An integrated fuzzy AHP and fuzzy TOPSIS approach in the hotel industry

Nguyen Quang Vinh [1], Quang Hung Do [2], *, Luc Manh Hien [1]

[1]Faculty of Business Administration, University of Labour Social Affairs, Hanoi, Vietnam
[2]Faculty of Information Technology, University of Transport Technology, Hanoi, Vietnam

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

In the context of the COVID-19 epidemic, the turnover intention rate is increasing day by day. The objective of this study is to identify the main factors influencing turnover intention in the Vietnam hospitality industry. The study utilizes the fuzzy AHP and fuzzy TOPSIS model to evaluate the dimensions of the hotel employee turnover intention model. The performance evaluation for employee turnover intention includes Work Itself, Supervision, Coworkers relationships, Salary and Benefit, Career Opportunities, Job Stress, Perceived Risk, and Job Insecurity. These dimensions generate a final evaluation for ranking priority among the employee turnover intention of the proposed model. The importance level of dimensions is evaluated by 17 experts, and decision-making is processed through the fuzzy concept and fuzzy environment. From the critical fuzzy AHP and fuzzy TOPSIS analysis results, the study shows that the most important dimensions of employee turnover intention in the hotel industry model are Salary and Benefit. Moreover, the results indicate that the least important dimensions are the Co-workers' Relationship, Supervision, and Career Opportunities. The second group dimensions that impact employee turnover in the context of the COVID-19 epidemic are Work Itself, Job Stress Perceived Risk, and Job Insecurity. Moreover, this study's results show that three-star hotels have the highest value of turnover intention; the second is the Four and Five-star hotels, and the third is the Below three-star hotels. The results of the study will help businesses in the fields of hospitality have a more comprehensive view of human resource management activities. Especially, this study provides implications for hotel managers in understanding employee behavior and their turnover intention during the context of the COVID-19 epidemic based on the eight proposed dimensions.

1. Introduction

In 2020, Vietnam's tourism faced many challenges due to the impact of the COVID-19 epidemic. In addition to solutions to overcome difficulties and prevent epidemics, there was an attempt to restructure the tourist market (Chen et al., 2020). Like many other industries, human resources in tourism are equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills that play an essential role in the development of tourism products as well as hotel services.; it may not come from the COVID-19 epidemic or other factors. Previous studies have demonstrated the success of human resource management in delivering employee satisfaction and employee motivation in the tourism industry (Khan et al., 2020; Li et al., 2020; Mittal and Dhar, 2016; Mohamed, 2016). However, these studies have not yet clarified the specific ranking of these factors. Employee satisfaction and work motivation, Commitment to the Organizational, Work environment, or Salary level are all the causes of turnover intention. However, in Vietnam, studies mainly focus on the factors affecting work motivation or employee satisfaction. In the context of the complicated COVID-19 epidemic, the tourism industry is predicted to face specific difficulties. This is the time for the hotel industry to retain employees or encourage employees to work hard and support their company to overcome challenges and prepare conditions to welcome tourists back after the pandemic.

The main objective of this study is to collect, build, and synthesize a complete, systematic

document review on current issues related to the field of turnover intention in the hospitality industry. In addition, the study aims to verify the main factors influencing turnover intention in the Vietnam hospitality industry.

Multiple-criteria decision-making (MCDM) is a technique that evaluates multiple conflicting criteria in decision-making. MCDM combines alternative's performance across numerous, contradicting, qualitative and/or quantitative criteria and results in a solution requiring a consensus. The objective of MCDM is not to suggest the best decision, but to aid decision-makers in selecting suitable alternatives or a single alternative that fulfills their requirements and is in line with their preferences. Various MCDM techniques and approaches have been developed and implemented successfully in many application areas. There are several MCDM techniques including the analytical hierarchal process (AHP), the analytical network process (ANP), TOPSIS, and fuzzy decision-making. MCDM has been one of the fastest-growing problem areas in many disciplines. The fuzzy analytic hierarchy process (FAHP) method (Saaty and Vargas, 1980) was used to solve complex decision-making problems with different selection criteria and people involved in the decision-making process. Although the conventional AHP explains and describes expert knowledge, it cannot detail or reflect human behavior and thinking (Saaty and Vargas, 1980). Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) is a powerful management tool that successfully solves many multiple criteria decision problems. In the pure AHP, the relative importance of decision elements is evaluated from comparison judgments which are represented as crisp values. However, in many cases, the human preference is uncertain and decision-makers usually feel more confident utilizing linguistic variables rather than expressing their judgments in the form of numeric values. In order to deal with more decision making problems in real situations, the fuzzy set theory was incorporated into AHP. Being an extension of AHP, the fuzzy AHP is able to solve the hierarchical fuzzy decision-making problems. Since its appearance, the fuzzy AHP method has been widely used by many researchers to solve different decision making problems in various areas. Therefore, FAHP and fuzzy TOPSIS were developed to solve ambiguous gradation problems. The matrix pair comparisons in the FAHP process are fuzzy numbers, allowing the decision-maker to assign priorities in the form of a natural linguistic expression of the importance of each criterion (Yaghoobi, 2018). Consequently, fuzzy logic provides a systematic basis for dealing with ambiguous or undefined situations (Kahraman et al., 2014).

Additionally, fuzzy decision-making has been applied in various fields, such as Ali et al. (2019) in software-defined networking for controller selection and controller placement and Lyu et al. (2020) in risk assessment using a new consulting process or determining the importance of the criteria of traffic accessibility. Sirisawat and Kiatcharoenpol (2018) applied fuzzy AHP-TOPSIS approaches to prioritize solutions for reverse logistics barriers. Pramanik et al. (2017) researched resilient supplier selection using AHP-TOPSIS-QFD under a fuzzy environment. Shaw et al. (2012) studied supplier selection using fuzzy AHP and fuzzy multiobjective linear programming for developing low-carbon supply chains. Goyal et al. (2021) applied fuzzy-AHP MCDM methodology to identify the relative importance of various barriers in adopting sustainable production and consumption (SPC) initiatives. Çalık (2021) developed a new group decision-making approach based on Industry 4.0 components for selecting the best green supplier by integrating AHP and TOPSIS methods under the fuzzy environment. Hassanzadeh and Valmohammadi (2021) evaluated and rank the credit/financial institutes of the Tehran stock market by the use of fuzzy AHP and TOPSIS techniques. The above-mentioned studies have indicated the effectiveness and accuracy of the Fuzzy AHP and fuzzy TOPSIS approach in dealing with various practical problems.

