

Exploring the Impact of Talent Management on the Organizational Effectiveness in the Egyptian Hospitality Industry

Reda M. A. Gadelrab

Faculty of Tourism and Hotel Management, Helwan University

Abstract:

The main purpose of this study is to explore Talent Management within hospitality industry through focusing on how Talent Management affects the Organizational Effectiveness. The survey of this study is conducted on 71 entry, middle and senior levels of the human resources department to obtain their perspectives related to Talent Management in ten five star hotels and six four star hotels. The obtained data are analyzed through the SPSS version 22. The main finding of this study is that Talent Management integrates with human resources procedures and has a strong significant positive impact on Organizational Effectiveness.

Keywords: Hospitality Industry; Human Resources; Talent Management; Talents; Organizational Effectiveness; Egypt.

.....

Introduction:

The human resources represent one of the major costs and also one of the main pillars of contemporary organizations, since the degree of their success and survival is determined by the quality, attitudes and behaviors of their people in the work place (Alleyne et al., 2006; Davidson et al., 2010). Therefore, human resources is a critical issue in delivering services and products in the hospitality industry (Gill, 2008; Robinson et al., 2010).

The Egyptian hotel sector has shown a strong growth in the recent years (Nassar, 2012). It should be noticed that the hotels are considered the largest employer in tourism sector (Collins, 2007) that needs effective human resources practices to achieve competitive advantage (Raub et al., 2006; Chalkiti and Sigala, 2010). Thus, managing people in the hotel industry is a big dilemma (Alleyne et al., 2006), as more emphasis has been placed on delivering consistent quality products and services (Gadelrab, 2010).

Literature Review:

According to Baum (2008) there is a lack of research on Talent Management and its development within the hospitality industry. He referred Talent to ensure that the hospitality sector is able to recruit, retain, support and develop personnel of the highest quality consistent with the diversity of work and employment situations that exist within the sector.

Talent Management:

There is no clear and single description for talent management (Lewis and Heckman, 2006). However, it can be considered as people who have specific qualifications or knowledge distinguishing them from others and restricting them to be replaced within the organization. It is more than Human Resources Management (D'Annunzio-Green, 2008). It is a holistic approach to recruiting, retaining and developing talent within the organization for its sustainable benefit (Iles et al., 2010). The term Talent Management was first introduced by McKinsey and Company in 1997, it is a professional term that has recently been common in the early 2000s (Wikipedia, 2013). It means the process of developing and fostering new workers through interviewing, hiring, orienting and successfully integrating new hires into an organization's culture, and thereafter, developing and keeping current workers and attracting highly skilled workers to work for an organization. Again it is a strategy used by organizations to consider how they identify, attract, retain and develop employees through the organization (Deery, 2008; Scott and Revis, 2008). In summary, it is about aligning the right personnel with the right jobs at the right time (Baum, 2008), since it is a holistic approach to the Human Resources Management (Watson, 2011). Therefore, maintaining stable and well-qualified employees represents a key asset of talent management which is considered a big challenge to hospitality operations (Martin et al., 2006; Maxwell and MacLean, 2008).

Identification of Talents:

Williams (2000) 35; cited in Iles et al. (2010) stated that talented people are those who do the following: "Regularly demonstrate exceptional ability and achievement either over a range of activities and situations, or within a specialized and narrow field of expertise; consistently indicate high competence in areas of activity that strongly suggest transferable, comparable ability in situations where they have yet to be tested and proved to be highly effective". In summary, talents are the most effective managers, leaders or people at all levels who can help a company fulfill its aspirations and drive its performance (Iles et al., 2010).

Attraction of Talents:

Maxwell and MacLean (2008) ascertained that training and work life balance are critical issues to attract new talents in the industry. According to Beardwell (2010) attracting talents is targeted at the external work market. It includes the use of recruitment and selection techniques to identify skills required, then attracting the most qualified people to meet an organization's goals (Armstrong, 2012).

Retention of Talents:

In terms of employee retention, Deery (2008) stated particular issues that should be taken into account to ensure employee retention, e.g. appropriate recruitment, training and balance between work and life. Therefore, survival and success of the organization is relying substantially on the employee retention (Vural et al., 2012). Davies and Davies (2010) ascertained that money does not retain talented people, since they advocated spending the money on talent rather than giving it to them.

Development of Talents:

Energizing and involving talents will create a positive work environment which produces the most satisfied and loyal customers (Tews and Tracey, 2009; Garlick, 2010). This is through adopting transformational leadership which means that hotel employees are motivated and encouraged to use their own judgment and intelligence to solve problems while performing their jobs by transferring missions to them, and expressing appreciation for good work (Brownell, 2010; Gill et al., 2011). Therefore customer satisfaction is regarded by the employee job satisfaction (Gu and Siu, 2009; Gallardo et al., 2010; Pelit et al., 2011). Thus, effective development of talents should be used to retain talented personnel, since selecting the most talented people is not enough for the organizational success (Vural et al., 2012).

Organizational Effectiveness:

Talent Management is considered as an organizational approach ensuring the availability of talents (Baum, 2008) and talents can be treated on an organizational manner (Vural et al., 2012). Organizational effectiveness is the individual's belief in and desire to achieving organization's goal and value (Vural et al., 2012). It is recognized as the performance outputs that can be measured more easily than input factors (Meyers et al., 2013). Effective Talent Management can create a long-term organizational effectiveness through getting the right people in the right place at the right time (Ashton and Morton, 2005). Clarke and Winkler (2006) emphasized the use of Talent Management concept to enhance organizational effectiveness and the support of industry branding through tracking the performance and progress of those identified as talents. According to Maxwell and MacLean (2008) the hospitality sector can benefit from using a talent management strategy as a successful way of organizational effectiveness in the industry than others, thereby can achieve the best outcome from talents' performance at work (Vural et al., 2012).

Methodology:

The population of the research included five and four star hotels in Greater Cairo. Human Resources Managers (seniors and middle) were chosen as a sample. Titles of seniors varied, i.e. Executive Human Resources; Director of Human Resources; Human Resources Manager; Recruitment Manager; Training Manager; Personnel Manager. They are assisted by middle managers who participated in the current study. A convenience sampling method was preferred as a sampling method for the research to enable easier reach to data collection.

Considering the five star hotels, the total number of population is 32 hotels (Egyptian Hotel Association, 2012). Ten out of 32 hotels (31.3%) agreed to participate in the study. The sample consisted of 23 Senior Managers and 32 Middle Managers in charge of Human Resources. As for the four star hotels, the total number was 16 hotels, six out of them (37.5%) agreed to cooperate through seven Senior Managers and nine

Exploring the Impact of Talent Management on the Organizational Effectiveness in the Egyptian Hospitality Industry

Middle Managers responsible for Human Resources. Thus, the total numbers of seniors and middle managers for both hotel categories were 30 and 41 respectively.

