

Original scientific paper

UDC: 331.101.3:640.4(497.5)

<https://doi.org/10.18045/zbefri.2024.1.39>

Effects of job attitudes on withdrawal behaviors: Evidence from the Croatian hotel industry*

Vedrana Čikeš¹, Kristina Črnjar², Helga Maškarin Ribarić³

Abstract

The hotel industry, like other service sectors, faces significant challenge in managing withdrawal behaviors, due to their substantial impact on performance and profitability. This paper investigates the relationship between two job attitudes – organizational commitment and job involvement – and two withdrawal behaviors – absenteeism and intention to leave. The study utilized a random sample of 734 hotel employees in Croatia. Logistic regression analysis was used to predict absenteeism and turnover intentions. Statistically significant negative relationships were found between affective and normative commitment and absenteeism, as well as affective, normative and continuance commitment and turnover intentions. However, no significant effect was found between job involvement and absenteeism, although a strong and negative relationship exists between job involvement and turnover intentions. Additionally, a positive relationship was identified between job involvement and all components of organizational commitment. These findings can provide a foundation for human resource management and decision-making processes in the hotel industry, offering insights into employee attitudes, and can be a pushover in the creation of strategies to manage undesirable employee behaviors.

Keywords: *absenteeism, turnover intentions, organizational commitment, job involvement, hotel industry*

JEL classification: *J22, J63*

* Received: 13-05-2024; accepted: 28-05-2024

¹ *Teaching assistant, University of Rijeka, Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management, Primorska 46, p.p. 97, 51410 Opatija. Scientific affiliation: human resource management, managerial skills, knowledge management. Phone: +385 51 294 195. E-mail: vedrana.cikes@fthm.hr.*

² *Full Professor, University of Rijeka, Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management, Primorska 46, p.p. 97, 51410 Opatija. Scientific affiliation: human resource management, managerial skills, knowledge management. Phone: +385 51 294 185. E-mail: kcrnjar@fthm.hr.*

³ *Tenured Professor, University of Rijeka, Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management, Primorska 46, p.p. 97, 51410 Opatija. Scientific affiliation: performance management systems, labor productivity. Phone: +385 51 294 882. E-mail: helgam@fthm.hr.*

1. Introduction

Tourism and hospitality play an important role in the global economy due to its significant economic contributions. These sectors stimulate economic growth, create jobs, and foster cultural exchange. According to the World Travel & Tourism Council (WTTC), in 2023, the tourism sector contributed approximately 10.4% to the global GDP and supported around 334 million jobs, which is about 1 in 10 jobs in the global workforce. In a country like Croatia, where tourism accounts for 19.6% of the GDP (Croatian National Bank, 2024) and directly employs about 6% of the total workforce (Croatian Bureau of Statistics, 2024), the significant impact of tourism on the overall economy is clearly evident.

The hotel industry, a vital component of tourism, is labor-intensive, and the human factor plays a key role in its success. Similar to other service industries, the hotel industry faces significant challenges in managing withdrawal behaviors, which include physical withdrawal manifestations such as absenteeism and turnover intentions. Turnover research has shown that an employee's self-expressed intentions to leave their job are the best predictor of actual turnover (Beecroft et al. 2008). Withdrawal behaviors adversely affect hotel profitability by increasing costs related to replacement, employment, training, and other planned or unplanned expenses. According to the European Commission (Hassard, 2014), absenteeism costs €20 billion a year in the EU-15 alone. The Bureau of Labor Statistics (Walsh, 2021) estimated the overall absenteeism rate for all employees in the United States in 2020 was 2.8%. When it comes to turnover, the annual overall turnover rate in the U.S. in 2017 was 26.3%, based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Researchers found withdrawal behaviors significantly decrease customer satisfaction (Yan et al., 2021; Mohsin et al., 2022), causing lower service quality and increased workload for other employees (Mukwevho et al., 2020).

Absenteeism and turnover intentions are often being researched in hospitals and among nurses (Smokrović et al., 2022, Labrague et al., 2020; Brborovic et al., 2016), in manufacturing industry (Nowak et al., 2023; Li et al., 2019) and public sector (Mastekaasa, 2020; Kim and Min Park, 2014), while studies in hotel industry are quite scarce (Mukwevho et al., 2020; Pizam and Thornburg, 2000; Kim et al., 2015; Qiu et al., 2015).

Although the causes of absenteeism and turnover intentions in various settings can be attributed to a combination of factors, including individual (Kolz, 1999; Störmer and Fahr, 2013; Seyrek and Turan, 2017), job-related (Barmby et al., 2001; Scoppa, 2010; Samad, 2006; Ahmad, 2018), and organizational support factors (Adebayo and Nwabuoku, 2008; Madden et al., 2015; Perryer, 2010), research has consistently shown that job attitudes play a significant role in influencing both turnover intentions and absenteeism (Punnett et al., 2007; Wegge, 2007; Maynard

et al., 2006; Shah Nawaz and Jafri, 2009). Job attitudes that are being examined in this research are organizational commitment and job involvement.

This study aims to advance insights into the relationship between job attitudes and withdrawal behaviors, specifically absenteeism and turnover intentions, thereby contributing to the literature in several ways. First, although the relationship between job attitudes and withdrawal behaviors has been extensively researched, studies exploring the link between organizational commitment and job involvement with absenteeism and turnover intentions remain relatively scarce. Second, while research on these behaviors is common in various sectors and industries, they are notably rare within the hotel and tourism sectors, where only a few studies have been conducted. Third, the significance of implementing human resource practices to manage absenteeism and turnover intentions is still insufficiently emphasized. Finally, no previous studies exploring absenteeism and turnover intentions within the tourism and hotel industry have been identified in Croatia, a country that generates 14.6 billion EUR from tourism and where the dependence on this sector is particularly pronounced.

Based on the above, following hypotheses have been proposed:

- *H1: Organizational commitment is negatively related to absenteeism.*
- *H1a: Affective commitment is negatively related to absenteeism.*
- *H1b: Continuance commitment is negatively related to absenteeism.*
- *H1c: Normative commitment is negatively related to absenteeism.*
- *H2: Organizational commitment is negatively related to turnover intentions.*
- *H2a: Affective commitment is negatively related to turnover intentions.*
- *H2b: Continuance commitment is negatively related to turnover intentions.*
- *H2c: Normative commitment is negatively related to turnover intentions.*
- *H3: Job involvement is negatively related to absenteeism.*
- *H4: Job involvement is negatively related to turnover intentions.*
- *H5: Organizational commitment and job involvement are positively related.*

This research paper is organized in the following way. The paper begins with the Literature review and hypothesis development section, where key theories and previous studies are discussed to establish a foundation for the current research and formulate hypotheses. The Research methodology section explains the methodological framework, including the design and approach of the study, the data collection process, the sample characteristics, instruments, and scales used to assess the primary research. The Analysis section deals with the statistical techniques used to examine the data. The Results and Discussion section presents the findings,

interprets their implications, and integrates them with existing literature. The paper concludes with the Conclusion section, which summarizes the key insights, gives practical implications for management, acknowledges the study's constraints, and suggests some recommendations for further studies in this field.

2. Literature review and hypothesis development

This section provides an insight into the concepts of organizational commitment and job involvement, two attitudes that are explored in this paper. The third subsection offers an overview of recent studies on the relationship between these attitudes and absenteeism and turnover intentions. Based on previous research, hypotheses are defined at the end of the chapter.

