

6th INTERNATIONAL THEMATIC MONOGRAPH

MODERN MANAGEMENT TOOLS AND ECONOMY OF TOURISM SECTOR IN PRESENT ERA



**BELGRADE
2021/22**

6th INTERNATIONAL THEMATIC MONOGRAPH

**MODERN MANAGEMENT TOOLS
AND ECONOMY OF TOURISM SECTOR
IN PRESENT ERA**

Belgrade
2021/2022

6th International Thematic Monograph

Modern Management Tools and Economy of Tourism Sector in Present Era

ISSN 2683-5673

Editors:

Vuk Bevanda, PhD, Associate Professor, Faculty of Social Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia

Snežana Štetić, PhD, Full Time Professor, College of Tourism, Belgrade, Serbia

Published by:

Association of Economists and Managers of the Balkans

in cooperation with the Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality, Ohrid, North Macedonia

Ustanicka 179/2 St. 11000 Belgrade, Serbia

office@udekom.org.rs

+381 62 8125 779

Printed by:

SKRIPTA International, Belgrade

Cover image:

Civita di Bagnoregio (Italy) by Michele Palmieri from Pixabay

Belgrade, 2021/2022

ISBN 978-86-80194-49-3

ISSN 2683-5673

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31410/tmt.2021-2022>

Disclaimer: The author(s) of each chapter appearing in this publication is/are solely responsible for the content thereof; the findings, interpretations and conclusions expressed in the chapters are those of the authors and do not reflect the view of the editors, reviewers, editorial board members, the publishers or anyone else involved in creating, producing or delivering this publication.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

CIP - Katalogizacija u publikaciji
Narodna biblioteka Srbije, Beograd
338.48(082)
005(082)
338.482(082)

MODERN Management Tools and Economy of Tourism Sector in Present Era : 6th

International Thematic Monograph / [editors Vuk Bevanda, Snežana Štetić]. - Belgrade : Association of Economists and Managers of the Balkans ; Ohrid : Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality, 2022 (Belgrade : Skripta International). - XVIII, 637 str. : graf. prikazi, tabele ; 30 cm. - (Modern Management Tools and Economy of Tourism Sector in Present Era, ISSN 2683-5673)

Na nasl. str. godina izdavanja i: 2021. - Tiraž 100. - Napomene i bibliografske reference uz tekst. - Bibliografija uz svaki rad. - Registri.

ISBN 978-86-80194-49-3 (AEMB)

a) Turizam -- Zbornici b) Menadžment -- Zbornici v) Turizam -- Društveno-ekonomski aspekt -- Zbornici

COBISS.SR-ID 71230217

Editorial Committee:

Dobrica Jovičić, PhD, Full Time Professor, Faculty of Geography, Institute of Tourismology, Belgrade, Serbia

Snežana Besermenji, PhD, Full Time Professor, Faculty of Sciences Novi Sad, Department of Geography, Tourism and Hotel Management, Serbia

Tatjana Pivac, PhD, Full Time Professor, Faculty of Sciences Novi Sad, Department of Geography, Tourism and Hotel Management, Serbia

Kristina Košić, PhD, Full Time Professor, Faculty of Sciences Novi Sad, Department of Geography, Tourism and Hotel Management, Serbia

Ivo Županović, PhD, Full Time Professor, Faculty of Business and Tourism Budva, Montenegro

Darko Lacmanović, PhD, Full Time Professor, Faculty of Tourism Bar, Mediterranean University, Podgorica, Montenegro

Zoran Todorović, PhD, Professor, Montenegro Business School, Montenegro Tourism School, Mediterranean University, Montenegro

Silvana Đurašević, PhD, Associate Professor, Dean, Faculty of Tourism Bar, Mediterranean University, Podgorica, Montenegro

Ana Tripković-Marković, PhD, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Business and Tourism, Budva, Montenegro

Ivona Jovanović, PhD, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Tourism and Hotel Management Kotor, Montenegro

Elvis Mujačević, PhD, Associate Professor, Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management Opatija, Croatia

Jasmina Gržinić, PhD, Associate Professor, Faculty of Economics and Tourism „Dr. Mijo Mirković”, Pula, Croatia

Aljoša Vitasović, PhD, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Economics and Tourism „Dr. Mijo Mirković”, Pula, Croatia

Iva Slivar, PhD, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Economics and Tourism „Dr. Mijo Mirković”, Pula, Croatia

Ana Štambuk, PhD, Full Time Professor, Faculty of Economics, University of Rijeka, Rijeka, Croatia

Elizabeta Mitreva, PhD, Associate Professor, Faculty of Tourism and Business Logistics, University Goce Delcev, Stip, North Macedonia

Tatjana Boshkov, PhD, Associate Professor, Faculty of Tourism and Business Logistics, University Goce Delcev, Stip, North Macedonia

Irina Petrovska, PhD, Associate Professor, Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality, Ohrid, North Macedonia

Tatjana Dimoska, PhD, Associate Professor, Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality, Ohrid, North Macedonia

Anton Vorina, PhD, Senior Lecturer, School of Sustainable Tourism ERUDIO, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Jasmina Osmanković, PhD, Full Time Professor, Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Sarajevo, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Hercegovina



Contents

Index of Authors	IX
Index	XI
List of Reviewers	XIII
Preface	XV
Authors' Affiliation	XVII
Fueling Novel and Sustainable Tourism Ecosystems through Resource Orchestration	1
Angela Caridà Maria Colurcio	
Short-Term and Long-Term Effects of International Tourism Development on the Economic Growth of Mediterranean Countries	21
Mirela Mitrašević Miloš Pjanić Darko Marjanović	
Is the Tourism-Led Growth Hypothesis Valid for Višegrad Group Countries?	35
Vera Mirović Branimir Kalaš Nataša Pavlović	
Analysis of Tourism Demand in Selected WB Countries during the COVID-19 Pandemic	51
Milena Lazić Aleksandra Bradić-Martinović	
Impact of Terrorism on Tourism Demand in the EU and the Mediterranean	73
Jaro Berce Darko Lacmanović Andrej Raspor	
Application of the Concept of Target Costing in Hospitality	93
Bojana Novičević Čečević Ljilja Antić Jovana Milenović	
Purchasing Power Parity under Tourism Price Indices: An Analysis for Euro Area	109
Jani Bekő Darja Boršič	
Estimating the Output Response to Tourism Spending in the Mediterranean Countries	133
Marko Seneković Jani Bekő	
Comparative Market Price Analysis of Dental Services in the Framework of Health Tourism by Applying the Due Diligence Model	155
Jova Miloradić Pavle Parnicki Diona Đurđević	
The Sustainability Management in the Cruise Tourism – An Application	171
Tiziana Crovella Annarita Paiano Miraj Ahmed Bhuiyan Giovanni Lagioia	
Tourism in Slovakia in the Times of COVID-19 Pandemic – Communication of the Municipalities with Tourists	189
Denisa Jánošová Renáta Sádecká Lenka Labudová	

Tourism Sector in the Crisis: An Evidence of Slovak Travel Agency Satur and Tourism Industry Practitioners from New York	205
Yuanxin Li Darina Saxunová	
Efficiency Evaluation in the Tourism Sector in Croatia and Serbia: Applications of Data Envelopment Analysis	221
Katerina Fotova Čiković Joško Lozić Marin Milković	
Tourism Development Perspectives of Bosnia and Herzegovina: Possibilities and Limitations	237
Jamila Jaganjac Merima Aljić Zoran Jasak	
Historical and Cultural Potentials in the Area of Durres in the Function of Its Sustainable Development	253
Manjola Xhaferri Mirela Tase	
Performance of the Slovenian Hotel Companies in Times of COVID-19	273
Mateja Jerman	
Tourism Infrastructure in the Function of Sustainable Tourism Development: The Case Study of the City of Kruševac, Republic of Serbia	289
Bogdan Lukić Branko Protić Velimir Šećerov Marija Belij Radin Vladimir Popović Dragica Gatarić Katarina Miličević	
Corporate Restructuring in the Economy of the Tourism Sector: A Case Study of Air Serbia	315
Jovana Kisin Jelena Ignjatović Jelena Vemić Đurković	
Measuring Perceived Tourism Service Quality in Quantitative Marketing Research	333
Ines Djokic Nikola Milicevic Nenad Djokic	
Linking Tourism Service Quality Measurement and Qualitative Marketing Research	347
Ines Djokic Nikola Milicevic Nenad Djokic	
Marketing Communication as a Support to Modern Tourism Business	363
Branko Mihailović Vesna Popović	
Urban Culture in Pandemic Era: Opportunities for Using Virtual Marketing Tools in Local Tourism	379
Jana Pecníková Daniela Mališová Kristýna Moškořová	

The Impact of Digital Marketing on Health Tourism in the Western Balkans during the COVID-19 Pandemic	393
Bojana Ostojić	
Miodrag Bogdanović	
Jelena Ružić	
MICE Tourism in the Pre-COVID-19 Era: Key Determinants of Academic Conference Attendees' Satisfaction	407
Vuk Bevanda	
Nevena Bevanda	
Destination Branding and Cultural Tourism – Case from Serbia	425
Ivana Domazet	
Maša Vukanović	
Film Industry in the Function of Destination Branding	441
Dejan Dašić	
Gruja Kostadinović	
Online Tools for Tourism Recovery – IT Perspectives, Legal, Economic and Management Aspects	457
Zaklina Spalevic	
Milos Ilic	
The Impact of Information Technology and Software Tools on Improvement of Business of Tourism Sector in the Sarajevo Canton	471
Mahir Zajmović	
Ibrahim Obhodaš	
Integrated Approach to Developing a Parking Model in Tourist Destinations	489
Robert Maršanić	
Edna Mrnjavac	
Drago Pupavac	
Ljudevit Krpan	
What We Can Learn from the Process of Urbanization of a Mountain Tourist Resort: The Zlatibor Case	501
Milorad Filipović	
Miroљjub Hadžić	
Miodrag Vujošević	
Interaction between Tourism and Culture for the Purpose of Urban Regeneration of the Town of Smederevo	517
Marko Milosavljević	
Milica Dobričić	
Human Resources Hospitality Employment Perspective: Cluster Scenario for Selected Tourism Industries	533
Žarko Rađenović	
Tatjana Boshkov	
Determinants of Employment in Travel and Tourism Industries in EU: A Panel Data Estimation	549
Darja Boršič	
Lea Žižek	
Social Entrepreneurial Intention Factors of Tourism Management Students	567
Sandra Milanović	
Miljana Talić	
Žarko Rađenović	
CO₂ Neutrality of Small and Medium-Sized Hotels – Publicity Stunt or Sustainable Competitive Advantage?	585
Christian Enz	
Dagmar Škodová Parmová	
Paul Wolf	