The objectives of this study are:

- To identify the main factors influencing turnover intention in the Vietnam hospitality industry.
- To rank the factors based on experts' opinions.

By the integrated fuzzy AHP and fuzzy TOPSIS methods, this study first applies the fuzzy AHP to determine the preference weights of evaluation. After that, fuzzy TOPSIS is used to improve the gaps of alternatives between the actual performance value and pursued aspirational level in each dimension and criterion. This work will be helpful for government and management in making policies to promote businesses in the fields of hospitality.

2. Literature review

2.1. Turnover intention

Turnover intention is a behavioral factor that has been studied by many scholars, especially in the field of human resource management; it has a role to reflect the actual situation in the workplace, the relationship among colleagues, between staff and investors, or customers. This information helps human resource managers gain a comprehensive perspective and make timely plans to limit leaving intention of employees to stabilize personnel and sustainably develop their businesses. According to the research of several authors (Cho and Lewis, 2012; Karatepe et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020; Limyothin and Trichun, 2012) on turnover intention, the most apparent manifestation of employees' job dissatisfaction is due to a number of reasons. The result leads to the act of leaving, causing severe damage to the organization in terms of people, brainpower, and technology. Or the partner factors affecting employees make them feel unsatisfied, affecting their commitment and leading to turnover intention (Amin and Akbar, 2013; Aykan, 2014; Jung

et al., 2021; Kulachai and Amaraphibal, 2017; Rasheed et al., 2020). Turnover intention is understood as the thoughts, considerations, and calculations of employees for the behavior of leaving the current organization in the context of the influence of subjective or objective factors inside and outside the hotel business.

There are many factors that affect the intention of leaving hotel employees. During the research process, the authors compiled 360 related articles, then applied the systematic literature review (SLR) method, following the instructions of other researchers (Kitchenham et al., 2009; Murata et al., 2014). To use the document system conveniently after researching, the authors have numbered and divided the documents into the job description index theory, commitment to the organization, group of models, and a group of studies. Empirical research, the group of factors affecting the turnover intention in general, the group of factors affecting the turnover intention in the hotel industry. Most of the articles focus on studying only a few factors affecting turnover intention. Therefore, the study of many factors affecting the turnover intention of the hotel staff, including the use of two moderative variables, is a new research direction that helps the author to contribute a more holistic and multidimensional view of influence and the relationship of factors related to the turnover intention the hotel industry staff. The authors have coded selected articles according to the article number; the content of the articles is mainly associated with the turnover intention or leaving the hotel industry.

2.2. Turnover intention of hotel staff

Park and Gursoy (2012) have showed that the factors such as vitality, dedication, absorption, job satisfaction, practice factors human resource management and employee development including performance appraisal, training and development, career advancement, organizational trust (Hemdi and Nasurdin, 2006; Yang et al., 2012), describe multi-level model of management support at management level, department level, supervisor level, individual level, departmental support, departmental supervision, sincere team, transformational leadership membership, civil rights organizational behavior, the effect of organizational commitment on employee attitudes and loyalty – hotel employee retention (Li et al., 2017; Sun et al., 2020), the content of the structural equation research (Limyothin and Trichun, 2012) the factors studied by the author are work and life quality,

acceptance of organizational culture, job satisfaction and team commitment organization, demographic characteristics in hospitality businesses (Li et al., 2019), the relationship between job change in hotels and intention to quit; .The regulatory role of organizational support is perceived and the psychologically competitive environment-artificial intelligence and robot awareness of hotel staff. According to Wang et al. (2020), their study shows the influence of professionalism on the intention to change the job of hotel employees, the mediating role of employee engagement and job satisfaction, factors that are paired topics in the research content of professionalism, satisfaction, cohesion the effect of friendship deviant behavior in the workplace of hotel employees-the regulatory role of the hotel staff. Organization (Peng et al., 2020) employee green behavior from a positive perspective and positive spillover because such voluntary behaviors benefit actors other than employees, specifically can be hotels that use them and their natural surroundings (Labrague et al., 2018) working environment, co-worker relations, job satisfaction, salary, organizational commitment, engagement, work motivation, job satisfaction, work environment (Park and Min, 2020) work attitude, work stress, the conflict between parties (Akova et al., 2015; Emiroğlu et al., 2015). Table 1 includes the factors influencing turnover intention in the hospitality industry.

2.3. Proposed model

Based on previous studies on the turnover intention model, this study applies a systematic literature review (SLR). Based on the documents, SLR involves activities like planning (identifying research questions), implementation (document retrieval, research selection, and data aggregation), and reporting (writing a report). Research activities are conducted by searching raw data using keywords like Turnover intention, Turnover intention model, or Turnover intention model in the hotel industry. The research overview includes five academic database systems:

1. ResearchGate;
2. ScienceDirect;
3. Elsevier;
4. Scopus; and
5. Emerald Insight.

The study's proposed factors of the turnover intention model are included in Fig. 1.

Table 1: Factors influencing turnover intention in the hospitality industry

No.	Performance criteria	Source
1	Work Itself	Peng et al. (2020)
2	Supervision	Labrague et al. (2018)
3	Coworkers Relationship	Park and Gursoy (2012)
4	Salary and Benefit	Park and Gursoy (2012)
5	Career Opportunities	Hemdi and Nasurdin (2006)
6	Job Stress	Akova et al. (2015), Emiroğlu et al. (2015)
7	Perceived Risk	Emiroğlu et al. (2015)
8	Job Insecurity	Akova et al. (2015), Emiroğlu et al. (2015)

3. Research method

3.1. Determining the evaluation criteria weight

After the most important factors were identified, the fuzzy AHP method and fuzzy TOPSIS were used to determine the right judgment of factor importance. In this respect, fuzzy AHP can be very useful in involving several decision-makers with multiple conflicting criteria to reach a consensus in the decision-making process. On the other side, the fuzzy TOPSIS technique is used to calculate alternative ratings. The choice of TOPSIS is due to its capability of ranking a wide number of alternatives. This approach can be considered as a driver in implementing the alternative that represents the best trade-off according to the various considered criteria.