2.1. Organizational commitment

Traditionally, organizational commitment has been conceptualized and measured in various ways. Authors agree that organizational commitment is a multidimensional construct and the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of commitment vary across dimensions (Meyer et al., 2002). Despite this, the classification of commitment in three distinguishable components – affective, continuance and normative, developed in the 1990s by Allen and Meyer (1990), continues to serve as a foundation for many studies. According to this classification, the affective component of organizational commitment refers to employees' emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in, the organization. The continuance component addresses commitment based on the costs that employees associate with leaving the organization, while the normative component refers to employees' feelings of obligation to remain with the organization (Allen and Meyer, 1990). Organizational commitment however can be a result of a combination of two or three mentioned aspects of commitment, i.e., it does not necessarily have to be based on only one component. According to Maslić Seršić (2000), one individual may simultaneously feel a strong emotional connection (affective component) but also an obligation to stay in the organization (normative component), while another employee may be satisfied with his job (affective component) but also aware that leaving the organization would be complicated and incur some costs (instrumental component). The intensity of each component, therefore, depends on the individual, his personal values and needs.

Recent studies about organizational commitment are oriented at the COVID-19 crisis (Chanana, 2021; Sokal et al., 2021), improvement of employee performance (Ridwan et al., 2020), emotional intelligence and quality of work life (Sudiro et al., 2023).

2.2. Job involvement

The main stream of research about the job involvement has been derived from the work of Lodahl and Kejner (1965) and Kanungo (1982). Job involvement refers to the psychological identification and participation of an individual in their work (Morrow, 1983). It encompasses the extent to which an individual is personally engaged to their job tasks and responsibilities. It is important to differentiate between work involvement and job involvement. Work involvement, influenced by the process of early socialization, pertains to an individual's values regarding work and its benefits. In contrast, job involvement is specifically tied to an individual's current employment situation and depends on the degree to which it meets their current needs (Brown, 1996).

In newer studies, job involvement is being researched between millennial workers (Tapia-Andino and Barcellos-Paula, 2023) and is often being put in relation with different types of leadership (Zia et al., 2022; Xu et al., 2022).

2.3. The relationship between organizational commitment, job involvement and withdrawal behaviors

Organizational commitment and job involvement serve as precursors to employee withdrawal behaviors, specifically sickness absenteeism and turnover intentions. Sickness absence is the most common form of absenteeism and it refers to the pattern of missing work in which an employee is absent from work owing to sickness and health complaints (van Ruyseveldt et al. 2024). Absenteeism can be caused by various determinants, which can be categorized to personal, demographic, attitudinal, health-related, organizational, and job determinants (Čikeš et al., 2018). While absenteeism is a way of 'escaping' the work context temporarily, turnover intentions indicate the inclination of an employee to withdraw from the organization definitely (Schaufeli et al., 2009). Turnover intention has been defined as the conscious and deliberate willingness to leave the organization, and is considered the last in a sequence of withdrawal cognitions (van Ruyseveldt et al., 2023).

In 1987, Blau and Boal conceptualized that job involvement and organizational commitment have been used to predict general turnover and absenteeism. Further empirical studies confirmed the relationship between these job attitudes and absenteeism and/or turnover as their determinants (Cheloha and Farr, 1980, Somers, 1995; Johns, 2001; Luchak and Gellatly, 2007). The higher the organizational commitment and job involvement are, the lower absenteeism is (Ho et al., 2012, Davey et al., 2009). Organizational commitment has been found to have a negative association with turnover intentions, suggesting that employees who are more emotionally and psychologically attached to their organizations are less likely to

have intention to leave (Yan et al., 2021). When it comes to a relationship between job involvement and organizational commitment, studies have shown that a positive relationship exists between these variables (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Saxena and Saxena, 2015). The higher organizational commitment is, the higher is employees' job involvement.

Following these findings, we propose these hypotheses:

- *H1: Organizational commitment is negatively related to absenteeism,*
- *H1a: Affective commitment is negatively related to absenteeism,*
- *H1b: Continuance commitment is negatively related to absenteeism,*
- *H1c: Normative commitment is negatively related to absenteeism,*
- *H2: Organizational commitment is negatively related to turnover intentions,*
- *H2a: Affective commitment is negatively related to turnover intentions,*
- *H2b: Continuance commitment is negatively related to turnover intentions,*
- *H2c: Normative commitment is negatively related to turnover intentions,*
- *H3: Job involvement is negatively related to absenteeism,*
- *H4: Job involvement is negatively related to turnover intentions, and*
- *H5: Organizational commitment and job involvement are positively related.*

3. Methodology

This section outlines the methodology of a study focused on exploring the relationship between job attitudes and withdrawal behaviors—specifically absenteeism and turnover intentions—within the Croatian hotel industry. The data collection process, measurement techniques, and the methods used for data processing are thoroughly explained and illustrated.

3.1. Procedure and sampling

The primary research was conducted in Croatia, during April and May 2019. The questionnaire was distributed among hotel employees within randomly selected hotels throughout the country.

In the context of this research, employees of the Croatian hotel industry are those employed in business entities classified in the category 55.10 Hotels and similar accommodation, of the Croatian National Classification of Business Activities (i.e., NKD). The number of employees taken into consideration for accessing sampling

(the population) is set for the year 2018. According to the Croatian Chamber of Commerce data, Croatia had 31.703 employees who worked in 1.183 hotel entities. To estimate the sample size, an a priori power analysis was conducted, using the G*Power 3.1 program (Faul et al., 2009). Based on an alpha error of the study of 0.05 and a power of 0.95, a sample size required 312 participants.

The process of data collection had several steps. First, we randomly selected 100 hotel entities from the Croatian Ministry of Tourism and Sport data (2019). After that, we asked permission from the hotel entity Director and/or Board of Directors to collect the data from their employees. In total, 2338 questionnaires were distributed by e-mail or the courier/Human resource management department, depending on how the hotel entity management requested. Finally, 734 usable questionnaires were returned, which presents a response rate of 37.11% for the case where both a) the hotel entity Director and/or Board of Directors, and b) their employees, agreed to participate. After fulfilling the survey, employees who received the questionnaire in person sealed their answers in an envelope in order to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

3.2. Measurements

Demographic and labor variables were gender, age, total length of service, length of service in the current company, level of education (low, medium, high) and type of working contract (part-time, full-time). Low educational level was defined as completing the primary school and vocational secondary school; medium education was defined as completing high school and high education was defined as completing university or PhD.

Dependent variables. Absenteeism was measured by self-reported sickness-absence frequency in the past 12 months. Absence frequency refers to the number of absence spells per person per year, irrespective of their duration (Chadwick-Jones et al., 1971). Sickness absence did not include the days of absence regarding maternity or parental leave. The intention to leave the organization was measured by two items from Dawley et al. (2010): *I will likely look for another job in the next twelve months.* and *I will likely look for another job in the next three years.*, and evaluated on a Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Independent variables. An original organizational commitment scale by Meyer et al. (1993) was previously translated in Croatian by Maslić Seršić (2000) and was used in this study. The questionnaire consisted of three subscales that measure affective, continuance and normative commitment. As a measure for job involvement, ten items from Kanungo (1982) were used. All items for independent variables were assessed using a five-point Likert-type scale (strongly disagree=1 to strongly agree=5).