Measuring Environmental Performance in the Cruise Sector Using GRI Standards	605
Annarita Paiano	
Tiziana Crovella	
Andrea Pontrandolfo	
Teodoro Gallucci	
Illegal Migrations through the Applied Theory of Markets and Principles of the Tourism Industry	621
Suzana Herman	
Nuša Lazar	
Rasto Ovin	



Index of Authors

A

Aleksandra Bradić-Martinović, 51
Andrea Pontrandolfo, 605
Andrej Raspor, 73
Angela Caridà, 1
Annarita Paiano, 171; 605

B

Bogdan Lukić, 289
Bojana Novičević Čečević, 93
Bojana Ostojić, 393
Branimir Kalaš, 35
Branko Mihailović, 363
Branko Protić, 289

C

Christian Enz, 585

D

Dagmar Škodová Parmová, 585
Daniela Mališová, 379
Darina Saxunová, 205
Darja Boršič, 109; 549
Darko Lacmanović, 73
Darko Marjanović, 21
Dejan Dašić, 441
Denisa Jánošová, 189
Diona Đurđević, 155
Dragica Gatarić, 289
Drago Pupavac, 489

E

Edna Mrnjavac, 489

G

Giovanni Lagioia, 171
Gruja Kostadinović, 441

I

Ibrahim Obhodaš, 471
Ines Djokic, 333; 347
Ivana Domazet, 425

J

Jamila Jaganjac, 237
Jana Pecniková, 379
Jani Bekő, 109; 133
Jaro Berce, 73
Jelena Ignjatović, 315
Jelena Ružić, 393
Jelena Vemić Đurković, 315
Joško Lozić, 221
Jova Miloradić, 155
Jovana Kisin, 315
Jovana Milenović, 93

K

Katarina Miličević, 289
Katerina Fotova Čiković, 221
Kristýna Moškořová, 379

L

Lea Žižek, 549
Lenka Labudová, 189

Lj

Ljilja Antić, 93
Ljudevit Krpan, 489

M

Mahir Zajmović, 471
Manjola Xhaferri, 253
Maria Colurcio, 1
Marija Belij Radin, 289
Marin Milković, 221
Marko Milosavljević, 517
Marko Seneković, 133
Maša Vukanović, 425
Mateja Jerman, 273
Merima Aljić, 237
Milena Lazić, 51
Milica Dobričić, 517
Miljana Talić, 567
Milorad Filipović, 501
Milos Ilic, 457
Miloš Pjanić, 21
Miodrag Bogdanović, 393
Miodrag Vujošević, 501
Miraj Ahmed Bhuiyan, 171

Mirela Mitrašević, 21
Mirela Tase, 253
Miroљjub Hadžić, 501

N

Nataša Pavlović, 35
Nenad Djokic, 333; 347
Nevena Bevanda, 407
Nikola Milicevic, 333; 347
Nuša Lazar, 621

P

Paul Wolf, 585
Pavle Parnicki, 155

R

Rasto Ovin, 621
Renáta Sádecká, 189
Robert Maršanić, 489

S

Sandra Milanović, 567
Suzana Herman, 621

T

Tatjana Boshkov, 533
Teodoro Gallucci, 605
Tiziana Crovella, 171; 605

V

Velimir Šećerov, 289
Vera Mirović, 35
Vesna Popović, 363
Vladimir Popović, 289
Vuk Bevanda, 407

Y

Yuanxin Li, 205

Z

Zaklina Spalevic, 457
Žarko Rađenović, 533; 567
Zoran Jasak, 237



Index of Keywords

A

Academic conference, 407
Academic conference attendees, 407
Accommodation booking, 457
Airline industry, 315
Archaeological sites, 253

B

Brands, 425
Business, 471
Business transformation, 315

C

Capital investment in tourism activities, 549
Case Study, 379
Cities, 189
Cluster analysis, 533
Coding, 347
Comparative price analysis, 155
Competitive advantage, 585
Congress tourism, 407
Construct, 333
Consumer price indices for accommodation, 109
Consumer price indices for catering, 109
Cost price, 93
COVID-19, 51; 205; 273; 393; 457
Crisis, 273
Croatia, 221
Cruise shipping industry, 171
Cruise tourism, 605
Cultural tourism, 253; 425
Cultural tourists, 425
Culture, 379; 517

D

Danube, 517
Data Envelopment Analysis, 221
DEA, 221
Demand, 51
Dental services, 155
Destination branding, 425

Destination image, 441
Determinants, 133
Digital marketing, 393
Domestic tourism spending, 549
Due diligence, 155

E

Eco-friendly behavior, 171
Economic activity, 133
Economic aspects, 441
Economic growth, 35
Economy, 315; 457
Emerging of markets, 621
Employment, 533
EU, 73

F

Film-induced tourism, 441
Fixed effects models, 549
Flexible measurements against crisis, 205
Foreign tourism spending, 549

G

GDP per capita growth, 21
GRI, 605

H

Health tourism, 155; 393
Heritage, 425
Historical tourism, 253
Hospitality, 93
Hospitality sector, 1
Hotel industry, 273; 585
Hotels, 489
Humane orientation, 567
Human resources, 533

I

Institutional framework, 237
International tourism receipts, 21
IT, 471
Italian Village Project, 1
IT services, 457

J

Jastrebac, 289

L

Logistics chains, 489

M

Marketing, 379
Marketing communication, 189; 363
Market regulation, 621
Mediterranean, 73
MICE, 407
Municipalities, 189
Museums, 425

N

National branding, 425
New York, 205

P

Pandemic, 189
Panel autoregressive distributed lag model, 21
Panel data estimation, 35
Panel unit root tests, 109
Parking, 489
Performance, 273
Performance measurement, 273
Pooled mean group estimator, 21
Prior experience, 567
Promotion, 237

R

Random effects model, 549
Regression, 533
Relationship marketing, 363
Resource Integration, 1
Resource orchestration, 1
Revenue decline, 205
Ribarska Banja, 289
RQDA, 347

S

Sarajevo Canton, 471
Satisfaction, 407
Satur, 205
Serbia, 221; 289; 517
Service Ecosystem Emergence,
1
Service sector, 93
SERVQUAL, 333; 347
Similarity of business models
approach, 621
Slovakia, 189; 205
SmartPLS, 333
SME, 585
Smederevo, 517
Social entrepreneurial intention,
567
Software, 471
Spatial development, 501
Statement of financial position -
balance sheet, 155
Strategic partnership, 315
Structural Equation Modelling,
333
Sustainability, 171; 585; 605
Sustainable development, 253;
501
Sustainable tourism, 289

T

Target cost, 93
Terrorism, 73
The City of Kruševac, 289
Tourism, 35; 51; 73; 189; 273;
315; 363; 471; 501; 517
Tourism business, 205; 363
Tourism drivers, 237
Tourism efficiency, 221
Tourism industry, 1; 533
Tourism infrastructure, 289
Tourism management student,
567
Tourism market, 363
Tourism recovery, 205
Tourism sector, 109
Tourism Spending Multiplier,
133
Tourist destination, 73; 441; 489

Tourist markets, 425
Tourists, 489
Tourists' Reviews, 347

U

Urbanism, 501
Urban Landscape, 379
Urban regeneration, 517

V

Value creation, 1
Vector Autoregression Model,
133
Virtual Tools, 379
Višegrad group, 35