Specifically, this research attempts to evaluate the turnover intention of employees among three classes of hotels. By reviewing the related literature, the criteria for turnover intention evaluation have been developed. However, it is difficult to assume that each evaluation criterion is equally important.

The selection of a suitable method to apply to determine the weights depends on the nature of the problem (Hsieh et al., 2004). Evaluating turnover intention is a complex and wide-ranging problem, so this issue requires an inclusive and flexible method. The pure AHP method tends to be less effective when dealing with uncertainty in the decision-making process. Chen and Tzeng (2004) noted that the weights of criteria in decision-making problems have different meanings, and not all of them can be assigned equal importance. Since its appearance, many researchers have widely used the fuzzy AHP method to solve other decision-making problems in various areas. The fuzzy AHP can address the uncertainty and imprecision of the evaluation process (Zadeh, 1965). To evaluate the hotel class which is affected the most among the mentioned three classes, this study applied the TOPSIS method, which is based on the concept that the chosen alternative should have the shortest distance from the positive ideal solution and the longest distance from the negative ideal solution (Sun, 2010).


Fig. 1: The proposed factors of the turnover intention model

3.1.1. Establishing fuzzy number

Since fuzzy sets were introduced by Zadeh (1965), they are also seen as an extension of the classical notion of sets. In that theory, the membership of elements in a set is assessed in binary terms and with a set of bivalent conditions that means an element either belongs or does not belong to the set. The concept of mathematics was applied by Hsieh et al. (2004) and Sun (2010).

A number of fuzzy Ã on ℝ to be a triangular fuzzy number (TFN) if the membership function $\mu_A{\sim}(x)$: ℝ -> [0,1] is equal to Eq. 1:

$$\mu_A{\sim}(x) = \begin{cases} (x-l)/(m-l), & l \leq x \leq m \\ (u-x/(u-m), & m \leq x \leq u \\ 0, & otherwise \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

As shown by Eq. 1, l and u represent the lower and upper bounds of the fuzzy number Ã, respectively, and m is the modal value of Ã. The membership function of the TFN is shown in Fig. 2.


Fig. 2: The membership function of TFN

⊕ is the addition of fuzzy numbers;

$$Ã1 \oplus Ã2 = (l1,m1,u1) \oplus (l2,m2,u2) = (l1+l2,m1+m2,u1+u2) \quad (2)$$

⊗ is the multiplication of fuzzy numbers;

$$Ã1 \otimes Ã2 = (l1,m1,u1) \otimes (l2,m2,u2) = (l1\,l2,m1m2,u1u2) \text{ for } l1\,l2 > 0;\ m1m2 > 0;\ u1u2 > 0 \quad (3)$$

⊖ is the subtraction of fuzzy numbers;

$$Ã1 \ominus Ã2 = (l1,m1,u1) \ominus (l2,m2,u2) = (l1-ul2,m1-m2,u1l2) \text{ for } l1\,l2 > 0;\ m1m2 > 0;\ u1u2 > 0 \quad (4)$$

∅ is the division of fuzzy numbers;

$$Ã1 \oslash Ã2 = (l1,m1,u1) \oslash (l2,m2,u2) = (l1/l2,m1/m2,u1/u2) \text{ for } l1\,l2 > 0;\ m1m2 > 0;\ u1u2 > 0 \quad (5)$$

Reciprocal of a fuzzy number;

$$Ã_1^{-1} = (l1,m1,u1) = (1/u1,1/m1,1/l1) \text{ for } l1\,l2 > 0;\ m1m2 > 0;\ u1u2 > 0 \quad (6)$$

3.1.2. Linguistic variable

Zadeh (1965) noted that, for conventional quantification, it is tough to express situations that are hard to define reasonably. A linguistic variable's values are words or sentences in a natural or artificial language (Sun, 2010). This study used this type of expression to compare three apartment investment companies' evaluation dimensions by nine basic linguistic terms, including "extremely important," "very strongly important," "essentially important," "weakly important," and "equally important" concerning a fuzzy nine-level scale. Table 2 shows the computation technique based on the Gumus (2009) definition of fuzzy numbers.

3.2. Fuzzy AHP method

There are various fuzzy AHP methods for solving other managerial problems. The fuzzy AHP method proposed by Hsieh et al. (2004) is utilized to calculate the factor weights in different works such as Sun (2010). The steps are as follows:

- Step 1: Making pairwise comparisons and obtaining the individual judgment matrices: The experts perform pairwise comparisons of the importance or preference between each pair of criteria. The comparison of measures is in the form of linguistic variables. This can be achieved through questionnaires.

Table 2: Linguistic variables and their fuzzy numbers

Numerical rating	Linguistic variable	TFN
1	Equally important	(1,1,1)
2	Intermediate value between 1 and 3	(1,2,3)
3	Essentially important	(2,3,4)
4	Intermediate value between 3 and 5	(3,4,5)
5	Strongly important	(4,5,6)
6	Intermediate value between 5 and 7	(5,6,7)
7	Very strongly important	(6,7,8)
8	Intermediate value between 7 and 9	(7,8,9)
9	Extremely important	(8,9,10)

$$Ã^k = \begin{bmatrix} ã_{11}^k & ã_{12}^k & \dots & ã_{1n}^k \\ ã_{21}^k & ã_{22}^k & \dots & ã_{2n}^k \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ ã_{m1}^k & ã_{m2}^k & & ã_{mn}^k \end{bmatrix} \quad (7)$$

The evaluation of experts is calculated according to Eq. 8. The derived matrix is in the form of Eq. 9.

