

HRD Competencies of Employees in Public and Private Sector Hotel Industries in Goa - A Comparative Study

Dr. Sunil Subhash Patil *

Key Words:

1. HRD Competencies
2. Hotel Industry

Abstract

The research was carried out to study the HRD competencies of employees in hotels in Goa. The main objective of the study was to compare the HRD competencies of employees in public sector hotels and private sector hotels in Goa. It was observed that the HRD competencies related research was done in foreign countries, from Indian prospective HRD competencies related research was not reported. The growth and development of hotel industry in India and Goa was analyzed. The employees related a profile in hotels in Goa was studied in details. In order to compare the HRD competencies of employees in public sector hotels and private sector hotels and training effectiveness for improving competencies structured questionnaires was prepared and primary data was collected. Overall there is a variation in HRD competencies between public sector hotels employees and private sector hotels employees. In public sector hotels employees need to improve HRD competencies comparatively private sector hotels employees.

INTRODUCTION

With the changing business organizational environment and increasing globalization of economy, the marketplace has become increasingly complex, highly uncertain, competitive and transformational. What makes the ultimate difference is whether an organization is able to develop and establish competitive differentiation or not. It is here that people provide organizations with a sustained competitive advantage. Organizations are required to adopt proactive development programmes towards attainment of corporate objectives by nurturing a development oriented culture. Human resource development (HRD) deals with creating conditions that enable people to get the best out of themselves and their lives. Development is never ending process. As people develop themselves in new directions, new problems and issues arise, requiring them to develop new competencies to meet the changing requirements, aspirations and problems. It is not enough to say that people are the strategic assets of an organization. They are the building blocks of the organization. Human resources form the life blood of an innovative enterprise. It is the human resource that helps in building and achieving organizational excellence in people process and performance. The growing importance of HRD is reflected both in specialization in the field of human resource

development as well as in the eagerness and willingness of people to share responsibility for many HR functions. This implies that to be successful, organizations have to develop and seriously re-look at appropriate HRD strategies to tap the human potential within the organization and align it with their corporate strategic mission and objectives.

Today the concept of HRD is considered seriously by most of the medium and large scale industrial organizations, so as to keep the organizations competent and forward-looking. HRD aims at the promotion of the well-being of individuals, families and societies. It deals with creating conditions that enable people to get the best out of themselves and their lives. As people develop themselves, new problems and issues arise and the growth-development-problem loop continues. Leonard Nadler who first coined the word HRD, along with GD. Wiggs, says that development is concerned with providing learning experiences to employees so that they may be ready to move into new directions that organizational change may require. HRD is recognized as an important tool for corporate strategy, integrating conceptual values with human values. At the organizational level, the goal of HRD should have competent, committed and motivated employees to ensure higher levels of productivity, profitability and growth for the organization and these goals can be achieved by identifying the competencies of employees.

In contemporary service industries, it is all about competence in people, and mainly the employee's qualities. The level of service excellence depends on the qualities of

*Assistant Professor, D.A.V. Velankar College of Commerce Solapur and can be reached at mr.sunilpatil@gmail.com



employees. The qualities are about knowledge, skills and thoughts which lead to survival growth and development. Therefore, training and development are essential in many ways; it increases productivity while employees are armed with professional knowledge, experienced skills and valid thoughts; training and development activities also motivates and inspires employees by providing employees all needed information in work as well as helps them to recognize how important their jobs are. Training and development can be seen as a key instrument in the implementation of human resource practices and policies. Successful service industries always include employee's training as their important development strategy. Training and developments most important role is to develop various types of competencies that relate to several areas like Technical Competence: People require necessary technical skills that contribute to their competency. A person who joins an organization say in the area of human resource, marketing or production needs to enhance his competency in these areas, same ways in the areas like Managerial Competencies, Interpersonal Competencies, and Business Competencies Intellectual Competencies etc. Focus on competencies acts as a developmental tool for employees. It helps employees understand organizational needs and develop individual skills to meet the competency gap. Competency is also a great tool for retention. It is a great source of motivation as high performers tend to get rewarded over time.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Mitrani Et Al (1992) mention the need for competency and predict that organization of the future will be built around people. They add that there will be less emphasis on jobs as the building blocks of the organization: instead increased attention will be focused on employee competency. A frequent criticism of research and practice involving competencies is that very term "competency" suffers from conceptual ambiguity (Lies, 2001). Indeed. It would be fair to say that even among experts, there is a lack of consensus about the precise definition of the term (Schippmann Et Al., 2000). For some, competencies refer to behaviors or actions, for others to underlying abilities or characteristics, and for still others to the outcomes of actions (Lies, 2001). Furthermore, some recent definitions have extended the traditional narrower focus on individuals (e.g. Mc Clelland, 1973) buy additionally incorporating team, process, and organizational capabilities (e.g. Athey and Orth, 1999). Further still, some, competences are task – oriented focusing on a job's tasks, roles and responsibilities- while for others, they are work oriented focusing on the underlying skills and attributes required by successful