W

WB Countries, 51
Western Balkan, 393



List of Reviewers

1. Adrian Zoicaș-Ienciu, PhD, Babeș-Bolyai University, Str. M. Kogalniceanu nr. 1, Cluj-Napoca, Romania
2. Adriana Radosavac, PhD, Faculty of Applied Management, Economics and Finance (MEF), Jevrejska Street no. 24/1, Belgrade, Serbia
3. Aleksandra Bradić-Martinović, PhD, Institute of Economic Sciences, Zmaj Jovina 12, Belgrade, Serbia
4. Aleksandra Marcikić Horvat, PhD, Faculty of Economics in Subotica, University of Novi Sad, Segedinski put 9-11, Subotica, Serbia
5. Andrej Raspor, PhD, CEATM d.o.o. (Central Europe Association of Tourism Management), Dolga Poljana 57, Vipava, Slovenia
6. Angela Caridà, PhD, University Magna Graecia of Catanzaro – Department of Law Economics and Social Science - Campus Salvatore Venuta – Catanzaro, Italy
7. Annarita Paiano, PhD, University of Bari Aldo Moro, Department of Economics, Management and Business Law, Largo Abbazia Santa Scolastica 53, Bari, Italy
8. Anton Vorina, PhD, ERUDIO School of Sustainable Tourism, Ljubljana, Slovenia
9. Arbana Sahiti, PhD, Economic Faculty, Department of Bank Finance and Accounting, University of Prishtina “Hasan Prishtina”
10. Barbara Galbusera, PhD, ASST Lecco, via Lombardia 74, La Valletta Brianza, Lecco, Italy
11. Bogdan Lukić, PhD, Faculty of Geography, Department of Spatial Planning, University of Belgrade, Studentski trg 3/III, Belgrade, Serbia
12. Bojana Ostojić, PhD, Project Management College, Educons University, Belgrade, Serbia
13. Branimir Kalaš, PhD, Faculty of Economics in Subotica, University of Novi Sad, Segedinski put 9-11, Subotica, Serbia
14. Branko Mihailović, PhD, Institute of Agricultural Economics, Volgina Street no. 15, Belgrade, Serbia
15. Daniel Tomić, PhD, Faculty of Economics and Tourism “Dr. Mijo Mirković”, Juraj Dobrila University of Pula, Croatia
16. Darja Boršič, PhD, Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Maribor, Razlagova 14, Maribor, Slovenia
17. Darko Lacmanović, PhD, Montenegro Tourism School, Podgorica, Josipa Broza Tita bb, Podgorica, Montenegro
18. Darko Marjanović, PhD, Institute of Economic Sciences, Zmaj Jovina 12, Belgrade, Serbia
19. Dejan Dašić, PhD, Faculty of Finance, Banking and Auditing, Alfa University, Palmira Toljatija 3, Belgrade, Serbia
20. Diona Đurđević, PhD, Faculty of Business Economics, University Educons, Vojvode Putnika 85-87, Sremska Kamenica, Serbia
21. Dobrila Lukić, PhD, Eight Belgrade Grammar School, Grcica Milenka 71, Belgrade, Serbia
22. Donatella Privitera, PhD, University of Catania, via Biblioteca 4, Catania, Italy
23. Gordana Gavric, PhD, Faculty of Business Economics and Entrepreneurship, Mitropolita Petra 8, Belgrade, Serbia
24. Hanifi Murat Mutlu, PhD, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of International Trade and Logistics, Gaziantep University, Turkey
25. Ivana Domazet, PhD, Institute of Economic Sciences, Zmaj Jovina 12, Belgrade, Serbia
26. Jamila Jaganjac, PhD, University Vitez, Školska 23, Travnik, Bosnia and Herzegovina
27. Jana Pecnikova, PhD, Faculty of Arts, Matej Bel University, Tajovského 40, Banská Bystrica, Slovakia
28. Jani Bekő, PhD, Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Maribor, Razlagova 14, Maribor, Slovenia
29. Jasmina Gržinić, PhD, Faculty of Economics and Tourism “Dr. Mijo Mirković”, Pula, Croatia
30. Jelena Ignjatovic, PhD, Academy of Vocational Studies, Department of Agricultural Business Studies and Tourism, 15000 Sabac, Serbia
31. Jelena Vemić Đurković, PhD, University Educons, Vojvode Putnika bb, Sremska Kamenica, Serbia
32. Joško Lozić, PhD, University North, Trg dr. Žarka Dolinara 1, Koprivnica, Croatia
33. Jova Miloradić, PhD, Faculty of Business Economics, University Educons, Vojvode Putnika 85-87, Sremska Kamenica, Serbia
34. Katerina Fotova Čiković, PhD, University North, Trg dr. Žarka Dolinara 1, Koprivnica, Croatia
35. Koviljka Banjević, PhD, Academy of Applied Technical Studies Belgrade, Department of Belgrade Polytechnic, Katarine Ambrozić 3, Belgrade, Serbia
36. Ljiljana Kontić, PhD, Faculty of Business and Law, University MB, Belgrade, Serbia
37. Mahir Zajmović, PhD, University „VITEZ“, Školska 23, Travnik, Bosnia and Herzegovina
38. Manjola Xhaferri, PhD, Political Science and Law Faculty, Department Political Science, “Aleksander Moisiu” University, Durrës, Albania

39. Marcin Pełka, PhD, Wrocław University of Economics and Business, Komandorska 118/120, Wrocław, Poland
40. Marina Guzovski, PhD, Libertas International University, Trg J. F. Kennedy 6b, Zagreb, Croatia
41. Mateja Jerman, PhD, Faculty of Management, University of Primorska, Izolska vrata 2, Koper, Slovenia
42. Merima Aljić, PhD, Tourist Board of Tuzla Canton, Muftije efendije Kurta 1, Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina
43. Mert Topcu, PhD, Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat University, Alanya, Antalya, Turkey
44. Milena Lazić, PhD, Institute of Economic Sciences, Zmaj Jovina 12, Belgrade, Serbia
45. Milica Dobričić, PhD, Ministry of Construction, Transport and Infrastructure, Belgrade, Serbia
46. Milos Ilic, PhD, Academy of Professional studies South Serbia, Department of Agricultural and Food Studies Prokuplje, Ćirila i Metodija 1, Prokuplje, Serbia
47. Miloš Pjanić, PhD, Faculty of Economics in Subotica, University of Novi Sad, Segedinski put 9-11, Subotica, Serbia
48. Miraj Ahmed Bhuiyan, PhD, School of Economics, Guangdong University of Finance and Economics, Guangzhou, China
49. Mirela Tase, PhD, Business Faculty, Department of Tourism, “Aleksander Moisiu” University, Durrës, Albania
50. Mirjana Nedović, PhD, Lavoslav Ružička Polytechnic in Vukovar, Županijska 50, Vukovar, Croatia
51. Miroljub Hadzic, PhD, Faculty of Business, Singidunum University, Danijelova 29, Belgrade, Serbia
52. Miroslava Petrevska, PhD, College of Tourism Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia
53. Nenad Djokic, PhD, Faculty of Economics in Subotica, University of Novi Sad, 9-11 Segedinski put, Subotica, Serbia
54. Nikola Milicevic, PhD, Faculty of Economics in Subotica, University of Novi Sad, 9-11 Segedinski put, Subotica, Serbia
55. Olgica Glavaški, PhD, Faculty of Economics in Subotica, University of Novi Sad, Segedinski put 9-11, Subotica, Serbia
56. Olja Arsenijević, PhD, Institute for Serbian Culture Pristina-Leposavic, 24. novembra bb, Leposavić, Serbia
57. Pavle Jakovac, PhD, Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Rijeka, Ivana Filipovića 4, Rijeka, Croatia
58. Pavle Parnicki, PhD, Faculty of Business Economics, University Educons, Vojvode Putnika 85-87, Sremska Kamenica, Serbia
59. Pavle Radanov, PhD, Faculty of Applied Management, Economy and Finance, Jevrejska 24/1, Belgrade, Serbia
60. Renáta Pakšiová, PhD, University of Economics in Bratislava, Dolnozemska cesta 1, Bratislava, Slovakia
61. Renáta Sádecká, PhD, Faculty of Mass Media Communication, University of Ss. Cyril and Methodius, Nám. J. Herdu 2, Trnava, Slovakia
62. Robert Maršanić, PhD, Road Administration Primorje-Gorski Kotar Country & University North Koprivnica, Croatia
63. Romeo Mano, PhD, University “Eqrem Çabej”, Rr. Studenti 30, Gjirokastër, Albania
64. Rui Dias, PhD, Polytechnic Institute of Setúbal, School of Business Administration, Setúbal, Portugal
65. Sanja Raspor Janković, PhD, Polytechnic of Rijeka, Trpimirova 2/V, Rijeka, Croatia
66. Sergey Volkov, PhD, Faculty of “Economics and Management”, Volgograd State Technical University, Russia
67. Sevdie Alshiqi, PhD, Economic Faculty, Department Management and Informatics, University of Prishtina “Hasan Prishtina”
68. Snežana Štetić, PhD, College of Tourism Belgrade, Bulevar Zorana Djindjića 152a, Belgrade, Serbia
69. Suzana Demyen, PhD, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Department of Business Administration of Reșița, University Babeș-Bolyai of Cluj – Napoca, Romania
70. Tatjana Dimoska, PhD, Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality – Ohrid, North Macedonia
71. Tatjana Pivac, PhD, Faculty of Sciences, Department of Geography, Tourism and Hotel Management, University of Novi Sad, Trg Dositeja Obradovića 3, Novi Sad, Serbia
72. Tea Golja, PhD, Juraj Dobrila University of Pula, Zagrebačka 30, Pula, Croatia
73. Tiziana Crovella, PhD, University of Bari Aldo Moro, Department of Economics, Management and Business Law, Largo Abbazia Santa Scolastica, 53, Bari, Italy
74. Umut Denizli, PhD, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Gümüşhane University, Turkey
75. Vera Mirović, PhD, Faculty of Economics in Subotica, University of Novi Sad, Segedinski put 9-11, Subotica, Serbia
76. Vesna Jablanovic, PhD, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Belgrade, Nemanjina 6, Belgrade, Serbia
77. Vesna Popović, PhD, Institute of Agricultural Economics, Volgina Street no. 15, Belgrade, Serbia
78. Vlasta Roška, PhD, Libertas International University, Trg J. F. Kennedy 6b, Zagreb, Croatia
79. Žarko Radenović, PhD, Innovation Center, University of Niš, Univerziteti trg 2, Niš, Serbia



Preface

International Thematic Monograph: *Modern Management Tools and Economy of Tourism Sector in Present Era – 2021/2022* is the sixth annual publication of this kind published by the Association of Economists and Managers of the Balkans in cooperation with the Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality, Ohrid, North Macedonia.

Presented thematic monograph characterizes the following facts:

- **23 members of its Editorial Board come from 6 different countries** of the Balkans region: 6 from Serbia, 6 from Montenegro, 5 from Croatia, 4 from North Macedonia, one from Slovenia, and one from Bosnia and Herzegovina;
- Out of more than **60 chapters** that have been submitted for publication, it has **37 double-blind peer-reviewed chapters** accepted and published in English on more than **650 pages**;
- All chapters have been scanned with Crosscheck (powered by Turnitin) and have ORCID iD integration;
- It gathered **93 authors** from **12 different countries**: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Italy, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Slovenia who come from different faculties, universities, colleges, scientific institutes, enterprises, ministries and associations – listed at the next page;
- **43% of all listed authors originate from abroad**;
- In a review process of a thematic monograph their contribution gave **79 highly esteemed reviewers all with PhDs**;
- Among listed **peer reviewers 50,63% of them are international by country of origin**;
- The average **grade of all published chapters** obtained according to all reviews is **74,68** out of 100.