Items with no previous translation were translated into Croatian using the double-blind back translation method. In order to test the survey elements, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted. Survey items and the results of the exploratory factor analysis are reported in Table 1. First, Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett’s test of sphericity were used to test the suitability of items for factor analysis. KMO values were: 0.735 for affective commitment, 0.842 for continuance commitment, 0.858 for normative commitment, and 0.919 for job involvement, all exceeding the recommended value of above 0.5 (Kaiser, 1974). Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant for all constructs, with a p-value of <0.001 . Further, principal components with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and a varimax rotation for factor loadings were used to decide on the number of factors for every construct. Analysis extracted two factors for affective commitment, named joy affect factor and attachment affect factor, as previously elaborated by Bergami and Bagozzi (2000), and one factor for continuance and normative commitment, as well as for job involvement. Items with a factor loading lower than 0.6 were extracted from further analysis (one from the normative commitment scale and three from the job involvement scale). The KMOs for new factor structures were 0.850 for normative commitment ($p<0.001$) and 0.922 for job involvement ($p<0.001$). Cronbach’s alpha showed excellent internal consistency for job involvement, good consistency for affective commitment – joy, continuance, and normative commitment; and questionable consistency for affective commitment – attachment (George and Mallery, 2003).

Table 1: Results of exploratory factor analysis

Items	Factor loading	Eigen value	Variance explained (%)	Reliability
<i>Affective commitment – overall</i>			68.295	0.731
<i>Affective commitment – factor joy</i>		2.647	44.110	0.828
This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	0.875			
I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.	0.837			
I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.	0.853			
<i>Affective commitment – factor attachment</i>		1.451	24.185	0.684
I do not feel like ‘part of the family’ at my organization.*	0.791			
I do not feel ‘emotionally attached’ to this organization.*	0.776			
I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.*	0.755			

Items	Factor loading	Eigen value	Variance explained (%)	Reliability
<i>Continuance commitment</i>		3.283	54.712	0.833
Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.	0.610			
If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.	0.755			
One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.	0.718			
It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.	0.766			
Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.	0.828			
I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.	0.742			
<i>Normative commitment</i>		3.181	63.628	0.856
I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.	0.739			
I owe a great deal to my organization.	0.816			
Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.	0.855			
I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.	0.829			
This organization deserves my loyalty.	0.743			
<i>Job involvement</i>		4.565	65.217	0.910
The most important things that happen to me involve my present job.	0.749			
I live, eat and breathe my job.	0.828			
Most of my interests are centered around my job.	0.878			
I have very strong ties with my present job which would be very difficult to break.	0.846			
Most of my personal life goals are job-oriented.	0.840			
I consider my job to be very central to my existence.	0.778			
I like to be absorbed in my job most of the time.	0.724			

Note: *reverse-coded items

Source: Author's calculation

After factor analysis, the median split was used to create categorical variables for all independent and dependent variables. All values on the variables at or below the median are categorized as low and all values above the median are categorized as high (Table 2).

Table 2: Median values for dependent and independent variables

Variable	Median
Affective commitment – joy	3.67
Affective commitment – attachment	3.33
Continuance commitment	3.17
Normative commitment	3.2
Job involvement	3.28
Absenteeism frequency	0
Turnover intention (in 1 year)	2
Turnover intention (in 3 years)	2

Source: Author's calculation

3.3. Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the demographic, dependent and independent variables. The Shapiro-Wilk test indicated that the data were not normally distributed ($p < 0.05$). To examine the differences between groups, Mann-Whitney U test was conducted. The association between variables was assessed using the Chi-square test of independence. Logistic regression was utilized to estimate the relationship between dependent and independent variables. SPSS version 23 was used for data analysis.

4. Results and discussion

In total, 734 employees participated in the study (37.1%). Most of the participants were women (60.9%). The median was 38 years. Most of the participants had a medium level of education (38.6%), followed by high (31.6%) and low education (29.8%). A total of 63.5% of employees had a full-time contract. At the time of filling out the survey, most employees (53.3%) worked in the current company for more than 5 years, while 56.3% of them had more than 10 years of overall experience. Most employees reported low commitment to the organization (50.7% for affective commitment – joy; 67.3% for affective commitment – attachment; 77.1% for continuance commitment; 77.4% for normative commitment) and

low job involvement (73.8%). In total, high absenteeism was reported by 33.8% of participants. The proportion of employees with a high intention to leave the organization within the next 1 year was 37.3% and within the next 3 years was 49.4%.

The Mann-Whitney U test indicated a statistically significant difference in age with respect to absenteeism frequency ($p=0.011$) and turnover intentions for both the next 1 year ($p<0.001$) and the next 3 years ($p<0.001$), as detailed in Table 3. The median age of employees with high absenteeism frequency is 35 years (20-65), which is lower compared to 39 years (19-65) for those in the low absenteeism frequency group. Similarly, younger employees demonstrate higher turnover intentions, with a median age of 34 years (19-65) in the high turnover intention group, compared to 39 years (20-65) for the next 1 year, and 41 years (20-65) for those planning to leave in the next 3 years. These findings indicate that younger employees are significantly more likely to be absent from work and to demonstrate greater turnover intentions. Further, results of the test showed that no statistical difference was found between absenteeism frequency and the length of service, but a statistically significant difference exists when observing turnover intentions and total length of service ($p=0.000$), as well as the length of service in the current company ($p=0.000$). Employees with high turnover intentions, both in 1 year and in 3 years, generally had lower median total years of service (10 (1-40) for 1 year and 9 (1-40) for 3 years) than employees with low turnover intentions (15 (1-45) for 1 year and 18 (1-45) for 3 years). Also, median years of service in the current company was lower among employees with a high turnover intention (5 (1-40) for 1 and 3 years) than employees who had low turnover intentions (8 (1-43) for 1 year and 9 (1-43) in 3 years). The analysis reveals a pattern in which employees with fewer total years of service report higher turnover intentions, whether considering leaving within one or three years, compared to those with more years of service, who show lower intentions to leave (Table 3).

Table 3: Results of Mann-Whitney U test

Variable	Absenteeism frequency			Turnover intention (in 1 year)			Turnover intention (in 3 years)		
	Low	High	p -value	Low	High	p -value	Low	High	p -value
	Med (range)	Med (range)		Med (range)	Med (range)		Med (range)	Med (range)	
Age	39 (19-65)	35 (20-65)	0.011	39 (20-65)	34 (19-65)	0.000	41 (20-65)	34 (19-65)	0.000
Total length of service (in years)	15 (1-45)	11.5 (1-45)	0.072	15 (1-45)	10 (1-40)	0.000	18 (1-45)	9 (1-40)	0.000
Length of service in the current company (in years)	7 (1-43)	5 (1-40)	0.165	8 (1-43)	5 (1-40)	0.000	9 (1-43)	5 (1-40)	0.000

Source: Author's calculation

The chi-square test indicated a statistically significant difference in absenteeism frequency among employees based on their management level ($\chi^2 = 12.148$, $df = 3$, $p = 0.007$), as indicated in Table 4.