A questionnaire using five rating Likert scale was used to investigate human resources managers' perspectives regarding Talent Management and its impact on the Organizational Effectiveness. The rating scale was ranged from 1 to 5, where one for "strongly disagree" and five referred to "strongly agree". The research instrument was pre-tested and reworded after an interview with some of the Human Resources Managers to ensure the instrument validation. The questionnaire consisted of five key sections with 60 statements. Four sections are for Talent Management and one section is for the Organizational Effectiveness:

- 1- Identification of Talents includes four statements;
- 2- Attraction of Talents includes 15 statements;
- 3- Retention of Talents includes 15 statements;
- 4- Development of Talents includes 16 statements;
- 5- Organizational Effectiveness includes ten statements.

Appropriate statistical analyses namely: Cronbach's Alpha Reliability test to ensure the reliability of the five sections of the questionnaire distributed; Frequencies to illustrate descriptive analysis of managers scores in terms of their consent to questionnaire statements; Spearman Rank Correlations to investigate whether there are relationship among the four different sections of Talent Management and Organizational Effectiveness section; Non Parametric Tests using Mann Whitney U Test to identify variances among hotel categories and managers level in terms of their scores.

Findings and Discussion:

Reliability of the questionnaire:

Table 1: Reliability Statistics for all five sections of the questionnaire

Questionnaire category	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Identify Talents	.873	4
Attract Talents	.963	15
Retain Talents	.958	15
Develop Talents	.962	16
Organizational Effectiveness	.949	10
Total of Questionnaire Statements		60

Considered reliable if Cronbach's Alpha is more than 0.70

Cronbach's Alpha reliability measures for all five sections of the questionnaire are .873; .963; .958; .962; .949 respectively as shown in. This indicates that the overall 60 statements of the questionnaire and the scale are reliable to be measured in the current study (Table1).

Descriptive Analysis for the whole Questionnaire Items:

The 60 items were illustrated by their means, modes, standard deviation, variance, range, minimum score, maximum score, and sum of the scores. All these statistics are shown in Tables 2 – 6.

Considering Identification of Talents, the results in Table 2 show that 3 out of 4 statements were found important as their modes equal 4 which means that most of the respondents are agreeing to statements 1, 2, and 4. These statements are: "Skills, abilities, experiences and qualifications needed for selection are identified according to the strategy, goals and culture of the organization."; "There are clear and specific

standards for measuring talents in the organization.”; “There is a comprehensive database of talents in the organization.”

Regarding Attraction of Talents, the findings in Table 3 indicate that 14 out of 15 statements in this section were found significant as their modes equal 4. This indicates that most of the respondents agreed to all statements of the second section. These statements are from 1 – 15 except statement 12 “The brand of the organization represents something that everyone wants to be enrolled in.”

In terms of Retention of Talents, it was found that 11 out of 15 statements were significant as their modes equal 4 (Table 4). This states that most of the respondents agree to all statements of the third section except statements 1 “Aligning employees with the mission and vision of the organization.”; 3 “Locating qualified professionals needed in the right positions.”; 8 “A written career development plan for talents is in place within the organization.”; and 14 “Your organization currently allocated a formal budget in place for employees' retention.”

As for “Development of Talents”, the results in Table 5 reveal that 13 out of 16 statements were important as their modes equal 4. This means that most of the respondents agreed to all 16 statements in the fourth section except statements 4 “Creating an environment where employees' ideas are listened to and valued.”; 7 “Conducting formal performance appraisals on a regular basis (quarterly; biannually; annually).”; 16 “Preparing current employees to improve performance to surpass expectations.”

With regard to the Organizational Effectiveness, nine out of ten statements were significant as their modes equal 4 (Table 6). This leads to that most of the respondents agreed to the whole section except statement 3 “The organization seeks to achieve consumer satisfaction through providing quality products at reasonable prices.”

Relationships between Talent Management and Organizational Effectiveness:

The results in Tables 7; 8; 9; 10 illustrates correlations among Talent Management four sections and the Organizational Effectiveness section. All statements of all five sections were coded and numbered according to its position in the questionnaire; “Identification of Talents” Statements were coded as ITS1 to ITS4, “Attraction of Talents” Statements were coded as ATS1 to ATS15, “Retention of Talents” Statements were coded RTS1 to RTS15, “Development of Talents” Statements were coded as DTS1 to DTS16 and “Organizational Effectiveness” Statements were coded as OES1 to OES10.

Exploring the Impact of Talent Management on the Organizational Effectiveness in the Egyptian Hospitality Industry

Table 2: A Descriptive Analysis of “Identification of Talents” Statements

Item	N		Mean	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Sum
	Valid	Missing								
1-Skills, abilities, experiences and qualifications needed for selection are identified according to strategy, goals and culture of the organization.	71	0	3.7324	4	0.75513	0.57	3	2	5	265
2-There are clear and specific standards for measuring talents in the organization.	71	0	3.0986	4	0.84777	0.719	2	2	4	220
3-There are objective criteria for evaluating employees' performance inside the organization.	71	0	2.9859	3	0.90227	0.814	4	1	5	212
4-There is a comprehensive database of talents in the organization.	71	0	2.9437	4	1.24082	1.54	4	1	5	209

Table 3: A Descriptive Analysis of “Attraction of Talents” Statements

Item	N		Mean	Mode	Std. Deviation	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Sum
	Valid	Missing							
1. There are specific and clear instructions to attract talents.	71	0	3.2676	4	1.10786	4	1	5	232
2. Attracting talents represents a priority issue in the organization.	71	0	2.9718	4	1.13354	4	1	5	211
3. Your organization has a staff member whose position is exclusively responsible for overseeing talent employees inside and outside the organization.	71	0	3.0704	4	1.01874	4	1	5	218
4. Creating a culture that makes individuals want to join the organization.	71	0	3.0704	4	1.01874	4	1	5	218
5. Identifying gaps between current employees and new hires at competency levels.	71	0	3.1408	4	0.97535	4	1	5	223
6. Identifying vacancies that will be created as the company advances and expands.	71	0	2.9859	4	1.15255	4	1	5	212
7. Assessing candidates' skills earlier in the hiring process.	71	0	3.169	4	1.15864	4	1	5	225
8. Using a formal approach to identify why employees join the organization.	71	0	3.0986	4	1.16073	4	1	5	220
9. Proactively attempting to recruit employees from competitors.	71	0	3.6338	4	0.97452	4	1	5	258
10. Your organization currently allocated a formal budget in place for recruiting individuals.	71	0	3.3099	4	0.9349	3	2	5	235
11. It is expected that budget for recruiting individuals will change over the next three years.	71	0	3.0282	3	1.15847	4	1	5	215
12. The brand of the organization represents something that everyone wants to be enrolled in.	71	0	3.0563	4	0.96935	4	1	5	217
13. All managers have knowledge about the policies of recruiting new employees.	71	0	3.1831	4	1.09948	4	1	5	226
14. The direct manager of the vacant job attends the selection of the candidates to fill the vacancy.	71	0	3.0845	4	1.25067	4	1	5	219
15. The senior management concerned with attracting talents from inside or outside the organization.	71	0	3.2817	4	1.1362	4	1	5	233

