily giving compliments and feedback and I am one of them. ¹I'm much better at giving compliments than giving negative and constructive feedback, so I how to work much more on that part. Because it is important to correct if something is bad. ²And then we also have other leaders who are more likely to correct and not that good to compliment, and we're working on this (...). We're for example walking around with five stones in one pocket and during the day they are supposed be

MHRHOV

over in the other pocket, because for each time you're giving compliment you're supposed to move one over (...). We're working a lot on this, because it is important that people feel appreciated and seen. I as a leader wish to show that I appreciate that the employees are doing a good job by doing things that lifts the employees, like baking a cake etc., this to show that they are appreciated (...). But I think it is very much about being impulsive.

¹Need for improvement in giving negative and constructive feedback. ²”The five stones”.

Developing talents through meetings

(...). I'm more like the person who is more concerned with the revenue and to develop people and to get people to get passionate about what they are doing and to go that extra mile to achieve results and happy guests (...). You must see all individually. ¹I have development dialogue with my leader team and my strategy team. In the strategy team there are few employees who makes most of the decisions. I take the most important decisions alone, but I think it's important to include them when taking a decision. And then we have the leader team who I meet twice a year where we set goals, where they tell me where they want to go and on how I can help to achieve these goals personally and career wise. And then those leaders has the same development dialogues with their employees within their departments about their ambitions, their short-term and long-term goals, personal development etc. (...).

¹Development dialogues.

It's about giving the opportunity to develop

¹*It is about seeing and recognizing them and to offer them the opportunity and to*

MHRHOV

encourage them. Many who works here has school on the side and has therefore limited time. Often it is about inviting them to take on extra duties like safety officer. We just had a conference-host who had the responsibility for the upselling competition. Then the development in terms of the actual task and through all the coaching that we do in relation to the hotel and from the central board. It is about giving the opportunity and to encourage people to constantly develop. That lies in the fundamental leadership, that we want everyone to get up and forward at all cost (...).²Whether we won the “Hotel of the year” there is always a new goal to achieve and then everyone must contribute (...). So it is important to give the opportunity, to make them realize that they can develop here with us, and sometimes it is about that they must continue another place to being able to develop because it isn’t always available positions here – and then we must help them (...).³I had an argue with a director in the same chain for a couple of years ago because the director’s seller was supposed to start here, and the director made a huge uproar. And I just thought that it was so short-sighted. I understood the director’s despair because a lot of energy was put down to train the seller, so I understood it. But the employees must be allowed to leave. We must be generous about it, to wish the best for the employees and to trust that we can bring in new talented people.

¹Developing through encouragement and giving the opportunity. ²Always new goals to achieve.

³Developing talents is about letting them go.

Summary:

The GM states the importance in showing care for each other besides of only working, and that this aspect of consideration of any kind of people in the organization has made this hotel an attractive workplace. Further the GM states the important of

MHRHOV

feedback, but that this is something that needs to be improved at this hotel when it comes to both positive and negative feedback. It is further mentioned that a leader's role is to recruit and develop good employees, pointing out the importance of creating a good working environment with the opportunity for the employees to develop, even if this means that they eventually might leave. The crucial part of doing this is to see everyone individually and having dialogues on how to achieve goals personally and career wise etc., where this supportive role becomes a process of developing the employee for the contribution for the overall organizational goals, but that this also involves that the employees eventually leaving for further career development. The Manager further states that employees leaving leads to giving the opportunity to gain new talents, but that the challenge lies in its salary and its location within the oil industry, which attracts employees to earn more money. This is combined with that the hotel industry is a business that is depended of a workforce that is available 24/7.

Employee (female)– Receptionist apprentice:

Values displaying care for the customers and the employees

¹A good leader is one who the employees can trust, this through showing that they are more than a leader by showing that they are there for a person, and has a sincere interest in a person and in forming their future (...). ² So a good environment is also extremely important (...). I notice the difference between the different places I have worked that a good environment has a lot to say for your working day (...). Here I feel that there isn't any problem to talk to your boss by saying your opinions. I therefore think that the values is shown to that we are a hotel where we both can focus on the guests but also the employees as well by showing that we care about everyone's well-being.

MHRHOV

¹Being more than “just a leader”. ²An environment of care for both guests and employees.

Working in an environment where you can develop

They are doing a good job in facilitating for growth and development. They have an own trainee program you can participate on if you want to work your way up. So if I want to work my way up I have great opportunities for that (...). I want to learn as much as possible at this hotel. ¹As an apprentice I have asked to learn about all the departments, so later today I get the permission to join someone on sales and to see what they are doing. I know and can the reception pretty good now, so I have expectations to learn about the whole hotel and its operation (...). I mentioned for my boss a couple of weeks ago during the performance review that I wanted this, and the boss simply sent a mail to every department that I wanted to learn more about each department, and then we got a reply on that I was more than welcome. So now they are setting up a plan for when I can come to the departments.

¹A management sincere about one’s growth.

Feedback crucial for doing a good job

We have performance reviews once every six months, and then we get feedback on how much we have sold and on membership enlistment etc. In addition we get frequent feedback every week from the guests in our system. Our boss is also sitting right behind the reception and get to see everything that happens, and if you do some mistakes or something wrong the feedback is given right away (...). ¹The fact that we receive feedback so we know where we are standing absolutely motivates me to do a good job (...). To be taken care of, like they are doing here with feedback and compliments when

MHRHOV

you deserve it and little spank when you deserve that are important. So is being seen and heard and being treated with respect.

¹Using feedback in different settings.

The guests as a motivational factor

(...). To come to work on Monday and seeing that the guests that you made an extra effort for appreciates this in terms of Trip Advisor etc. makes you happy, the bosses happy and it is really nice (...). I think the guests are important. We have a good relationship with our guests. I came in here one morning by jogging to work. I met one of the regular guests who was shocked because I had jogged to work, and later that day he came and told me that since I had jogged to work he was going to start taking the stairs up to his hotel room. And because of that I started to give him a room up on one of the highest floors every time he was a guest here. This is why I want to be here, because of the guests (...). It is a great focus on the guests and our regular guests, and it's very much like that by going through the arrival lists on weekdays and to put out some extra chocolate if we recognize any names.

Important with a welcoming culture

¹Turnover can become a problem. I notice that in the reception there is a huge employee turnover in a way that people works here for a half year and then new ones are coming in. ²Then it is important to take that person right away in the warmth, and to give the right training needed, if not it's difficult because there so much you need to know considering the comprehensive computer system etc. If you first fall out it is difficult to come in again (...). I notice that when I came here as a 16 year old and didn't know what I wanted and had dropped out of high school they took me in and trained me and

MHRHOV

showed me and practically raised me. I understand now that this is what I want. (...).¹High turnover in the reception.²The importance in welcoming with open arms.

Summary:

According to the employee a good leader is defined as someone who is being more than a leader, a person who has a sincere interest in forming one's future.

The environment in Organization B is, according to the employee, an environment where there's an opportunity to develop, this through the management's as much focus on the employees as for the guests. As the management are actively supporting and helping employees to grow by taking action right away, this shows an organizational culture of care. This culture of care is also shown in how the employee was taken in to the organization. The employee further states the crucial role feedback has in doing a good job, this by using feedback to know better where they stand, to know there are seen, heard and treated with respect, which motivates for doing a good job. In addition to this, being there for the guests seems to be a crucial motivational factor for doing a good job.

4.3 Findings Organization C:

GM:

A talent is about having desire

¹To a great extent, if I'm trying to find a talent then I'm looking for the desire, that the person has the desire. In what extent he has the abilities or knowledge from before is not so interesting, the most important is that the person wants something. Of course, if one in addition has the abilities needed to accomplish what you want then I will claim that this is a talent. It is a combination of will, desire, but also the ability to achieve

MHRHOV

something.

¹Desire.

A leader is about listening and understanding

¹*For my part it is one who listens. You have to be able to listen and to hear what the employees are saying and in a way understand that, not just listen but to understand what the employees are communicating. To have the ability to understand, and thereby knowing what kind of a leader you need. It can be tasks you have that some employees takes easily and some which are more challenging (...). One must be able to listen to the employee's needs, and this can again be reflected into that the employees know what I am looking for and what I need (...). As long as I am being able to listen to what you want, that you as an employee can express a wish for what you want. We do have performance reviews but the most important for me is to listen to what you wish and what you are picturing (...).*

²*It is expected of me to show the values that the chain stands for, caring, casual, creative and competitive. These are values that they sees in me and I hope I appear like a person and a leader with compassion, which I mean fits in in what we're doing. And these are in turn values that I believe in, and which is reflected in the chain's values- to act informal and to take care of everyone and having consideration. To give the opportunity is important, and I hope the core values is also something that other's also sees I me and something that I show through my job (...).*

I try to relate to and I wish for them to be clear about what they want, if not I can't do anything. Further I try to do what I can to place a path that can help the employee to come closer to what they want. That doesn't happen over night, and because of that I must show commitment to really wanting to help the employees, so he/she can stay

MHRHOV

positive.

¹Being a leader is about listening and understanding. ²Expressing values.

Leading in different ways

¹*A leader must be able to lead in various ways based on your needs and based on the task (...). The ability is therefore about leading in many different ways, to be different kind of a leader based on who your employees are and what kind of tasks you need to be led through (...). As I said you must be led in different ways based on who you are and what your tasks are. When I took over this hotel we were in a situation leading to that I had to lead in a specific way, and when things changed so did the way of leading. It is about the way you use your human resources, if my leaders are capable to lead their own departments without me and that I go from steering them to supporting them. Of this reason my task considering talented employees changes regarding what kind of goals I have in my job. For instance last year the focus was on cost reductions, and this year the focus is more on the sales and the business. ²To lead talents in itself I have a wish to treat everyone equally, but then I have to work with the focus on each and every employee considering their career development and for them to reach their goals, but that I lead the employees differently based on their goals etc. Here we don't do as much different other than some getting opportunities considering others who doesn't have the same wishes. This chain also has a talent program, but this is for those who has performed over time and who has a clear wish and goal to develop and to have a career in the chain and where the chain at the same time can see you as a future resource (...). So it is very individual, but the most important is that I get to hear your needs, and where I must answer this and on how we together can make this happen. It is my duty to try to do something. But behind that person I must also start to think about recruitment*

MHRHOV

and about replacing that person.

¹Being able to adapt to various situations. ²Focus on each and every employees.

To go in the same direction

¹*Where I can see a path that benefits both me and the company and at the same time where you are being supported in the path you are taking- if these path are going fairly well side by side it is an advantage and if it crosses it becomes a challenge in a way that you are wanting something else than I need you to. The interaction, being able to see the opportunities for us to go fairly well in the same path is important. That we're being able to find the cooperation that you as an employee feel that the job you are doing here is leading you to the direction you want in your career, and that I get to exploit you considering the work you are supposed to do but that I at the same time push you in the direction you want. I would never be comfortable with pushing you in a direction that you don't want, because then you wouldn't become a talent anymore. And then I would lose you in a way, and you would lose the well-being etc., and that is not helpful. ²That is something I think we must be better at, not to necessarily push employees in the right direction first after it has passed some years and by then seeing that you are skilled, but to already from day one try find the path. If you don't know where you want, then try to try to help by searching for a direction through conversations along the way to find out if this is the right direction. And that the distance between the leader and the employees are not too big.*

¹Walking down the same path important for all, but not necessarily right. ²Need of improvement.

MHRHOV

Formal and informal feedback

I use the term “management by walking around”, to walk around and to drip feedback to the formal feedback which is the performance review. I’m trying to be a person who gives feedback and to be aware on complimenting a lot and clearly and in public, and to give constructive feedback and criticism in smaller rooms. But I think feedback is very important. To listen to who you are can show to in which extent one should give feedback, where someone needs feedback all the way while some only needs it in yearly meetings. I need to know what kind of employees I have.

We have performance reviews, the formal part, once a year with schemes and web, very formal and proper. That is when you as an employee gets the opportunity to say what you mean, and I have the formal opportunity to say what I mean about you. Here you can tell what you want and I say how I can help you with this (...). In addition I have meetings with my leader group twice a week where there also is an opportunity to give feedback on yourself and the department. I give advice and support on what you need and in addition feedback. Feedback is therefore used as much as you need it (...).

¹*As a leader I must through the use of feedback give them progress considering what they want and considering the task I want them to perform, that one sees a progress and a development. I use to say it quite directly that either you have development or you have liquidation – if you don’t improve or are enjoying I don’t want you here and to rather liquidate you in a tidy and orderly way. So feedback is basically to get you forward (...). The goal is therefore for us to be better and reach our goals, and this also means for you to reach your goals.*

¹Feedback for progression.

MHRHOV

To be seen

I try to tell people if I mean they have done a good job and I try to point this out. ¹The background and the goal is that the employees both shall experience some sort of safety in that I see them and appreciate them and that they shall feel this. I am committed to that the employees should feel that they are seen. If that means that I give them critic or compliment they are still seen. But then criticism and praise and feedback should be driving them forward, either by you correcting them or that you as a leader must think if you are supporting or steering the employee.

¹To recognize employees.

Giving challenges

There are several areas considering developing the employee competencies. ¹One is that we must reach our goals, and then I have to know what kind of competencies my employees have in relation to the goals that has to be reached, and if the employees have good enough competencies for this. There we have the academic bit it, if one has enough knowledge about your job. We use a lot of time on this under training. (...).