performers (Kandola and Pearn, 1992). In response to this lack of consensus, the current research adopted a broad definition of a competency as measurable Individual characteristic that differentiates superior from average performance, or effective from ineffective performance (Spencer Et Al., 1992). Within this definition, competencies can therefore include, inter alia, motives, traits, self-concepts, knowledge and skills (Spencer and Spencer, 1993). Mansfield (2004) constants three different usages of competence: outcomes (vocational standards describing what people need to be to do in employment) ; tasks that people do (describing what currently happens); and personal traits or characteristics describing what people are like).The SHRM (2003) has indicated that competencies have become integral in the field of HRM and a new competency model is necessary because the business world is changing at an unprecedented rate. These changes require HR professionals to add significant value and to do so quickly. Moreover, since HRM activities directly impact the company's ability to compete, competency models need to be continuously researched and updated (SHRM, 2003). (Homer, 2001). Indeed for some, competency approach has made a revolutionary contribution (Lawler, 1994; McClelland, 1994). In terms of individual competencies, the literature identifies a wide range of factors that are generally important for staff and management success in organizations.

Objectives of the Study

1. To study the HRD competencies related research studies and literature.
2. To study and compare the existing HRD competencies of employees in public sector and private sector hotels in Goa.
3. To identify the gaps in HRD competencies of employees in hotels of Goa.

Hypotheses of the Study

1. **H01 $\mu_1 = \mu_2$** : There is no significant difference between the business competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa.

H1 $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is significant difference between the business competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa.

2. **H02 $\mu_1 = \mu_2$** : There is no significant difference between the personal competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa.

H2 $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is significant difference between the personal competencies of public sector hotel employees



and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa.

3. **H03 $\mu_1 = \mu_2$** : There is no significant difference between the interpersonal competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa.

H3 $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is significant difference between the interpersonal competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa.

4. **H04 $\mu_1 = \mu_2$** : There is no significant difference between the behavioural competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa.

H4 $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is significant difference between the behavioural competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa.

5. **H05 $\mu_1 = \mu_2$** : There is no significant difference between the technical competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa.

H5 $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is significant difference between the technical competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa.

6. **H06 $\mu_1 = \mu_2$** : There is no significant difference between the intellectual competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa.

H6 $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is significant difference between the intellectual competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

The present study deals with HRD competencies in public sector and private sector hotel industry in Goa. The study is comparative in nature. The type of research is empirical and analytical research where investigation into a problem or situation which provides insights to the researcher.

The statistical records of hotels available in Department of Tourism, Government of Goa, as on June (2012), there are 12 public sector Goa (GTDC) Goa Tourism Development Corporation hotels and 63 private sector (five star deluxe, five star, four star, three star, two star, one star & Heritage) hotels. For the purpose of the study GTDC hotels of public sector and three star hotels of private sector is considered. Since the nature of study is comparative and GTDC Hotels are compared with three star hotels only because both the categories of hotels are having the same features. While

selecting the public and private sector hotels the criteria like oldest by age in establishment, facilities available, near to the tourist destination and number of employees working is considered.

There are total 12 public sectors (GTDC) hotels; these hotels are classified into city accommodations, beach accommodations and eco accommodations. Out of 12 public sector hotels 50% (06 hotels) are selected for the study in the following proportion, 04 hotels from north Goa and 02 hotels from south Goa. These 06 hotels are further selected from every category of accommodations (02 city accommodations, 02 beach accommodations and 02 eco accommodations) respectively.