Best Chapter Award Candidates of the 6th International Thematic Monograph: *Modern Management Tools and Economy of Tourism Sector in Present Era* are:

- Milena Lazić, Aleksandra Bradić-Martinović, chapter title – *Analysis of tourism demand in selected WB countries during the COVID-19 pandemic*;
- Sandra Milanović, Miljana Talić, Žarko Rađenović, chapter title – *Social entrepreneurial intention factors of tourism management students*;
- Vera Mirović, Branimir Kalaš, Nataša Pavlović, chapter title – *Is the tourism-led growth hypothesis valid for Višegrad group countries?*;
- Jani Bekő, Darja Boršič, chapter title – *Purchasing power parity under tourism price indices: an analysis for euro area*;
- Mateja Jerman, chapter title – *Performance of the Slovenian hotel companies in times of COVID-19*.

More information on Best Chapter Award Winners, award guidelines and criteria is available at the following link: <https://www.udekom.org.rs/best-chapter-award>

According to given criteria, i.e. usefulness and accuracy of the review; depth and scope of the review, i.e. not length, but rather coverage; timeliness of the review; the extent to which the review is constructive; and the submitter's average feedback to the usefulness and tone of the reviewer

Best Reviewer Award Winners are:

- Ivana Domazet, PhD, Institute of Economic Sciences, Zmaj Jovina 12, Belgrade, Serbia;
- Jasmina Gržinić, PhD, Faculty of Economics and Tourism “Dr. Mijo Mirković”, Pula, Croatia;
- Koviļjka Banjević, PhD, Academy of Applied Technical Studies Belgrade, Department of Belgrade Polytechnic, Katarine Ambrozić 3, Belgrade, Serbia.

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to all colleagues who participated in a process of publishing this thematic monograph and with great honor would like to invite **you all to start preparing chapters for our 2022/2023 annual edition.**

Call for chapters is available at the following link: <https://www.udekom.org.rs/publications>.

The Publishers



Authors' Affiliation

1. Academy of Professional Studies South Serbia, Department of Agricultural and Food Studies Prokuplje, Cirila i Metodija 1, Prokuplje, Serbia
2. Academy of Vocational Studies, Department of Agricultural Business Studies and Tourism, 15000 Šabac, Serbia
3. Association of Economists and Managers of the Balkans, Ustanička 179/2, Belgrade, Serbia
4. Business Faculty, Department of Tourism Durrës, “Aleksander Moisiu” University, Albania
5. CEATM d.o.o. (Central Europe Association of Tourism Management), Dolga Poljana 57, Vipava, Slovenia
6. Center for Study in Cultural Development, Rige od Fere 4, Belgrade, Serbia
7. College of Finance and Accounting FINra, Mitra Trifunovića Uče 6, Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina
8. Dekorina d.o.o., Glavni trg 17/b, Maribor, Slovenia
9. DOBA Business School, Prešernova ulica 1, Maribor, Slovenia
10. Faculty of Arts, Matej Bel University, Tajovského 50, 974 01 Banská Bystrica, Slovak Republic
11. Faculty of Business Economics, University Educons, Vojvode Putnika 85-87, Sremska Kamenica, Serbia
12. Faculty of Business Economics, University of East Sarajevo, Semberskih ratara, Bijeljina, Bosnia and Herzegovina
13. Faculty of Business, University Singidunum Belgrade, Danijelova 29, Belgrade, Serbia
14. Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Maribor, Razlagova 14, Maribor, Slovenia
15. Faculty of Economics in Subotica, University of Novi Sad, 9-11 Segedinski put, Subotica, Serbia
16. Faculty of Economics, Matej Bel University, Tajovského 10, Banská Bystrica, Slovak Republic
17. Faculty of Economics, University of Belgrade, Kamenička 6, Belgrade, Serbia
18. Faculty of Economics, University of Niš, Trg Kralja Aleksandra Ujedinitelja 11, Niš, Serbia
19. Faculty of Economics, University of South Bohemia, Studentská 13, 370 05 České Budějovice, Czech Republic
20. Faculty of Economics, VSB – Technical University, Sokolská třída 33, Ostrava, Czech Republic
21. Faculty of Geography, University of Belgrade, Studentski trg 3/III, Belgrade, 11000, Serbia
22. Faculty of Law, Security and Management “Constantine the Great” Nis, University Union – „Nikola Tesla” Belgrade, Serbia
23. Faculty of Management, Comenius University in Bratislava, Odbojárov 10, Bratislava, Slovakia
24. Faculty of Management, University of Primorska, Izolska vrata 2, Koper, Slovenia
25. Faculty of Mass Media Communication, University of Ss. Cyril and Methodius, Nám. J. Herdu 2, Trnava, Slovakia
26. Faculty of Project and Innovation Management, University Educons, Belgrade, Serbia
27. Faculty of Social Sciences Belgrade, University Business Academy in Novi Sad, Serbia
28. Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana, Kardeljeva pl. 5, Ljubljana, Slovenia
29. Faculty of Sports Belgrade, University Union – „Nikola Tesla” Belgrade, Serbia
30. Faculty of Tourism and Business Logistics, University “Goce Delchev” – Stip, North Macedonia
31. Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management, Opatija, Croatia

32. Geographical Institute “Jovan Cvijić” SASA, Djure Jakšića 9, Belgrade, Serbia
33. High Business School Novi Sad, Vladimira Perića - Valtera 4, 21000 Novi Sad, Serbia
34. Innovation Center, University of Niš, Univerzitetski trg 2, Niš, Serbia
35. Institute of Agricultural Economics, Volgina Street no. 15, Belgrade, Serbia
36. Institute of Economic Sciences, Zmaj Jovina 12, Belgrade, Serbia
37. Institute of Urbanism and Spatial Planning RS, Belgrade, Serbia
38. Mathematics and Statistics, University of Stralsund, Zur Schwedenschanze 15, 18435 Stralsund, Germany
39. Ministry of Construction, Transport and Infrastructure, Belgrade, Serbia
40. Montenegro Tourism School, Josipa Broza Tita bb, Podgorica, Montenegro
41. Political Science and Law Faculty, Department Political Science, “Aleksander Moisiu” University, Durrës, Albania
42. Polytechnic of Rijeka, Vukovarska 58, Rijeka, Croatia
43. Road Administration Primorje-Gorski Kotar County and University North Koprivnica, Croatia
44. School of Economics, Guangdong University of Finance and Economics, Guangzhou, China
45. Sinergija University, Rade Banjičića, Bijeljina, Bosnia and Herzegovina
46. Tourist Board of Tuzla Canton, Muftije efendije Kurta 1, Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina
47. University Educons, Vojvode Putnika 87, Sremska Kamenica, Serbia
48. University Magna Graecia of Catanzaro, Department of Law Economics and Social Science – Campus Salvatore Venuta, 88100 Catanzaro, Italy
49. University North, Trg dr. Žarka Dolinara 1, Koprivnica, Croatia
50. University of Applied Science Baltazar Zaprešić, Ul. Vladimira Novaka 23, Zaprešić, Croatia
51. University of Bari Aldo Moro, Department of Economics, Management and Business Law, Largo Abbazia Santa Scolastica 53, Bari, Italy
52. University VITEZ, Školska 23, Travnik, Bosnia and Herzegovina
53. Urban Developers and Investors Ltd, Bulevar Mihajla Pupina 10L, Belgrade, Serbia



Human Resources Hospitality Employment Perspective: Cluster Scenario for Selected Tourism Industries

Žarko Rađenović¹ 
Tatjana Boshkov²

Received: November 15, 2021

Revised: April 18, 2022

Accepted: May 12, 2022

Keywords:

Human resources;
Tourism industry;
Employment;
Cluster analysis;
Regression



Creative Commons Non Commercial CC BY-NC: This chapter is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial 4.0 License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>) which permits non-commercial use, reproduction and distribution of the work without further permission.

Abstract: *Creating an employment policy and its perspective development within the tourism industry depends on the successful management of human resources. This research aims to determine the significance of the impact of certain employment indicators on the performance of hospitality human resources in the European Union countries (including the United Kingdom), Norway, Switzerland, Turkey, and several Balkan countries. The annual job fluctuation and changes in tourist potential enable the performance analysis of employment indicators within a shorter period, in this case for 2019 and 2020. The authors will use multiple hierarchical regression to determine the magnitude of the contribution of individual indicators to job permanency in the tourism industry. The cluster analysis based on Ward's method and squared Euclidean distance will group countries according to the performance of employment indicators in tourism. In this way, the most dominant group of countries will be formed, and during the mentioned period, will be shown the eventual movement of particular countries to clusters where better conditions prevail, in the tourism industry labor market. The cluster structure changes in the analyzed years should prove the fluctuation of human resources in the tourism industry, which depends a lot on the education level.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The management of human resources in tourism in recent years is a real challenge given the rapidly growing development of the tourism and hospitality industry and therefore their significant contribution to the development of the economic activity. Consequently, the quality selection of employees in the tourism industry is an extremely important segment in the provision of services, especially in the case of competitive advantage between tourist destinations in different countries. The development of human resources management policy in tourism implies understanding the needs of the market in terms of tourist preferences as well as the customization of services to increase the competitive advantage of a particular tourist destination.

That is why it is extremely important to recruit employees in the tourism industry based on their education and skills to improve the quality of service and ensure the re-arrival of tourists to a particular destination in the future. As a labor-intensive activity, the tourism sector should enable the influx of those employees who can pay full attention to tourists and ensure the popularity of the destination in the future, which is achieved by motivating employees, constant training, and maintaining job permanence, and competitive earnings.

Therefore, in creating the strategy and policy of human resources management in the tourism sector, it is extremely important to determine the trajectory of employees in tourism following their education, age, and skills to provide the best possible service to new tourists.

¹ Innovation Center, University of Niš, Univerzitetski trg 2, 18000 Niš, Serbia

² Faculty of Tourism and Business Logistics, University "Goce Delchev" – Stip, North Macedonia

Competitiveness of earnings concerning other economic branches is very important so that employees have the motivation to improve their skills, which is indirectly reflected in the satisfaction of visitors to a particular tourist destination.