²For my part I try to push them by giving them goals and challenges so they can be driven forward, this because one never can be fully trained. We therefore work a lot interactively with coursing about concepts and laws, this to increase the competency of your work position and your workplace. But this is also depended on a leader group with enough competency (...). We must therefore look at what I need of competency and on what I already got (...).

I therefore ask what the employees want, this to recognize the employees and on what kind of potential they have, what they are good at and on what they can be good at. Then you can sometimes push them a little, and maybe they aren't aware of it, but to

MHRHOV

realize that this is something they're good at, this by giving them challenges in their everyday work life through tasks they're doing. To give challenges in the daily life one can see how they respond and to identify abilities and knowledge they might possess. If there's something I can do to involve the employees with they can gain insight and joy in their work, something that also can contribute in exploiting their potential.

¹Mapping workforce competencies. ²Exploiting potential through challenges.

A bit old-fashioned, with a lack of knowledge throughout the organization

¹There are some in the organization that has a hierarchical approach to the extent that if they are unsatisfied with something they will not speak up to the person involved, they would rather come and say it to me. There are some who thinks "levels", but in a great degree it is casual here. But we are working towards our core values. ²Our hotel is also pretty new, so we have some challenges culturally considering that we cooperate too little here, we are too unknown with each other and the departments. There are a little to clear distinction between the departments in a way that they don't know each other good enough and therefore not understanding the tasks and the mission that others might have which leads to challenges in the everyday work life. We're aware of this and are working on this. I think we in so far has a positive culture and has a goal to be more positive. We are seeking to appear with our core values, where there aren't only the customers who shall feel the values but also the employees, if not we can't communicate it out (...). I think it's important with a clear culture that you can communicate out so that you can attract, and I mean that this is showed here so that you can have the right people in the organization. To communicate the culture will therefore lighten the way of managing the talents.

¹A hierarchical perspective. ²Not enough knowledge to other departments.

Challenge in maintaining activity

¹*Considering the challenge in retaining talents it is right now with sales to do, to have enough activity to keep a certain level, to have the people and enough people, and to do the fun stuff, that it is actually going good. It isn't fun for a talent to be in a place where it goes bad, but we have room for more, we want to do more with a lots of facilities for conference. I have people who I know must be given these kind of occasions or else they will look for another place to work. Right now the challenge is in creating enough exciting opportunities to get that pleasure and for those who wants to be challenged to actually get the opportunity to do that. A talent that is aware of it will feel that he/she is getting the challenges needed, but if you want to reach goals but is feeling that one is a little stuck one is no longer a talent for my anymore, you must move on. You must have that activity allowing us to have fun and to develop and to learn new thing. At last you are moving on, but the importance lies in gaining as much as you can from here before moving on. Here the activity is therefore something I focus on, where on must constantly create activity and possibilities to retain talents (...).*

¹The need of continuous activity.

A kind of a “taboo” subject

Further the whole industry as a whole has a challenge. For example chefs are the ones that is more difficult to attract and to get the good talents in this industry. Those who really wants to be chefs are ending up in the fine restaurants and not in the big hotels. ¹This is something that the industry doesn't dare to talk about, because they know it will cost money. We are a very lousy industry considering these kind of things, because it requires efforts from companies, but in salary we have ended up on a level

MHRHOV

that in the hotel industry is in general so low that we aren't considered as a "talent-arena". If I want to develop myself I don't go to the hotel industry. So it is clear that it is the industry that has the biggest challenge when it comes to becoming more attractive for the talents and for those who wants (...). ²It is the responsibility of the industry, it is a leadership responsibility in every organization and chain to take care of the talents, but to be considered as a talent arena is an industry responsibility. And in that discussion the industry is not clear enough.

¹Not to be seen as a talent arena. ²The need for responsibility.

Summary:

The GM in Organization C values the ability to listen and understand in a leader, which the Manager also hope is shown throughout the organization. With the Manager emphasizing on different ways of managing depended on each situations, the way of managing the employees are by focusing on each employees and at the same time combining it with the hotel's overall goals. The improvement however, lies in starting in an earlier stage in developing employees. The intention of feedback is further seen as a way to progress their growth, where the main way of developing employees further lies in giving challenges in the everyday work life. However, one of the challenges for the organization lies in a lack of knowledge between the departments and a hierarchical perspective, which results in an ineffective communication. To remain an attractive workplace and retaining valuable employees it is further mentioned that one is depended on having a continuous flow of activities to satisfy the employees, which seems to be a significant challenge at this organization. The GM also points out the low salary in general in the hotel industry resulting in that the hotel industry not being considered being a talent arena, which also makes it difficult to attract valuable

MHRHOV

employees. The hotel industry overall must therefore take responsibility.

Employee (male) – Conference coordinator:

A leader is one that listens

¹A leader is one who listens to their employees, and not just listens but also one who's making efforts and are visible. Everybody can sit and say that they agree on what's being said without doing anything. A leader must therefore show that they listen to the employees in terms of taking actions (...). I therefore have the expectations for them to be supportive that I can turn to if there's something that I need to ask. But I'm more or less trying to figure things out for myself instead of going to them (...). Here there is a good leadership As we have had some restructuring and downsizing the structure has been more flat. It has led to being able to communicate much closer to both the people over me and people below me in the organization.

¹Taking action by listening.

An organization with lack of interaction

The culture here is very inclusive. I have been implemented in the leader group, so then I get to see all the departments. From my point of view there is an open culture, that we are getting a lots of information about what's happening and very quickly. ¹But the interaction could have been better. The interaction and the communication between the departments aren't effective, where one feels that one must go to the different departments personally to bring a message. The different departments just don't know enough about each other. But we're continuously working towards improving our understanding for how the other departments works, this through having employees in the different departments to work in another department for a little period, this to better

MHRHOV

understand each other.

¹Lack of knowledge due to lack of interaction.

Receiving feedback depended on the setting

¹If there is a lot happening at the hotel, if there is a busy week, we usually get feedbacks when it has calmed down, either if it is compliments or critic. If there is a big event on the hotel and you have performed a task in a wrong way they let you know right away, or if it has calmed down a little. I think that is very good because I don't have any needs to have one behind my ear who are complimenting me all the time. I like to do my job and to then know about it (...). So it is the accumulated impression that is left behind. March is a busy period and then you get, whether you like it or not, challenged yourself and that is something that I like – to try something new. It is only through continuous that you find ways to develop yourself and to challenge yourself, and that has increased my desire.

¹Feedback given in calm periods unless it's necessary.

The expectation to develop myself

(...). If I'd worked 8am to 4pm every day it would have been boring, that isn't the reason for being in the hotel business (...).¹ I therefore have expectations to be able to grow and to develop myself here, to gain new knowledge and skills to continuously develop myself career wise. The hotel business is a lifestyle (...).

²I have been in this position in 2 ½ years, and I told the manager in January this year that I have gained enough experience on what I'm doing now, and that I therefore want to move forward and preferably within economics and administrations which I have an interest in. The manager has then helped a lot to facilitate for this. I told the manager

MHRHOV

that I was interested in working in a specific kind of position, and the manager took immediately contact with the central board and already now I'm starting to get tasks that is related to that position (...). But the manager also sees that I can be a valuable employee for this hotel, which led to that I was given more responsibility. So yes, when I told that I wanted to move forward with another position the manager was very helpful.

¹Expectation for career development. ²A supportive leader.

Summary:

The employee states that a leader is one that both listens and are taking actions based on this. But although the organization are very much flat leading to being able to communicate much closer to people over and below you in the organization, the interaction between the departments are missing. The reason is because the different departments doesn't know enough of each other. Receiving feedback is further depended on the situation and the necessity of giving it right away or after some time. When it comes to being able to grow and develop in the organization the Manager is supportive and by actively helping the employee to grow, even if this means that the employee might leave.

Employee (female)– Conference coordinator:

A leader is one who sees

¹A leader is one who sees the employees and are able to see their positive abilities and that one gets to exploit this. To help them move forwards and to get them use their potential I think is also very important (...). I expect that a leader treat me with respect, and that a leader helps with developing and to move forward and to mace us become good employees. And also by giving us the tools we need to do a good job, and that they

MHRHOV

listen to us and that our meanings counts (...). So I'm very pleased with working here. I think the management works very well (...).

¹Being able to see the employees.

An informal organization

¹*The culture here is not flat, but we all get along very well and where we can speak informal within all stages of the hotel. All the departments works well together, and because of that I don't feel there so much hierarchy here.*

¹A positive culture.

Being there for the guests

¹*I'm very on to that one must be proud of what you're doing, and to deliver a proper product and that it is quality in what you're doing, and that this is leading to that all the guests feels welcomes. Of this reason I expect for myself to give the guests what they have come for, and that they are satisfied and happy when they leave (...). So the things that is motivating me is that I really like what I am doing, I really like people by being with them and by helping them. To give them a nice stay is very nice (...).*

¹Customer service expressed through love for work.

Important to receive feedback

¹*We get feedback from customers after events, and from the management after big events where we have meetings on how things went, and this applies to both compliments, critics and improvements. We also have yearly performance reviews where we get overall feedbacks. We also get more daily feedbacks in the form of pat on the back or a simple compliment, but nothing we sit down and go through with (...). If*

MHRHOV

there's something I need to work with I do that. If it's positive it's very nice because then you get a sense of achievement leading to wanting to perform even more and to be even better (...). ²I think it's very important to get feedback, especially if you have done a good job, so you'll want to keep doing a good job. It is important to not only hear the things you have done bad so the focus only is on the negative, but that the focus primarily is on the positive. I think this is working very well here.

¹Various types of feedback. ²Important with feedback.

Importance with the possibility for career development, but unfortunately also about money

Colleagues are very important, but one also want to work in a place with good reputation and where there is possibilities to more forward and up (...). ¹It is about the development opportunities that one is getting the support to move forward. ²Salary is also important of course, but everything doesn't revolves around money either. But it is a lot about being able to build a career which is crucial, but I also feel that the salary has a lot to say. Especially considering that I live in Stavanger where there is so expensive. But one would rather wish that salary doesn't have that much to say (...).

At the moment it works very well here. I have now got the opportunity to attend a kind of business school in the chain, where this also gives a great opportunity to gain more knowledge and more competency and more abilities.

¹Crucial with the opportunity to develop. ²Salary unfortunately an important factor.

Challenge in keeping good routines, and in having a lots of work

¹*There is a challenge in turnover here. There are always new people you have to train from the scratch when you finally have had someone into the good routines and to know*

MHRHOV

the house and the customers and the way we want to do things. And then they suddenly disappear leading to that we have to repeat this process or procedure. It is very tiring. One often forgets that the new person doesn't know all the things at the hotel (...). ²And then there is the eternal downsizing that insofar happens in all companies currently and that is negative for us who are remaining, because then there are a lots of more work to do for us who are remaining. That can simply be exhausting.

¹Too much workforce replacements. ²Downsizing creating loads of work.

Summary:

According to this employee a leader is one who sees and recognize the employees. This employees further states that the organizational structure is not flat, and that all the departments are working very well. The employee further emphasizes the importance of getting feedback, especially positive feedback, this to further wanting to do a good job. The opportunity to develop are further highly prioritized, that it is important to have a supportive manager in the employee's career development. And here the leader is very supportive. Unfortunately the salary is a significant factor in the hotel business, and especially in this region. The reason is because even if you don't want to, the salary has a lot to say especially since living in Stavanger, which is an expensive place. Turnover is also seen as a challenge due to the difficulties in maintaining a high quality of routines because of the high rate of workforce going in and out.

5.0 Discussion

This paper is as known about the issue of retaining talents in the hotel industry, where the focus in this paper is in three organizations that belongs to three different hotel chains. Although each of the managers has very similar point of view when it comes to how one can best retain and manage employees, there are still some factors that distinguishes the managers from each other and maybe also the perception of the employees. This part will therefore be displayed by discussing each of the organizations separately, and by then deal with the discussion in a bigger perspective by comparing the different organization with each other.

5.1 Organization A

Both of the managers defines a talent as one who has the human knowledge of interacting with others in the organization, this with a combination of having the skills of being practically oriented within the activities that implies hotel operation. This can in many ways be related to the definition of human – and social capital by Luthans et. al. (2004) by looking at one's human knowledge and the social ability to interact as social capital and their skills and knowledge to perform their job as human capital. But although one's passion, vision and goals might seem to be an essential factor in being a talented employee it might not be a determining factor for actually being seen as a talented employee in itself. The reason is because although passion, vision and goals seems to be important factors and contributors to become a talent these three factors can not define a talent alone. First of all you need the skills and knowledge to perform your task and to stand out, in other words your passion, vision and goals needs to be expressed through your skill and ability to perform in your job. This is also seen in that a talent is by several authors defined as one who through their skills and knowledge performs superiorly (Boxall & Purcell, 2003; McDonnel et. al., 2010). As mentioned

MHRHOV

earlier both of the managers states the importance of having human knowledge and by leading through the employees as a leader, where Nickson (2007) states that the two factors that increases employee motivation and commitment are a workplace that involves and engages, and by having the opportunity to influence managerial decisions. But especially in this organization it seems that the impression and the view on how the actual working environment in the organization is considering the opportunity of engagement and development is quite different from the management point of view and the employee.