$$\tilde{a}\,ij = (\tilde{a}_{ij}^k \otimes \tilde{a}_{ij}^k \dots \otimes \tilde{a}_{ij}^k)1/k \quad (8)$$

$$\tilde{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{a}_{11} & \tilde{a}_{12} & \dots & \tilde{a}_{1n} \\ \tilde{a}_{21} & \tilde{a}_{22} & \dots & \tilde{a}_{2n} \\ \dots \dots \dots \dots \dots \dots \dots \\ \tilde{a}_{m1} & \tilde{a}_{m2} & & \tilde{a}_{mn} \end{bmatrix} \tag{9}$$

• Step 2: Constructing the comparison matrices: The geometric mean and fuzzy weight of the factors are calculated according to Hsieh et al. (2004):

$$\tilde{r}i=(\tilde{a}i1 \otimes \dots \otimes \tilde{a}ij \otimes \dots \otimes \tilde{a}in)1/n \tag{10}$$
$$\widetilde{w}i=\tilde{r}i \otimes [\tilde{r}i \oplus \dots \oplus \tilde{r}i \oplus \dots \oplus \tilde{r}i]{-1} \tag{11}$$

where, $\tilde{a}ij$ represents the relative importance of criterion i to j and $\tilde{r}i$ is the geometric mean value of criterion *i*. $\widetilde{w}i$ is the fuzzy weight of criterion *i*, represented by TFN. $\widetilde{w}_i=(lw_i, mw_i, uw_i)$, where lw_i, mw_i, and uw_i are the low, middle, and high values of TFN, respectively.

• Step 3: Defuzzification: The center of area (COA) method is used to calculate the best nonfuzzy performance (BNP) value for each factor.

$$BNP = \frac{[(U_{wi}-L_{wi})+ (M_{Wi}-L_{wi})]}{3} + L_{wi} \tag{12}$$

• Step 4: Calculating the consistency ratio for a matrix: Defuzzification is applied to calculate the consistency ratio index. Next, the consistency matrix is obtained as in pure AHP. The two matrices, A_m and A_g, are derived from the comparison matrix using the defuzzification method.

A_m is the matrix derived from the mean (m) values of the fuzzy comparison matrix:

$$Am [a_{ijm}] \tag{13}$$

A_g is the matrix derived from the geometric mean by the smallest value (l) and the largest possible (m):

$$Ag={}^2\sqrt{a_{iju}}a_{ijl} \tag{14}$$

The two matrices with CR values below 0.1 indicate the consistency of the matrix.

The defuzzification is achieved using the following equation:

$$A = [aijl + 2 * aijm + aiju/4] \tag{15}$$

Then, the matrix is normalized with the following equation:

$$A_i = \left[\frac{a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i}\right] \tag{16}$$

The consistency index (CI), for a comparison matrix, can be computed with the use of the following equation:

$$CI = (\lambda max - n)/(n - 1) \tag{17}$$

where, λ_{max} is the largest eigenvalue of the comparison matrix and *n* is the dimension of the matrix.

$$\lambda_{max} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(AW)_i /w_i \tag{18}$$

The consistency ratio (CR) is defined as the ratio between the consistency of a given evaluation matrix and the consistency of a random matrix:

$$CR = (CI/RI) \tag{19}$$

where, $RI(n)$ is a random index (RI) that depends on *n*, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: RI of random matrices (Saaty and Vargas, 1980)

n	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
R	0	0	0.52	0.90	1.12	1.24	1.32	1.41	1.45	1.49

If the CR of a comparison matrix is equal to or less than 0.1, it may be acceptable. If the CR is unacceptable, the decision-maker is encouraged to repeat the pairwise comparisons.

3.3. The fuzzy TOPSIS method

Nădăban et al. (2016) stated that fuzzy TOPSIS was a practical tool for coping with many studies. The mathematical concept of this study is applied from Sun (2010), and the TOPSIS method consists of the following steps:

• Step 1: The evaluation criteria weight determination: The fuzzy preference weight is employed from the FAHP results in this research.
• Step 2: Constructing the decision matrix and assign the linguistic variables to the alternatives.

$$\tilde{D} = \begin{array}{c} \\ A_1 \\ A_1 \\ \vdots \\ A_1 \end{array} \begin{array}{cccc} C_1 & C_2 & \dots C_n \\ \left[\begin{array}{cccc} \tilde{a}_1 & \tilde{a}_{12} & \dots & \tilde{a}_{1n} \\ \tilde{a}_{21} & \tilde{a}_{22} & \dots & \tilde{a}_{2n} \\ \dots \dots \dots \dots \dots \dots \\ \tilde{a}_{m1} & \tilde{a}_{m2} & & \tilde{a}_{mn} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \tag{20}$$

i=1,2, ...,m;j=1,2...,n

$$\tilde{a}_{ij} \frac{1}{K} (\tilde{a}_{ij}^{-1} \oplus \dots \oplus \tilde{a}_{ij}^{k} \dots \oplus \tilde{a}_{ij}^{K} \tag{21}$$

where $\tilde{a}_{ij}^{k}$ is the selection rating of alternative A_i with respect to criterion C_j evaluation by the kth expert and,

$$\tilde{a}_{ij}^{k} = \left(l_{ij}^{k}, m_{ij}^{k}, u_{ij}^{k}\right) \tag{22}$$

• Step 3: Normalizing the decision matrix: To normalize the fuzzy decision matrix, $\tilde{R}$ is used as in Eq. 23.

$$\tilde{R} =[\widetilde{r_{ij}}]mxn\ i=1,2 \dots, m;j=1,2,\dots n \tag{23}$$

The process of normalization is conducted as in Eq. 24.

$$\widetilde{r_{ij}} = \left(\frac{l_{ij}}{u_{ij}}, \frac{m_{ij}}{u_{ij}}, \frac{u_{ij}}{u_{ij}}\right), u_j^+ = max \{uij/i = 1,2 \dots n\} \tag{24}$$

Additionally, it can set the best-aspired level u_j^+, and j=1,2,...n is equal to one; otherwise, the worst is zero (Sun, 2010).