Exploring the Impact of Talent Management on the Organizational Effectiveness in the Egyptian Hospitality Industry

Table 4: A Descriptive Analysis of “Retention of Talents” Statements

Item	N		Mean	Mode	Std. Deviation	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Sum
	Valid	Missing							
1. Aligning employees with the mission and vision of the organization.	71	0	3.3944	3	0.99253	4	1	5	241
2. Creating a culture that makes employees want to stay with the organization.	71	0	3.1831	4	1.09948	4	1	5	226
3. Locating qualified professionals needed in the right positions.	71	0	3.1408	3	0.85014	4	1	5	223
4. Rewarding top-performing employees.	71	0	3.1408	4	1.12499	4	1	5	223
5. Creating an environment where employees are excited to come to work each day.	71	0	3.1127	4	1.14079	4	1	5	221
6. The organization aims to retain talents.	71	0	3.6197	4	0.86794	3	2	5	257
7. Creating a culture where employees passionately believe in what they are doing.	71	0	3.2254	4	0.92886	4	1	5	229
8. A written career development plan for talents is in place within the organization.	71	0	3.0845	3	0.82369	4	1	5	219
9. Providing current employees with salary adjustments as they master significant skills required for the job.	71	0	3.1127	4	1.07636	4	1	5	221
10. Conducting exit interviews.	71	0	3.2535	4	1.28417	4	1	5	231
11. Using a formal approach to identify why employees leave the organization.	71	0	3.0704	4	1.22269	4	1	5	218
12. Using a formal approach to identify why employees stay at the organization.	71	0	3.1268	4	1.19439	4	1	5	222
13. A strategy or plan is in place to deal with competitors' attempt to recruit employees away from the organization.	71	0	3.1408	4	1.13761	4	1	5	223
14. Your organization currently allocated a formal budget in place for employees' retention.	71	0	3.1127	3	1.10259	4	1	5	221
15. It is expected that budget for retaining employees will change over the next three years.	71	0	3.1268	4	1.14555	4	1	5	222

Table 5: A Descriptive Analysis for “Development of Talents” Statements

Item	N		Mean	Mode	Std. Deviation	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Sum
	Valid	Missing							
1. Building a deeper reservoir of successors at every level.	71	0	3.2676	4	1.08177	4	1	5	232
2. Creating a culture that values employees' work.	71	0	3.5493	4	0.85838	4	1	5	252
3. Creating policies that encourage career growth and development opportunities.	71	0	3.2394	4	0.88584	4	1	5	230
4. Creating an environment where employees' ideas are listened to and valued.	71	0	2.9577	3	0.97741	4	1	5	210
5. Providing current employees with adequate training that allows them to do their jobs well.	71	0	3.1127	4	1.17776	4	1	5	221
6. Making employees feel empowered to make decisions that affect their work.	71	0	3.1972	4	1.19067	4	1	5	227
7. Conducting formal performance appraisals on a regular basis (quarterly; biannually; annually).	71	0	3.1549	3	1.32717	4	1	5	224
8. Conducting regular employee surveys (quarterly; biannually; annually).	71	0	3.1831	4	1.1124	4	1	5	226
9. Using a formal approach to track potential leaders' performance.	71	0	3.2394	4	1.12713	4	1	5	230
10. Using a formal approach to identify potential leaders.	71	0	3.0845	4	1.19219	4	1	5	219
11. Employees upgraded for higher positions are assessed against competencies and qualifications required to be successful in that position.	71	0	3.1408	4	1.0993	4	1	5	223
12. Junior or mid-level employees are prepared to step into senior leadership positions.	71	0	3.2535	4	1.09177	4	1	5	231
13. Your organization currently allocated a formal budget in place for developing employees.	71	0	3.0704	4	1.22269	4	1	5	218
14. It is expected that budget for developing employees will change over the next three years.	71	0	3.5775	4	0.83942	4	1	5	254
15. Preparing current employees for advancement opportunities.	71	0	3.1127	4	0.8872	3	1	4	221
16. Preparing current employees to improve performance to surpass expectations.	71	0	3.1127	3	1.02189	4	1	5	221

Exploring the Impact of Talent Management on the Organizational Effectiveness in the Egyptian Hospitality Industry

Table 6: A Descriptive Analysis for “Organizational Effectiveness” Statements

Item	N		Mean	Mode	Std. Deviation	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Sum
	Valid	Missing							
1. The organization is concerned with increasing revenues to achieve employees' satisfaction.	71	0	3.4789	4	0.79028	3	2	5	247
2. The Management seeks to improve the level of wages and incentives to increase employees' satisfaction.	71	0	3.1831	4	1.03247	4	1	5	226
3. The organization seeks to achieve consumer satisfaction through providing quality products at reasonable prices.	71	0	2.9014	3	0.94347	4	1	5	206
4. The organization achieves high growth rates of sales.	71	0	3.2394	4	1.04833	4	1	5	230
5. Increasing profitability is the fundamental goal for the management of the organization.	71	0	3.2113	4	1.06792	4	1	5	228
6. The organization continuously achieves increases in new products to meet the needs and desires of its customers.	71	0	3.0845	4	1.30654	4	1	5	219
7. The organization seeks to increase market share through high quality products compared to competitors' products.	71	0	3.3662	4	1.0315	4	1	5	239
8. Increase Loyalty and affiliation of employees for the organization achieves stability in the workforce and decreases employees' turnover.	71	0	3.1831	4	1.07318	4	1	5	226
9. The percentage of employees leaving their jobs in the organization is fewer compared to other organizations.	71	0	3.2535	4	1.09177	4	1	5	231
10. Keeping up with the up to date technology and technicality.	71	0	3.1408	4	0.9456	3	2	5	223

Regarding the relationships between Identification of Talents and Organizational Effectiveness, it was found that there were strong highly positive correlations among all the four statements for Identification of Talents and all the ten statements of Organizational Effectiveness as shown in Table 7. For example, There is a strong positive significant correlations (Pearson rho; $r = 0.721$; $p = 0.000$) between Identification of Talents statement one (ITS1) “Skills, abilities, experiences and qualifications needed for selection are identified according to strategy, goals and culture of the organization” and Organizational Effectiveness statement one (OES1) “The organization is concerned with increasing revenues to achieve employees' satisfaction”. This indicates that the more adherence and referring to the strategy, goals and culture of the organization when identifying skills, abilities and qualifications needed for selection, the more achievement of employees' satisfaction through organization commitment to revenue increase.