Table 4: Results of Chi-square test of independence for absenteeism frequency

Variable	Absenteeism frequency			χ^2	df	p -value
	Total n (%)	Low n (%)	High n (%)			
<i>Gender</i>				1.503	1	0.220
Female	438 (60.9)	283 (59.3)	155 (64.0)			
Male	281 (39.1)	194 (40.7)	87 (36.0)			
<i>Type of working contract</i>				0.608	1	0.436
Full-time	457 (63.5)	298 (62.5)	159 (65.4)			
Part-time	263 (36.5)	179 (37.5)	84 (34.6)			
<i>Level of education</i>				1.310	2	0.520
Low	217 (29.8)	137 (28.4)	80 (32.5)			
Medium	281 (38.6)	190 (39.4)	91 (37.0)			
High	230 (31.6)	155 (32.2)	75 (30.5)			
<i>Member of management level</i>				12.148	3	0.007
No	515 (72.5)	325 (68.7)	190 (80.2)			
Yes, lower-level management	120 (16.9)	88 (18.6)	32 (13.5)			
Yes, middle-level management	62 (8.7)	51 (10.8)	11 (4.6)			
Yes, top-level management	13 (1.8)	9 (1.9)	4 (1.7)			
<i>Affective commitment – joy</i>				9.085	1	0.003
Low	372 (50.7)	227 (46.7)	145 (58.5)			
High	362 (49.3)	259 (53.3)	103 (41.5)			
<i>Affective commitment – attachment</i>				0.264	1	0.607
Low	494 (67.3)	324 (66.7)	170 (68.5)			
High	240 (32.7)	162 (33.3)	78 (31.5)			
<i>Continuance commitment</i>				0.053	1	0.818
Low	566 (77.1)	376 (77.4)	190 (76.6)			
High	168 (22.9)	110 (22.6)	58 (23.4)			
<i>Normative commitment</i>				10.160	1	0.001
Low	568 (77.4)	359 (73.9)	209 (84.3)			
High	166 (22.6)	127 (26.1)	39 (15.7)			
<i>Job involvement</i>				0.260	1	0.610
Low	542 (73.8)	356 (73.3)	186 (75.0)			
High	192 (26.2)	130 (26.7)	62 (25.0)			

Source: Author's calculation

Among the employees with low absenteeism frequency, most of them (68.7%) are not part of management, 18.6% of them belong to the lower-level, 10.8% to the middle-level, and 1.9% to the top-level management. In the group of employees with high absenteeism frequency, 80.2% of them don't belong to hotel management. Employees within top-level management have the lowest frequency of high absenteeism, at 1.7%. These findings suggest that absenteeism is less prevalent among management, particularly top-level management, potentially due to higher levels of responsibility.

A statistically significant difference exists in absenteeism frequency among groups with different levels of affective commitment – joy ($\chi^2 = 9.085$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.003$). Among employees with high absenteeism frequency, 58.5% demonstrate low affective commitment. Conversely, in a group of employees with low absenteeism frequency, 53.3% reported high affective commitment. There is also a statistically significant difference in absenteeism frequency between groups with varying levels of normative commitment ($\chi^2 = 10.160$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.001$). Among employees with low absenteeism frequency, 73.9% exhibit low normative commitment. In contrast, a higher proportion of employees with high absenteeism frequency, 84.3%, demonstrate high normative commitment. No statistical significance in a chi-square test was found between absenteeism and the following variables: gender, type of working contract, level of education, affective commitment – attachment, continuance commitment, and job involvement. This indicates that the observed differences between the groups are likely due to random chance rather than a meaningful association between the variables.

When observing turnover intentions between employees, statistically significant differences were found in regard to their working contract type (in 1 year: $\chi^2 = 15.576$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.000$; and 3 years: $\chi^2 = 20.463$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.000$) and their management level (in 1 year: $\chi^2 = 14.295$, $df = 3$, $p = 0.003$; and 3 years: $\chi^2 = 11.481$, $df = 3$, $p = 0.009$), as detailed in Table 5.

Table 5: Results of Chi-square test of independence for turnover intentions in 1 and 3 years

Variable	Turnover intention (in 1 year)				Turnover intention (in 3 years)					
	Total n (%)	Low n (%)	High n (%)	X2	Total n (%)	Low n (%)	High n (%)	X2	df	p-value
<i>Gender</i>										
Female	437 (61.0)	282 (63.2)	155 (57.4)	2.396	436 (60.9)	224 (62.7)	212 (59.1)	1.025	1	0.311
Male	279 (39.0)	164 (36.8)	115 (42.6)		280 (39.1)	133 (37.3)	147 (40.9)			
<i>Type of working contract</i>										
Full-time	457 (63.7)	312 (69.2)	145 (54.5)	15.576	456 (63.6)	260 (71.6)	196 (55.4)	20.463	1	0.000
Part-time	260 (36.3)	139 (30.8)	121 (45.5)		261 (36.4)	103 (28.4)	158 (44.6)			
<i>Level of education</i>										
Low	215 (29.7)	130 (28.7)	85 (31.3)	0.546	214 (29.5)	110 (30.1)	104 (28.9)	3.158	2	0.206
Medium	280 (38.6)	178 (39.3)	102 (37.5)		281 (38.8)	150 (41.1)	131 (36.4)			
High	230 (31.7)	145 (32.0)	85 (31.3)		230 (31.7)	105 (28.8)	125 (34.7)			
<i>Member of management level</i>										
No	513 (72.6)	298 (67.9)	215 (80.2)	14.295	512 (72.4)	237 (67.1)	275 (77.7)	11.481	3	0.009
Yes, lower-level management	119 (16.8)	83 (18.9)	36 (13.4)		120 (17.0)	68 (19.3)	52 (14.7)			
Yes, middle-level management	62 (8.8)	49 (11.2)	13 (4.9)		62 (8.8)	41 (11.6)	21 (5.9)			
Yes, top-level management	13 (1.8)	9 (2.1)	4 (1.5)		13 (1.8)	7 (2.0)	6 (1.7)			
<i>Affective commitment – joy</i>										
Low	370 (50.6)	173 (37.8)	197 (72.2)	80.920	370 (50.6)	123 (33.2)	247 (68.4)	90.460	1	0.000
High	361 (49.4)	285 (62.2)	76 (27.8)		361 (49.4)	247 (66.8)	114 (31.6)			
<i>Affective commitment – attachment</i>										
Low	491 (67.2)	264 (57.6)	227 (83.2)	50.468	491 (67.2)	204 (55.1)	287 (79.5)	49.194	1	0.000
High	240 (32.8)	194 (42.4)	46 (16.8)		240 (32.8)	166 (44.9)	74 (20.5)			
<i>Continuance commitment</i>										
Low	563 (77.0)	327 (71.4)	236 (86.4)	21.886	564 (77.2)	248 (67.0)	316 (87.5)	43.597	1	0.000
High	168 (23.0)	131 (28.6)	37 (13.6)		167 (22.8)	122 (33.0)	45 (12.5)			
<i>Normative commitment</i>										
Low	565 (77.3)	319 (69.7)	246 (90.1)	40.791	566 (77.4)	243 (65.7)	323 (89.5)	59.212	1	0.000
High	166 (22.7)	139 (30.3)	27 (9.9)		165 (22.6)	127 (34.3)	38 (10.5)			
<i>Job involvement</i>										
Low	539 (73.7)	296 (64.6)	243 (89.0)	52.505	539 (73.7)	221 (59.7)	318 (88.1)	75.878	1	0.000
High	192 (26.3)	162 (35.4)	30 (11.0)		192 (26.3)	149 (40.3)	43 (11.9)			