As leadership is about having a shared mindset throughout the organization (Chambers et. al., 1998) this doesn't seem to be the case for Organization A, or more specifically considering this employee. Enz (2010) states the importance of a leader being supportive and facilitating for a learning environment for the employee, where the employee in this organization also draws out the importance of having an environment where one gets the opportunity to learn, develop and grow, and the importance of a positive relationship with the manager by having a positive environment of communication. But according to this employee the structure and the environment in this organization makes it difficult to develop oneself and to grow in this organization. By only judging by this one can at first glance say that the management at Organization A are not living up to the values they are stating, this because of the management's perspective of this organization being completely different from the perspective and the way the employee has perceived the result of the management. This can also give the employee and his words the benefits of the doubt, this because the employees are the ones who experience at first-hand what this paper is researching about. According to both of the managers Organization A is very flat where the distance between the manager and the employees are short and where the communication throughout the

MHRHOV

organization of this reason is good. However, considering Chambers' et. al. (1998) view on leadership being about a shared mindset one must specify that even though the one and only employee interviewed in this organization has this dissatisfaction towards the organization and the management the way of managing have failed considering being inclusive for everyone in the organization. The fact that this employee feels this way must have basis in a reasonable experience leading to this. Regarding there being a proper HR department or if it's under one's job title the HRM approach is according to Hoque (2000) more flexible when it comes to each and every hotel that belongs to a chain, where HR management is crucial in retaining and managing valuable employees. However, the HR Manager mentioned that there has been less HR resources available for this hotel and where this in addition to a supervisor-approach has led to not having enough capacity for a full HR focus for the employees. As this can have led to not being able to focus as much on every employee this might have been the cause for this employee's dissatisfaction and in not being heard. At the same time considering that this employee is not Norwegian the employee mentions the organization being very old-fashioned and with a non-effective communication, where the feeling of being excluded can be in both the older employees and their perception of the new and young workforce with a cultural background, this in addition to the minimal interaction between the departments. But the question that then rises is why the employee didn't move on sooner when there is so much dissatisfaction, although the employee said in the interview that the plan was to leave soon. As the employee emphasized on the importance of a learning environment this is clearly not an environment where one can grow from his perspective, where actions must be taken to change your state of being. But another question that again comes up is then how the management hasn't been able to notice this dissatisfaction when the distance between the manager and the employees

MHRHOV

is short.

The HR Manager further states that a decrease in HR resources will in the long term make the organization stronger in terms of learning from it. Although that sounds nice, the problem is the degree of damage this could have for the organization culture and the relationship to the employees in the meantime the organization is going through this change. As a decrease in the resources can lead to a less focus on every aspect of being an employee and the feeling of being a part of the organization future this might lead to people leaving making it difficult to create a basis of a good workforce before being able to fully adapt to the changes. Further the HR Manager states that the position in HR has led to having a great influence in retaining and developing talents in terms of initiating thinking processes and being a representative for how employees can experience things. But considering this one employee the need of a representative expressing his experience seems to have been absent. One can of course say that this happening could be natural due to the decrease in HR resources, but considering that some employees' voices must have been picked up on the way by the HR Manager the most crucial voice of this employee seems to have fallen between the implications of the downsizing and therefore been damaging in a way that it can be difficult to pick up this problem when it is so "unknown" for the management.

This further leads to the way this organization's managers are retaining and managing the employees in Organization A. According to Kunich and Lester (referred in Daft, 2011) the aim of feedback is to support individual learning. But to be an effective leader it's crucial to give feedback regularly rather than just for annual performance reviews, and where it's important that the use of feedback lies entirely on performance and on improvement (Cannon & Witherspoon, referred in Daft, 2011).

MHRHOV

The feedback in the organization is balanced between both daily and through annual reviews, this with the purpose of an continuous growth by looking at their strengths and weaknesses and by then encourage them to take courses and training. But at the same time the employee means the communication and feedback doesn't happen often enough. However, considering that this employee is not Norwegian and has had some work experiences in other countries the mindset of a similar working culture might have been expected when starting to work at this organization. As GM states the importance of feedback in the performance and in growing the use of feedback might not be as "bad" as the employee says it is but that the difference in the background of the organizational cultures might have had an effect. Here it seems that both the employee and the GM are having different perspective on feedback. As the GM relates feedback more to a performance and something that has been achieved the employee seems to expect that the use feedback in terms of an everyday communication. This might also show to the cultural differences between them, that the way of working in an organization for the employee has been more related to the feedback used as a form of guidance and not as a way to improve and develop.

But with that said, as feedback are seen as a tool to further grow and develop through performance the way of using feedback is also needed in everyday work life as an ordinary communication tool. As the GM says that feedback also can be used by giving a simple "high-five" or a "good job", this shows that feedback also can have a factor in developing employees through motivation.

But with the GM's intention of feedback lying in one's performance, this has also led the GM to focus more on proactive leadership and performance within the organization. As the GM states that this clearly shows leadership from his side, his picture of what

MHRHOV

leadership is can at the same time be misinterpreted or taken too lightly. Considering leadership being about a shared mindset (Chambers et. al., 1998) this also shows that leadership is not about drastically displaying changes in an organization just because being in a position of a leader, but to constantly aim to change the organization for the better of the employees because you are a leader. As performance leads to growth and development (Enz, 2010) the intention for implementing more performance-focused systems throughout the organization might slightly have made the GM talk a little against himself and his values considering his emphasize on the crucial of human knowledge. Considering that this has been unfamiliar to the older employees it was also mentioned in the interview that one must focus on employees at all levels and the fact that they are in different stages in life and career. The sentence "...in different stages in life and career" and with the HR Manager stating the importance of facilitating for the different needs and demands for the differences in the workforce might show that implementing performance-systems throughout the organization is an approach that doesn't benefit the workforce overall, where the older employee's unfamiliarity with this system can make them feel less comfortable, excluded over the need for the new and young workforce, and eventually create a bigger distance between departments consider the employee saying there's already a lack of knowledge between them.

When it comes to relating a talent to a certain segment this is also where the GM and the HR Manager's perspective differ. While the HR Manager emphasizes the importance in treating the workforce differently based on their needs and satisfaction as other workforces than just the young and energetic workforce also have a lot to offer. The different "generations" in the workforce that adds value to the organization might also vary in the need of extra training. As the young workforce might want training to

MHRHOV

grow and develop for career advancement the much older workforce might be satisfied with what they have achieved so far and want to stay like this without using any time for more training. So the feeling of exclusion might also result in the impression of the rest of the employees feeling the same way in a way that there's too little interaction and knowledge between the departments. The employee's feeling of being excluded might in some way be the feeling the older employees are having in a way that they are unfamiliar in being measured by performance and getting the impression of a management unknowing about how to maximize the workforce effort overall. But as this employee's feeling of dissatisfaction might show how leadership can fail in being able to manage everyone the way the employee expressed himself during the interview and by knowing it is anonymous might also at the same time have contributed to also emphasis and point out more of the negative aspect than the positive.

Considering challenge in turnover and in retaining employees the GM and HR Manager further mentions the smooth continuity in the workforce and thereby the quality as a challenge. As the turnover rate in the hotel industry is generally higher than in other industries (Wood, 1992, referred in Hoque; Yam & Raybould, 2011) the 24/7 operation and the low skills required seems to be the main reasons (Taylor & Finley, referred in Yam & Raybould, 2011). The HR Manager also mentions that some of the reason might lie in the fact that it takes time to develop a form of care for the workplace making it easier to leave it for another organization. However, according to them both the biggest challenge lies in their location in Stavanger and the salary. According to Allen (2008) the difference in employees staying lies in the payment and the working condition, this in addition to the opportunities of development compared to the effort made.

The challenges in Organization A in retaining talents lies in the low salary and an

MHRHOV

impatient young workforce who moves on to another organization to gain higher salary. But at the same time the managers here aren't looking at talents as irreplaceable and are therefore not making a big effort in retaining those who want to leave, but rather see this as an opportunity to gain new talents by focusing more on recruiting the right people with the desire for career advancement within the chain. But as there are major costs in turnover (Lockyer, 2007) this view on that employees not being irreplaceable can be a problem for the organization, this in terms of taking this issue too lightly. Although the HR Manager mentioned the challenge lying in not always knowing when the employees want to leave before they have left, the workforce in the hotel industry when it comes to valuable employees might be too scarce to just see them as resources that can easily be replaceable. The reason is because the HR Manager also mentions that the hotel industry are just being a temporary workplace for valuable employees to move forward and being hired by an organization in another industry, especially the oil industry here in Stavanger. But even though a temporary workplace, it is still a workplace that has a basis in the employees and where one cannot be sure of the next person hired does add a certain value to the organization as the one that left. But on the other hand, the hotel industry is a business where being an employee can be learned through courses and training, and that having an education doesn't automatically mean you are a talent. Being in an industry with a low entrance-barrier in skills required (Taylor & Finley, referred in Yam & Raybould, 2011) and a high turnover can result in that a talent in this setting is more defined with a person's skill and ability to learn things quickly, and that one's vision and goals are something that is being developed along the way. Of this reason I think that as the hotel industry can't be an attractive work place by competing on salary it can be an attractive workplace by developing, defining and forming an employee's skills and ability to become valuable

MHRHOV

along the way. So when it comes to paying what it takes to retain talents that must be done towards the employees that are determined on building a career within the chain, or else it can become a waste of investment. Of this reason there is also a point in the statement by the HR Manager about no one being irreplaceable, that as the hotel industry is a temporary workplace for many the talents can be developed from within through training and courses, where the importance lies in being able to develop employees adding value in the time they work there. But as the HR Manager says that if they can't offer more money the employees aren't motivated enough for growth, development etc. this also shows to Allen (2008) stating that money lies above anything else.

5.2 Organization B

In Organization B the GM emphasizes the effort towards being the most attractive workplace in the hotel business in Stavanger, this by showing to a caring environment where there's opportunity to grow and develop. As one of the challenges in managing talents lies in exactly identifying talents (Chambers et. al., 1998) the GM at Organization B identifies a talent as one who has passion to achieve a goal, and that this passion is what distinguishes a talent from the rest. But to identify a talent Enz (2010) states the crucial in a leadership being aware of the range of human resources they have in the organization and on what they can get out of this. The GM further defines a good leader as one who is aware of the range of the employees and their strength and weaknesses, and in the importance of a diversity in the workforce. However the GM also makes it clear about her own weakness as a leader, where the GM specifies that the use of feedback must be improved. As the GM states being clearly better at giving positive feedback rather than negative or constructive feedback and where this is an area the GM therefore must work much more on. But as feedback is used to support

MHRHOV

individual learning (Kunich & Lester, referred in Daft, 2011), the importance lies in giving feedback regardless of it being negative, positive or constructive (Cannon & Witherspoon, referred in Daft, 2011). But according to Cannon & Witherspoon (referred in Daft, 2011) people can find it difficult to both give and receive negative or constructive feedback, and where this seems to be the case for GM in this organization. The one employee interviewed in this organization stated the importance of feedback for being able to do a good job, where the use of feedback was a crucial factor that motivates for doing a good job and to know where they stand.

The use of feedback can therefore be considered in two ways but both with the aim to support individual learning: the one is that positive feedback is used to drive an employee's motivation to contribute even more, and the second that negative and constructive feedback is used to improve your performance or to guide and polish your skills and abilities based on your performances.

When looking at it like this the GM seems to have too much focus on only "pleasing" the employees through positive feedback rather than knowing when to use the right feedback, even though the GM is aware of this. But as the GM mentioned the use of "the 5 rocks" to improve the use of positive feedback among the other leaders in the organization the way of the GM herself to improve the use of constructive feedback wasn't mentioned. One could of course consider the use of "the 5 rocks" in improving the GM's use of feedback as well. However the limitation or the constraints of using this method may perhaps have already been in the difference purpose or aim of positive and negative/constructive feedback itself, and where this can correlate to Govaerts' et. al. (2011) perspective on training where the purpose of training is either due to a lack of skills or to develop skills and talents. The reason is because as positive feedback can be used to motivate employees and therefore be communicated in a more natural way and

MHRHOV

not necessarily be tied up to a specific situation the use of negative or constructive feedback on the other hand is more tied up to a specific situation in terms of performance or a task. As the GM emphasizes Organization B being a caring environment and being an attractive workplace this “rosy” picture might have led the focus move more towards seeing positive feedback as more important than constructive feedback. In addition the GM mentions the importance of a leader to be targeted and be specific about what you want with your leadership, where the GM of this reason can have difficulties in putting herself in her own definition of a good leader, this because of the improvement needed in constructive feedback. But on the other hand, the GM’s more use of positive feedback and the focus on a caring environment and an attractive workplace can also show to a clear and targeted leadership in a way that the GM are making an organization more based on her values and perspectives. In addition, although she mentions the need of improving constructive and negative feedback she also mentions the importance with a diverse workforce. As one clearly cannot be amazingly good at all aspects of being a leader the GM seems to have taken advantage of her weakness in the way the GM sees the value in a diverse workforce. As the value of a diverse workforce is by GM seen as appreciating people who are different from yourself and to make them work together it is also shown in complementing one’s strengths and weaknesses. So although the GM states the need of improving the negative and constructive feedback the GM’s way of leading the organization can at the same time be seen as a clear leadership, this by being able to be aware of your limitations and to use this to your advantage.

With the GM stating the importance of a caring environment and giving the employees the opportunity to grow and develop this is also what the employee interviewed

MHRHOV

experiences as well.