There are total 63 (five star deluxe, five star, four star, three star, two star, one star & Heritage) private sector hotels, out of which 23 hotels are three star hotels. Out of 23 three star hotels 25% (6 hotels) are selected for the study in equal proportion, 03 hotels from north Goa and 03 hotels from south Goa respectively.

For the present study sample size is of total 360. The samples are selected in equal proportion from public sector and private sectors hotels. In public sector the population size on pay sheet of GTDC is 356 out of which 180(50%) sample are selected. In private sector each three star hotel is having on an average 50-60 population out of which 30(50%) sample are selected ($30 \times 06 = 180(50\%)$). While selecting the sample all the major departments of hotels are considered. (Front Office, Food & Beverage, Housekeeping, Accounts and Finance, Human Resource, Sales & Marketing and Engineering & Maintenance and Security) and sample of all categories permanent, temporary and contractual are considered.

The collected data has been exposed to different statistical techniques like Likert's summated and Semantic differential scale to measure attitude of individual or group to particular situation, Percentage, Mean, Standard Deviations, Tabulation, Classification, Graphical presentation of different aspects of respondents like number of employees, different competencies, relationship of training and competencies.

The mean score of each statement was obtained and converted into percentile value, in order to obtain clear and easy understandable picture of the level of agreement for each statement, from every categories of sample respondents.

For analyzing and interpreting the mean score and percentile value collectively the following ranking scale was developed. According to the values obtained from the mean score/percentile values the following rankings were given.



For each variable whatever the mean score/percentile values are obtained rankings are given and interpretation is made accordingly.

For the testing of stated hypotheses paired T test is used. The paired T test is applied for comparing the small group of variables, which are having some relationship. The different computer applications like Excel, Excess and SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) has been used.

Testing of Hypothesis

1. $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no significant difference between the business competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa.

$H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is significant difference between the business competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa.

Table 1 : Variables Ranking

Sr. No	Mean Score	Percentile Value	Rankings
1	5.00 – 4.75	100.00 – 95.00	Perfect
2	4.74 – 4.25	94.80 – 85.00	Excellent
3	4.24 – 3.75	84.80 – 75.00	Good
4	3.74 – 3.25	74.80 – 65.00	Standard
5	3.24 – 2.75	64.80 – 55.00	Poor
6	2.74 - <	54.80 - <	Fail

Table 2 : Paired Samples Correlations

Business Competencies	N	Correlation	Sig
Pair 1 VAR00001 & VAR00002	8	-0.316	0.446

Table 3 : Paired Samples T Test

Business Competencies	Paired Difference					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 2 VAR00001 - VAR00002	-0.21625	-0.28565	0.10099	-0.45506	0.2256	-2.141	7	0.070

Table 4 : Paired Samples Correlations

Personal Competencies	N	Correlation	Sig
Pair 2 VAR00003 & VAR00004	30	0.728	0.000



Inferences

From the above paired sample T test table no 2 & 3 it is seen that pair-1 business competencies V-1 and V-2 P value is 0.070 consequently it is concluded that at 5% level of significance the null hypothesis $H_0 \mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no significant difference between the business competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa is weakly accepted. The alternative hypothesis $H_1 \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is significant difference between the business competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa is rejected.

2. $H_0 \mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no significant difference between the personal competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa.

$H_2 \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is significant difference between the personal competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa.

Inferences

From the above paired sample T test table no 4 & 5 it is seen that pair-2 personal competencies V-3 and V-4 P value is 0.000 consequently it is concluded that at 5% level of significance the null hypothesis $H_0 \mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no significant difference between the personal competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa is strongly rejected. The alternative hypothesis $H_2 \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is significant difference between the personal competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa is accepted.

Table 5 : Paired Samples T Test

Personal Competencies	Paired Difference					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 2 VAR00003 - VAR00004	-0.15433	-0.02050	0.10099	-0.19627	0.11240	-7.527	29	0.000

Table 6 : Paired Samples Correlations

Interpersonal Competencies	N	Correlation	Sig
Pair 3 VAR00005 & VAR00006	8	0.781	0.022

3. $H_0 \mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no significant difference between the interpersonal competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa.

$H_3 \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is significant difference between the interpersonal competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa.