For normalizing the weight of the decision matrix, the formulation is as in Eq. 25:

$$\tilde{V} = [\widetilde{v_{ij}}]nxn, i = 1,2,\dots,m; j = 1,2\dots,n \qquad (25)$$

where, $\widetilde{v_{ij}} = \widetilde{r_{ij}} \otimes \widetilde{w_j}$ (26)

- Step 4: Determining the FPIS and FNIS: The positive triangular fuzzy numbers (PTFNs) are included in the interval [0.1], and the elements of the fuzzy decision matrix $\widetilde{v_{ij}}$ are normalized PTFNs. Therefore, the FPIS is defined as FPIS A+, and FNIS is defined as FNIS A-. The formulas are presented in Eqs. 27, and 28.

$$A+= (\widetilde{v_1^+},\dots \widetilde{v_j^+},\dots \widetilde{v_n^+}) \qquad (27)$$
$$A-=(\widetilde{v_1^-},\dots \widetilde{v_j^-},\dots \widetilde{v_n^-}) \qquad (28)$$

where, $\widetilde{v_j^+}=(1,1,1) \otimes \widetilde{w_j}=(lw_j, mw_j, uw_j)$ and $\widetilde{v_j^-}=(0,0,0)$, j=1,2,…n (Sun, 2010).

- Step 5: Calculating the distance of each apartment investor from FPIS and FNIS: The distance ($\widetilde{d_i^+}$ and $\widetilde{d_i^-}$) of each apartment investor from A+ and A- can be calculated by Eq. According to the vertex method stated in Chen (2000), the distance between fuzzy numbers and B- is calculated as

$$D(\tilde{A}_1, \tilde{A}_2)=\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}[(l_1 - l_2)^2 + (m_1 - m_2)^2 + (u_1 - u_2)^2]} \qquad (29)$$
$$\widetilde{d_i^+}=\sum_{j=1}^{n} d(\widetilde{v_{ij}}, \widetilde{v_j^+}), I=1,2,\dots, m; j=1,2,\dots n \qquad (30)$$
$$\widetilde{d_i^-}=\sum_{j=1}^{n} d(\widetilde{v_{ij}}, \widetilde{v_j^-}), I=1,2,\dots, m; j=1,2,\dots n \qquad (31)$$

- Step 6: Obtaining the closeness coefficient and rank the order of alternatives: Now that the closeness coefficient is determined, it is possible to obtain the ranking order of alternatives that allows the most suitable alternative (apartment investor) to be selected by the decision-maker. Eq. 32 shows the calculation of the closeness coefficient.

$$CCi=\frac{\widetilde{d_i^-}}{\widetilde{d_i^+}+\widetilde{d_i^-}}=1-\frac{\widetilde{d_i^+}}{\widetilde{d_i^+}+\widetilde{d_i^-}}, i=1,2,\dots m \qquad (32)$$

where, $\frac{\widetilde{d_i^-}}{\widetilde{d_i^+}+\widetilde{d_i^-}}$ is the fuzzy satisfaction degree in the ith alternative and $\frac{\widetilde{d_i^+}}{\widetilde{d_i^+}+\widetilde{d_i^-}}$ is the fuzzy gap between the degrees in i^{th}.

From the formula, a large value of index CC_i indicates the good performance of the alternative A_i.

4. Data analysis

4.1. Experts' information background

A total of 17 experts, including managers, consultants, and scholars from the hotels, and universities, participated in the survey. Four of the returned questionnaires were deemed invalid; they were returned to the experts for revisions. Three responses were excluded from the analysis because the experts refused to correct their answers. The results of this study are based on 17 experts. Table 4 presents the experts' information.

Based on a review of previous studies on employee turnover behavior and interviews with experts in the hotel industry, this study selected eight performance criteria (Table 5): Work Itself, Supervision, Coworkers Relationship, Salary and Benefit, Career Opportunities, Job Stress, Perceived Risk and Job Insecurity.

4.2. FAHP results

The importance comparison for each factor was performed via a questionnaire. The importance ranks of the performance criteria were assessed by 17 experts and converted from linguistic variables to equivalent fuzzy numbers (Table 6). The geometric mean method was used to calculate each factor in the comparison matrix.

$$\tilde{a}_{ij} = (\tilde{a}_{ij}^1 \otimes \tilde{a}_{ij}^2 \dots \otimes \tilde{a}_{ij}^{17})^{1/17}$$

Take $\tilde{a}_{12}$ as an example:

$$\tilde{a}_{12}=(2,3,4) \otimes (3,4,5) \otimes \dots \otimes (7,8,9)^{1/17} =((2\times3\times\dots\times7)^{1/17}, (3\times4\times\dots\times8)^{1/17}, (4\times5\times\dots\times9)^{1/17})=(2.10, 2.67, 3.26)$$

Table 4: Basic information of respondents

No.	Position	Education	Years of experience	Organization
1	Director of human resource	Bachelor	25	Meliá Hanoi Hotel
2	Director of human resource	MA/MSc	28	Hilton Hanoi Opera Hotel
3	Director of human resource	Doctor	25	Sofitel legend metropole Hanoi Hotel
4	Director of human resource	MA/MSc	20	Sheraton Hanoi Hotel
5	Director of human resource	Bachelor	30	Intercontinental Hanoi Westlake Hotel
6	Director of human resource	Bachelor	20	JW Marriott Hanoi Hotel
7	Director of human resource	Bachelor	20	Hanoi de I 'Opera Hotel
8	Director of human resource	Bachelor	22	Novotel Kien Giang Hotel
9	Training manager	MA/MSc	18	Novotel Hanoi Hotel
10	Food and Beverage director	Bachelor	25	Crowne Plaza Hanoi Hotel
11	Room division director	MA/MSc	20	Zeneden Hotel Group
12	Human resources director	Bachelor	25	Muong Thanh Hotel group
13	Hotel general manager	Bachelor	18	Vinpearl Hanam Hotel
14	Room division director	Bachelor	20	Hyatt Regency West Hanoi Hotel
15	Hotel general manager	Bachelor	20	Sahul Hanoi Hotel
16	Hotel general manager	Bachelor	22	My Way Hanoi Hotel
17	Hotel general manager	Bachelor	18	Muong Thanh Xa La Hanoi Hotel

Table 5: Performance criteria

No.	Code	Performance criteria
1	WO	Work Itself
2	SU	Supervision
3	CO	Coworkers Relationship
4	SA	Salary and Benefit
5	CA	Career Opportunities
6	JS	Job Stress
7	PE	Perceived Risk
8	JI	Job Insecurity