But rather than taking specific actions in retaining talents the GM is aware of that in the work for developing employees this also means that talents eventually leaves. But to rather see this as a “loss” the GM looks at this as an opportunity to develop and attract new talents, and that meanwhile the employees are within the organization the importance is to give them the opportunity to develop here. But considering that developing talents in this organization are done by having leader team meetings and where the leaders of each of the departments are the ones who follows up the development of their employees the impact that the GM has in retaining and developing the employees seems to be indirect, or at least not having a direct supervision other than managing through the department managers. With this in mind it can be easy to state it’s important to give employees the opportunity to grow and develop but rather being difficult to actual implement it in the organization as you don’t have the direct supervision to all of the employees but mostly to your department leaders. Although the GM takes most of the important decisions it is still decisions that the department managers are taking further down to their own employees, where there’s not given that the values of a caring and developing environment is in the same extent displayed in how the department leaders are managing their employees as the GM has envisioned. As written earlier Allen (2008) refers to the importance of the opportunity of development for the employees, and as the GM states the challenge of the hotel industry in terms of the low salary it’s essential to emphasize on a good working environment in this industry. To develop the employees the GM mentions giving the employees the opportunity to take on extra duties and in the actual work task itself as the main factors. By giving these kind of everyday challenges the GM says it’s about giving them the opportunity to constantly develop, even if it means that they have to continue another

MHRHOV

place. Here I think one must emphasize on the last part of the sentence considering the employees' need to continue another place if they want a constant development. With the GM's way of developing the employees through daily tasks and challenges and at the same time stating the importance of encouraging employees to constantly developing themselves this can at the same time suddenly become very limiting in the way of managing and developing the employees. Although your tasks at work can be various and where "no days are similar" the development being based on the actual tasks you are supposed to do can be very limited in a way that when you first start at a new job the development of your skills, abilities and knowledge will happen in a faster pace, but after a while facing the same work tasks can result in a stagnation in your development process and going through a repeating circle. But of course, as facing job tasks for the first time can be seen as a challenge, this can again results in polishing, refining and perfecting your skills and abilities. But in this stage the management must also have a plan for further development of the employees, this to keep them satisfied. In addition to this the way of inviting the employees to take on extra duties may only gain a small number of the overall employees where the balance of development throughout the workforce of this reason also might be uneven. But of course, the employees must also make an effort in developing themselves, where the importance also lies in them being able to take initiatives and to show a desire to further develop. But when going back to the organization relying on a caring environment the way of identifying talents might also be a challenge because of a greater focus on the overall satisfaction of the workforce and at the same time trying to focus on every individual. Although this is positive it's at the same time easier to say that one is helping all the employees along the way rather than having the capacity or the resources to actually support the individual learning of everyone, where maybe the need of a greater focus on

MHRHOV

those who are seen as a talent is needed. However, as stated by the GM one part of developing employees is also to letting go of them. But my biggest concern is as mentioned the impression of generalizing the workforce and not seeing them as individuals, this by letting them develop through taking extra duties and through daily tasks, which at the beginning of an employment can be effective but can quickly stagnate the employees development, this in addition to that the great focus on caring for others might also lead to generalizing the workforce.

In this manner each of the employee and their impression of development can therefore be very different from each other based on their skills and abilities. However, the caring environment seems also to reflect a value displaying a care for the guests at the hotel as well. As the employee emphasized on how the management has supported for the employee to develop further the reason for enjoying working at Organization B was also expressed in the relationship to the guests and that these are some of the main factor on the satisfactory level of working there.

The GM is further acknowledging the fact that the challenge lies in the salary and the location in Stavanger considering the oil industry and real estate, where the hotel industry's responsible here lies in recruiting and developing good employees. At the same time the employee interviewed also acknowledge the challenge in turnover and the high rate of employee turnover in the reception.

But at the same time considering the GM stating that when talents leave it gives the opportunity to gain new talents one must also consider that this could be said with more of an ease here in Stavanger than in other regions of the country, this regarding this organization being located within the oil capital. The reason lies exactly in the University of Stavanger and in the Norwegian Hotel School (NHS) where the students

MHRHOV

there are taking on an education to build a future within the hotel business. With many of the students getting their first work experience within the hotel when starting their education here the hotel industry will there in a way have a constant surplus in the workforce, even if the turnover is high. But as a high turnover rate is economically expensive for an organization (Lockyer, 2007) the GM therefore states the importance to make an attractive workplace towards the young workforce. But being an attractive workplace is also depended on being able to display the attractiveness outward. According to the GM this organization is looking beyond the standard job application and a CV or one's education when they are defining a talent, they rather look at one's potential to succeed. With a number of people not having any education other than graduating from high school this organization can therefore be seen as an attractive organization and displaying values that is being appreciated, and where this also displays a value of a caring organization.

The employee also mentioned that the organization let her in with open arms when dropping out from high school. In one perspective this can therefore be seen as an attractive workplace by becoming more than an employer but as a place where one sees value in everyone. But on the other hand the picture of an attractive workplace can in an extent become more blurry and limited, especially for those who has an education but are in the beginning of an employment competing with those who don't have an education. Although this might be a little on the edge the GM's perspective of this organization being the most attractive workplace in this region might of this reason only be seen like an attractive workplace only for those without education. As some of the reasons for a high turnover lies in the low entry level of skills required (Milman & Ricci, Taylor & Finley, referred in Yam & Raybould, 2011) the high turnover rate can therefore in Allen's (2008) "calculation" be seen as looking at the opportunities to

MHRHOV

develop compared to the effort made. In this case an attractive workplace vs. unattractive workplace and the difference in turnover rate might therefore lie in the fact that the workforce with or during an education within hotel management feeling the effort made not being equivalent with the career opportunities, where they might feel they start with the same base with those who doesn't have an education in their luggage.

5.3 Organization C

In Organization C the GM states that managing talents are done specifically for those who have performed over time and at the same time has the wish and goal to develop within the chain, and where the chain also can see you as a future resource. A talent is therefore by the GM defined as someone who has the desire and the abilities to accomplish or achieve something. But considering that the GM mentions that the way of managing talents in this organization is done towards those who has performed over time and are having the desire this can also mean that being recognized can take a while. As it seems like talent management here has a clear guideline considering that the employees must in a way prove themselves worthy the GM further states that there are some improvements needed. The management must be better at acknowledging the skills and values the employees can add to the organization already from the hiring stage and not start recognizing their talents after it has gone a few years. But considering that the GM defines a good leader as one who has the abilities to listen and understand the employees' needs one might ask if these are the values that the GM has displayed as well. The reason is because although defining a leader by these values the need of improving the recognition of valuable employees already from the hiring stage seems only to be a thinking process of what needs to be improved in the future. For a leader to listen and understand the needs of the employee these are values that should be displayed by the GM by already creating an organization where one recognizes

MHRHOV

employee skills and abilities from the beginning, and not something one consider needs to be improved. This can be shown to Daft (2011) referring to that leadership being about influencing each other by having shared values. As the emphasis on listening and understanding can be seen as values that creates the basis of an organizational culture of recognizing others it seems like the GM's leadership is of this reason slightly different from his definition of it. But at the same time one can go back to Daft (*ibid*) also stating that leadership is about constantly wanting to change the organization for the better. Considering this the GM mentioned that in addition to the hotel being relatively new there were some challenges including cost reduction when he took over, which meant that the way of managing needed to be in a certain way and that the leadership then changed as things worked out. Although leadership is about constantly changing for the better this is a process that takes time, and where the results are gradually appearing. So, although one can say that the values of listening and understanding are not displayed in the organizational culture based on that the organization needs to improve their recognition of valuable employees in an earlier stage, it can at the same time show that the GM is being aware of it and where this being a crucial factor to change for the better in the future.

But when leading an organization one might also tend to focus more on those of the employees who are not performing as they should, or easier said that the focus can lie more towards trying to guide and support those of the employees who underperforms because they lack in skills and ability to actually perform positively in the organization. This can also result in that talented and valuable employees gets less attention and support than needed to grow and develop. With Boyle (2013a) stating that in maximizing the strategy of retaining employees it's essential with an effective management of the human resources in the organization and in the use of feedback

MHRHOV

especially towards valuable employees, the focus on trying to change a “weak” employee might therefore result in often shadowing and forgetting the importance of focusing on the talents. With the GM implementing the strategy of recognizing an employee in an earlier stage might therefore be positive for the organization, this to recognize and map the valuable employees from the rest and focus more on them.

Regarding of a feedback being positive, negative or constructive the GM states that the background of giving feedback is to recognize the employees and to use this to drive the employees forward. But with the GM further stating that both daily feedbacks and feedbacks in annual reviews is being used he is also emphasizing on that the amount of feedback is depended on each of the employee, where giving feedback can vary from giving it constantly or only in yearly meetings. When it comes to receiving feedback among the two employees interviewed their perspective on feedback seems to differ from each other. The female employee mentioned the importance of receiving feedback for further doing a good job and to improve, and where feedback is used in various types of settings. But as for the male employee he seem to find it more appealing to find your own ways to develop rather than receiving feedback. Although the example of these two employees can show to the GM stating that the amount of feedback given in this organization is depended on each employee I think that, especially considering the male employee, it lies in your subconscious wanting to receive feedback regularly rather than just a couple of times, this to feel that your work tasks and performance is being acknowledged. At the same time the GM states the aim of feedback is to give the employees progress, but with the variation of the amount of feedback given being depended on each employee one must ask if the progression of the employee in a way are being stagnated than what it could be if feedback was given more regularly. The

MHRHOV

reason is because as Kunich & Lester (referred in Daft, 2011) states that the aim of feedback is to support individual learning, the importance of a leader is to give feedback on regular basis (Cannon & Witherspoon, referred in Daft, 2011). This might show to that the GM only seeing the use of feedback as a tool being used only as a necessity. Although feedback of course can be seen as a tool it seems that the use of feedback is being based on the amount of feedback the employee indicates they need rather than what they actual need. So it seems that the aim of using feedback of not only to recognize them but also to support and develop the employees seems to be a little forgotten along the way. But with that said the GM has regularly meeting with his leader group and where the department leaders has the closer supervision to the employees, this meaning giving feedback to the employees first of all happens through the department leaders. However, this doesn't mean that feedback aren't that rare either. As mentioned by the GM he uses a term called "management by walking around", meaning that he gives daily feedback to the employees in form of compliments and positive feedback in the public and negative or constructive feedback in smaller rooms. So although the GM mentioned that giving feedback is depended on the employee the GM's values and commitment of "seeing" the employees might also show to that the GM also sees the importance of giving feedbacks regularly.

But when it comes to the communication throughout this organization the GM mentions there's an ineffective communication because of a lack of knowledge between the departments considering understanding the other department's challenges and tasks in their workday. With the GM stating the reason for the lack of knowledge and therefore some challenges in the organizational culture between the departments lying in the hotel being quite new, the perspective of this "distance" between the departments is also

MHRHOV

expressed through the male employee as well. Although this employee mentions there is an inclusive culture in this organization he also specifies the lack of interaction between the departments. But as Daft (2011) defines leadership being all about creating a culture based on core values this organization doesn't seem to be an organization based on a strong leadership. The reason is because although the GM states there is a positive culture in this organization this perspective can easily break up due to the values that the GM stands for. Besides of the values of the chain which is also displayed in the GM the core values that the GM emphasizes are listening and understanding. With these two values representing what the GM stands for this should also have been the foundation on how the organizational culture should have been.

Regardless of the hotel being quite new and things might not be quite in place yet a positive culture may not be the first impression considering the lack of knowledge between the departments. Further my thought is that regardless of a hotel being newly established the creating and assembling of a team of employees is the foundation of every organization, where it isn't necessarily the facility that represents the hotel but the employees. This lack of knowledge between the departments can also be shown in the female employee, but somehow in another way. The female employee didn't mention this problem at all during the interview but rather mentioning the good cooperation the different departments have with each other, and thereby a positive communication throughout the organization. As this not only shows the huge difference in perspective and impression on how the state of the organization is among both the GM and the employee on a matter that can be seen as crucial, this can show an ineffective communication in this organization with a lack of "togetherness". One might also ask how this challenge haven't been dealt with properly even though the GM has meeting with his leader group twice every weekend, especially considering that this challenge

MHRHOV

are seen as a great weakness for creating a strong organizational culture. Going back to Daft (2011) referring to that leadership being about a shared mindset which again reflects reaching a shared vision and goal, this organization and the belonging departments seems to operate individually which also can lead to being aware of their own department's secondary objectives, but not the overall objective of the organization as one. This can also lead to not being able to exploit the skills and abilities of a talent in an effective way because of one's working range being limited to one's department. This lack of knowledge between departments can again show to Enz (2010) stating the importance of supporting employees, its organization and its environment, this to face a challenge in the most efficient way. But with this said the organization has been starting to improve the understanding of the other departments by letting employees work in different departments for a period, this according to the GM and the male employee. This also shows that actions are being taken when being aware of a challenge, which can also reflect the values of the GM of listening and being aware, and to then take action. In addition the GM mentioned the need of managing in various ways depended on the situation, which was shown from the beginning. With this in mind one might also think that even though improvement are necessary one doesn't always have the resource to manage one specific challenge until other factors are under place.

Considering retaining and developing the employees in the organization the GM is focusing on mapping the competencies of the workforce, and by then giving them goals and challenges to drive them forward. The aim of giving the employees challenging tasks in their daily work life is therefore to see how they respond to the tasks and to then identify the abilities and knowledge the employees possess. However the GM are stating that the challenge lies in maintaining a continuous of activities. In retaining the

MHRHOV

employees the GM acknowledge the challenge lies in sales and in having enough activities and challenges to keep the employees satisfied. The importance of a continuous of job activities in retaining talents can further be shown to that the intrinsic rewards of job challenge, involvement and task variety, and the extrinsic rewards of employee learning and development are seen as crucial factors for employees to be satisfied and for them staying (Allen, 2008; Hausknecht, Rodda & Howard, 2009; Walsh & Taylor, 2007). But as for both of the employees they did not experience the activity as a challenge, or at least they did not mention it. Instead they both mentioned how the GM has been supportive in giving them opportunities to grow and develop through attending a business school in the chain and in facilitating for further career advancement within the chain.