To see the discrepancy in the perspective of the development of employment policy in tourism, this paper will analyze the impact of certain employment indicators on the permanence of work in tourism. Also, the cluster analysis will cover the grouped countries of the European Union, Turkey, Norway, Switzerland, and some Balkan countries, by similarity concerning employment indicators, to see which countries are leaders in the field of human resources in tourism. Cluster analysis is used to get a picture and describe in real terms the human resource management and tourism employment perspective for a short-term period (from 2019 to 2020) (Hermawati et al., 2019). That was a period (2020) that has been affected by the pandemic COVID-19 structural changes in each economic sphere, especially in tourism.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Human resource management in the tourism industry is important starting the necessity for economic development, generally. The tourism sector has its revolution regarding technology, knowledge, human attitude, and desire, personal preferences. In this way, a tourism company is a highly regulated powerhouse that stabilizes the economic environment. Employees in an organization, from executives to tellers, must have a higher level of integrity and trustworthiness and also work-life balance which is rated as the most important out of the many facets of a career. “Measure of subjective career success is typically attitudes, emotions, and perceptions of how individuals feel about their accomplishments rather than the objective amount of achievement” (Arthur et al., 2005). Taking into account that creating an employment policy and its perspective development within the tourism industry depends on the successful management of human resources we should define it. Management of human resources is constituent of the tourism sector. Managing this sector means well connecting the individual attitude and the organization’s goals. The tourism sector needs human resources in a more specific way regarding the fact that its HRM delivers services. It’s not a product that can be controlled before the product is delivered. Firms that operate in the tourism sector use specific models to select the right people that will carry for tourists’ needs.

Equally the employer may decide to change their business activity in the future which may adversely impact future job opportunities for individuals; as part of succession or diversity planning a tourist organization may decide to appoint people from outside thereby reducing the opportunities available to existing employees, or it may be that during a recession or economic slowdown redundancy impacts on an individual’s career. King (2004) has identified several principles that it is claimed underpin the effective provision of management of human resources within an organization. Author King highlights several important segments and characteristics that need to be observed to have effective human resource management. In this context, he emphasizes the importance of the right information to identify potential opportunities. It is also considered that every employee should show proactivity in performing their tasks but also intentions for career advancement because the tourism sector is dynamic. In this regard, the dynamics itself require a rapid change in the way of providing services and type of services according to the wishes of tourists.

Employees will also be motivated to give their best only if the top management monitors and rewards their enthusiasm of employees. King (2004) has also suggested that effective

management of human resources contains five components, that are important in the case of the tourism industry too:

- Career planning and support. This involves activities including setting through personal development plans, appraisal, and development reviews, development programs, and work experience.
- Career information and advice. This involves activities including career counseling and coaching, career workshops and courses.
- Developmental assignments. This involves activities including external or internal secondments, project assignments and work shadowing, and international assignments.
- Internal job markets and job allocation processes.

When selecting employees in the tourism industry, it is necessary to pay attention to social factors, where Beltrami emphasizes the following (Beltrami 2011):

- Consolidation of fundamental labor rights, such as a journey of 40 hours a week.
- Periods of unemployment, compensation, and remuneration for the holidays.
- Recognition of congestion and poor welfare in most European cities, due to the good weather of the south, choosing its beaches as the ideal place for recovery.

Therefore, tourism professionals and researchers should consider that the identity and consciousness of the people that live in a region can influence the external image of a cluster, for example, in the resources management, promoting innovation, establishing relationships with external agents, and especially the strategies for attracting tourists (Chavez et al., 2016). Tourism employment should not purely be seen as a production factor, but also as a social phenomenon (e.g. number of persons employed, their socio-demographic profile conditions of work, motivation, etc.). The starting point in thinking about competency is to recognize that there is a difference between what someone knows and what they can do effectively. „Organizations are facing incredible pressures in multiple areas (economy, technology, structure, society in general) to adjust to the new, evolving demands of their constituencies and to become more efficient and competitive within their environments” (Ballout, 2007). In a tourism organizational context, the focus on competency rather than knowledge should ensure that there is a detectable impact on operational effectiveness and performance as a result. Accordingly, the development of knowledge-based tourism confirms the importance of intellectual capital in the field of tourism, which indicates that employability whose content is human capital becomes a prerequisite and key factor in the success of an individual’s career. (Guo et al., 2012).

There is some debate about the relationship (if any) between the terms ‘competency’, ‘competence’, and ‘skill’ concerning this topic. Some writers and indeed practitioners tend to regard the terms as interchangeable, others see a difference between them. Competence can refer to an ability of an individual to deliver what is required in terms of output. The distinction between competency and skill is less easy to identify, as in its broadest sense a skill reflects the ability to ‘do’ something. So skill can be defined as expertness. Boyatzis (1982) overcame this difficulty by suggesting that competency comprised any or all of the following elements:

- Traits. This aspect of competency reflects the characteristics or innate qualities that an individual possesses and which impact their performance at work.
- Motives. Some people are motivated to deliver superior performance and to achieve good results for many reasons.
- Skills. This aspect would be a skill as reflected in the traditional sense of the term as outlined above.

- Self-image. The self-image that individuals hold about themselves influences how they interpret the world around them and their circumstances and will consequently form the basis of how they decide to interact with those situations.
- Social role. This aspect of competency reflects the acceptable and conventional social norms and behaviors that exist in a particular context.

Salaman and Taylor (2002) identified that several weaknesses were inherent in the application of the competency approach concerning management jobs, including:

- An emphasis on behavior marginalizes the effect on success through other factors in the social, cultural, and organizational context.
- Most will emphasize a small, narrow set of behaviors and attitudes whereas most management jobs will involve a wide range of tasks and requirements.
- There is a tendency to focus on current competency requirements rather than on long-term management development.
- There is an inbuilt assumption that management decision-making and action are always rational and aimed at achieving the highest performance.
- There is an assumption that managers are results-driven whereas in practice they must balance many competing pressures in deciding which outcomes must take precedence.

3. METHODOLOGY

The primary methodological framework in this research is based on the application of multiple hierarchical regression and hierarchical cluster analysis. Namely, by applying multiple hierarchical regression, the authors aim to determine which of the human resources hospitality indicators contributes the most to creating employment policy in the tourism industry in European Union countries (including the United Kingdom). The methodological framework will cover within its research Norway, Turkey, Switzerland as well as Balkan countries such as Serbia, Northern Macedonia, and Montenegro. The analyzed values of indicators from the Eurostat Database will also be used for the application of cluster analysis where countries will be grouped according to the performance of indicators. The aim of applying cluster analysis is to find a dominant cluster in a relatively small and narrow time interval for 2019 and 2020, as well as to determine the migration of countries to clusters with better performances. The implementation of cluster analysis determines statistically significant differences between clusters by applying appropriate statistical techniques. The mentioned cluster analysis was conducted in IBM SPSS 26.0 as one of the possibilities of using the information contained in a multidimensional observation (Hitka et al., 2017).

In this research, an agglomerative procedure was used to conduct a hierarchical cluster analysis. First, the distances of all units to each other are calculated, and then the groups are formed through joining or separating techniques. The merging technique (agglomerative, hierarchical method) starts from the fact that each unit is alone in a group of one member. Close groups are gradually merged until all the units in one group are finally found. In agglomerative procedures, each object or unit of observation begins as its cluster. In the following steps, the two closest clusters (or individuals) are combined into a new cluster, thus reducing the number of clusters by one in each subsequent step. Finally, all individuals are grouped into one large cluster (group). For this reason, agglomerative procedures are sometimes called construction methods. An important feature of hierarchical procedures is that earlier results are always ranked among later results. In “agglomerative” methods, each object is treated in the first step as a

separate cluster. Then the two nearest objects merge into the first cluster. Arithmetic means for each variable are calculated for each cluster. Then, for each object, the square Euclidean distance to the arithmetic mean of the cluster is calculated. These distances are summed for all cluster members. Those clusters for which the total (total) sum of these deviations is the smallest are merged.

The distance between two objects is determined as the sum of square differences in values for each variable. The Euclidean distance between two points is the line of the hypotenuse of a right triangle. Euclidean distance is used to calculate specific measures such as simple Euclidean distance and square, or absolute, Euclidean distance which is the sum of squares. The square Euclidean distance has the advantage that it does not take the square root that speeds up the calculation process, so it is a recommended measure for Ward's clustering methods. Ward's method was applied to form an agglomeration scheme to identify groups of countries that are similar to each other, but also different from other groups of countries (Rađenović et al., 2022). According to available data from Eurostat Database and literature, the authors have decided to analyze the following indicators:

- Employed persons by full-time/part-time activity (X1)- „The distinction between full-time and part-time work is generally based on a spontaneous response by the respondent. The main exceptions are the Netherlands and Iceland where a 35-hours threshold is applied, Sweden where a threshold is applied to the self-employed, and Norway where persons working between 32 and 36 hours are asked whether this is a full- or part-time position.“ (Eurostat- the statistical office of the European Union, 2017a)
- Employed persons by age groups (X2)- Employed persons are all persons between 15 and 74 years of age who worked at least one hour for pay or profit during the reference week or were temporarily absent from such work. The employment rate is the percentage of employed persons in the total population. (Eurostat- the statistical office of the European Union, 2017b)
- Employed persons by educational attainment level (X3)- “The educational attainment level of an individual is the highest ISCED (International Standard Classification of Education) level completed, the successful completion of an education program being validated by a recognized qualification, i.e. a qualification officially recognized by the relevant national education authorities or recognized as equivalent to another qualification of formal education.” (Eurostat- the statistical office of the European Union, 2017c)
- Permanency of job (permanent or temporary) (X4)- Unit of measure is the type of an employment contract in total measured in thousands according to workability population. (Eurostat- the statistical office of the European Union, 2017d)
- Average seniority of work with the same employer (X5)- Unit of measure is the period in years. (Eurostat- the statistical office of the European Union, 2017e)
- Employed persons and employees by sex and full-time/part-time activity (X6)- Unit of measure is employees by sex in total measured in thousands. (Eurostat- the statistical office of the European Union, 2017f).