Table 6: Comparison matrix of the performance criteria in hotel employee turnover

	WO			SU			CO			SA			CA			JS			PE			JI		
WO	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.10	2.67	3.26	3.01	3.68	4.48	0.68	0.89	1.23	1.92	2.32	2.77	0.54	0.65	0.79	0.33	0.42	0.52	0.51	0.62	0.75
SU	0.31	0.37	0.48	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.70	0.87	1.12	0.39	0.47	0.59	0.70	0.86	1.05	0.31	0.38	0.48	0.72	0.88	1.13	0.34	0.41	0.50
CO	0.22	0.27	0.33	0.90	1.15	1.43	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.59	0.71	0.87	1.19	1.46	1.75	0.47	0.60	0.75	0.35	0.41	0.50	0.39	0.48	0.59
SA	0.81	1.12	1.48	1.70	2.11	2.58	1.15	1.41	1.70	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.48	3.07	3.82	2.14	2.69	3.33	2.28	2.94	3.64	3.25	3.91	4.59
CA	0.36	0.43	0.52	0.95	1.16	1.43	0.57	0.68	0.84	0.26	0.33	0.40	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.22	0.26	0.32	0.45	0.56	0.73	0.43	0.54	0.68
JS	1.27	1.53	1.86	2.07	2.61	3.18	1.33	1.67	2.15	0.30	0.37	0.47	3.12	3.89	4.62	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.90	1.09	1.31	0.84	0.94	1.06
PE	1.91	2.39	3.01	0.88	1.14	1.40	1.99	2.44	2.88	0.27	0.34	0.44	1.38	1.78	2.22	0.76	0.92	1.11	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.52	0.59	0.66
JI	1.34	1.61	1.95	1.99	2.44	2.96	1.70	2.10	2.60	0.22	0.26	0.31	1.47	1.86	2.31	0.94	1.06	1.19	1.52	1.70	1.91	1.00	1.00	1.00

Next, the fuzzy weight for each factor was calculated. The following formula was used for the calculation ($\tilde{r}_1$):

$$\tilde{r}_1 = (\tilde{a}_{11} \otimes \tilde{a}_{12} \otimes \tilde{a}_{13} \otimes \tilde{a}_{14} \otimes \tilde{a}_{15} \otimes \tilde{a}_{16} \otimes \tilde{a}_{17} \otimes \tilde{a}_{18})^{1/8}$$
$$= ((1 \times 2.10 \times \ldots \times 0.51)^{1/8}, (1 \times 2.67 \times \ldots \times 0.62)^{1/8}, (1 \times 3.26 \times \ldots \times 0.75)^{1/8}) = (0.96, 1.17, 1.41)$$

Similarly, the $\tilde{r}_i$ was obtained as follows:

$\tilde{r}_2 = (0.51, 0.61, 0.74)$
$\tilde{r}_3 = (0.55, 0.66, 0.80)$
$\tilde{r}_4 = (1.68, 2.05, 2.47)$
$\tilde{r}_5 = (0.46, 0.55, 0.67)$
$\tilde{r}_6 = (1.12, 1.33, 1.58)$
$\tilde{r}_7 = (0.92, 1.10, 1.31)$
$\tilde{r}_8 = (1.10, 1.28, 1.49)$

Similarly, the $\tilde{r}_i$ was obtained.
Then, the factor weight ($\tilde{w}_i$) for each factor was calculated with the following equation:

$$\tilde{w}_1 = \tilde{r}_1 \otimes [\tilde{r}_3 \oplus \tilde{r}_2 \oplus \tilde{r}_4 \oplus \tilde{r}_5 \oplus \tilde{r}_6 \oplus \tilde{r}_7 \oplus \tilde{r}_8]^{-1} = ((0.96, 1.17, 1.41) \otimes (1/0.96 + \ldots + 1.10), 1/(1/1.17 + \ldots + 1.28), 1/(1.41 + \ldots + 1.49)) = (0.09, 0.13, 0.19)$$

Similarly, $\tilde{w}_I$ for each factor was as follows:

$\tilde{w}_2 = (0.05, 0.07, 0.10)$
$\tilde{w}_3 = (0.05, 0.08, 0.11)$
$\tilde{w}_4 = (0.16, 0.23, 0.34)$
$\tilde{w}_5 = (0.04, 0.06, 0.09)$
$\tilde{w}_6 = (0.11, 0.15, 0.22)$
$\tilde{w}_7 = (0.09, 0.13, 0.18)$
$\tilde{w}_8 = (0.10, 0.15, 0.20)$

Using the COA method, BNP values in fuzzy number form for each factor were obtained as follows. Taking the BNP value for the A factor (design and quality) as an example, the following equation was used:

$$BNP = \frac{[(U_{w1} - L_{w1}) + (M_{w1} - L_{w1})]}{3} + L_{w1} = \frac{[(0.19 - 0.09) + (0.13 - 0.09)]}{3} + 0.09 = 0.14$$

After obtaining the crisp number of the BNP value, normalization was achieved using Eq. 15. The obtained matrix is shown in Table 7. Using Eq. 16, the normalized matrix was derived as in Table 8.

Table 7: Defuzzification matrix

	WO	SU	CO	SA	CA	JS	PE	JI
WO	1.00	2.67	3.71	0.92	2.33	0.66	0.42	0.63
SU	0.38	1.00	0.89	0.48	0.87	0.39	0.90	0.42
CO	0.27	1.16	1.00	0.72	1.47	0.60	0.42	0.48
SA	1.13	2.13	1.42	1.00	3.11	2.71	2.95	3.91
CA	0.44	1.18	0.70	0.33	1.00	0.26	0.57	0.55
JS	1.55	2.61	1.71	0.38	3.88	1.00	1.09	0.95
PE	2.43	1.14	2.44	0.35	1.79	0.93	1.00	0.59
JI	1.63	2.45	2.13	0.26	1.87	1.06	1.71	1.00