Table 7: Correlations between Identification of Talents and Organizational Effectiveness

		ITS1	ITS2	ITS3	ITS4
OES1	Pearson Correlation	.721(**)	.760(**)	.691(**)	.713(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71
OES2	Pearson Correlation	.723(**)	.762(**)	.724(**)	.766(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71
OES3	Pearson Correlation	.544(**)	.548(**)	.602(**)	.569(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71
OES4	Pearson Correlation	.786(**)	.809(**)	.683(**)	.812(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71
OES5	Pearson Correlation	.638(**)	.560(**)	.641(**)	.613(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71
OES6	Pearson Correlation	.675(**)	.663(**)	.631(**)	.681(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71
OES7	Pearson Correlation	.623(**)	.693(**)	.635(**)	.731(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71
OES8	Pearson Correlation	.590(**)	.686(**)	.593(**)	.684(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71
OES9	Pearson Correlation	.621(**)	.652(**)	.656(**)	.654(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71
OES10	Pearson Correlation	.674(**)	.731(**)	.655(**)	.750(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71

** Correlation is highly significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regarding the relationship between Attraction of Talents and Organizational Effectiveness, it was revealed that there were strong highly positive correlations among all 15 statements in Talents Attraction and all ten statements of the Organizational Effectiveness as seen in Table 8. For example, There is a strong positive significant correlations (Pearson rho; $r = 0.586$; $p = 0.000$) between Attraction of Talents statement one (ATS1) “There are specific and clear instructions to attract talents” and Organizational Effectiveness statement one (OES1) “The organization is concerned with increasing revenues to achieve employees' satisfaction”. This reveals that the more existence of specific and clear instructions for the talents attraction, the more achievement of employees' satisfaction through organization commitment to revenue increases.

Exploring the Impact of Talent Management on the Organizational Effectiveness in the Egyptian Hospitality Industry

In terms of the relationship between Retention of Talents and Organizational Effectiveness, it was found that there were strong highly positive correlations among all 15 statements of Talents Retention and all ten statements of the Organizational Effectiveness as illustrated in Table 9. For example, There is a strong positive significant correlations (Pearson rho; $r = 0.721$; $p = 0.000$) between Retaining Talents statement one (RTS1) “Aligning employees with the mission and vision of the organization” and Organizational Effectiveness statement one (OES1) “The organization is concerned with increasing revenues to achieve employees' satisfaction”. This means that the more alignment of employees with the vision and mission of the organization, the more achievement of employees’ satisfaction through organization commitment to revenue increase.

Considering the relationship between Development of Talents and Organizational Effectiveness, it was revealed that there were strong highly positive correlations among all 16 statements of Talents Development and all ten statements of Organizational Effectiveness as illustrated in Table 10. For example, There is a strong positive significant correlations (Pearson rho; $r = 0.717$; $p = 0.000$) between Developing Talents statement one (DTS1) “Building a deeper reservoir of successors at every level” and Organizational Effectiveness statement one (OES1) “The organization is concerned with increasing revenues to achieve employees' satisfaction”. This indicates that the more focus on building a deeper reservoir of talents at every level in organization, the more achievement of employees’ satisfaction through organization commitment to revenue increase.

Differences among Hotel categories and Management Level in terms of Talent Management and Organizational Effectiveness:

The findings in Appendix 1 reveal the differences among hotel categories (i.e., five and four star hotels) scores with regard to Talent Management and Organizational effectiveness. Whereas the results illustrated in Appendix 2; show the differences among management level (i.e. senior and middle) relating to Talent Management and Organizational effectiveness.

Considering variances among hotel categories in terms of Talent Management four sections and Organizational Effectiveness section in the questionnaire, it was found that there were no statistically significant differences in all five sections of the questionnaire scores between five and four star hotels as shown in Appendix 1. For example, in ITS1, the Z value is -0.50083 (rounded) of a significance level (Asymp. Sig., 2-tailed) of $p = 0.616494$. The probability values (p) is not less than or equal to 0.05, so the difference is not significant. The Mean Rank for 55 questionnaires distributed to five star hotels is 35.40, as against 38.06 in the 16 questionnaires distributed to four star hotels.

Table 8: Correlations between Attraction of Talents and Organizational Effectiveness

		ATS1	ATS2	ATS3	ATS4	ATS5	ATS6	ATS7	ATS8	ATS9	ATS10	ATS11	ATS12	ATS13	ATS14	ATS15
OES1	Pearson Correlation	.586(**)	.717(**)	.721(**)	.738(**)	.653(**)	.666(**)	.706(**)	.571(**)	.750(**)	.724(**)	.703(**)	.729(**)	.720(**)	.652(**)	.691(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES2	Pearson Correlation	.606(**)	.664(**)	.639(**)	.639(**)	.698(**)	.698(**)	.666(**)	.533(**)	.763(**)	.814(**)	.688(**)	.775(**)	.675(**)	.618(**)	.650(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES3	Pearson Correlation	.572(**)	.585(**)	.617(**)	.528(**)	.512(**)	.432(**)	.617(**)	.505(**)	.566(**)	.472(**)	.565(**)	.522(**)	.651(**)	.600(**)	.546(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES4	Pearson Correlation	.707(**)	.787(**)	.773(**)	.680(**)	.721(**)	.748(**)	.731(**)	.696(**)	.842(**)	.871(**)	.677(**)	.788(**)	.730(**)	.703(**)	.710(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES5	Pearson Correlation	.579(**)	.595(**)	.682(**)	.603(**)	.547(**)	.478(**)	.548(**)	.582(**)	.652(**)	.678(**)	.549(**)	.651(**)	.709(**)	.650(**)	.645(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES6	Pearson Correlation	.724(**)	.725(**)	.693(**)	.597(**)	.630(**)	.636(**)	.623(**)	.710(**)	.687(**)	.750(**)	.593(**)	.707(**)	.695(**)	.739(**)	.763(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES7	Pearson Correlation	.776(**)	.681(**)	.777(**)	.655(**)	.658(**)	.605(**)	.617(**)	.566(**)	.690(**)	.710(**)	.625(**)	.765(**)	.696(**)	.673(**)	.654(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES8	Pearson Correlation	.523(**)	.603(**)	.537(**)	.563(**)	.726(**)	.695(**)	.641(**)	.433(**)	.570(**)	.640(**)	.490(**)	.663(**)	.540(**)	.606(**)	.566(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES9	Pearson Correlation	.616(**)	.548(**)	.575(**)	.587(**)	.731(**)	.650(**)	.655(**)	.487(**)	.639(**)	.692(**)	.582(**)	.648(**)	.651(**)	.633(**)	.621(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES10	Pearson Correlation	.673(**)	.737(**)	.716(**)	.642(**)	.706(**)	.723(**)	.721(**)	.677(**)	.692(**)	.742(**)	.648(**)	.802(**)	.758(**)	.678(**)	.667(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71