Based on the values of indicators for both observed years, descriptive statistics were performed in Table 1.

Correlation analysis for 2020 also shows similar values as for the previously observed year where there is statistically significant conjunction between the mentioned indicators (Table 3).

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for human resources hospitality indicators for 2019 and 2020

Indicator	N	Min	Max	Mean	Stdev.	Indicator	Min	Max	Mean	Stdev.
X1_2019	35	201	42400	7778.78	10678.96	X1_2020	194.50	41861.70	6929.57	9720.51
X2_2019	35	20	4077	690.39	1098.37	X2_2020	16.90	4070.30	561.82	930.18
X3_2019	35	201	42400	7778.78	10678.96	X3_2020	194.50	41861.70	6929.56	9720.51
X4_2019	35	178	38322	6459.09	9006.67	X4_2020	172.0	37821.80	5748.67	8218.36
X5_2019	35	50	9489	1747.47	2532.46	X5_2020	36.40	8917.20	1425.22	2121.59
X6_2019	35	201	42400	7778.78	10678.96	X6_2020	194.50	41861.70	6929.57	9720.51

*Note: X1_2019- Employed persons by full-time/part-time activity; X2_2019- Employed persons by age groups; X3_2019- Employed persons by educational attainment level; X4_2019- Permanency of job (permanent or temporary); X5_2019-Average seniority of work with the same employer; X6_2019- Employed persons and employees by sex and full- time/part-time activity; X1_2020- Employed persons by full- time/part-time activity; X2_2020- Employed persons by age groups; X3_2020- Employed persons by educational attainment level; X4_2020- Permanency of job (permanent or temporary); X5_2020-Average seniority of work with the same employer; X6_2020- Employed persons and employees by sex and full- time/part-time activity.

Source: Authors' calculation based on Eurostat Database

Table 2. Pearson Correlation between selected indicators for 2019

		X4_2019	X3_2019	X1_2019	X2_2019	X5_2019	X6_2019
Pearson Correlation	X4_2019	1.000	.994	.994	.928	.964	.994
	X3_2019	.994	1.000	1.000	.942	.977	1.000
	X1_2019	.994	1.000	1.000	.942	.977	1.000
	X2_2019	.928	.942	.942	1.000	.978	.942
	X5_2019	.964	.977	.977	.978	1.000	.977
	X6_2019	.994	1.000	1.000	.942	.977	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	X4_2019	.	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	X3_2019	.000	.	.000	.000	.000	.000
	X1_2019	.000	.000	.	.000	.000	.000
	X2_2019	.000	.000	.000	.	.000	.000
	X5_2019	.000	.000	.000	.000	.	.000
	X6_2019	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.

Source: Authors' calculation based on Eurostat Database

Table 3. Pearson Correlation between selected indicators for 2020

		X4_2020	X3_2020	X1_2020	X2_2020	X5_2020	X6_2020
Pearson Correlation	X4_2020	1.000	.994	.994	.923	.964	.994
	X3_2020	.994	1.000	1.000	.932	.974	1.000
	X1_2020	.994	1.000	1.000	.932	.974	1.000
	X2_2020	.923	.932	.932	1.000	.973	.932
	X5_2020	.964	.974	.974	.973	1.000	.974
	X6_2020	.994	1.000	1.000	.932	.974	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	X4_2020	.	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	X3_2020	.000	.	.000	.000	.000	.000
	X1_2020	.000	.000	.	.000	.000	.000
	X2_2020	.000	.000	.000	.	.000	.000
	X5_2020	.000	.000	.000	.000	.	.000
	X6_2020	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.

Source: Authors' calculation based on Eurostat Database

The correlation analysis (Pearson Correlation) for indicator values for both observed years was first performed in IBM SPSS 26.0. Thus, the values of the correlation coefficients for 2019 are extremely high and positive, which only indicates a strong correlation of selected indicators/ variables that act in the same direction on creating employment policy in the tourism industry. In addition, in the Sig. column (Table 2) could be realized that all correlations are statistically significant.

Applying multiple hierarchical regression in this research, the authors aim to determine which of the independent predictor variables by sequential introduction into the regression model most affects the dependent variable - Permanency of job. As can be seen in the Model Summary table for 2019, the adjusted coefficient of determination explains more than 90% of the variability in the model which means that the regression model is valid. Also, a Durbin-Watson test value of 1,489 or less than 2 indicates that the model tends to have no autocorrelation (Table 4).

Table 4. Model summary for hierarchical regression model in 2019

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				Durbin-Watson	
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2		Sig. F Change
1	.994 ^a	.989	.988	978.176	.989	2849.528	1	33	.000	
2	.995 ^b	.989	.989	961.069	.001	2.185	1	32	.149	
3	.995 ^c	.990	.989	958.243	.000	1.189	1	31	.284	1.489

a. Predictors: (Constant), X3_2019

b. Predictors: (Constant), X3_2019, X2_2019

c. Predictors: (Constant), X3_2019, X2_2019, X5_2019

d. Dependent Variable: X4_2019

Source: Authors' calculation based on Eurostat Database

In order to prove the validity of the regression model in terms of the statistical significance of the variables in the model, the ANOVA procedure was conducted for both years. In the column Sig. for 2019 we see that there is a statistically significant difference between the variables included in the model because the value in all three steps of the hierarchical regression is less than 0.05 (Table 5).

Table 5. ANOVA procedure for regression model for 2019

Model		ANOVA ^a				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2726507598.196	1	2726507598.196	2849.528	.000 ^b
	Residual	31575312.343	33	956827.647		
	Total	2758082910.539	34			
2	Regression	2728525980.965	2	1364262990.483	1477.028	.000 ^c
	Residual	29556929.574	32	923654.049		
	Total	2758082910.539	34			
3	Regression	2729617762.475	3	909872587.492	990.898	.000 ^d
	Residual	28465148.063	31	918230.583		
	Total	2758082910.539	34			

a. Dependent Variable: X4_2019

b. Predictors: (Constant), X3_2019

c. Predictors: (Constant), X3_2019, X2_2019

d. Predictors: (Constant), X3_2019, X2_2019, X5_2019

Source: Authors' calculation based on Eurostat Database

From the table of regression coefficients for 2019, after the hierarchical regression in three steps, it can be seen that the independent variable *Employed persons by educational attainment level* have the greatest influence on the dependent variable *Permanency of job*. Thus, with the growth of the level of education in the tourism industry, there is a greater opportunity for job maintenance and making career progress. In the Sig. column for 2019, the indicator *Employed persons by educational attainment level* has a statistically significant value in all three steps of hierarchical regression (Table 6).

Table 6. Hierarchical regression coefficients for variables in 2019

Model	Coefficients ^a							
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.*	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
1	(Constant)	-63.891	205.597		-.311	.758	-482.180	354.399
	X3_2019	.839	.016	.994	53.381	.000	.807	.871
2	(Constant)	-105.934	203.994		-.519	.607	-521.455	309.587
	X3_2019	.903	.046	1.070	19.590	.000	.809	.997
3	X2_2019	-.662	.448	-.081	-1.478	.149	-1.575	.250
	(Constant)	-94.168	203.680		-.462	.647	-509.575	321.240
	X3_2019	.969	.076	1.148	12.772	.000	.814	1.123
	X2_2019	.011	.762	.001	.014	.989	-1.543	1.564
	X5_2019	-.565	.519	-.159	-1.090	.284	-1.623	.492

a. Dependent Variable: X4_2019

Source: Authors' calculation based on Eurostat Database

The Model Summary (Table 7) table as a result of hierarchical regression showed similar results of the adjusted coefficient of determination and Durbin-Watson statistics for the variables in 2020. Accordingly, in this case, too, it is a valid regression model.

Table 7. Model summary for hierarchical regression model in 2020

Model	Model Summary ^d									
	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				Sig. F Change	Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2		
1	.994 ^a	.988	.988	906.395	.988	2681.000	1	32	.000	
2	.994 ^b	.988	.988	915.213	.000	.386	1	31	.539	
3	.994 ^c	.989	.988	917.0190	.000	.878	1	30	.356	1.448

a. Predictors: (Constant), X3_2020

b. Predictors: (Constant), X3_2020, X2_2020

c. Predictors: (Constant), X3_2020, X2_2020, X5_2020

d. Dependent Variable: X4_2020

Source: Authors' calculation based on Eurostat Database

A statistically significant difference between the mentioned indicators was proved in the ANOVA procedure for 2020 (Table 8).

Table 8. ANOVA procedure for regression model for 2020

Model	ANOVA ^a					
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2202579099.259	1	2202579099.259	2681.000	.000 ^b
	Residual	26289645.387	32	821551.418		
	Total	2228868744.646	33			
2	Regression	2202902681.598	2	1101451340.799	1314.985	.000 ^c
	Residual	25966063.049	31	837614.937		
	Total	2228868744.646	33			
3	Regression	2203641034.148	3	734547011.383	873.500	.000 ^d
	Residual	25227710.498	30	840923.683		
	Total	2228868744.646	33			

a. Dependent Variable: X4_2020

b. Predictors: (Constant), X3_2020

c. Predictors: (Constant), X3_2020, X2_2020

d. Predictors: (Constant), X3_2020, X2_2020, X5_2020

Source: Authors' calculation based on Eurostat Database

Table 9. Hierarchical regression coefficients for variables in 2020

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	-75.385	191.873		-.393	.697	-466.217	315.447
	X3_2020	.840	.016	.994	51.778	.000	.807	.874
2	(Constant)	-92.014	195.578		-.470	.641	-490.899	306.870
	X3_2020	.867	.045	1.025	19.114	.000	.774	.959
3	X2_2020	-.295	.474	-.033	-.622	.539	-1.261	.672
	(Constant)	-83.841	196.158		-.427	.672	-484.449	316.768
	X3_2020	.924	.076	1.093	12.104	.000	.768	1.080
	X2_2020	.290	.784	.033	.370	.714	-1.311	1.892
	X5_2020	-.516	.551	-.133	-.937	.356	-1.640	.609

Source: Authors' calculation based on Eurostat Database

The output table of the regression model for the values of regression coefficients as in 2019 also shows a statistically significant and the largest impact of the indicator *Employed persons by educational attainment level* on the tourism industry workplace permanence (Table 9).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The following analysis of the empirical part of this chapter is oriented on cluster analysis as a type of multivariate technique. The cluster analysis was conducted using a hierarchical agglomeration approach, where Ward's method was used to form the agglomeration scheme. Ward's procedure means that "the average value for each variable (center of the cluster) is calculated for each cluster, and then the square of Euclidean distance from the center of the cluster is calculated for each object, after which the distance for the objects is summed" (Simović et al. 2020, p.620).