As this shows to a supportive leader taking actions to develop the employees this way of developing the employees can also be conflicting at the same time. The reason is because the GM states that the focus on developing the employees lies in giving them daily challenges, but at the same time he acknowledge the challenge in keeping a steady flow of activities to keep the employees satisfied. With the GM being aware of this challenge in developing the employees the employees at the same time hasn't experienced this issue but rather mentioning how the GM has supported their further career advancement. This might show to the reason for why the GM being so actively supportive, this to cover up for the lack of activities facing the organization. Of course the GM can be sincere about the intention of supporting the employees, and where one must also take into consideration that giving the employees the opportunity of talent programs and other involving tasks also can be seen as developing and growing the employees. However some of the reason for paying extra attention on giving the employees these talent programs might lie in keeping the employees satisfied while

MHRHOV

shifting the focus away from the challenge of maintaining the activity. But at the same time one can say that as a hotel's activity can be related to the effort made in attracting more customers to the hotel, it can also be independent at the same time in a way that the trends and the curves in the hotel market makes it difficult to maintain a constant flow of activities that keeps the employees occupied and satisfied. This can of this reason lead to taking actions to satisfy the employees in the periods of low activity, this to retain them and wanting them to perform in the periods of high activity. However, as one of the main factors for motivating and retaining the employees is a workplace allowing for involvement and engagement (Nickson, 2007), it seems that this can be a challenge in this organization.

But considering that, as mentioned earlier, the GM states that developing the employees are done by giving them challenges he also makes a controversial statement by saying that the hotel industry can't be seen as a market consisting of talents. As the reason according to the GM lies in that the salary are too low for an employee to be attracted enough to work in the hotel industry, this can refer to Allen (2008) stating that the factors that determines employees leaving or staying includes both the payment and the opportunities to develop compared to the made effort. But by saying that the hotel industry aren't seen as a talent arena externally might raise the question of if the GM himself is seeing or recognizing the current employees in the hotel industry as valuable or as talented. If the GM's definition of a talent being determined with desire, the definition of a talent then becomes a factor that I believe is being independent from which type of industry you belong to. It is rather about being able to exploit your skills and abilities, and where the driving force lies in your desire to succeed. For this reason the GM's perspective of the hotel industry not being seen as a talent arena might also be

MHRHOV

displayed in the leadership of only seeing the human resources in the hotel industry as a process of only “coming & going”. The female employee also refers to that rather than salary it is more important to develop and to build a career. But as the employee states that one cannot exclude the fact that salary is important, this is not because of the salary itself but because living in the expensive Stavanger.

As this shows that money isn't everything to everyone, this can at the same time show to the perspective of the GM. Going back to Allen (2008) stating the importance of salary in employees staying or leaving, one of the reasons for a high turnover in the hotel industry lies in the low skills required when working at a hotel (Milman & Ricci, Taylor Finley, referred in Yam & Raybould, 2011). This can show to when the GM are excluding the hotel industry as a talent arena. As Becker & Huselid (referred in Oldroyd & Morris, 2012) states that some employees are naturally more valuable than others on a resource-based view, this shows to that there must be a group of workforce that is in under the label “talent”. With a clear line between valuable employees and “other” employees the image of not seeing the hotel industry as a talent arena may have been made because the valuable employees are leaving the hotel industry both because of them realizing the low salary and the low skills required, and because they leave before they have made an influence and added an extra value for the organization and for the industry to take advantage of their talent. This can result in the hotel industry no longer to be seen as a talent arena, and rather suffer from the impact of turnover before having the opportunity to convince employees or trying to retain them.

5.4 Organization A, B and C

In Organization A the GM is focusing on performance and with the use of feedback being tied up to the performance. In Organization B the GM emphasizes on a caring environment when it comes to retaining and managing the employees, while in

MHRHOV

Organization C the GM focuses on giving challenges in the everyday work life. As Nickson (2007) states the importance of involving and engaging employees for them to be committed to their organization, this can further relate to Ramsey (2006) stating that engaged employees are five times more likely to stay in an organization than those who are less engaged. With this in mind the four factors that according to Gibbons (referred in Hughes & Rog, 2008) leads to employees being involved are 1) a caring management, 2) the feeling of being a contributing part of the organization, 3) the opportunity to advance in career and skills, and 4) the relationships to other colleagues and the manager. This can also relate to Walker's (referred in Govaerts et. al., 2011) seven factors for an employee to stay: work challenge, learning opportunities, being recognized, a good communication, a good work-life balance, and a good relationship. So with the primary focus on Gibbons' (*ibid*) four factors, and where Walker's (*ibid*) seven factors can be seen as a more particular segmentation of Gibbon's four factor, a deeper discussion on each of the organizations compared to each other will follow.

Considering Gibbons' (*ibid*) first factor out of four, a caring management, let's first try to define what a "caring management" actually is. When looking back at the "Literature review" in this paper Daft (2011) stated that there is a difference between the word "leadership" and "management", where leadership is about creating core values and a culture leading to their vision, while management is about specific actions taken by the organization to achieve their mission. One could therefore say that the term "caring management" would fit under the definition of what Daft (*ibid*) defines as management, just because both contains the word "management". But considering that the clear difference between leadership and management lies in that the leadership's values defines who you are and where the management shows to how you do things

MHRHOV

specifically, this can show to that a management and the way of managing the organization is a result of your leadership and the values that you believe in. So as caring management can be shown to that the word *caring* can be seen as a value defining who you are a caring management can, like leadership and management, show to that this is a result of your ability and value to care for others and that this is displayed in how you manage the employees. So when going back to all of the three organizations one can say that Organization A stands out from the other two. Although the GM in all of the three organizations states having an organization with a positive culture, one must at the same time point out the dissatisfaction of the employee in Organization A. Of course one could consider that there could be other dissatisfied employees in the other two organizations as well, but as this isn't a quantitative research but a qualitative it's impossible to capture all the variables other than the specific sample you already have in front of you and where you have to take basis from this, in this case from one or two employees in each organization of many employees. Further one could say that one organization is better than the others just based on how the employees has responded to the interview. However the limitation of doing this lies in relying too much on the employee's words to take a conclusion, and looking at one's satisfaction or dissatisfaction as an overall result of the management. But on the other hand, the fact that a caring management not only relates to those of the employees that are valuable but the whole organization, the dissatisfaction of the employee in Organization A can't be taken lightly.

But the impression of a caring management has some similarities between the three GMs. In Organization A a management showing care is emphasized on having the human knowledge, this by leading and succeeding though the employees. While in Organization B and C both the GMs are emphasizing on being able to listen and to

MHRHOV

understand the employees. A management emphasizing on caring can by all of the GMs show to the ability of looking at the interaction with the employees as a relationship deeper than a hierarchical relationship. But with that said, as leadership is about creating an organizational culture based on core values (Daft, 2011) one must take into consideration that the amount of value of possessing and expressing care is not equal from person to person. As some people appreciate the value of care above other things that doesn't mean that others do that as well. This can reflect to each of the three GMs with each of them being different from each other in their perspectives, personalities and their values. So even though knowing the importance of a caring environment for the employees it can become easier to add values or even emphasize on the value of care much higher than what the actual truth is, this as a kind of confirming to oneself that being aware of and stating the importance of caring can justify for actually showing to a caring management. But considering that one of the reasons for the high turnover lies in the demand for flexibility due to a 24/7 operation (Milman & Ricci, Taylor & Finley, referred in Yam & Raybould, 2011) a management showing care might lie in facilitating a good work-life balance as possible. What distinguishes the three organizations from each other considering the term care for the employees the difference lies in the specific segments of the actual workforce they are focusing on, and also what they focus on in creating a caring environment.

In Organization A the segment of the workforce that is focused on is not targeted at a specific part of the workforce but rather being aware of the importance of a workplace that fits all. The reason is because every employee of the organization is in different stages in life and career and therefore has different demands and needs, and where the value of human knowledge therefore is emphasized by both the GM and the HR Manager. In Organization B the GM are more specific when talking about the

MHRHOV

importance of showing a caring environment. The GM is stating the importance to understand one another in the organization, this by emphasizing the importance of a diverse workforce. However, when mentioning the importance of a caring environment the GM are emphasizing on the younger workforce, where the reason lies in the majority of the workforce being young. While in Organization C a form of care is by GM shown through emphasizing on listening and understanding the employees, this in the terms of recognizing each and every one of them.

As this paper's objective is aimed at the talented employees of the organizations expressing care is however something that concerns all the human resources. So even though all three can show to values that expresses a form of care towards the employees, what distinguishes Organization A is the emphasis on that employees are in different stages in life and career, and where the management therefore must be tailored around the fact that the employees has a life outside their job. It can of this reason show to that a form of care is by Organization A expressed through looking further than only within the organization, while Organization B and C are more focused on the form of care only occurring and deals with the employees' life within the organization. This also show to that Organization A and C are not linking a talent to a specific segment of the workforce such as Organization B linking a talent more towards the younger workforce. This can lead to that the values each of the Managers expressing a caring management and environment is more applicable for the overall organization for both A and C, and where Organization B's value expressing a caring environment seems to be more aimed towards the young and talented employees. However, a caring management must also be beyond just stating values, it must also be about how the organization displays these values in terms of how they function in the way of doing things, the interaction and on

MHRHOV

how this affects the employee. Expressing a form of care towards the employees and on how the organization is operating is therefore perceived differently among the three organizations considering their values and on operating the organizations.

In both Organization A and C it is mentioned that there's a lack of interaction and a lack of knowledge between the departments, leading to an ineffective communication. As this was mentioned only by the employee in Organization A and by the GM and one of the employee in Organization C, it was however mentioned by both of the GMs at A and C that the organizational culture was positive. Considering the lack of interaction in Organization A only being expressed by the employee and not the GM, does this mean that the culture is positive or not? The same case goes to Organization C when it comes to the culture being positive when both the GM and one of the employee acknowledge there is a lack of knowledge between the departments.

On one hand one can say that the culture in both of the organizations can be positive in a way that as long as the majority of the organization are experiencing a positive culture then that's the conclusion. The reason is because it may be difficult to please and satisfy everyone in an organization, and that it's part of the organization's everyday life that it's normal with dissatisfaction considering there's so many different people working there. Of this reason one can say that leadership is not about obtaining a perfect organizational condition, but rather looking at how to always improve. In this way one can therefore say that even though there are some dissatisfied employees in an organization a positive culture is defined by the overall experience and not determined by the few. But on the other hand one can state there's lack of positive culture in both of the organizations. In the case of Organization A the reason is because as this is something that the employee experiences this can show to the contrast that can occur when it comes to how you think you're managing the organization and on how it actually can be perceived by those who

MHRHOV

experiences the result of your leadership. The same goes to Organization C. Considering one of the employees not being familiar to the problem of lack of knowledge between departments in the organization and where both the GM and the other employee acknowledging a lack of interaction between the departments but still stating a positive culture, this can show to not seeing the organization in a bigger perspective. For instance, if the case is that the interaction within each of the departments are good but where the communication between departments are ineffective, this can show to a culture where the positivity is absent, and therefore also the ability to express a caring environment overall. The reason is because as leadership is about a shared mindset (Chambers et. al. (1998), this show that the leadership has failed in making an impact of their core values in shaping the culture. This also displays the dissatisfaction the employee in Organization A has and that this also shows a failed leadership in creating a positive culture of togetherness, where only one dissatisfied employee in an organization can be enough to state that the leadership hasn't reached everyone and has therefore failed. But even though the communication is ineffective in both of the organizations that doesn't mean there's an absent of care, but that it can be more difficult to show care. In Organization B on the other hand both the GM and the employee stated this being an organization with a positive culture and a caring environment, where the values of a caring organization comes out clearly from both the GM and the employee in their explanation on the focus on both the wellbeing of the guests as the employees. Besides of the GM emphasizing the importance of showing caring environment to be attractive for the employees the management's way of showing care can also be seen in their recruitment process standing out from the more general way of hiring people, this by focusing more on the value of a person and what they possess rather than looking at their CV. But although the GM is aware of it, a

MHRHOV

caring management is not only about satisfying the employees positively there and then through the use of positive feedback. A care is also shown in being able to give feedback when something needs to be improved, or correcting when something is done wrong. So although Organization B can be seen as a caring organization this can at the same time be to an extent. With the GM acknowledging the need to improve negative and constructive feedback shows that the GM has been more focused on the one side of showing care, to satisfy the employee there and then more than in the long run.

Although the GMs in the three organizations do show a form care by stating the importance of a learning environment with the focus on understanding the employees, what distinguishes them from each other and also the challenge seems to lie in showing care throughout the organization (Organization A), to show more than one side of care (Organization B), and to show care through a greater solidarity (Organization C). But showing care is also about being able to facilitate for a supporting system in the organization, which can show to all the three organizations having some limitations. The reason lies in the decrease in HR resources in Organization A, and in Organization B and C where the role of the HR-responsible is implemented in the position of the GM. Considering that these organizations is relatively flat-structured and where the structure of the different organizations in the hotel industry aren't that big internally, this can lead to the image of not needing a proper HR department in the organization, or where not as much HR resources is needed. But considering the different perceptions by the managers compared to the employees, especially in Organization A and C, a proper HR department seems to be missing in all of the three organization. One can of course state that it could be effective to combine HR responsibility with another position, especially if the organizational structure is flat. But in this case the structure is flat, and the HR

MHRHOV

responsibility is implemented in the GM's position. But the reason for why a proper HR department is needed is shown in the differences in how the managers perceives the organization and on how the employees are doing it. This might have resulted in not being able to represent the employees in an efficient way, and where it's difficult to follow up more than a fraction of the HR procedures. As HR concerns everyone in an organization this is a process that can't be done half way.