** Correlation is highly significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Exploring the Impact of Talent Management on the Organizational Effectiveness in the Egyptian Hospitality Industry

Table 9: Correlations between Retention of Talents and Organizational Effectiveness

		RTS1	RTS2	RTS3	RTS4	RTS5	RTS6	RTS7	RTS8	RTS9	RTS10	RTS11	RTS12	RTS13	RTS14	RTS15
OES1	Pearson Correlation	.721(**)	.720(**)	.621(**)	.694(**)	.732(**)	.769(**)	.766(**)	.551(**)	.641(**)	.639(**)	.645(**)	.555(**)	.623(**)	.560(**)	.753(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES2	Pearson Correlation	.695(**)	.725(**)	.589(**)	.679(**)	.758(**)	.796(**)	.805(**)	.569(**)	.688(**)	.643(**)	.646(**)	.630(**)	.695(**)	.647(**)	.789(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES3	Pearson Correlation	.515(**)	.624(**)	.463(**)	.457(**)	.555(**)	.547(**)	.564(**)	.507(**)	.475(**)	.563(**)	.551(**)	.480(**)	.452(**)	.450(**)	.514(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES4	Pearson Correlation	.677(**)	.755(**)	.587(**)	.722(**)	.813(**)	.777(**)	.839(**)	.605(**)	.773(**)	.718(**)	.745(**)	.763(**)	.690(**)	.718(**)	.736(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES5	Pearson Correlation	.500(**)	.575(**)	.392(**)	.522(**)	.684(**)	.674(**)	.628(**)	.580(**)	.613(**)	.658(**)	.601(**)	.651(**)	.575(**)	.489(**)	.527(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES6	Pearson Correlation	.558(**)	.606(**)	.516(**)	.653(**)	.732(**)	.671(**)	.702(**)	.484(**)	.694(**)	.668(**)	.730(**)	.689(**)	.617(**)	.559(**)	.651(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES7	Pearson Correlation	.610(**)	.683(**)	.527(**)	.595(**)	.729(**)	.668(**)	.748(**)	.467(**)	.631(**)	.673(**)	.761(**)	.669(**)	.686(**)	.566(**)	.698(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES8	Pearson Correlation	.642(**)	.686(**)	.598(**)	.629(**)	.601(**)	.567(**)	.646(**)	.451(**)	.576(**)	.598(**)	.567(**)	.695(**)	.587(**)	.646(**)	.527(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES9	Pearson Correlation	.632(**)	.734(**)	.500(**)	.622(**)	.676(**)	.706(**)	.718(**)	.548(**)	.571(**)	.697(**)	.586(**)	.654(**)	.592(**)	.617(**)	.636(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES10	Pearson Correlation	.640(**)	.744(**)	.615(**)	.666(**)	.793(**)	.693(**)	.744(**)	.535(**)	.700(**)	.723(**)	.696(**)	.730(**)	.672(**)	.601(**)	.643(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71

** Correlation is highly significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 10: Correlations between Development of Talents and Organizational Effectiveness

		DTS1	DTS2	DTS3	DTS4	DTS5	DTS6	DTS7	DTS8	DTS9	DTS10	DTS11	DTS12	DTS13	DTS14	DTS15	DTS16
OES1	Pearson Correlation	.717(**)	.681(**)	.793(**)	.692(**)	.770(**)	.733(**)	.596(**)	.614(**)	.559(**)	.593(**)	.628(**)	.801(**)	.733(**)	.719(**)	.778(**)	.445(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES2	Pearson Correlation	.710(**)	.691(**)	.795(**)	.645(**)	.817(**)	.737(**)	.605(**)	.592(**)	.600(**)	.626(**)	.682(**)	.757(**)	.759(**)	.750(**)	.835(**)	.454(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES3	Pearson Correlation	.558(**)	.526(**)	.610(**)	.615(**)	.576(**)	.590(**)	.446(**)	.548(**)	.493(**)	.503(**)	.565(**)	.621(**)	.514(**)	.506(**)	.577(**)	.427(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES4	Pearson Correlation	.837(**)	.804(**)	.783(**)	.610(**)	.846(**)	.866(**)	.733(**)	.746(**)	.664(**)	.681(**)	.714(**)	.758(**)	.733(**)	.766(**)	.815(**)	.548(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES5	Pearson Correlation	.643(**)	.682(**)	.625(**)	.515(**)	.594(**)	.652(**)	.612(**)	.628(**)	.575(**)	.524(**)	.558(**)	.554(**)	.546(**)	.611(**)	.683(**)	.358(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.002
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES6	Pearson Correlation	.792(**)	.735(**)	.686(**)	.540(**)	.746(**)	.705(**)	.750(**)	.746(**)	.665(**)	.610(**)	.668(**)	.666(**)	.524(**)	.684(**)	.743(**)	.410(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES7	Pearson Correlation	.717(**)	.673(**)	.747(**)	.554(**)	.789(**)	.720(**)	.751(**)	.725(**)	.734(**)	.637(**)	.735(**)	.678(**)	.568(**)	.676(**)	.719(**)	.462(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES8	Pearson Correlation	.548(**)	.572(**)	.599(**)	.443(**)	.752(**)	.676(**)	.582(**)	.558(**)	.601(**)	.635(**)	.644(**)	.582(**)	.600(**)	.658(**)	.668(**)	.541(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES9	Pearson Correlation	.655(**)	.627(**)	.719(**)	.519(**)	.722(**)	.697(**)	.594(**)	.632(**)	.588(**)	.609(**)	.636(**)	.616(**)	.639(**)	.711(**)	.752(**)	.486(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
OES10	Pearson Correlation	.717(**)	.678(**)	.710(**)	.656(**)	.794(**)	.800(**)	.654(**)	.722(**)	.651(**)	.674(**)	.737(**)	.698(**)	.671(**)	.760(**)	.815(**)	.530(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71

** Correlation is highly significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed).

With regard to variances among managers level, i.e. senior or middle in relation to Talent Management four sections and Organizational Effectiveness section, it was noticed that there were no statistically significant differences in all five sections of the questionnaire scores of senior and middle managers as illustrated in Appendix 2. For example, in ITS1, the Z value is -0.218 (rounded) of a significance level (Asymp. Sig., 2-tailed) of $p= 0.827$. The probability values (p) is not less than or equal to 0.05, so the difference is not significant. The Mean Rank for the 30 questionnaire distributed to seniors was 36.57, as against 35.59 in the 41 questionnaires distributed to middle managers.