Inferences

From the above paired sample T test table no 6 & 7 it is seen that pair-3 interpersonal competencies V-5 and V-6 P value is 0.005 consequently it is concluded that at 5% level of significance the null hypothesis $H_0 \mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no significant difference between the interpersonal competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa is strongly rejected. The alternative hypothesis $H_3 \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is significant difference between the interpersonal competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa is accepted.

4. $H_0 \mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no significant difference between the behavioural competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa.

$H_4 \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is significant difference between the behavioural competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa. Inferences

From the above paired sample T test table no 8 & 9 it is



seen that pair-4 behavioural competencies V-7 and V-8 P value is 0.002 consequently it is concluded that at 5% level of significance the null hypothesis $H_0 \mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no significant difference between the behavioural competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa is strongly rejected. The alternative hypothesis $H_4 \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is significant difference between the behavioural competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa is accepted.

5. $H_0 \mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no significant difference between the technical competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa.

$H_5 \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is significant difference between the technical competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa.

Inferences

From the above paired sample T test table no 10 & 11 it is seen that pair-5 technical competencies V-9 and V-10 P value is 0.000 consequently it is concluded that at 5% level of significance the null hypothesis $H_0 \mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no significant difference between the technical competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa is strongly rejected. The alternative hypothesis $H_5 \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is significant difference between the technical competencies of public sector hotel

Table 7 : Paired Samples T Test

Interpersonal Competencies	Paired Difference					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 3 VAR00005 - VAR00006	-0.15250	0.10687	0.03778	-0.24185	-0.106315	-4.036	7	0.005

Table 8 : Paired Samples Correlations

Behavioural Competencies	N	Correlation	Sig
Pair 4 VAR00007 & VAR00008	8	0.876	0.004

Table 9 : Paired Samples T Test

Behavioural Competencies	Paired Difference					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 4 VAR00007 - VAR00008	-0.21750	0.12748	0.045017	-0.32407	-0.11093	-4.826	7	0.002

Table 10 : Paired Samples Correlations

Technical Competencies	N	Correlation	Sig
Pair 5 VAR00009 & VAR00010	8	0.974	0.000

employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa is accepted.

6. $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no significant difference between the intellectual competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa.

$H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is significant difference between the intellectual competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa. Inferences

From the above paired sample T test table no 12 & 13 it is seen that pair-6 intellectual competencies V-11 and V-12 P value is 0.051 consequently it is concluded that at 5% level of significance the null hypothesis $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no significant difference between the intellectual competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel employees in Goa is weekly accepted. The alternative hypothesis $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is significant difference between the intellectual competencies of public sector hotel employees and that of private sector hotel

employees in Goa is rejected.

CONCLUSION

Overall there is a variation in HRD competencies between public sector hotels employees and private sector hotels employees. In public sector hotels employees need to improve HRD competencies comparatively private sector hotels employees. The competency is the heart of the hotel industry, if the hotel industries design knowledge events to boost the competencies of employees to perform the specific job function, then they can build up individuals who are competent and do it in a more targeted style. A competency is a bundle of knowledge, skill, ability, capability, proficiency. Competencies are also to be mechanism of the job that is essential for employees to perform effectively, if they are to be deemed competent. The career advancement in hotel industries employees should have some trait and these traits represent the word competencies. C-Capability, O-Outstanding, M-Model, P-Proficiency, E-Expertise, T-Talent, E-Extraordinary, K-Knowledge, C-Capacity, I-Intelligent, E-Efficient, S-Skill

Table 11 : Paired Samples T Test

Technical Competencies	Paired Difference					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 5 VAR00009 - VAR00010	-0.10875	0.03682	0.01302	-0.13953	-0.07797	-8.355	7	0.000

Table 12 : Paired Samples Correlations

Intellectual Competencies	N	Correlation	Sig
Pair 6 VAR00011 & VAR00012	8	0.723	0.043

Table 13 : Paired Samples T Test

Intellectual Competencies	Paired Difference					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 6 VAR00011 - VAR00012	-0.05375	0.06457	0.02283	-0.10773	-0.00023	-2.354	7	0.051