Considering Gibbons' (referred in Hughes & Rog, 2008) second factor, the feeling of being a contributing part of the organization, this is also strongly correlated to the first factor of a caring management in terms of the management being able to build an organization around the employees. Considering the feeling of being a part of an organization the employee in Organization A seems to stand out from the employees in the other two organizations, this in terms of the employee in Organization A being the only one feeling an absent from the management when it comes to appreciation and in the opportunity to develop. As it comes out from the interview the employee and the managers in Organization A has very different perspective on the organization internally compared to the other organizations. While the management in Organization A feels the flat structure and the short distance in the organization has resulted in a positive culture and also a positive communication the employee rather feels excluded, this in terms of the organization being old-fashioned despite the diversity in the workforce culture, the lack of knowledge between departments and in the ineffective communication overall. But as the employee mentions that the manager is more absent than present, the biggest challenge for the employee seems therefore to lie in having the opportunity to contribute to the organization, this where the absence can make it difficult to recognize what kind of employees you have in the organization and therefore on what they are actually

MHRHOV

contributing with to the organization. Because leadership is about involving people by being an example (Daft, 2011) the employee's feeling of a management being absent can create a feeling of your contribution not having any meaning. But for the employees to feel they're a contributing part of the organization it seems that, especially in Organization A and C, the focus lies in offering training and courses to the employees, this to prepare them for future positions and for further development. However, for all of the three organizations the main initiatives for making the employees a contributing part seems to lie in acknowledging the important work the employees are doing, this by acknowledging and recognizing them through the use of feedback. But the feeling of being a contributing part might also lie in the feeling of your skills, abilities and knowledge being appreciated and therefore the feeling of this is in some way adding a certain value to the organization. In this case the GMs in Organization A and C seems to be aware of this and the need for mapping the skills and abilities of an employee already from the recruitment stage. This can relate to Silzer & Church (2009) stating that the purpose of identifying potential talents at an early stage lies in preparing them for future organizational positions and roles. But being a contributing part of an organization can also be seen as a process of "bargaining" between the employee and the organization, this in terms of the extent the management are putting an effort in facilitating for an environment where an employee can grow and develop. This can further display the extent of an employee's feeling of being a contributing part of the organization, and thereby their effort of returning the favor in form of skills, abilities and their effort. This can in many ways display the GM in Organization B stating the importance of giving the employees the opportunity to develop, but that this also includes that good people eventually leaves. For Organization C however the difficulties in feeling being a contributing part seems to lie in what the GM acknowledge as a challenge, to have a

MHRHOV

continuous flow of activities to keep the workforce satisfied and to retain them. But as the GM are emphasizing on that employees are being developed by giving them challenges in form of their work tasks, the concern of contribution therefore lies in maintaining the daily activity to keep the employees occupied and satisfied. Considering the GM stating that one no longer becomes a talent as soon as you get stuck and therefore needs to move on, this can also be applied to the feeling of being a contribution in this organization. As one can feel being a contributing part of the organization by having the opportunity to do courses and training, the more crucial factor for feeling being a contributing factor might lie in having the opportunity to use your skills and abilities in the form of the work task itself and its including activities. But on the other hand, giving courses and training can in same extent be contributing for the employees to further develop and the feeling of being a part of the organization, this through the feeling of being invested in. Of this reason a caring management can also be seen in the GMs in Organization B and C stating that a part of developing the employees is also to let them go. So as the employees in organization B and C are positive towards the management and in how they are getting the opportunities to further develop, this can be seen as a sign of being a contributing part of the organization and its operation. But considering Organization A the lack of knowledge and the interaction between the employee and the management can show to an organization where this employee doesn't feel being a contributing factor at all, and where this organization therefore stands out more negatively from the other two when it comes to the employee feeling included.

When it comes to Gibbons' (referred in Hughes & Rog, 2008) third factor, the opportunity to advance in career and skills, it comes out from the interview that the

MHRHOV

GMs in all of the three organizations makes it clear that they're active and supportive in giving the employees the opportunity to advance and to develop. Although the employee in Organization A mentioned the difficulties in developing and growing in the organization due to the circumstances mentioned earlier, the management however emphasized the importance of supporting the employees in their development and in the fact that talents are not bounded to only one specific part of the workforce segment. Considering the other two organizations however all the employees responded positive when it comes to having the opportunity to advance in their careers at their organizations. However, in developing the employees there seems to be some similarities between the three organizations, this by all of the GMs emphasizing on the use of your daily work tasks as a part of your training. In Organization A the GM emphasizes on leading through performance and therefore the use of feedback, in Organization B the GM emphasizes on giving the opportunity to develop by giving them more responsibility or in the actual task itself, and while in Organization C the GM emphasizes on giving them challenges to see how they respond to the task. But looking further into the opportunity to develop and to advance when comparing all the three organizations it seems that Organization B at the same time stands out from the other two. While the GMs in the other two organizations are further mentioning the use of interactive training, courses and programs for the employees to further advance, this is not mentioned by the GM in Organization B. Of course the reason might have lied in the more subjective answers of the interviewee. However, the difference between Organization B and the other two organizations seems to lie in the GM's own perspectives and approaches considering employees and to let them advance career-wise. When it comes to further career advancements through training and interactive courses Organization A and C seems to have a greater focus on mapping the workforce

MHRHOV

competencies and on how this fits with the organizational goals and objectives and thereby being more selective towards who they see as more valuable employees. As both of the organizations' focus on mapping the workforce can relate to Chambers et. al. (1998) stating that sourcing the type of talented employees wanted is depended on the organization and hence the employee's quality, this further shows the need to be specific about the type of qualities needed from the employees and also to develop training programs so the employees' qualities and skills can contribute positively for the organization in the future. This can further relate to the GM in Organization A by defining that everyone is somehow a talent, but where the difference in talents lies in their passion and in their skills in performing. But although the GM in Organization B also states the importance of mapping the workforce based on their strengths and weaknesses and to see them individually the GM has at the same time a very collective perspective of her workforce by stating that when it comes to giving the employees the opportunity to develop she wants everyone to grow and develop within the organization at all cost.

So when it comes to the three organizations and their approach in the employees' opportunity to advance this can be related to Chambers' et. al. (1998) definition of the four main groups of talent pools that organizations seeks to attract: "Go with a winner", "Big risk, big reward", "Save the world", and "Lifestyle". When it comes to Organization A "Go with a winner" seems to fit best out of the four groups, this based on the perspective of the GM. The reason is because although the GM is valuing the personal growth of the employees the main factor of his leadership lies in being proactive and to lead through the employees performance, where this can be more correlated to a greater focus on obtaining a positive outcome for the organization

MHRHOV

overall. However, when it comes to the HR Manager in Organization A “Lifestyle” seems to fit best, where the reason lies in her great focus on the need of a flexible workplace due to a workforce that are situated in different stages in life. In addition the emphasis on a flexible workplace rather than the excitement and the growth of the organization seems to lie in her own personal experience, which essentially can lie in the dilemma many newly established employees can face: the priority between work and family.

Considering Organization B however, the GM seems to fit in “Big risk, big reward”. The background lies in her great focus and emphasis on a caring environment for the employees, being a supportive leader for the employees and for the organization to be displayed as an attractive workplace for others. As this doesn’t mean the GM isn’t seeing the importance of the organizational overall success and objectives, this rather shows a greater focus on the actual employees in the organization.

For the GM in Organization C it seems to lie between “Go with a winner” and “Big risk, big reward”. The reason is because the GM mentioned that the optimal considering developing employees are if the employee’s own goals for career advancement in some way are correlated to the same path as the organization and its overall goal and objectives. As this can show to the GM focusing on the organization’s overall growth and success, the GM also acknowledges that always having the same interests as the employee isn’t always the case. The GM therefore shows to the importance of being a supportive leader considering each of the employees’ individual development and career advancement.

This leads to Gibbons’ (*ibid*) last out of four factors, the relationships to other colleagues and the manager. According to Allen (2008) creating relationship with

MHRHOV

employees and others in the organization is an important contribution for why an employee choose to stay in an organization.

When it comes to all of the three organizations their definition of relationships with others seems to have the basis in the GM's effort in creating an organizational culture of core values that can be displayed in the employees as well. Besides of the employee in Organization A being rather negative in portraying the organization and where the relationship therefore doesn't seem to be that good the management on the other hand mentions a positive organizational culture influenced by a positive relationship across the departments. The way the HR Manager explains the close relationships in the organization is by mentioning that you can sit and eat lunch with the GM even if your job is to change the light bulbs. This short distance throughout the organization considering the upper management and the employees are therefore according to both the GM and the HR Management resulting in being able to create positive relationships in the organization. But this close relationship is not what the employee has been perceiving. During the interview the employee had a greater emphasis on the importance of the relationship between a manager and the employee, and where a positive relationship is created by a manager who listens and communicates with the employee. But by also mentioning the lack of interaction between departments this seems to have resulted in the employee not being able to develop a positive and yet crucial relationship with the others in the organization making him wanting to stay. Seeing it from how the GMs are perceiving the organizations and how the employees perceives it as well it is therefore easier to state there being a more positive relationship in both Organization B and C, this simply because of a management stating and expressing values that again is what the employees also perceives as well.

MHRHOV

When it comes to Organization B developing a relationship seems to be taken to another level than the other two organizations. While the GM has emphasized on creating a caring organization by not only being an organization for the customers and guests but also for the employees themselves the GM seems to value the fact that one must first of all show care towards the employees to attract and satisfy the customers. This further shows the employee in Organization B not only expressing there being a positive culture between her and her employees and the upper management, but that this care that the management has for the employees seems to have made it possible for this employee to create and develop an mutual and positive relationship towards the guests as well. In other words, as the management expressing care towards the employees might show to developing a relationship going beyond just professional this might display what the employees feels as well, that the feeling of the bond and relationships created in this organization goes beyond just a professional relationship that not only applies towards the other employees and the management but also towards the guests as well. However, as other organizations in general the GM states that because of so many different people working here it's normal that some situations of frustrations etc. can occur. Considering that it's normal that these kinds of situations can occur the GM emphasizes on that the reason for being able to solve these situations and still remain a strong and positive workforce lies in the relationship of knowing each other. Being able to create a relationship where a care is going beyond just the professional also seems to lie in the values the GM and the organization wants to express and on making sure that these values also are to be find in a potential employee when hiring.

When it comes to Organization C considering creating relationships what makes the environment in this organization more similar to Organization A than B seems to lie in

MHRHOV

that this organization is more onto “playing by the book”. Although the GM in Organization C wants to show to a caring and a casual organizational culture the relationships being developed here between colleagues and with the managers seems to be more constituted around the professional level rather than the personal level. The reason first of all lies in both the GM and one of the employees acknowledging the lack of knowledge between departments and also some of the employees having a very hierarchical perspective on things, which can lead to an ineffective communication. If this is the case a relationship with a greater significance can be very limited, this in terms of Luthans et. al. (2004) defining one’s social capital as being able to create a positive relationships of trust and to develop a network in the organization. In addition to the GM’s much focus on the organizational objectives and goals and on how this might affect his management, this although he emphasize on the need of being able to lead in different ways, this seems to show to an organization where creating a relationship is more based on the interaction to achieve a goal rather than an interaction to get people together. But at the same time an organization’s priority first of all lies in achieving what goals and objectives they have, and where all the other things therefore has to been as a second priority This can further be related to Cappelli (2008) stating that managing talents is a supporting factor for the organization to achieve its overall objectives. As Organization C is a quite new hotel and where the GM mentioned some difficulties from the beginning resulting in different priorities, this might show to an organization where developing relationship has been difficult to achieve so far. However, for both of the employees their appreciations for a good relationship at the workplace seems to be less aimed towards the employees and other colleagues. As for the interview with the male employee the only form of relationship that was mentioned was the relationship between him and the management considering the support for

MHRHOV

further advancement in the career. For the female employee on the other hand it seems that the support of the manager and the interactions with the guests has a greater impact considering developing relationships. Considering the lack of interaction between the departments and therefore relying more to oneself the reason for not emphasizing that much on the relationship with the other colleagues might therefore show to a greater factor lying in nothing holding you back if you want to move on another place. Although the female employee mentioned that good colleagues are important when it comes to choosing a job, she emphasized more on the importance of having opportunities to develop. This can therefore show to that although developing relationships with colleagues are important, the crucial factor lies in being able to develop a good relationship with the manager as they are the ones who can be seen as the “facilitator” for the employees’ further growth and development.

With the basis from the interviews conducted for this research this shows to both Organization A and C standing out from Organization B, this with the background in each of the management’s perspective of their organization as well as the perspectives of the employees. A further justification for two of the organizations standing out therefore lies in the organization’s composition and functioning according to all of the interviewees considering their own organization. Although this paper is about what the managers are doing in managing and retaining employees on a more personal level and where this can be seen as a closer interaction between the employee and the manager, the crucial part for the actions and initiatives to go through might lie in the organization overall and by having the environment that facilitates for this. But by saying that Organization B seems to stand out in a more positive way a crucial factor for this seems to lie in the length of time been in an organization and where being in an organization

MHRHOV

for a longer time corresponds to being able to make a greater impact and to get to know the organization in a more sufficient way. Although the GM in Organization B has been in the position as the GM for around three years just like the other managers the reason for this organization being able show more to a caring and a positive culture that again is displayed in the employee seems to lie in the GM previous work position also being in the same chain and in the same organization as well.