Conclusion and Implications:

The aim of this study was to explore the impact of talent management on enhancing the organizational effectiveness in the Egyptian Hospitality Industry through investigating ten five star hotels and six four star hotels to identify perspectives of 30 senior managers and 41 middle managers in the human resources department. The findings can be summarized as follows: (1) Strong statistically highly significant correlations were found among all four dimensions of talent management and organizational effectiveness, indicating a positive impact of the Talent Management on the Organizational Effectiveness; (2) No statistically significant differences have been noticed between hotel categories regarding talent management and organizational effectiveness; (3) No statistically significant differences have been detected between managers level related to talent management and organizational effectiveness. In general, it could be stated that talent management integrates with human resources procedures and has a strong impact on the organizational effectiveness.

References:

- Alleyne, P.; Doherty, L. and Greenidge, D. (2006) Approaches to HRM in the Barbados hotel industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 94-109.
- Armstrong, M. (2012) *Armstrong's Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*. 12th ed. London: Kogan Page.
- Ashton, C. and Morton, L. (2005) Managing talent for competitive advantage: Taking a systemic approach to talent management. *Strategic HR Review*, Volume 4, No.5, pp. 28-31.
- Baum, T. (2008) Implications of hospitality and tourism labour markets for talent management strategies. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 20, No. 7, pp.720 – 729.
- Beardwell, J. (2010) Talent Management. In Beardwell, J. and Claydon, T.(ed.) *Human Resource Management: A Contemporary Approach*, 6th ed. London: Pearson.
- Brownell, J. (2010) Leadership in the Service of Hospitality, *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, Volume 51, No. 3, pp. 363-378.
- Chalkiti, K. and Sigala, M. (2010) Consequences of staff turnover Management strategies for addressing staff turnover in the Greek tourism industry: A comparison between insular and peninsular regions, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 22, No. 3, pp. 335-359.
- Collins, A.B. (2007) Human resources: a hidden advantage? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 78-84.
- D'Annunzio-Green, N. (2008) Managing the talent management pipeline: Towards a greater understanding of senior managers' perspectives in the hospitality and tourism sector, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 20, No. 7, pp. 807 – 819.
- Davidson, M.C.G., Timo, N. and Wang, Y. (2010) How much does labour turnover cost?: A case study of Australian four- and five-star hotels, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 451-466.
- Deery, M. (2008) Talent management, work-life balance and retention strategies, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 20, No. 7, pp. 792-806.
- Egyptian Hotel Association (2012) *The Egyptian Hotel Guide*, 32nd Ed., N.A., Egypt, PP. 60-65.
- Gadelrab, R. (2010) *Managing Food Quality in Hotels: Integrated Quality Approaches to Food Production*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Wales Institute, Cardiff, UK.

Exploring the Impact of Talent Management on the Organizational Effectiveness in the Egyptian Hospitality Industry

- Gallardo, E.; Sánchez-Cañizares, S.-M.; López-Guzmán, T. and Jesus, M.M. N. (2010) Employee satisfaction in the Iberian hotel industry: The case of Andalusia (Spain) and the Algarve (Portugal), *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 22, No. 3, pp. 321-334.
- Garlick, R. (2010) Do Happy Employees Really Mean Happy Customers? Or Is There More to the Equation? *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, Volume 51, No. 3, pp. 304-307.
- Gill, A., Fitzgerald, S., Bhutani, S., Mand, H. and Sharma, S. (2011) The relationship between transformational leadership and employee desire for empowerment, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 263-273.
- Gu, Z. and Siu, R.C.S. (2009) Drivers of job satisfaction as related to work performance in Macao casino hotels: An investigation based on employee survey, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 21, No. 5, pp. 561-578.
- Iles, P.; Chuai, X. and Preece D. (2010) Talent Management and HRM in Multinational companies in Beijing: Definitions, differences and drivers. *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 46, No. 2, pp. 147-158.
- Lewis, R. E. and Heckman, R. J. (2006) Talent Management: A Critical Review. *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 16, pp. 139-154.
- Martin, A.; Mactaggart, D. and Bowden, J. (2006) The barriers to the recruitment and retention of supervisors/managers in the Scottish tourism industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 18, No. 5, pp. 380-97.
- Maxwell, G.A. and MacLean, S. (2008) Talent management in hospitality and tourism in Scotland: Operational implications and strategic actions, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 20, No. 7, pp. 820-830.
- Nassar, M. (2012) Exploring current benchmarking practices in the Egyptian hotel sector, *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 6, pp. 730-742.
- Pelit, E.; Öztürk, Y. and Arslantürk, Y. (2011) The effects of employee empowerment on employee job satisfaction: A study on hotels in Turkey, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 23, No. 6, pp. 784-802.
- Raub, S.; Alvarez, L. and Khanna, R. (2006) The different roles of corporate and unit level human resources managers in the hospitality industry, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 135-144.
- Robinson, R. N.S.; Arcodia, C. V.; Tian, C. and Charlton, P. (2010) Cookery-related employment vacancy advertisements and skills shortages, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 483-499.
- Scott, B. and Revis, S. (2008) Talent management in hospitality: graduate career success and strategies, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 20, No. 7, pp. 781-791.
- Tews, M. J. and Tracey, J. B. (2009) Helping Managers Help Themselves: The Use and Utility of On-the-Job Interventions to Improve the Impact of Interpersonal Skills Training, *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, Vol. 50, No. 2, pp. 245-258.
- Vural, Y.; Vardarlier, P. and Aykir, A. (2012) The Effects of Using Talent Management With Performance Evaluation System Over Employee Commitment. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 58, pp. 340 – 349.
- Watson, S. (2011) Where are we now? A review of management development issues in the hospitality and tourism sector: Implications for talent management, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 20, No. 7, pp. 758-780.
- Wikipedia (2013) Talent Management. Available from: [://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talent_management](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talent_management). Accessed 7, Jan., 2013.

Appendices:

Appendix 1: Differences between Five and Four Star Hotels' Scores – Mann Whitney U Test Statistics (a)