Table 8: Normalized matrix

	WO	SU	CO	SA	CA	JS	PE	JI	MEAN
WO	0.36	0.38	0.53	0.30	0.30	0.15	0.09	0.12	0.14
SU	0.14	0.14	0.13	0.15	0.11	0.09	0.19	0.08	0.07
CO	0.10	0.17	0.14	0.23	0.19	0.14	0.09	0.09	0.08
SA	0.41	0.31	0.20	0.32	0.40	0.62	0.63	0.72	0.24
CA	0.16	0.17	0.10	0.11	0.13	0.06	0.12	0.10	0.06
JS	0.55	0.38	0.24	0.12	0.50	0.23	0.23	0.17	0.15
PE	0.87	0.16	0.35	0.11	0.23	0.21	0.21	0.11	0.13
JI	0.58	0.35	0.30	0.08	0.24	0.24	0.36	0.18	0.14

The consistency indices were calculated using Eqs. 17–19. The obtained results are:

$\lambda = 8.7$; CI=0.11=>with n =8=>RI=1.41 CR=CI/RI=0.08<0.1

So the CR is acceptable. After obtaining the factor weight ($\widetilde{w}$), BNP value and geometric mean matrix for each factor, the ordered ranking of factors is shown in Table 9.

Table 9: Rankings and local weights of factors

Factor	Weight ($\widetilde{w}$)	BNP value	Rank
Work itself	(0.09, 0.13, 0.19)	0.14	4
Supervision	(0.05, 0.07, 0.10)	0.07	7
Coworkers relationship	(0.05, 0.08, 0.11)	0.08	6
Salary and benefit	(0.16, 0.23, 0.34)	0.24	1
Career opportunities	(0.04, 0.06, 0.09)	0.07	7
Job stress	(0.11, 0.15, 0.22)	0.16	2
Perceived risk	(0.09, 0.13, 0.18)	0.13	5
Job insecurity	(0.10, 0.15, 0.20)	0.15	3

Table 8 shows the BNP importance weight and the geometric mean of eight factors that impact employee turnover in the hotel industry during the COVID-19. The results in Table 8 reveal the experts' experience and knowledge on the priority order of the selected factors in the research model. Salary and Benefit rank first with the highest BNP value (BNP=0.24). Job Stress ranks second (BNP=0.16); Job Insecurity is third (BNP=0.15). The fourth-ranked factor is Work Itself (BNP=0.14), followed by Perceived Risk is ranked fifth (BNP=0.13;). Coworkers Relationship ranks sixth (BNP=0.05), and finally, the seventh place belongs to the Supervision and Career Opportunities (BNP=0.07).

As a result of FAHP, the study shows that the most important factor influencing employee turnover is Salary and Benefit. Moreover, the results indicate that the least important dimensions are the Co-workers' Relationship, Supervision, and Career Opportunities, the second group dimensions that impact employee turnover in the context of the COVID-19 epidemic are Work Itself, Job Stress, Perceived Risk, and Job Insecurity.

4.3. Fuzzy TOPSIS

This study concentrated on the performance evaluation of apartment selection, so this study was based on the linguistic term from the definition of Hsieh et al. (2004) and Sun (2010). The experts have their own range of linguistic variables used in this study according to their subjective judgment (Hsieh et al., 2004; Sun, 2010). The linguistic terms include "very low impacted," "low impacted," "fair," impacted" and "strong impacted" from the selection that term experts can use to express their opinions about the rating regarding each criterion of hotel class. Table 10 shows the list of evaluations based on expert opinions. The geometric mean method was used to calculate each factor in the comparison matrix by applying Eqs. 21, and 22, and the integrated matrix is shown in Table 11. Eqs. 23 and 24 are applied to normalize the fuzzy decision matrix (Table 12).The next step in the FTOPSIS analysis is to find the weighted fuzzy decision matrix by using Eq. 25, Table 13 shows the weighted normalized fuzzy decision matrix.

Table 10: Linguistic scale for the rating of each investor

Linguistic variable	Corresponding triangular fuzzy number
Very low impacted	(0,1,3)
Low impacted	(1,3,5)
Fair	(3,5,7)
Impacted	(5,7,9)
Strong impacted	(7,9,10)

Table 11: Integrated matrix

	Below three-star hotel	Three-star hotel	Four and five-star hotel
Work itself	(3.53, 5.35, 7.06)	(3.24, 4.94, 6.59)	(1.76, 3.35, 5.12)
Supervision	(2.29, 3.88, 5.65)	(2.35, 4.00, 5.82)	(3.29, 5.12, 6.88)
Coworkers relationship	(3.06, 4.94, 6.88)	3.88, 5.65, 7.24)	(3.76, 5.59, 7.24)
Salary and benefit	(3.76, 5.59, 7.24)	(4.06, 5.94, 7.71)	(3.00, 4.65, 6.24)
Career opportunities	(1.94, 3.59, 5.53)	(2.76, 4.59, 6.59)	(4.47, 6.41, 8.06)
Job stress	(3.00, 4.76, 6.65)	(2.88, 4.65, 6.59)	(4.06, 5.94, 7.65)
Perceived risk	(2.41, 4.06, 5.94)	(3.24, 5.00, 6.82)	(3.41, 5.24, 7.00)
Job insecurity	(1.82, 3.47, 5.47)	(3.47, 5.24, 7.00)	(3.59, 5.47, 7.18)

Table 12: Normalized matrix

	Below three-star hotel	Three-star hotel	Four and five-star hotel
Work itself	(0.50, 0.76, 1.00)	(0.46, 0.70, 0.93)	(0.25, 0.48, 0.73)
Supervision	(0.33, 0.56, 0.82)	(0.34, 0.58, 0.85)	(0.48, 0.74, 1.00)
Coworkers relationship	(0.42, 0.68, 0.95)	(0.54, 0.78, 1.00)	(0.52, 0.7, 1.00)
Salary and benefit	(0.49, 0.73, 0.94)	(0.53, 0.77, 1.00)	(0.39, 0.60, 0.81)
Career opportunities	(0.24, 0.45, 0.69)	(0.34, 0.57, 0.82)	(0.55, 0.80, 1.00)
Job stress	(0.39, 0.62, 0.87)	(0.38, 0.61, 0.86)	(0.53, 0.78, 1.00)
Perceived risk	(0.34, 0.58, 0.85)	(0.46, 0.71, 0.97)	(0.49, 0.75, 1.00)
Job insecurity	(0.25, 0.48, 0.76)	(0.48, 0.73, 0.98)	(0.50, 0.76, 1.00)

Next, we determine the fuzzy positive and fuzzy negative ideal reference points by defining the positive-ideal solution (FPIS) as A+ and the negative-ideal solution (FNIS) as A-(Eqs. 27, and 28).