For both the GMs in Organization A and C the case seems to be different. Although both of them have been the manager at their respective organizations for around 3 years their previous positions outside their current organizations before becoming the GM might show to not being able to get to know the whole organizational structure and to implement core values sufficiently. This can also refer to the HR Manager in Organization A stating that it takes time to express a concern and consideration for an organization you work for. As the GM in Organization B might have been able to do exactly this by working in the same organization before becoming GM at the same place the situation is different for the other two. But considering that this is based on how the employees perceives the organization in a subjective way the crucial is not to judge how the organization is based on one person and to then generalize it to the rest of the organization. Therefore one cannot ignore the fact that the GMs in Organization A and C also has been able to express values they stands for and created an organization with a positive culture. As this especially can be related to Organization A the difficulties in retaining and managing talents in Organization C seems to lie in the GM and one of the employee considering the lack of interaction. Considering that managing talent is not bounded to one specific part of an organization but rather being a strategy to be shared with the rest of the organization (Morton, referred in Hughes & Rog, 2008) the limitation for Organization C seems to lie in the flow of communication in the

MHRHOV

organization overall.

But as all of the three GMs shares the same perspectives on the importance of satisfying and developing the employees through daily tasks and challenges it therefore seems to be some similarities in managing talents. But as retaining talents not only is about the specific initiatives in developing employees but also in the intangible factors that goes beyond being just a workplace for the employee the challenge in creating a positive culture for all the three organizations seem to lie in turnover itself. Considering that creating relationships are seen as an important contribution for an employee to stay (Allen, 2008) the frequent replacements in the workforce can put these three organizations in a disadvantage, this regardless of how attractive the workplace is. The reason lies in all of the GMs stating the low salary and the location in Stavanger leading to the hotel industry only being a temporary workplace before moving further, which makies it difficult to create and develop a deep enough relationship to others before one of the parties a relationship has been created with eventually leaves.

6.0 Conclusion

In this part of the paper a conclusion of the research result will be presented, this by relating it to the implications of the findings, this in addition to discussing the limitations to it. At the end a recommendation based on this paper will be given.

6.1 Theoretical implications

Although talent management is a field of interest for many organizations Lewis & Heckman (2006) states there being a lack of clarity in literature when it comes to the definition of talent management, this in addition to its scope and the goals of it. But considering that the scope of talent management covers everything from recruitment, managing careers, planning replacements, and identifying talents etc., (Chugh & Bhatnagar, 2006; Hughes & Rog, 2008; Lewis & Heckman, 2006), this research paper has focused more on the interviewee's subjective perspective on managing talents. As this has shown the different initiatives and actions done from the managers' point of view when it comes to managing the talented employees this has further resulted in a greater understanding on the literature reviews on talent management, on how this can relate to the managers themselves, on how they perceive talent management and on how they personally are managing them. But as this research paper of this reason might only have covered one part of talent management and on retaining them, this in terms of a greater focus on managing careers and the actions to develop the employees, the managers' subjective opinions and perspectives has also given the important opportunity to compare this with how the employees perceives they're being managed.

Considering the literature review showing to a higher turnover in the hotel industry than in other this paper confirms Allen's (2008) statement of the difference in employees staying or leaving being depended on the working conditions, the payment and the opportunity to develop compared to the effort. In this research it therefore shows that all

MHRHOV

of the three managers acknowledge the low salary in the hotel industry in general and in each of the organizations making it a challenge in keeping the talented employees, this with a combination of being located in Stavanger where the workforce therefore are being more attracted towards a higher salary. But with the managers interviewed stating that the challenge of turnover also lying in the internal quality of the workforce this can relate to that turnover results in a reduction in the service quality in the hospitality industry (Lockyer, 2007; Walsh & Taylor, 2007). However, with the literature review referring to turnover as being a big problem in the hotel industry the managers in this paper seems to not let the turnover have more attention that it needs. The managers in Organization A and B rather show to that turnover can lead to something positive, this in terms of having the opportunity to gain a new talent into the organization. But when it comes to the manager's perspective in Organization C when it comes to turnover due to salary he seems to stand out from the other two, this in terms of stating that the hotel industry cannot be seen a talent arena, this due to the low salary making the hotel industry an unattractive workplace for potential talents.

Considering giving employees challenges so they can further develop and grow this is seen as an important factor in retaining employees (Chambers et. al., 1998; Echols, referred in Govaerts et. al, 2011). As this can further be confirmed by both the managers and the employees interviewed in this research this research further shows to that as the managers are emphasizing the importance of giving the employees the opportunity to develop through challenges in the everyday work life the importance of being given challenges to grow and develop is also shared by the employees.

What the employees sees as important factors when being an employee in an organization can therefore relate to the determining factors of extrinsic- and intrinsic

MHRHOV

rewards for an employee to stay (Allen, 2008; Hausknecht, Rodda & Howard, 2009; Walsh & Taylor, 2007). But although the employees as well emphasized the importance of being able to grow and develop in the organization the fact of this actually happening to the participants interviewed was perceived differently. While all the employees interviewed in Organization B and C responded that the managers are supportive and caring when it comes to the employee developing, this hasn't been the case for the employee in Organization A. As this research clearly showed how different the organization can be perceived by different people in the organization this is at the same time a clear example on how you as a manager think you best can run an organization and where the employees are the ones who are experiencing the results of how you manage.

6.2 Management implications

When it comes to managing the human resources in each of the organizations this research has been given valuable information on how a very subjective form of managing talents can be perceived by the employees. As this paper has shown to how the managers' perception on the organization can be totally different from how the employees are perceiving it, this can at the same time show to organizations where the lack of knowing each other and the lack of communication has led to not being able to utilizing the most of a talented employee in terms of skills, knowledge and ability. As only one out of the three organizations had a proper HR Manager in place, this might also show to that although combining HR responsibilities with another position could be seen as an effective way of managing the organization, this is only effective if being able to follow through on every HR procedures. As the reason for both Organization B and C not having a proper HR Manager in place might lie in the impression of the organization not being big enough to need one, the different perspectives of the GM and

MHRHOV

one of the employees in Organization C might show to that a proper HR department would have made the organization more effective in terms of managing and retaining employees more effectively. At the same time one must take into consideration that combining a HR role with another position can make the actual HR responsibilities more bias.

As the employees are experiencing in first hand the actions taken and the way a manager is leading an organization this can quickly give the image of “The management vs. the employees”. Of this reason it might therefore be difficult to both going into the role of an HR Manager and represent the employees and see things from their perspective while at the same time going into the role of a leader and manage them. Although Organization A on the other hand has a proper HR Manager the reduction of the HR resources for the past years might have shown to a negative development leading to not being able to represent and manage the employees in the organization in a way that is needed. With the employees defining and representing the hotel industry the importance of a proper HR department in all of the three organization might have resulted in a greater compliance between the manager, the employees and all of the departments, but also in the employees’ satisfaction and commitment to the organization.

This research paper has also shown to what the managers are seeing as the main challenge in retaining talents in not only these three organizations but in the hospitality industry in general, the low salary. As this is a factor beyond what the managers can control the managers’ focus therefore seems to lie in creating a workplace that can satisfy the employees, this with all the managers emphasizing the value of caring and recognizing the employees. But stating these values doesn’t always mean that you are

MHRHOV

living up to them and are representing them as a leader as well. As Daft (2011) states that leadership is about always aiming to change for the better, this can also relate to how you also are able to identify what needs to be improved in the organization. This further shows that both Organization B and C has been aware of and acknowledged what needed to be improved in the organization, which was the need to improve the use of negative and constructive feedback for the GM in Organization B, and the improvement needed in the interaction between the departments in Organization C. With the GM in Organization A not mentioning some of the weaknesses or the improvements needed in this organization it might have been because there weren't any specific factors that needed to be brought to attention. However, with the dissatisfaction of the employee this at the same time shows to a GM not being able to be aware of and able to identify what needs to be improved in the organization.

When it comes to the research questions it therefore shows to that all the managers are emphasizing the importance of having a leader who understands one another in the organization, and that this is in many ways affecting their way of managing the employees. But as the managers are looking at managing talents as a mutual interaction what they want in return from the talents seems to lie in having the passion, and where this is what the managers are identifying a talent with. But the fact that all the Managers interviewed acknowledge the fact that the low salary makes it difficult to retain talented employees, the GM in Organization C even states that the hotel industry cannot be seen as a talent arena due to the low salary.

But as for all the employees interviewed what seems to stand out is not mentioning the salary as an important factor for staying or leaving in an organization. The only exception was brought up by the one employee in Organization C stating that the only

MHRHOV

way the low salary could be seen was a negative factor wasn't because of the low salary itself, but because living in expensive Stavanger.

The employees also emphasizes the importance of having the opportunity to grow and develop in the organization by having a supportive management, and where the importance of supporting employees in their development is also emphasized by the managers as well. But for this to actually be in place in the three organizations this research showed how this wasn't the fact for all of the employees, this in terms of Organization A.

6.3 Limitations

This research paper has some limitations to it. As Neuman (2009) states that the challenge of reliability in qualitative research lies in not having control over subjects and their relationships and how this can change over time, the challenge therefore lies in the observation, the measurement and the findings to be consistent over time. This further shows to the limitations of this qualitative research when it comes to its reliability, where a higher reliability for this research could be achieved through observing and measuring more constant. But here one must take into consideration that the limitation of this research's reliability also lies in not being able to constantly observe and measure, this in addition to that each individual researcher might have different approaches in their effort in answering a research objective, of which different measurement also could result in different findings (Neuman, 2009). However, the biggest limitation when it comes to this paper's reliability seems to have been in the relationship between the employee and the manager in Organization A, where the outcome for this organization stood out from the rest. The reason for this being a limitation considering its consistency is if this research was to be done at a stage when this employee was newly hired, and where the chance for this employee to be much

MHRHOV

more positive towards the management at such an early stage would have been stronger. Observing and measuring on a more constant basis from that stage until current time would have shown a research less reliable, this due to the development of the relationship between the manager and the employee from the beginning of the employee's employment and until now. However, this would at the same time shown the fact that relationship does change over time.

When it comes to the internal validity what might have affected the research design and the conclusion is the sample in itself, more specifically the sampling of the employees. Although there was a purpose behind the specific sample the limitation first of all lies in only being able to interview one employee in two of the organizations, which might have led to not having a "diverse" enough data. By having a bigger sample of employees the analysis of Organization A could have gained different perspectives of one employee compared to the other, this considering the dissatisfaction of the employee. Although this could be considered in Organization B as well because of only one employee interviewed, the dissatisfaction in Organization A might have shown to the more crucial of having two participants in this organization. Because of this paper's sample this might also have led the analysis and the discussion being more based on Organization A compared to B and C, and not so much of an "equal" comparison of all three organizations towards each other. Further the limitation is also in the participating employees and their current positions at the organization. Out of a total of four participating employees interviewed as much as three of them had a position within course- and conference, and where also two of them belonged to the same organization. This might also have affected the research design and the conclusion in terms of not being able to cover a wider sector of the organization. This further shows to the

MHRHOV

limitation considering the original plan of the sample size. As the plan was to interview one GM in each organization, one HR Manager in each organization, and two employees in each organization the challenge was the fact that two of the GM had the HR-responsibility as well. As this could have led to a sort of bias in how the research was conducted, this might also have affected the research design and conclusion.

As mentioned earlier the fact that this is a qualitative research it makes it impossible to capture all the variables other than the “purposive sample” where there’s a motive and a reason behind choosing that sample (Punch, 2005). So the limitation in this research when it comes to its external validity also lies in not being able to pick up on how other people might have responded if they were a part of the sample rather than the current sampling. This has been clearly displayed in this research considering how especially Organization A was very negatively portrayed because of the employee. As the outcome of the findings are only based on a small part of the actual organization and on their subjective and personal perspective, this therefore makes it difficult to generalize the findings to the rest of the organization, and to the hotel industry in Stavanger in general. This further shows to that as some organizations in this research was either more positive or negative portrayed than others the situation could have been totally different if other employees was to be interviewed instead. As this show can show to that a qualitative study only can be generalized to a certain extent and within a certain area, this can relate to Neuman (2011) stating that qualitative research is being based on the assumption that things can be measured qualitative. But as this research paper has focused on three organizations each belonging to different hotel chains here in Stavanger this research can be generalized to other organizations as well, where the reason lies in the similarities in the organizations considering the flat structure and also

MHRHOV

because the HR department not being fully established. However, the main limitation for not being able to generalize might lie in the samples. Although the samples contains both managers and employees in three organizations a sample of several organizational units is needed, both in employees and department leaders as well. The reason is because although the organizations has a flat structure the managers doesn't have the direct supervision throughout the organization but mostly towards its department leaders.

6.4 Further recommendations

There seems to be a lack of literature when it comes to smaller hotel chains, this considering that the distributions of roles in organizations belonging to these chains seems to be more melted into each other. A further research suggestion is therefore to get a closer insight on the differences of having HR-responsibility implemented in another position and on having a proper HR-department in an organization. A deeper insight on this subject would gain a greater knowledge on how employees are being affected of either having a proper HR or where HR is a part of another position.