Source: Author's calculation

In a group of employees with low turnover intentions within one year, 69.2% are full-time employees, compared to 30.8% who are part-time employees. Similar proportions are observed with respect to turnover intentions over three years, with 71.6% being full-time and 28.4% part-time employees. Furthermore, the majority of employees with high turnover intentions are under full-time contracts, accounting for 54.5% of those intending to leave within one year and 55.4% within three years. Regarding group differences between turnover intentions and management level, findings suggest that these intentions are generally less pronounced among managers, particularly in top management, for both low and high turnover intentions, regardless of the time period. There is also statistically significant difference in turnover intentions and affective commitment – joy (in 1 year: $\chi^2 = 80.920$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.000$; and 3 years: $\chi^2 = 90.460$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.000$). Among employees with high turnover intentions, 72.2% demonstrate low affective commitment over a 1-year period and 68.4% over a 3-year period. In contrast, those with low turnover intentions tend to show higher affective commitment, 62.2% for the 1-year period and 66.8% for the 3-year period falling into this category. Statistically significant differences were also found between turnover intentions and the following variables: affective commitment – attachment (in 1 year: $\chi^2 = 50.468$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.000$; and 3 years: $\chi^2 = 49.194$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.000$), continuance commitment (in 1 year: $\chi^2 = 21.886$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.000$; and 3 years: $\chi^2 = 43.597$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.000$), normative commitment (in 1 year: $\chi^2 = 40.791$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.000$; and 3 years: $\chi^2 = 59.212$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.000$) and job involvement (in 1 year: $\chi^2 = 52.505$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.000$; and 3 years: $\chi^2 = 75.878$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.000$). In a group of employees with low turnover intentions for both periods of time, most of them reported lower levels of affective commitment – attachment, continuance commitment, normative commitment, and job involvement. However, among employees with higher turnover intentions, a larger proportion also reported low levels of these three components of commitment and job involvement. Finally, no statistically significant association was found between turnover intentions, both in the next 1 year and in 3 years, and the variables of gender and level of education based on the chi-square test.

In order to test the hypothesis, we applied logistic regression. The results are shown in Table 6. Negative relationships were found between absenteeism and: affective commitment – joy (OR = 0.623, 95%CI = 0.457-0.848, $p = 0.003$) and normative commitment (OR = 0.527, 95%CI = 0.355-0.785, $p = 0.002$). Significant relation between affective commitment – attachment and absenteeism were not found. Employees with high affective commitment (joy) are 1.6 times less likely to be absent from work than those with low affective commitment (joy). These findings partially confirm *H1a*. Individuals with high normative commitment are 1.9 times less likely to be absent from work compared to employees with low normative commitment, confirming *H1c*. No statistical significance was found between absenteeism and continuance commitment, which contradicts *H1b*. Following these

findings, hypothesis *H1* is partially confirmed. *H3* is being rejected because no relationship was found between absenteeism and job involvement. Allen and Meyer (2000) also found affective commitment to be negatively related to absenteeism, but no relation with absenteeism was found between continuance and normative commitment. Direct effects of job involvement on absenteeism were also not supported in some other previous studies (Brooke and Price, 1989).

Table 6: Results of logistic regression

Variable	Absenteeism frequency		Turnover intention (in 1 year)		Turnover intention (in 3 years)		Job involvement	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Affective commitment – joy	0.623***	0.457-0.848	0.234***	0.169-0.324	0.230***	0.169-0.313	9.688***	6.290-14.921
Affective commitment – attachment	0.918***	0.661-1.274	0.276***	0.191-0.398	0.317***	0.228-0.440	2.300***	6.290-14.921
Continuance commitment	1.043	0.726-1.500	0.391***	0.262-0.585	0.289***	0.198-0.423	4.887***	3.375-7.075
Normative commitment	0.527***	0.355-0.785	0.252***	0.161-0.393	0.225***	0.151-0.335	9.517***	6.447-14.049
Job involvement	0.913	0.643-1.296	0.226***	0.147-0.345	0.201***	0.137-0.293		

Note: *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$

Source: Author's calculation

In regard to turnover intentions in 1 year, negative relationships were found in regards to all dependent variables: affective commitment – joy (OR = 0.234, 95%CI = 0.169-0.324, $p < 0.000$), affective commitment – attachment (OR = 0.276, 95%CI = 0.191-0.398, $p < 0.000$), continuance commitment (OR = 0.391, 95%CI = 0.262-0.585, $p < 0.000$), normative commitment (OR = 0.252, 95%CI = 0.161-0.393, $p < 0.000$) and job involvement (OR = 0.226, 95%CI = 0.147-0.345, $p < 0.000$). Also, turnover intentions in 3 years are significantly negatively affected by: affective commitment – joy (OR = 0.230, 95%CI = 0.169-0.313, $p < 0.000$), affective commitment – attachment (OR = 0.317, 95%CI = 0.228-0.440, $p < 0.000$), continuance commitment (OR = 0.289, 95%CI = 0.198-0.423, $p < 0.000$), normative commitment (OR = 0.225, 95%CI = 0.151-0.335, $p < 0.000$) and job involvement (OR = 0.201, 95%CI = 0.137-0.293, $p < 0.000$). The highest impact has job involvement, followed by normative, affective commitment – joy, continuance commitment and affective commitment – attachment. These findings support the hypothesis *H2* and *H4*, as well as the sub-hypothesis *H2a*, *H2b* and *H2c*. It is more likely that hotel employees with higher organizational commitment

and job involvement will have lower intentions to leave regardless of the period of time, compared to employees with lower levels of organizational commitment and job involvement.

Similar findings regarding the relation between organizational commitment and withdrawal behaviors were found by Somers (1995), indicating that affective commitment emerged as the most consistent predictor of absenteeism and turnover; normative commitment was related only to withdrawal intentions and no direct effects for continuance commitment and absenteeism or turnover intentions were observed. Also, Tsaousoglou et al. (2022) found organizational commitment to be predictor of turnover intentional behavior among lodging industry employees.

All three dimensions of organizational commitment had a significantly positive effect on job involvement: the highest impact had affective commitment – joy (OR = 9.688, 95%CI = 6.290-14.921, $p < 0.000$), followed by normative commitment (OR = 9.517, 95%CI = 6.447-14.049, $p < 0.000$), continuance commitment (OR = 4.887, 95%CI = 3.375-7.075, $p < 0.000$) and affective commitment – attachment (OR = 2.300, 95%CI = 1.641-3.240, $p < 0.000$). These findings are confirming *H5*. The higher the employees' commitment is, the higher is their job involvement. This validation is also analogous to past findings on the effect of job involvement on organizational commitment (Ćulibrk et al., 2018).

5. Conclusions

The aim of this study was to enhance understanding of the relationship between job attitudes and withdrawal behaviors, specifically absenteeism and turnover intentions. Empirical research has shown that employees with higher organizational commitment and greater job involvement tend to have lower rates of absenteeism and fewer turnover intentions. Furthermore, employees who demonstrate high levels of organizational commitment are also highly engaged in their jobs.