	Hotel Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	Z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
<i>Identify Talents Statements:</i>						
ITS1	Five star	55	35.40	407	-0.50083	0.616494
	Four star	16	38.06			
ITS2	Five star	55	34.60	363	-1.12967	0.258617
	Four star	16	40.81			
ITS3	Five star	55	36.11	434	-0.0873	0.93043
	Four star	16	35.63			
ITS4	Five star	55	35.34	403.5	-0.5274	0.597918
	Four star	16	38.28			
<i>Attract Talents Statements:</i>						
ATS1	Five star	55	36.49	413	-0.38412	0.700892
	Four star	16	34.31			
ATS2	Five star	55	33.92	325.5	-1.63206	0.102667
	Four star	16	43.16			
ATS3	Five star	55	35.08	389.5	-0.73031	0.465198
	Four star	16	39.16			
ATS4	Five star	55	34.05	332.5	-1.54669	0.121938
	Four star	16	42.72			
ATS5	Five star	55	34.31	347	-1.35171	0.176468
	Four star	16	41.81			
ATS6	Five star	55	36.95	388	-0.74032	0.459103
	Four star	16	32.75			
ATS7	Five star	55	34.77	372.5	-0.97845	0.327852
	Four star	16	40.22			
ATS8	Five star	55	34.84	376	-0.91012	0.362757
	Four star	16	40.00			
ATS9	Five star	55	34.01	330.5	-1.60394	0.108728
	Four star	16	42.84			
ATS10	Five star	55	34.13	337	-1.54426	0.122525
	Four star	16	42.44			
ATS11	Five star	55	34.30	346.5	-1.35619	0.175038
	Four star	16	41.84			
ATS12	Five star	55	34.23	342.5	-1.43165	0.152244
	Four star	16	42.09			
ATS13	Five star	55	34.82	375	-0.93788	0.348304
	Four star	16	40.06			
ATS14	Five star	55	35.44	409	-0.43997	0.659957
	Four star	16	37.94			
ATS15	Five star	55	35.68	422.5	-0.25342	0.79994
	Four star	16	37.09			
<i>Retain Talents Statements:</i>						
RTS1	Five star	55	36.01	439.5	-0.00718	0.994272
	Four star	16	35.97			
RTS2	Five star	55	35.36	405	-0.51369	0.607469
	Four star	16	38.19			
RTS3	Five star	55	34.95	382	-0.85601	0.391991
	Four star	16	39.63			
RTS4	Five star	55	33.60	308	-1.88348	0.059635
	Four star	16	44.25			
RTS5	Five star	55	34.09	335	-1.50927	0.13123
	Four star	16	42.56			
RTS6	Five star	55	34.67	367	-1.08331	0.278669
	Four star	16	40.56			
RTS7	Five star	55	34.92	380.5	-0.89273	0.372001
	Four star	16	39.72			
RTS8	Five star	55	35.32	402.5	-0.56891	0.569417
	Four star	16	38.34			
RTS9	Five star	55	34.89	379	-0.88506	0.376124
	Four star	16	39.81			
RTS10	Five star	55	34.98	384	-0.79933	0.424097
Continued						

Exploring the Impact of Talent Management on the Organizational Effectiveness in the Egyptian Hospitality Industry

Appendix 1: Continued						
	Four star	16	39.50			
RTS11	Five star	55	34.89			
	Four star	16	39.81	379	-0.86411	0.387526
RTS12	Five star	55	35.53			
	Four star	16	37.63	414	-0.37674	0.706369
RTS13	Five star	55	37.12			
	Four star	16	32.16	378.5	-0.882	0.377776
RTS14	Five star	55	34.28			
	Four star	16	41.91	345.5	-1.3519	0.176406
RTS15	Five star	55	34.04			
	Four star	16	42.75	332	-1.54425	0.122528
<i>Develop Talents Statements:</i>						
DTS1	Five star	55	34.40			
	Four star	16	41.50	352	-1.294	0.195667
DTS2	Five star	55	34.30			
	Four star	16	41.84	346.5	-1.45645	0.145269
DTS3	Five star	55	33.75			
	Four star	16	43.72	316.5	-1.83239	0.066893
DTS4	Five star	55	33.69			
	Four star	16	43.94	313	-1.89669	0.057869
DTS5	Five star	55	35.26			
	Four star	16	38.53	399.5	-0.59334	0.552951
DTS6	Five star	55	35.45			
	Four star	16	37.88	410	-0.42754	0.668983
DTS7	Five star	55	34.94			
	Four star	16	39.66	381.5	-0.82346	0.410245
DTS8	Five star	55	35.27			
	Four star	16	38.50	400	-0.57868	0.562808
DTS9	Five star	55	35.46			
	Four star	16	37.84	410.5	-0.42335	0.672039
DTS10	Five star	55	33.75			
	Four star	16	43.75	316	-1.75745	0.078842
DTS11	Five star	55	34.13			
	Four star	16	42.44	337	-1.47903	0.139131
DTS12	Five star	55	33.09			
	Four star	16	46.00	280	-2.30607	0.021107
DTS13	Five star	55	34.45			
	Four star	16	41.31	355	-1.21345	0.224958
DTS14	Five star	55	35.26			
	Four star	16	38.53	399.5	-0.62536	0.531737
DTS15	Five star	55	35.70			
	Four star	16	37.03	423.5	-0.24278	0.808172
DTS16	Five star	55	36.22			
	Four star	16	35.25	428	-0.17817	0.858591
<i>Organizational Effectiveness Statements:</i>						
OES1	Five star	55	34.45			
	Four star	16	41.34	354.5	-1.32374	0.185591
OES2	Five star	55	34.98			
	Four star	16	39.50	384	-0.83998	0.400922
OES3	Five star	55	34.70			
	Four star	16	40.47	368.5	-1.09949	0.271557
OES4	Five star	55	34.56			
	Four star	16	40.94	361	-1.17993	0.238026
OES5	Five star	55	35.26			
	Four star	16	38.53	399.5	-0.58303	0.559875
OES6	Five star	55	34.39			
	Four star	16	41.53	351.5	-1.2541	0.209804
OES7	Five star	55	34.77			
	Four star	16	40.22	372.5	-0.98549	0.324385
OES8	Five star	55	34.53			
	Four star	16	41.06	359	-1.17127	0.241492
OES9	Five star	55	35.46			
	Four star	16	37.84	410.5	-0.42683	0.669501
OES10	Five star	55	35.67			
	Four star	16	37.13	422	-0.26277	0.792727

a Grouping Variable: Hotel Category

Reda M. A. Gadelrab

Appendix 2: Differences between Senior and Middle Managers' Scores – Mann Whitney U Test Statistics (a)