REFERENCES

- Andreas, R., Frese, M. and Utsch, A. (2005). Effects of Human Capital and Long Term Human Resources Development and Utilization on Employment Growth of Small-Scale Business: A Causal Analysis. *J. Entrepreneur Theory and Practice*.
- Antwi, K. B., & Analoui, F. (2008). Reforming public sector: Facing the challenges of effective human resource development policy in Ghana. *The Journal of Management Development*, 27(6), 600.
- Athey, T. R., & Orth, M. S. (1999). Emerging competency methods for the future. *Human Resource Management*, 38(3), 215-226.
- Bernthal, P. R., Colterayhn, K., Davis, P., Naughton, J., Rothwell, W. J., & Wellins, R. (2004). ASTD competency study: Mapping the future. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.
- Black James, A. and D.J. Champion (1976). *Methods in Social research*, New York, John Wiley and Sons.
- Boon, J. & van der Klink, M. (2002). Competencies: The Triumph of a Fuzzy Concept, Academy of Human Resource Development Annual Conference, Honolulu, HA February 27 – March 3, in: *Proceedings*, Vol.1, 327-334.
- Chalofsky, N. (1992) A unifying definition for the human resource development profession. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 3: pp.175.
- Clover, V.T. AND H.L Balsley (1979). *Business Research Methods*, Ohio: Grid Publishing.
- Dennis, Nickson 2007. *Human Resource Management For The Hospitality and Tourism Industries*. Elsevier.
- Dr. B Dias, Dr Sambatur and Dr. Wright (2010) A Changing Dynamics Of Human Resource, An Exploratory on perception satisfaction with competencies of HRD and its Implication Pg 474.
- Draganidis and Mentza, (2005) Competency based management a review of systems and Approaches, 53.
- Flood, H. & Flood, P. (2000). An Exploration of the Relationships between the Adoption of Managerial Competencies, Organizational Characteristics, Human Resource Sophistication and Performance in Irish Organizations. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 24 (2, 3, 4), 128-136.
- Gangani, N., McLean, G. N., & Braden, R. A. (2006). A competency-based human resource development strategy. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 19(1), 127-140.
- Gilley, J.W., Egglund, S.A. and Gilley, A.M. (2002) *Principles of Human Resource Development*. (2nd ed) Cambridge, Perseus Publishing.
- Goode W.L. AND Hatt Paul, K. (1952). *Methods in Social Research*, New York, McGraw Hill.
- Harbison, F. and Myers, C. A. (1964) *Education, manpower and economic growth: Strategies of human resource development*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kay, C., & Russette, J. (2000). *Hospitality-Management Competencies*. *The Cornell Hotel & Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 41 (2), 52.
- Margrat A. and Stuart D. (1996) *Personnel Management*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Marquardt, M. J., & Engel, D. W. (1993). *Global human resource development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. McClelland,
- McLagan, P. A. (1997, May). Competencies: The next generation. *Training and Development*, 51(5), 40-48.
- Nadler, Leonard. (1984) *The Hand Book of Human Resource Development*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Naisbitt, J., & Aburdene, P. (1990). *Megatrends 2000: Ten new directions for the 1990s*. New York: Morrow.
- Noe, R. A. (2002). *Employee training and development*. McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nordhaug, O. (1998): "Competencies Specificities in Organisations", *International Studies of Management & Organisation*, Vol. 28, No. 1, p. 8 - 29.
- Pinto, P. R., & Walker, J. W. (1978). *A study of professional training and development roles & competencies*. Washington, DC: American Society for Training and Development.
- Stuart, R., & Lindsay, P. (1997). Beyond the frame of management competencies: Towards a contextually embedded framework of managerial competence in organizations. *Journal of European Industrial Training*. 21(1), 26-33.
- Virmani, B.R. (2000). *Managing people in organizations: The challenges of change*. India, New Delhi: Response Books, Sage Publications.
- Watkins, K.E. (1991) Many voices: Defining human resource development from different disciplines. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 41(4): pp. 241-255.
- Wilson, J. P. (1999) *Human resource development. Learning and training for individuals and organizations*. London, Kogan Page.
- Woodruffe, C. (1998): "What is meant by competency?" *Leadership & Organisational Development Journal*, Vol. 14, No. 1, p. 22 - 33.
- World Travel & Tourism Council Report, *Travel & Tourism Industry Report, 10th Economic Plan and Economic Survey of India*.