This paper has several theoretical, empirical, and practical contributions. First, while organizational commitment, job involvement, absenteeism, and turnover intentions have been extensively researched separately, both theoretically and empirically, international literature and Croatian scientific and professional practice feature only a limited number of studies addressing the relation between these attitudes and withdrawal behaviors and our paper is fulfilling this gap. Second, this represents the first known study to examine withdrawal behaviors in the Croatian hotel industry, a sector of crucial importance for the whole economy. Third, the insights gained from this study have broader implications beyond the hotel industry and can be applied to various sectors. Understanding how absenteeism and turnover intentions are influenced by job attitudes is crucial for improving organizational outcomes across different industries. Finally, theoretical and empirical insights

into how absenteeism can be influenced by managing employees' work attitudes are not sufficiently applied in practice, leading to the neglect of a significant and potent factor for managing organizational outcomes and success. These practices can include involving employees in decision-making, offering work-life balance programs, and improving working conditions, which can be particularly hard and challenging in the tourism sector. Since the highest rates of absenteeism and turnover intentions were found among younger employees and the ones who worked in a hotel for a shorter period of time, these groups require special focus. The new generation of workers, particularly Generation Z, exhibits unique characteristics and mindsets, showing less inclination to stay in a single job for their entire careers compared to previous generations (X and Y). Organizations across different sectors should therefore pay more attention to these employees, offering them different compensation and benefits, and involve them more extensively in management processes than in the past. Such measures are essential for improving job attitudes and, consequently, reducing withdrawal behaviors. Moreover, these strategies should be considered by policymakers to develop guidelines and policies that support employee retention and engagement on a broader scale. These strategies should be implemented at every management level within the hotel industry and beyond.

Our study has several limitations, and the first one is the use of self-reported absence data. Employees may underreport or over-report their absenteeism due to fear of consequences. Future studies might use the company-registered sickness absenteeism data. Further, this study may face limitations related to how absenteeism is defined and measured. We used sickness absence and measured it with frequency. Future studies may also use other forms of absenteeism. Additionally, our study included two job attitudes and two withdrawal behaviors. Future research could investigate other (and more) job attitudes to expand the findings of our research. Finally, future research should aim to estimate the costs of absenteeism in Croatia, which would provide a more comprehensive understanding of its economic impacts, both for the organizations and the whole country and to further emphasize the importance of effective management of withdrawal behaviors.

References

- Adebayo, S. O., Nwabuoku, U. C. (2008) "Conscientiousness and Perceived Organizational Support as Predictors of Employee Absenteeism", *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences* [Internet], Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 363–367. Available at: <adebayo_and_nwabuoku_1-libre.pdf> (d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net)> [Accessed: May 2, 2024]
- Ahmad, A. (2018) "The Relationship Among Job Characteristics Organizational Commitment and Employee Turnover Intentions: A reciprocation perspective",

- Journal of Work-Applied Management*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 74–92, <https://doi.org/10.1108/JWAM-09-2017-0027>.
- Allen, N. J., Meyer, J. P. (1990) “The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization”, *Journal of occupational psychology*, Vol. 63, No. 1, pp. 1–18, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x>.
- Allen, N. J., Meyer, J. P., (2000) “Construct Validation in Organizational Behavior Research: The Case of Organizational Commitment”. In Goffin, R. D., Helmes, E., ed., *Problems and solutions in human assessment*, Boston, MA: Springer US, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-4397-8_13.
- Barmby, T., Nolan, M., Winkelmann, R. (2001) “Contracted Workdays and Absence”, *The Manchester School*, Vol. 69, No. 3, pp. 269–275, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9957.00247>.
- Beecroft, P. C., Dorey, F., Wenten, M. (2008) “Turnover Intention in New Graduate Nurses: A Multivariate Analysis”, *Journal of advanced nursing*, Vol. 62, pp. 41–52, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04570.x>.
- Bergami, M., Bagozzi, R. P. (2000) “Self-categorization, Affective Commitment and Group Self-Esteem as Distinct Aspects of Social Identity in the Organization”, *British journal of social psychology*, Vol. 39, No. 4, pp. 555–577, <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466600164633>.
- Blau, G. J., Boal, K. B. (1987) “Conceptualizing How Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment Affect Turnover and Absenteeism”, *Academy of management review*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 288–300, <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1987.4307844>.
- Brborovic, H., Brborovic, O., Mustajbegovic, J. (2016) “Looking for the Possible Association Between Stress, Presenteeism and Absenteeism Among Croatian Nurses: A Cross-Sectional Study”, *Iranian journal of psychiatry and behavioral sciences*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 4587–4594, <https://doi.org/10.17795/ijpbs-4587>.
- Brooke Jr, P. P., Price, J. L. (1989) “The determinants of employee absenteeism: An empirical test of a causal model”, *Journal of occupational psychology*, Vol. 62, No. 1, pp. 1–19, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1989.tb00473.x>.
- Brown, S. P. (1996) “A Meta-analysis and Review of Organizational Research on Job Involvement”, *Psychological bulletin*, Vol. 120, No. 2, pp. 235–255, <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.120.2.235>.
- Chadwick-Jones, J. K. et al. (1971) “Absence Measures: Their Reusability and Stability in an Industrial Setting”, *Personnel psychology*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 463–470. Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Nigel-Nicholson-2/publication/229714019_Absence_Measures_Their_Reliability_and_Stability_in_an_Industrial_Setting/links/643fe8c71b8d044c6335ad73/Absence-Measures-Their-Reliability-and-Stability-in-an-Industrial-Setting.pdf> [Accessed: October 13, 2023]

- Chanana, N. (2021) “The Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on Employees Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction in Reference to Gender Differences”, *Journal of Public Affairs*, Vol. 21, No. 4, <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2695>.
- Cheloha, R. S., Farr, J. L. (1980) “Absenteeism, Job Involvement, and Job Satisfaction in an Organizational Setting”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 65, No. 4, pp. 467–473, <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.65.4.467>.
- Croatian Bureau of Statistics (2024) *Aktivno stanovništvo u Republici Hrvatskoj u 2023. – prosjek godine* [Active population in the Republic of Croatia in 2023 – annual average] [Internet]. Available at: <<https://podaci.dzs.hr/media/g3eh2t5r/rad-2024-3-2-aktivno-stanovni%C5%A1tvo-u-republici-hrvatskoj-u-2023-prosje-godine.pdf>> [Accessed: May 2, 2024]
- Croatian National Bank (2024) *Release of statistical data on the balance of payments, gross external debt position and international investment position for the fourth quarter of 2023* [Internet]. Available at: <<https://www.hnb.hr/en/-/objava-statistickih-podataka-o-platnoj-bilanci-stanju-bruto-inozemnog-duga-istanju-me-unarodnih-ulaganja-za-cetvrto-tromjesecje-2023->>> [Accessed: May 2, 2024]
- Ćulibrk, J. et al. (2018) “Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement: The Mediating Role of Job Involvement”, *Frontiers in psychology*, Vol. 9, pp. 328–333, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00132>.
- Čikeš, V., Maškarin Ribarić, H., Črnjar, K. (2018) “The Determinants and Outcomes of Absence Behavior: A Systematic Literature Review”, *Social Sciences*, Vol. 7, No. 8, p. 120, <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci7080120>.
- Davey, M. M. et al. (2009) “Predictors of Nurse Absenteeism in Hospitals: A Systematic Review”, *Journal of nursing management*, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 312–330, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2834.2008.00958.x>.
- Dawley, D., Houghton, J. D., Bucklew, N. S. (2010) “Perceived Organizational Support and Turnover Intention: The Mediating Effects of Personal Sacrifice and Job Fit”, *The Journal of social psychology*, Vol. 150, No. 3, pp. 238–257, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224540903365463>.
- Faul, F. et al. (2009) “Statistical Power Analyses Using G* Power 3.1: Tests for Correlation and Regression Analyses”, *Behavior research methods*, Vol. 41, No. 4, pp. 1149–1160, <https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149>.
- George, D., Mallery, P. (2003) *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference, 11.0 update*, 4th edition, Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hassard, J. et al. (2014) *Calculating the cost of work-related stress and psychosocial risks*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, Available at: <<https://osha.europa.eu/sites/default/files/cost-of-work-related-stress.pdf>> [Accessed: May 5, 2024]
- Ho, C.-C. et al. (2012) “Work Values, Job Involvement, and Organizational Commitment in Taiwanese Nurses”, *International Journal of Psychology and*

- Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 64–70, <https://doi.org/10.5923/j.ijpbs.20120203.02>.
- Johns, G. (2001) “The Psychology of Lateness, Absenteeism, and Turnover”. In Anderson, N. et al., ed., *Handbook of industrial, work, and organizational psychology*, London: Sage Publications Ltd, <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781848608368.n13>.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974) “An Index of Factorial Simplicity”, *Psychometrika*, Vol. 39, pp. 31–36, <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02291575>.
- Kim, S. S., Im, J., Hwang, J. (2015) “The Effects of Mentoring on Role Stress, Job Attitude, and Turnover Intention in the Hotel Industry”, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 48, pp. 68–82, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2015.04.006>.
- Kim, S., Min Park, S. (2014) “Determinants of Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions of Public Employees: Evidence from US Federal Agencies”, *International Review of Public Administration*, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 63–90, <https://doi.org/10.1080/12294659.2014.887354>.
- Kolz, A. R. (1999) “Personality Predictors of Retail Employee Theft and Counterproductive Behavior”, *Journal of Professional Services Marketing*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 107–114, https://doi.org/10.1300/J090v19n02_06.
- Labrague, L. J., Nwafor, C. E., Tsaras, K. (2020) “Influence of Toxic and Transformational Leadership Practices on Nurses’ Job Satisfaction, Job Stress, Absenteeism and Turnover Intention: A Cross-sectional Study”, *Journal of Nursing Management*, Vol. 28, No. 5, pp. 1104–1113, <https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.13053>.
- Li, Y., Sawhney, R., Tortorella, G. L. (2019) “Empirical Analysis of Factors Impacting Turnover Intention among Manufacturing Workers”, *International Journal of Business and Management*, Vol. 14, No. 4, pp. 1–18, <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v14n4p1>.
- Luchak, A. A., Gellatly, I. R. (2007) “A Comparison of Linear and Nonlinear Relations Between Organizational Commitment and Work Outcomes”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 92, No. 3, pp. 786–793, <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.786>.
- Madden, L., Mathias, B. D., Madden, T. M. (2015) “In good company: The impact of perceived organizational support and positive relationships at work on turnover intentions”, *Management Research Review*, Vol. 38, No. 3, pp. 242–263, <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-09-2013-0228>.
- Maslić Seršić, D. (2000) “Što je odanost i kako je možemo mjeriti? [What is loyalty and how can we measure it?]”, *Suvremena psihologija* [Hard copy], Vol. 3, No. 1-2, pp. 99–111. Available at: <<https://hrcak.srce.hr/3199>> [Accessed: October 3, 2002]

- Mastekaasa, A. (2020) “Absenteeism in the Public and the Private Sector: Does the Public Sector Attract High Absence Employees??”, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 60–76, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muz003>.
- Mathieu, J. E., Zajac, D. M. (1990) “A Review and Meta-analysis of the Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences of Organizational Commitment”, *Psychological bulletin*, Vol. 108, No. 2, pp. 171–194, <https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-2909.108.2.171>.
- Maynard, D. C., Joseph, T. A., Maynard, A. M. (2006) “Underemployment, Job Attitudes, and Turnover Intentions”, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 27, pp. 509–536, <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.389>.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., Smith, C. A. (1993) “Commitment to Organizations and Occupations: Extension and Test of a Three-component Conceptualization”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 78, No. 4, pp. 538–551, <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.78.4.538>.
- Meyer, J. P. et al. (2002) “Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to the Organization: A Meta-analysis of Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences”, *Journal of vocational behavior*, Vol. 61, No. 1, pp. 20–52, <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842>.
- Mohsin, A., Brochado, A., Rodrigues, H. (2022) “Mind the Gap: A Critical Reflection on Hotel Employee Turnover”, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 35, No. 7, pp. 2481–2495, <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-03-2022-0295>.
- Mukwevho, H., Nesamvuni, A. E., Roberson, J. R. (2020) “Factors Impacting Employee Absenteeism and the Managers’ Perception of its Causes in the Hotel Industry”, *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, Vol. 9, No. 5, pp. 1161–1177, <https://doi.org/10.46222/ajht.1.19770720-75>.
- Nowak, J. et al. (2023) “Presenteeism and Absenteeism in the Manufacturing Sector: A Multilevel Approach Identifying Underlying Factors and Relations to Health”, *Current Psychology*, Vol. 42, pp. 18641–18659, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03013-1>.
- Qiu, H. et al. (2015) “Exploring Antecedents of Employee Turnover Intention – Evidence of China’s Hotel Industry”, *Journal of China Tourism Research*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 53–66, <https://doi.org/10.1080/19388160.2014.908756>.
- Perryer, C. et al. (2010) “Predicting Turnover Intentions: The Interactive Effects of Organizational Commitment and Perceived Organizational Support”, *Management Research Review*, Vol. 33, No. 9, pp. 911–923, <https://doi.org/10.1108/01409171011070323>.
- Pizam, A., Thornburg, S. W. (2000) “Absenteeism and Voluntary Turnover in Central Florida Hotels: A Pilot Study”, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 211–217, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0278-4319\(00\)00011-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0278-4319(00)00011-6).

- Punnett, B. J., Greenidge, D., Ramsey, J. (2007) “Job Attitudes and Absenteeism: A Study in the English Speaking Caribbean”, *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 214–227, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2007.02.006>.
- Republic of Croatia, Ministry of Tourism and Sport (2019) *Popis kategoriziranih turističkih objekata u Republici Hrvatskoj (7. 3. 2019.)* [List of categorised tourist facilities in the Republic of Croatia (7. 3. 2019)] [Data-Internet], Available at: <https://mint.gov.hr/UserDocsImages/AA_2018_c-dokumenti/190307_kategorizirani.xlsx>.
- Ridwan, M., Mulyani, S. R., Ali, H. (2020) “Improving Employee Performance Through Perceived Organizational Support, Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior”, *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy* [Internet], Vol. 11, No. 12, pp. 839–849. Available at: <<http://repository.upiypkt.ac.id/3808/1/7.%20improving-employee-performance-through-perceived-organizational-support-organizational-commitment-and-organizational-cit.pdf>> [Accessed: May 2, 2024]
- Samad, S. (2006) “The Contribution of Demographic Variables: Job Characteristics and Job Satisfaction on Turnover Intentions”, *Journal of International Management Studies* [Internet], Vol. 1, No 1, pp. 1–12. Available at: <<https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=986ca17bbaac8b3916382d1d291051447846d117>>.
- Saxena, S., Saxena, R. (2015) “Impact of Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment on Organizational Citizenship Behavior”, *International Journal of Management and Business Research* [Internet], Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 19–30. Available at: <https://www.sid.ir/en/VEWSSID/J_pdf/1022220150103.pdf> [Accessed: May 3, 2024]
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., Van Rhenen, W. (2009) “How Changes in Job Demands and Resources Predict Burnout, Work Engagement, and Sickness Absenteeism”, *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, Vol. 30, pp. 893–917, <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.ob.595>.
- Scoppa, V. (2010) “Worker Absenteeism and Incentives: Evidence from Italy”, *Managerial and Decision Economics*, Vol. 31, No. 8, pp. 503–515, <https://doi.org/10.1002/mde.1504>.
- Seyrek, I. H., Turan, A. (2017) “Effects of Individual Characteristics and Work Related Factors on the Turnover Intention of Accounting Professionals”, *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance and Management Sciences*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 236–244, <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARAFMS/v7-i1/2648>.
- Shahnawaz, M. G., Jafri, M. H. (2009) “Job attitudes as predictor of employee turnover among stayers and leavers/hoppers”, *Journal of Management Research* [Internet], Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 159–166. Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Mohammad-Shahnawaz-11/publication/211393906_Job_Atitudes_