	Manager Level	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	Z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
<i>Identify Talents Statements:</i>						
ITS1	Senior	30	36.57	598	-0.218	0.827
	Middle	41	35.59			
ITS2	Senior	30	34.48	569.5	-0.565	0.572
	Middle	41	37.11			
ITS3	Senior	30	37.75	562.5	-0.646	0.518
	Middle	41	34.72			
ITS4	Senior	30	37.58	567.5	-0.581	0.562
	Middle	41	34.84			
<i>Attract Talents Statements:</i>						
ATS1	Senior	30	34.93	583	-0.38507	0.700186
	Middle	41	36.78			
ATS2	Senior	30	32.40	507	-1.30209	0.192884
	Middle	41	38.63			
ATS3	Senior	30	36.13	611	-0.04893	0.960976
	Middle	41	35.90			
ATS4	Senior	30	32.65	514.5	-1.22307	0.221305
	Middle	41	38.45			
ATS5	Senior	30	37.80	561	-0.66387	0.506773
	Middle	41	34.68			
ATS6	Senior	30	35.95	613.5	-0.01806	0.985588
	Middle	41	36.04			
ATS7	Senior	30	35.50	600	-0.18391	0.854081
	Middle	41	36.37			
ATS8	Senior	30	35.68	605.5	-0.11427	0.909024
	Middle	41	36.23			
ATS9	Senior	30	36.98	585.5	-0.3655	0.71474
	Middle	41	35.28			
ATS10	Senior	30	35.00	585	-0.38045	0.703614
	Middle	41	36.73			
ATS11	Senior	30	35.15	589.5	-0.31285	0.754394
	Middle	41	36.62			
ATS12	Senior	30	31.33	475	-1.7388	0.082071
	Middle	41	39.41			
ATS13	Senior	30	34.20	561	-0.65905	0.509864
	Middle	41	37.32			
ATS14	Senior	30	37.53	569	-0.55222	0.5808
	Middle	41	34.88			
ATS15	Senior	30	36.12	611.5	-0.04287	0.965804
	Middle	41	35.91			
<i>Retain Talents Statements:</i>						
RTS1	Senior	30	33.30	534	-0.98375	0.325236
	Middle	41	37.98			
RTS2	Senior	30	35.62	603.5	-0.14276	0.886476
	Middle	41	36.28			
RTS3	Senior	30	35.60	603	-0.1498	0.88092
	Middle	41	36.29			
RTS4	Senior	30	34.57	572	-0.51897	0.60378
	Middle	41	37.05			
RTS5	Senior	30	36.58	597.5	-0.21277	0.831509
	Middle	41	35.57			
RTS6	Senior	30	36.72	593.5	-0.26987	0.787258
	Middle	41	35.48			
RTS7	Senior	30	34.55	571.5	-0.55205	0.580911
	Middle	41	37.06			
RTS8	Senior	30	39.07	523	-1.18056	0.237776
	Middle	41	33.76			
RTS9	Senior	30	34.85	580.5	-0.4234	0.672004
	Middle	41	36.84			
RTS10	Senior	30	34.70	576	-0.47086	0.637739
	Middle	41	36.95			
RTS11	Senior	30	35.45	598.5	-0.1977	0.843278
Continued						

Exploring the Impact of Talent Management on the Organizational Effectiveness in the Egyptian Hospitality Industry

Appendix 2: Continued						
	Middle	41	36.40			
RTS12	Senior	30	36.45			
	Middle	41	35.67	601.5	-0.16546	0.868584
RTS13	Senior	30	34.18			
	Middle	41	37.33	560.5	-0.66112	0.508536
RTS14	Senior	30	37.27			
	Middle	41	35.07	577	-0.45982	0.645647
RTS15	Senior	30	34.23			
	Middle	41	37.29	562	-0.641	0.521522
<i>Develop Talents Statements:</i>						
DTS1	Senior	30	34.75			
	Middle	41	36.91	577.5	-0.46641	0.64092
DTS2	Senior	30	37.40			
	Middle	41	34.98	573	-0.55338	0.580006
DTS3	Senior	30	34.67			
	Middle	41	36.98	575	-0.502	0.615671
DTS4	Senior	30	36.00			
	Middle	41	36.00	615	0	1
DTS5	Senior	30	32.70			
	Middle	41	38.41	516	-1.22681	0.219896
DTS6	Senior	30	33.43			
	Middle	41	37.88	538	-0.9282	0.353306
DTS7	Senior	30	33.18			
	Middle	41	38.06	530.5	-1.00608	0.314376
DTS8	Senior	30	35.62			
	Middle	41	36.28	603.5	-0.14072	0.888089
DTS9	Senior	30	33.75			
	Middle	41	37.65	547.5	-0.81935	0.412584
DTS10	Senior	30	35.83			
	Middle	41	36.12	610	-0.05994	0.952203
DTS11	Senior	30	36.55			
	Middle	41	35.60	598.5	-0.20041	0.841162
DTS12	Senior	30	34.00			
	Middle	41	37.46	555	-0.73146	0.464497
DTS13	Senior	30	35.30			
	Middle	41	36.51	594	-0.25358	0.799822
DTS14	Senior	30	34.17			
	Middle	41	37.34	560	-0.71833	0.472554
DTS15	Senior	30	35.62			
	Middle	41	36.28	603.5	-0.14313	0.886189
DTS16	Senior	30	34.65			
	Middle	41	36.99	574.5	-0.50862	0.611021
<i>Organizational Effectiveness Statements:</i>						
OES1	Senior	30	33.85			
	Middle	41	37.57	550.5	-0.84466	0.398299
OES2	Senior	30	34.47			
	Middle	41	37.12	569	-0.58361	0.559481
OES3	Senior	30	39.57			
	Middle	41	33.39	508	-1.39173	0.164003
OES4	Senior	30	36.42			
	Middle	41	35.70	602.5	-0.15792	0.874522
OES5	Senior	30	36.95			
	Middle	41	35.30	586.5	-0.34703	0.728569
OES6	Senior	30	33.68			
	Middle	41	37.70	545.5	-0.83304	0.404824
OES7	Senior	30	32.82			
	Middle	41	38.33	519.5	-1.17934	0.238263
OES8	Senior	30	35.72			
	Middle	41	36.21	606.5	-0.10396	0.917199
OES9	Senior	30	36.77			
	Middle	41	35.44	592	-0.28148	0.77834
OES10	Senior	30	33.75			
	Middle	41	37.65	547.5	-0.83349	0.404571

a Grouping Variable: Manager Level

إيضاح أثر إدارة المواهب في الفعالية التنظيمية في صناعة الضيافة
رضا محمد عبد الحفيظ جادالرب
كلية السياحة والفنادق - جامعة حلوان

الملخص العربي:

تعد إدارة المواهب من التحديات التي تواجه صناعة الضيافة، إلا أنها تحتاج إلى موظفين موهوبين لتحقيق أقصى قدر من الفعالية التنظيمية. وحيث أن الحصول على الأشخاص المناسبين في المكان المناسب وفي الوقت المناسب يعد المهمة الرئيسية لإدارة المواهب والتي يمكن أن تخلق الفعالية التنظيمية على المدى الطويل. إن الغرض الرئيسي من هذه الدراسة هو إيضاح إدارة المواهب بقطاع صناعة الضيافة من خلال التركيز على تأثير هذه الإدارة في الفعالية التنظيمية. تم إجراء دراسة استقصائية شملت واحدا وسبعين مديرا يقسم الموارد البشرية من المستويات المتوسطة والعليا للحصول على وجهات نظرهم المتعلقة بإدارة المواهب في عشرة فنادق فئة الخمس نجوم وستة فئة الأربع نجوم. تم تحليل البيانات المتجمعة من الاستبيانات من خلال برنامج SPSS الإحصائي النسخة الثانية والعشرون. وأوضحت الدراسة أن إدارة المواهب تدمج وتتكامل مع إجراءات الموارد البشرية كما أن لها تأثيرا إيجابيا كبيرا في الفعالية التنظيمية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: صناعة الضيافة؛ الموارد البشرية؛ إدارة المواهب؛ المواهب؛ الفعالية التنظيمية؛ مصر.