In this way, countries were grouped by similarity, but also differences between groups of countries were identified based on the values of the mentioned indicators. "Cluster membership is assessed by calculating the total sum of squared deviations from the mean of a cluster. The criterion for fusion should be the smallest possible increase in the error sum of squares". As can be seen in the agglomeration schedule table (Table 10) from 2019, the smallest possible increase in the error sum of square is after the fifth step. It could be concluded the same fact for the agglomeration schedule table (Table 11) for the 2020 year because of the same number of iterations after which there is no significant increase in the error sum of square (Kol'veková et al., 2019).

Looking at the changes in the agglomeration scheme in the last few iterative steps (in this case five), the authors concluded that five clusters were formed in both years, which is presented on the map charts (Figure 1) for EU countries together with the United Kingdom, Norway, Turkey, Switzerland, and some Balkan countries.

The first cluster's map chart for 2019 shows five groups of analyzed countries according to mentioned indicators. It could be concluded from the distribution of countries by clusters that Cluster 1 is the largest cluster which consists of 17 countries (Stryzhak et al., 2021). The single-country cluster is Germany. The following cluster map chart (Figure 2) shows the distribution of countries within five clusters for 2020. As can be seen directly in 2020, Germany is a single-country cluster. On the other hand, in 2020, based on the values of the analyzed indicators, there are evident structural changes in clusters considering their transitions from previous groups, compared to 2019.

Table 10. Agglomeration scheme for 2019

Stage	Cluster Combined		Coefficients	Stage Cluster First Appears		Next Stage
	Cluster 1	Cluster 2		Cluster 1	Cluster 2	
1	18	32	480.355	0	0	2
2	18	28	5609.293	1	0	4
3	14	24	14617.953	0	0	14
4	16	18	25244.248	0	2	9
5	1	22	39829.513	0	0	11
6	6	33	64494.993	0	0	14
7	25	26	121215.333	0	0	12
8	17	20	197161.118	0	0	17
9	13	16	286299.874	0	4	24
10	4	29	379313.254	0	0	15
11	1	30	525672.349	5	0	17
12	7	25	687002.616	0	7	19
13	11	15	857113.961	0	0	22
14	6	14	1037504.141	6	3	22
15	4	34	1274453.834	10	0	18
16	3	27	1630168.034	0	0	20
17	1	17	2192103.369	11	8	20
18	2	4	2780149.016	0	15	19
19	2	7	4068374.340	18	12	23
20	1	3	5772377.289	17	16	27
21	19	23	7985284.794	0	0	30
22	6	11	10454962.237	14	13	24
23	2	8	14122801.785	19	0	27
24	6	13	20595996.980	22	9	31
25	10	35	37217621.025	0	0	29
26	9	12	57979550.610	0	0	28
27	1	2	112388832.397	20	23	30
28	9	21	177212000.132	26	0	32
29	10	31	253951968.914	25	0	32
30	1	19	415561843.843	27	21	31
31	1	6	752792806.758	30	24	34
32	9	10	1266002370.461	28	29	33
33	5	9	2393308562.677	0	32	34
34	1	5	14649265346.090	31	33	0

Source: Authors' calculation based on Eurostat Database



Figure 1. Clusters' map charts for 2019

Source: Authors' elaboration based on conducted cluster analysis in IBM SPSS 26.0

Table 11. Agglomeration scheme for 2020

Stage	Cluster Combined		Coefficients	Stage Cluster First Appears		Next Stage
	Cluster 1	Cluster 2		Cluster 1	Cluster 2	
1	28	32	1049.580	0	0	5
2	16	18	3545.485	0	0	5
3	1	22	8941.475	0	0	12
4	14	24	22742.430	0	0	14
5	16	28	42451.958	2	1	10
6	6	33	73355.378	0	0	14
7	25	26	128526.408	0	0	11
8	17	20	197013.762	0	0	18
9	4	29	277035.082	0	0	15
10	13	16	373128.954	0	5	24
11	7	25	515446.844	0	7	19
12	1	30	671486.734	3	0	18
13	11	15	842023.274	0	0	22
14	6	14	1014216.966	6	4	22
15	4	34	1238202.106	9	0	17
16	3	27	1537266.071	0	0	20
17	2	4	1929247.811	0	15	19
18	1	17	2529540.205	12	8	20
19	2	7	3828372.624	17	11	23
20	1	3	5417054.157	18	16	28
21	19	23	7693343.862	0	0	29
22	6	11	10060667.176	14	13	24
23	2	8	13754218.390	19	0	28
24	6	13	20075637.083	22	10	31
25	10	35	34586210.843	0	0	27
26	9	21	51811582.268	0	0	30
27	10	12	100000272.761	25	0	30
28	1	2	153229554.836	20	23	29
29	1	19	312545100.765	28	21	31
30	9	10	571118901.858	26	27	32
31	1	6	900065815.615	29	24	33
32	5	9	2192240622.610	0	30	33
33	1	5	11760307878.020	31	32	0

Source: Authors' calculation based on Eurostat Database

**Figure 2.** Clusters' map charts for 2020

Source: Authors' elaboration based on conducted cluster analysis in IBM SPSS 26.0

Descriptive statistics for the obtained groups of countries (clusters) are based on the indicators mean in both observed years. As can be seen in Table 12, the highest mean for all indicators in 2019 has the single-country cluster Germany, which means that this cluster is the most dominant and that it has the most favorable conditions in the labor market in the tourism industry. Also, the fifth cluster consisting of France, Turkey and the United Kingdom shows that the conditions in it are better for most indicators compared to other clusters, except Germany of course. Thus, it is concluded that the permanence of jobs does not have a high frequency of changes in Germany and the employment perspective is very favorable with efficient human resource management in the German tourism industry. Serbia is in the first cluster of 17 developed countries from the European Union, which only indicates there are positive tendencies in the sphere of the Serbian tourism employment perspective. Other countries in Western Balkans, such as Montenegro and North Macedonia, are in the third cluster, which has weaker human resources conditions in the tourism industry (Table 12).

Table 12. Indicators' mean within clusters for 2019

CLU	Number of Countries	Mean 2019					
		X1_2019	X2_2019	X3_2019	X4_2019	X5_2019	X6_2019
1	17 (Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechia, Denmark, Ireland, Greece, Hungary, Netherlands, Austria, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Finland, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, Serbia)	4383.82	379.06	4383.82	3672.74	933.49	4383.82
2	1 (Germany)	42400.10	4077.30	42400.10	38321.80	9489.30	42400.10
		(max)	(max)	(max)	(max)	(max)	(max)
3	11 (Estonia, Croatia, Lithuania, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Slovenia, Iceland, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Cyprus)	711.32	51.77	711.32	616.25	169.71	711.32
4	3 (Spain, Italy, Poland)	19866.70	1081.73	19866.70	15961.83	3876.87	19866.70
5	3 (France, Turkey, UK)	29302.57	3275.80	29302.57	23548.53	7435.10	29302.57

Source: Author's calculation based on Eurostat Database through SPSS

Table 13. Indicators' mean within clusters for 2020

CLU	Number of Countries	Mean 2020					
		X1_2020	X2_2020	X3_2020	X4_2020	X5_2020	X6_2020
1	18 (Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechia, Denmark, Ireland, Greece, Hungary, Netherlands, Austria, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Finland, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, North Macedonia, UK)	4333.65	356.01	4333.65	3626.07	858.01	4333.65
2	1 (Germany)	41861.70	4070.30	41861.70	37821.80	8917.20	41861.70
		(max)	(max)	(max)	(max)	(max)	(max)
3	11 (Estonia, Croatia, Lithuania, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Slovenia, Iceland, Montenegro, Cyprus)	702.08	46.04	702.08	609.88	154.06	702.08
4	2 (Spain, Poland)	17822.15	932.05	17822.15	14585.50	3429.65	17822.15
5	4 (France, Italy, Serbia, Turkey)	25568.06	2202.86	25568.06	20036.73	5466.70	25568.067

Source: Author's calculation based on Eurostat Database through SPSS

In 2020, indicators' mean within clusters is still the largest for country-cluster Germany. However, this year there have been some structural changes in terms of countries' movement into clusters that have better performance of indicators. This is especially true for North Macedonia, which moved to the first cluster, while Cyprus lost its place in the first cluster and moved to the third cluster with less favorable indicator values.

The same happened with the United Kingdom, where this country migrated to the third cluster from the fifth, which means decreasing in human resources indicators' performances in the tourism industry. Italy and Serbia migrated to the fifth cluster where France and Turkey are located, where the fifth cluster together with the second cluster is dominating in relation to the others (Germany). Thus, it is concluded that Serbia has made significant progress in 2020 in terms of human resources policy in the tourism industry (Table 13).

In order to confirm the correctness and validity of the cluster analysis and the statistically significant difference in the average values of variables among the clusters, the authors performed the ANOVA procedure. Based on the Sig. column a statistically significant difference in the average values of variables among the cluster is confirmed since the value in this column is less than 0.05 (Table 14).