- as Predictor of Employee Turnover among Stayers and Leavers Hoppers/links/59280ed90f7e9b9979a21aa3/Job-Attitudes-as-Predictor-of-Employee-Turnover-among-Stayers-and-Leavers-Hoppers.pdf> [Accessed: May 3, 2024]
- Smokrović, E. et al. (2022) “A Conceptual Model of Nurses’ Turnover Intention”, *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, Vol. 19, No. 13, p. 8205, <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19138205>.
- Sokal, L., Trudel, L. E., Babb, J. (2021) “I’ve had it! Factors Associated with Burnout and Low Organizational Commitment in Canadian Teachers during the Second Wave of the COVID-19 Pandemic”, *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, Vol. 2, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2020.100023>.
- Somers, M. J. (1995) “Organizational Commitment, Turnover and Absenteeism: An Examination of Direct and Interaction Effects”, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 16, pp. 49–58, <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030160107>.
- Störmer, S., Fahr, R. (2013) “Individual Determinants of Work Attendance: Evidence on the Role of Personality”, *Applied Economics*, Vol. 45, No. 19, pp. 2863–2875, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2012.684789>.
- Sudiro, A. et al. (2023) “Towards Emotional Intelligence and Quality of Work Life: Improving the Role of Work Attitude”, *Cogent Business & Management*, Vol. 10, No. 1, <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2023.2189992>.
- Tapia-Andino, G. F., Barcellos-Paula, L. (2023) “Mediating Effect of the Adoption of Industry 4.0 Technologies on the Relationship between Job Involvement and Job Performance of Millennials”, *Administrative Sciences*, Vol. 13, No. 7, p. 159, <https://doi.org/10.3390/adms13070159>.
- Tsaousoglou, K., Koutoulas, D., Stavrinoudis, T. (2022) “Personality and Commitment as Predictors of Turnover Intentions among Greek Employees in the Lodging Industry”, *European Journal of Tourism Research*, Vol. 31, <https://doi.org/10.54055/ejtr.v31i.2296>.
- van Ruyseveldt, J. et al. (2023) “Job Characteristics, Job Attitudes and Employee Withdrawal Behaviour: A Latent Change Score Approach”, *Applied Psychology*, Vol. 72, No. 4, pp. 1449–1477, <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12448>.
- Walsh, M. J. (2021) *National Compensation Survey: Employee Benefits in the United States, March 2021*, Washington: US Bureau of Labor Statistics. Available at: <<https://roar-assets-auto.rbl.ms/documents/35985/employee-benefits-in-the-united-states-march-2021.pdf>> [Accessed: May 1, 2024]
- Wegge, J. et al. (2007) “Taking a Sickie: Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement as Interactive Predictors of Absenteeism in a Public Organization”, *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, Vol. 80, No. 1, pp. 77–89, <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317906X99371>.
- Xu, G. et al. (2022) “How Transformational Leadership Motivates Employee Involvement: The Roles of Psychological Safety and Traditionality”, *Sage Open*, Vol. 12, No. 1, <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211069967>.

- Yan, Z. et al. (2021) “How to Reduce Employees’ Turnover Intention from the Psychological Perspective: A Mediated Moderation Model”, *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, Vol. 14, pp. 185–197, <https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S293839>.
- Zia, M. Q. et al. (2022) “Transformational Leadership Promoting Employees’ Informal Learning and Job Involvement: The Moderating Role of Self-efficacy”, *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 43, No. 3, pp. 333–349, <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-06-2021-0286>.

Efekti stavova prema radu na povlačenje s posla: dokazi iz hrvatskog hotelijerstva

Vedrana Čikeš¹, Kristina Črnjar², Helga Maškarin Ribarić³

Sažetak

Hotelijerstvo, kao i drugi uslužni sektori, suočava se sa značajnim izazovima u upravljanju ponašanjima povlačenja s posla, zbog njihovog značajnog utjecaja na učinak i profitabilnost. Ovaj rad istražuje odnos između dva stava prema radu – odanosti organizaciji i zaokupljenosti poslom – i dva ponašanja povlačenja – apsentizma i namjere napuštanja. U istraživanju je korišten slučajni uzorak od 734 zaposlenika hotela u Hrvatskoj. Logistička regresijska analiza korištena je za predviđanje apsentizma i namjere napuštanja. Utvrđeni su statistički značajni odnosi između afektivne i normativne odanosti i apsentizma, kao i afektivne, normativne i instrumentalne odanosti i namjere napuštanja. Međutim, nije pronađen značajan učinak između zaokupljenosti poslom i apsentizma, iako postoji jaka i negativna veza između zaokupljenosti poslom i namjere napuštanja. Dodatno, identificiran je pozitivan odnos između zaokupljenosti poslom i svih komponenti odanosti organizaciji. Ovi rezultati mogu poslužiti kao temelj za upravljanje ljudskim resursima i procese donošenja odluka u hotelijerstvu, nudeći uvid u stavove zaposlenika i mogu poslužiti kao poticaj u stvaranju strategija za upravljanje nepoželjnim ponašanjem zaposlenika.

Ključne riječi: apsentizam, namjere napuštanja, odanost organizaciji, zaokupljenost poslom, hotelijerstvo

JEL klasifikacija: J22, J63

¹ Asistentica, Sveučilište u Rijeci, Fakultet za menadžment u turizmu i ugostiteljstvu, Primorska 46, p.p. 97, 51410 Opatija. Znanstveni interes: menadžment ljudskih resursa, menadžerske vještine, menadžment znanja. Tel.: +385 51 294 195. E-mail: vedrana.cikes@fthm.hr.

² Redovita profesorica, Sveučilište u Rijeci, Fakultet za menadžment u turizmu i ugostiteljstvu, Primorska 46, p.p. 97, 51410 Opatija. Znanstveni interes: menadžment ljudskih resursa, menadžerske vještine, menadžment znanja. Tel.: +385 51 294 185. E-mail: kcrnjar@fthm.hr.

³ Redovita profesorica u trajnom izboru, Sveučilište u Rijeci, Fakultet za menadžment u turizmu i ugostiteljstvu, Primorska 46, p.p. 97, 51410 Opatija. Znanstveni interes: sustavi upravljanja poslovnim rezultatom, produktivnost rada. Tel.: +385 51 294 882. E-mail: helgam@fthm.hr.