To gain a more detailed insight one could also go deeper into one specific organization and on how they specifically are managing and retaining talents, this by increasing the sample to include department leaders and also a wider sample of the employees. Although this makes it difficult to generalize the findings it will still gain valuable insight on the process of retaining talents, this by getting a closer look on the interaction between the different stages in the organizational structure.

But to gain a bigger perspective a suggestion is to increase the number of organizations in your research, and where the crucial might lie in also increasing the sampling in each organization, this to increase validity and reliability of the research. However, by further

MHRHOV

continuing with this qualitative research it might be essential to eventually switch to quantitative research as well.

The reason is because of the opportunity to go from one's subjective perspectives and to turn this into numbers and facts in terms of testing hypotheses based on previous qualitative researches, this by testing how various of factors can be correlated to each other.

7.0 References

- Allen, D. G. (2008). *Retaining Talent: A Guide to Analyzing and Managing Employee Turnover*. SHRM Foundation.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*. 17:99-120.
- Barney, J. B., & Wright, P. M. (1997). *On Becoming a Strategic Partner: The Role of Human Resources in Gaining Competitive Advantage*. Cornell University ILR School.
- Boxall, P. (1996). The Strategic HRM debate and the resource-based view of the firm. *Human Resource Management Journal*. 6(3): 59-75.
- Boxall, P., & Purcell, J. (2003). *Strategy and Human Resource Management*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Cappelli, P. (2008). Talent Management for the Twenty-First Century. *Harvard Business Review* – March 2008.
- Chambers, E. G., Foulon, M., Handfield- Jones, H., Hankin, S. M., & Michaels III, E. G. (1998). The war for talent. The McKinsey Quarterly: *The Online Journal of McKinsey & Co*. 1998 Number 3.
- Chugh, S., & Bhatnagar, J. (2006). Talent Management as High Performance Work Practice: Emerging Strategic HRM Dimension. *Management and Labour Studies* 31: 228.
- Conner, K. R., & Prahalad, C. K. (1996). A resource-based theory of the firm: Knowledge versus opportunism. *Organization Science*. 7:477.
- Daft, R. L. (2011). *The Leadership Experience* (5th ed.). South-Western, Cengage Learning. China, China Translation & Printing Limited.

MHRHOV

- Deery, M. (2008). Talent management, work-life balance and retention strategies. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*. Vol. 20 No. 7, 2008 pp. 792-806. *Emerald Group Publishing Limited* 0959-6119. Doi: 10.1108/09596110810897619
- Dess, G. G., & Shaw, J. D. (2001). Voluntary turnover, social capital, and organizational performance. *Academy of Management Review*. 26: 446-456.
- Enz, C. A. (2010). *Hospitality Strategic Management: Concept and Cases* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Hoboken, New Jersey.
- Flick, U. (2006). *An introduction to qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Cromwell Press, Trowbridge, Wiltshire. Sage Publications Ltd.
- Frank, F. D., Finnegan, R. P., & Taylor, C. R. (2004). *The race for talent: retaining and engaging workers in the 21st century*. Human Resource Planning, Vol. 27 No. 3, pp. 12-25.
- Garvin, D. A., Edmondson, A. C., & Gino, F. (2008). Is Yours a Learning Organization? March 2008. *Harvard Business Review*.
- Govaerts, N., Kyndt, E., Dochy, F., & Baert, Herman. (2011). Influence of learning and working climate on the retention of talented employees. *Journal of Workplace Learning*. Vol. 23 No. 1, 2011. Pp. 35-55. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Hausknecht, J. P., Rodda, J., & Howard, M. J. (2009). *Targeted employee retention: Performance-based and job-related differences in reported reasons for staying*. Human Resource Management, March- April 2009, Vol. 48, No. 2, pp. 269-288. Wiley InterScience.
- Hinkin, T. R., & Tracey, J. B. (2000). The cost of turnover. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 41(3), 14-21.

MHRHOV

Hoque, Kim. (2000). *Human Resource Management in the Hotel Industry. Strategy, innovation and performance*. Routledge.

Hospitality Training Foundation. (2003). *Labour Market Review*, 2003, HtF.

Hughes, J. C., & Rog, E. (2008). Talent management: A strategy for improving employee recruitment, retention and engagement within hospitality organizations. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*. Vol. 20 No. 7, 2008 pp. 743-757. *Emerald Group Publishing Limited* 0959-6119. Doi: 10.1108/09596110810899086

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, California. Sage Publications, Inc.

Lewis, R. E., & Heckman, R. J. (2006). Talent management: A critical review. *Human Resource Management Review*, 16(2006), 139-154.

Lockyer, T. L. G. (2007). *The International Hotel Industry: Sustainable Management*. The Haworth Press, Inc.

Luthans, F., Luthans, K. W., & Luthans, B. C. (2004). *Positive psychological capital: Beyond human and social capital*. *Business Horizons* 47/1 January-February 2004 (45-50).

McDonnel, A., Lamare, R., Gunnigle, P., & Lavelle, J. (2010). Developing tomorrow's leaders- Evidence of global talent management in multinational enterprises. *Journal of World Business*, 45(29), 150-160.

Neuman, W. L. (2009). *Understanding Research*. University of Wisconsin at Whitewater. Pearson Education, Inc.

Neuman, W. L. (2011). *Social Research Method: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (7th ed.). Boston. Pearson Education, Inc.

MHRHOV

- Nickson, D. (2007). *Human resource management: for the hospitality and tourism industries*. Elsevier Ltd.
- Oldroyd, J. B., & Morris, S. S. (2012). Catching Falling Stars: A Human Resource Response to Social Capital's Detrimental Effect of Information Overload on Star Employees. *Academy of Management Review*. Vol. 37, No. 3, 398-418.
- People 1st. (2006). *Skills Needs Assessment*, People 1st.
- Punch, K. F. (2005). *Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, London. Sage Publications Ltd.
- Ramsay, C. S. (2006). *Engagement at Intuit: It's the people*. Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. 21st Annual Conference, Dallas, TX. Vance, R. J. (2006). Employee engagement and commitment. SHRM Foundation.
- Ready, D. A., Hill, L. A., & Conger, J. A. (2008). Winning the Race for Talent in Emerging Markets. Nov 2008. *Harvard Business Review*.
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2005). *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Silverman, D. (2004). *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice* (2nd ed.). Great Britain by TJ International Ltd., Pastow, Cornwall. Sage Publications, Ltd.
- Silzer, R., & Church, A. H. (2009). The Pearls and Perils of Identifying Potential. *Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. 377-412.
- Tanke, M. L. (2001). *Human resources management for the hospitality industry*. (2nd Ed.). New York: Delmar, Thomson Learning.
- Thite, M. (2004). *Strategic positioning of HRM in knowledge-based organizations*. The Learning Organization Vol. 11 No. 1, 2004.

MHRHOV

Walsh, K., & Taylor, M. S. (2007). Developing In-House Careers and Retaining Management Talent: What Hospitality Professionals Want from Their Jobs. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 2007 48: 163. SagePublications. Doi: 10.1177/0010880407300521

Whicker, L. M., & Andrews, K. M. (2004). HRM in the Knowledge Economy: Realising the Potential. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*. SAGE 2004, 42, 2: 156-165

Wood, R. C. (1997). *Working in Hotels and Catering* (2nd Ed.). International Thomson Press.

Yam, L. & Raybould, M. (2011). *Employee retention: Job embeddedness in the hospitality industry*. 9th APacCHRIE Conference. Hospitality and tourism education: From a vision to an icon. Hong Kong, June 2011.

Other:

University of Phoenix & American Hotel & Lodging Educational Institute. (2012). Building Hospitality Talent: Recommendations from Industry Leaders. Talent Development Roundtable.

Lecture notes:

Boyle, M. V. (Week 6, 2013a). [lecture notes]. *Talent Management*. Gold Coast: Griffith University.

Boyle, M. V. (Week 9, 2013b). [lecture notes]. *Strategic HRM & Knowledge Management*. Gold Coast: Griffith University.

Perkins, H. (Week 2, 2013). [lecture notes]. *Market Research. Problem definition, research design*. Gold Coast. Griffith University.

MHRHOV

8.0 Appendix

8.1 Interview form (managers)

LEDELSEN:

Introduksjon:

Generelt:

- 1) Alder:
- 2) Kjønn:
- 3) Stilling:
- 4) Utdannelse:
- 5) Hvor lenge har du vært ansatt i denne bedriften?
- 6) Har du hatt samme stilling frem til nå, eller har den endret seg?

- 7) Hva er dine tidligere arbeidserfaringer?

Intervjuobjektets perspektiv:

- 8) Kan du fortelle meg hva du mener definerer et talent/eller en talentfull ansatt?

- 9) Hva mener du er de viktigste egenskapene for å være en god leder?

- 10) Hva legger du i ordet «menneskelige ressurser»?

- 11) Fra et ledelsesperspektiv, hvordan mener du en leder best kan beholde og lede talentfulle ansatte i en bedrift?

MHRHOV

Turnover:

12) Med tanke på turnover, ser du på dette som en utfordring for denne bedriften?

a) (Hva tenker du kan være årsaken?)

i) (Hvordan opprettholdes evt kvalitet innad i organisasjonen med tanke på ansatte som går inn/ut av organisasjonen?)

13) Er det høy turnover i denne bedriften per dags dato?

a) (Hva tenker du kan være årsaken?)

Bedriften:

14) Hvilken verdier mener du at du som leder viser de ansatte?

15) Hvordan vil du beskrive organisasjonskulturen i denne bedriften?

a) (Samhold, samspill, kommunikasjon mellom deg og de ansatte, kjerneverdier, engasjement mot de ansatte, lederskap)

16) Hvor viktig vil du si at organisasjonskulturen har å si for de talentfulle ansatte her?

Feedback

17) I hvilken setting bruker du feedback?

MHRHOV

- i) På kontinuerlig basis eller ved årlige evalueringsmøter?

18) Hvordan gir du feedback? (Bakgrunnen og målet for feedback)

- i) Positiv/negativ/kritisk/konstruktiv

Ledelse og utvikling

19) Hvordan leder du de talentfulle ansatte i denne organisasjonen, og har det vært noen forandring over tid?

- a) Hvordan har dette fungert?

- i) Hvordan forholder du deg til talentfulle ansatte mtp at de kan være dyktige på forskjellige områder?

20) Hva gjør du for å utvikle de ansattes kompetanse?

21) Hva gjør du som leder for å utnytte ansattes potensiale best mulig?

Å beholde ansatte

22) Hva gjør du spesielt for å beholde de talentfulle ansatte i bedriften?

MHRHOV

23) Hvor stor påvirkning føler du at du får i arbeidet for å beholde og utvikle talenter?
(for HR-ansvarlig)

24) Hva ser du på som utfordringer med tanke på å beholde de av ansatte som har et talent?

25) Hva mener du bør gjøres annerledes for å bedre håndtere talenter i fremtiden?

MHRHOV

8.2 Interview form (employees)

ANSATTE:

Introduksjon:

Generelt:

- 1) Alder:
- 2) Kjønn:
- 3) Stilling:
- 4) Utdanning:
- 5) Hvor lenge har du vært ansatt i denne bedriften?
- 6) Har du hatt samme stilling frem til nå, eller har den endret seg?

- 7) Hva er dine tidligere arbeidserfaringer?

Intervjuobjektets perspektiv:

- 8) Hva definerer du som en god leder?

- 9) Hva er viktig for deg ved valg av jobb?
 - i) (muligheten for karriereutvikling, utvikle seg selv, utfordringer)

Bedriften:

Organisasjonskultur

- 10) Hvordan vil du beskrive organisasjonskulturen her?
 - a) (Samhold, samspill, kommunikasjon mellom deg og de ansatte, kjerneverdier, engasjement mot de ansatte, lederskap)

Feedback

11) Når får du feedback (hvilken setting)?

i) Hvordan får du feedback? (negativ, positiv, kristisk)

(a) Hva får du ut av feedbacken?

Forventning

12) Hvilken forventinger har du til deg selv i bedriften?

a) Hvordan har disse forventningene blitt møtt?

13) Hvilke forventninger har du til ledelsen?

a) Hvordan har disse forventningene blitt møtt? – spesielt med tanke på spm 9)

Utvikling

14) Hvordan føler du at ledelsen tilrettelegger for at du kan utvikle deg her (kompetanse, evner, ferdigheter, kunnskap etc).

i) Har du konkrete eksempler?

MHRHOV

15) Hva mener du må til for at en ansatt skal få kunne utnytte sitt potensial i en organisasjon?

a) Hva mener du må til for at du skal kunne utnytte ditt eget potensial til fulle i denne bedriften?

i) (nye utfordringer, å kunne være mer involvert og delaktig)

b) Hva er det som motiverer deg til å gjøre en god jobb?

16) Fra ledelsens side, hvilken tiltak mener du må til for at du skal ønske å bli i bedriften?

a) Hvordan har ledelsen klart dette for deg?

i) Betyr dette at du har planer om å bli værende/forlate bedriften? – hvorfor?

Turnover

17) Med tanke på turnover, ser du på dette som en utfordring for denne bedriften?

i) Hvorfor?

MHRHOV

18) Kan du fortelle om konkrete situasjoner og hendelser som du har følt har bidratt til å øke motivasjonen din til å bli i bedriften eller som har bidratt til å øke motivasjonen til å slutte?

i) Hvordan føler du dette også gjelder for de andre ansatte i bedriften?

19) Til slutt så lurer jeg på hvor du ser deg selv om 3 år?