Table 14. ANOVA procedure

Indicators	Mean Square	F	Sig.*	Indicators	Mean Square	F	Sig.*	
X1_2019	Between Groups	943046497.059	268.970	.000	X1_2020	760221877.561	285.469	.000
	Within Groups	3506139.337				2663058.756		
X2_2019	Between Groups	9529373.364	98.563	.000	X2_2020	6077240.111	41.528	.000
	Within Groups	96683.172				146342.364		
X3_2019	Between Groups	943046497.059	268.970	.000	X3_2020	760221877.561	285.469	.000
	Within Groups	3506139.337				2663058.756		
X4_2019	Between Groups	667448866.279	226.799	.000	X4_2020	541095480.642	243.333	.000
	Within Groups	2942914.847				2223683.520		
X5_2019	Between Groups	52308144.741	177.891	.000	X5_2020	34102340.877	81.543	.000
	Within Groups	294045.431				418215.115		
X6_2019	Between Groups	943046497.059	268.970	.000	X6_2020	760221877.561	285.469	.000
	Within Groups	3506139.337				2663058.756		

Source: Author's calculation based on Eurostat Database through SPSS

Table 15. Levene's Statistic for analyzed years

Indicators	Levene's Statistic	Sig.	
X1_2019	Based on Mean	3.940	.018
	Based on Median	2.659	.066
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	2.659	.085
	Based on trimmed mean	3.872	.019
X2_2019	Based on Mean	10.663	.010
	Based on Median	2.987	.047
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	2.987	.117
	Based on trimmed mean	9.125	.000
X3_2019	Based on Mean	3.940	.018
	Based on Median	2.659	.066
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	2.659	.085
	Based on trimmed mean	3.872	.019
X4_2019	Based on Mean	6.468	.012
	Based on Median	4.626	.009
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	4.626	.025
	Based on trimmed mean	6.388	.002

X5_2019	Based on Mean	8.867	.010
	Based on Median	3.409	.030
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	3.409	.077
	Based on trimmed mean	8.231	.000
X6_2019	Based on Mean	3.940	.018
	Based on Median	2.659	.066
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	2.659	.085
	Based on trimmed mean	3.872	.019
X1_2020	Based on Mean	2.857	.054
	Based on Median	1.895	.153
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	1.895	.173
	Based on trimmed mean	2.810	.057
X2_2020	Based on Mean	8.436	.010
	Based on Median	7.510	.001
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	7.510	.014
	Based on trimmed mean	7.997	.000
X3_2020	Based on Mean	2.857	.054
	Based on Median	1.895	.153
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	1.895	.173
	Based on trimmed mean	2.810	.057
X4_2020	Based on Mean	6.480	.012
	Based on Median	2.855	.054
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	2.855	.105
	Based on trimmed mean	6.283	.002
X5_2020	Based on Mean	10.531	.010
	Based on Median	8.688	.000
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	8.688	.018
	Based on trimmed mean	10.279	.000
X6_2020	Based on Mean	2.857	.054
	Based on Median	1.895	.153
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	1.895	.173
	Based on trimmed mean	2.810	.057

*Statistical significance at level 0.05

Source: Authors' elaboration based on conducted cluster analysis in IBM SPSS 26.0

In order to determine the validity of the set model for cluster analysis, the authors used one of the statistical instruments - the test of homogeneity of variance (Table 15). The mentioned test “starts from the null hypothesis that the variance is the same in all samples if $P > 0.05$. If $P > 0.05$, the null hypothesis is accepted, i.e., the alternative is rejected, which implies such a situation that the variance is equal for at least one pair of samples” (Simović et al., 2020, p. 623). The results confirmed that there is no statistically significant difference between variations in a given sample (Levene's Statistic). This fact is shown in the column Sig. for both analyzed years in the section Based on Mean which implies acceptance of the null hypothesis according to which variance is homogeneous for a given variable by groups (Rađenović et al., 2022).

5. CONCLUSION

The applied multiple hierarchical regression led to the conclusion that the greatest impact on the permanence of work has an indicator related to the educational level of employees in the tourism sector. Namely, the level of education and qualifications, as well as the skills that contribute to the improvement of the tourist service, certainly have an impact on increasing

the earnings of employees working in tourism, as well as on consistency when it comes to the career path of employees.

Multiple hierarchical regression and its stepwise involvement of independent variables in the regression model found that even individually, the educational level has the highest impact on the perspective of employees in tourism, as evidenced by the fact that $p < 0.05$. Stable employment contracts based on work-ability potential depend on the long-term training of employees in the tourism industry and the transition to a higher level of education, which is confirmed by the results of regression analysis.

On the other hand, using cluster analysis, the authors determined which countries are dominant in terms of analyzed indicators. In both years, the most dominant cluster is Cluster 2 for all employment tourism indicators. Cluster 2 presents Germany as a single-country cluster. In other clusters, there have been significant structural changes, given that some countries have significantly changed their position when it comes to employment tourism indicators. For example, Serbia moved from Cluster 1, in which it was in 2019, which is the second most dominant, to Cluster 5, which has significantly lower performance compared to Cluster 1, in which this country was. This only indicates the great turbulence in the labor market in tourism in 2020, which is marked by the stagnation of tourism development due to the global pandemic.

In 2020, however, Italy moved to Cluster 5, which has a better performance compared to Cluster 4, which it was in 2019 when it comes to the labor market in tourism. The United Kingdom and North Macedonia also advanced in 2020 and moved from Cluster 5 and Cluster 3 to Cluster 1, respectively, which is second in dominance. It could be concluded that a flexible employment policy in the tourism industry could have results even in extreme business conditions such as a pandemic, which could be a recommendation for human resource management in the future.

6. FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTION

Future research should be focused on identifying key factors influencing the permanence of jobs in the tourism industry in order to adapt human resource management as much as possible to trends in tourism and tourist destinations. Constant education and monitoring of technological trends regarding the formation of e-booking systems also groups countries based on digital literacy of the tourism labor force, which can be the subject of cluster analysis. The efficiency of the hospitality of information systems influences the choice of tourist destinations, which is another indicator for future research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research was supported by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia – Agreements on the implementation and financing of scientific research in 2021 [number 451-03-9/2021-14/200371].

REFERENCES

- Arthur, M.B., Khapova, S.N. and Wilderom, C. (2005). Career Success in a Boundaryless Career World. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 177-202, doi: 10.1002/job.290.
- Ballout, H.I. (2007). "Career success: The effects of human capital, person-environment fit and organizational support", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 22 No. 8, pp. 741-765, DOI:10.1108/02683940710837705
- Boyatzis, R.E. (1982). *The Competent Manager: A Model for Effective Performance*. London: Wiley.
- Chavez, J., Torres, A. and Torres, M.C. (2016). Hierarchical Cluster Analysis of Tourism for Mexico and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Countries, *Turismo em Analise*, 27(2), pp. 235-255, DOI: 10.11606/issn.1984-4867.v27i2p235-255
- Fu, J.C., Fu, P. (2008). Study of the Relationship between human capital and occupational mobility: the role of human capital. *Chinese Journal of Ergonomics*, vol.14, no3, pp. 36-40.
- Guo, W., Xiao, H., Yang, X., (2012). An Empirical Research on the Correlation between Human Capital and Career Success of Knowledge Workers in Enterprise, International Conference on Solid State Devices and Materials Science, Faculty of Management and Economics, Physics Procedia 25 (2012) 715 – 725, doi: 10.1016/j.phpro.2012.03.148
- Hermawati, A. and Suci, R.P. (2019). Biplot and Cluster Analysis of Satisfaction Level and the Interest of MSMEs Human Resource of Tourism Sector in East Java to Transglobal Leadership, *International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology*, 10(8), pp. 348–363.
- Heslin, P.A., (2005). Conceptualizing and evaluating career success, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, pp. 113-136, DOI: 10.1002/job.270
- Hitka, M., Lorincová, S., Ližbetinová, L., Pajtinková Bartáková, G. and Merková, M., (2017). Cluster Analysis Used as the Strategic Advantage of Human Resource Management in Small and Medium sized Enterprises in the Wood-Processing Industry, *BioResources* 12(4), 7884-7897, DOI: 10.15376/biores.12.4.7884-7897
- King, Z. (2004). *Career Management: A CIPD Guide*. London: CIPD.
- Kol'vecková, G., Liptáková, E., Štrba, L., Kršák, B., Sidor, C., Cehlár, M., Khouri, S. and Behún (2019). Regional Tourism Clustering Based on the Three Ps of the Sustainability Services Marketing Matrix: An Example of Central and Eastern European Countries, *Sustainability*, 11, 400; DOI:10.3390/su11020400
- Eurostat- the statistical office of the European Union: LFS series - detailed quarterly survey results (from 1998 onwards) (lfsq) Reference Metadata in Euro SDMX Metadata Structure (ESMS) https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/cache/metadata/EN/lfsi_esms.htm (retrieved 16th April 2022)
- Rađenović, Ž., Krstić, B., & Marković, M. (2022). Economic Performance of Agriculture in the European Union Countries / Wyniki ekonomiczne w rolnictwie w krajach Unii Europejskiej. *Zagadnienia Ekonomiki Rolnej / Problems of Agricultural Economics*, 370(1), 5–21. DOI: 10.30858/zer/145686
- Salaman, G. and Taylor, S. (2002). 'Competency's consequences – changing the character of managerial work'. Paper presented at the ESRC Critical Management Studies. Seminar: Managerial Work, The Judge Institute of Management, Cambridge University
- Simović, O., Rađenović, Ž., Perović, D., & Vujačić, V. (2020). Tourism in the Digital Age: E-Booking Perspective. *ENTRENOVA – ENTerprise REsearch InNOVation*, 6(1), 616-627. <https://hrcak.srce.hr/ojs/index.php/entrenova/article/view/13515/6766>
- Stryzhak, O., Akhmedova, O., Leonenko, O., Lopatchenko, I. and Hrabar, N. (2021). Transformation of human capital strategies in the tourism industry under the influence of Economy 4.0., *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 19(2), 145-156. DOI:10.21511/ppm.19(2).2021.12