Table 13: Weighted fuzzy decision matrix

	Below three-star hotel	Three-star hotel	Four and five-star hotel
Work itself	(0.09, 0.13, 0.19)	(0.04, 0.09, 0.18)	(0.02, 0.06, 0.14)
Supervision	(0.02, 0.03, 0.08)	(0.02, 0.03, 0.08)	(0.02, 0.04, 0.10)
Coworkers relationship	(0.02, 0.05, 0.10)	(0.03, 0.06, 0.11)	(0.03, 0.06, 0.11)
Salary and benefit	(0.08, 0.17, 0.32)	(0.08, 0.18, 0.34)	(0.06, 0.14, 0.28)
Career opportunities	(0.01, 0.03, 0.06)	(0.01, 0.03, 0.07)	(0.02, 0.05, 0.09)
Job stress	(0.04, 0.09, 0.19)	(0.04, 0.09, 0.19)	(0.06, 0.12, 0.22)
Perceived risk	(0.03, 0.08, 0.15)	(0.04, 0.09, 0.18)	(0.04, 0.10, 0.18)
Job insecurity	(0.03, 0.07, 0.15)	(0.05, 0.11, 0.20)	(0.05, 0.11, 0.20)

$A+ = [(1,1,1), (1,1,1), (1,1,1), (1,1,1), (1,1,1), (1,1,1), (1,1,1), (1,1,1)] \otimes \tilde{w}_j$
$= [(1,1,1), (1,1,1), (1,1,1), (1,1,1), (1,1,1), (1,1,1), (1,1,1), (1,1,1)] \otimes$
$[(0.09, 0.13, 0.19), (0.05, 0.07, 0.10), (0.05, 0.08, 0.11), (0.16, 0.23, 0.34), (0.04, 0.06, 0.09), (0.11, 0.15, 0.22) (0.09, 0.13, 0.18), (0.10, 0.15, 0.20)]$

$= (0.09, 0.13, 0.19), (0.05, 0.07, 0.10), (0.05, 0.08, 0.11), (0.16, 0.23, 0.34), (0.04, 0.06, 0.09), (0.11, 0.15, 0.22) (0.09, 0.13, 0.18), (0.10, 0.15, 0.20)$
$A- = (0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 0),$

Using Eqs. 30, and 31, we obtain the matrixes of d^- and d^+, as shown in Tables 14 and 15.

Table 14: The matrix of d^+

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	d^+
Below three-star hotel	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.06	0.03	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.35
Three-star hotel	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.05	0.02	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.29
Four and five-star hotel	0.06	0.02	0.02	0.09	0.01	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.31

Table 15: The matrix of d^-

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	d^-
Below three-star hotel	0.13	0.05	0.07	0.21	0.04	0.13	0.13	0.10	0.85
Three-star hotel	0.12	0.05	0.07	0.23	0.05	0.12	0.12	0.13	0.89
Four and five-star hotel	0.09	0.06	0.07	0.18	0.06	0.15	0.15	0.14	0.89

The final step is estimating the ranking and performance of the alternatives. The closeness coefficient of alternatives d_1^- and d_1^+ is calculated as an example.

$d_1^+ = 0.35; d_1^- = 0.89$

Since the distances from FPIS and FNIS are determined, the closeness coefficient can be obtained with Eq. 32. Therefore, the index CC_1 of the first alternative (Nam Cuong investor) is calculated as:

$CC_1^- = \frac{0.89}{0.35 + 0.89} = 0,71$
$CC_1^+ = \frac{0,39}{0.39 + 0.86} = 0,29$

CC_i^- is defined as the satisfaction degree in the ith alternative and CC_{1j}^+ as the gap degree in the ith alternative (Sun, 2010). Taking CC_1 as an example,

the result shows that the gap degree in the below three-star hotel should be improved to achieve the aspiration level and that obtaining the best win-win strategy is 0.29 among a fuzzy set of feasible alternatives, and the aspired/desired satisfaction degree of fuzzy TOPSIS is 1.00. Similarly, Table 16 shows the turnover degree and gap degree of each class hotel. As a result, the turnover degree value of the three-star hotel is 0.75, which shows the highest value; the second is the Four and Five-star hotel with a turnover degree of 0.74, and the third is the below three-star hotel with a turnover degree of 0.71. In addition, the result also indicates the gap degree value of each class hotel. In this, the below three-star hotel has a gap degree value of 0.29, which is the highest value; the second is a Four and Five-star hotel with a gap degree value of 0.26, and the last one is a three-star hotel with a gap degree value of 0.25.

Table 16: Closeness coefficients to the aspired level among three-class hotels

	d^-	d^+	Gap degree of CC_i^+	Satisfaction degree of CC_i^-
Below three-star hotel	0.85	0.35	0.29	0.71
Three-star hotel	0.89	0.29	0.25	0.75
Four and Five-star hotel	0.89	0.31	0.26	0.74

4.4. Discussion

This research shows that salary has the strongest impact on turnover intention (rank 1; gm 0.45); these are new findings that some other research has not shown. For example, Belete (2018) only discussed that salary is the basic factor impacting turnover intention, but in the context of research, there are many factors that impact turnover

intention. The authors have not shown the specific level of influence of each factor on the turnover intention and especially on the salary. Some other arguments show that the turnover intention of hotel employees is largely due to the illegitimacy of the employee; therefore, it was accompanied by unsecured welfare policies (Ariza-Montes et al., 2019). In addition, due to the gender structure count 52% of women, have to take care of family, and other

jobs, plus the overload of stress in work are the most important factors leading to turnover intention (Haldorai et al., 2019). According to Stamolampros et al. (2019), Unsatisfied job is the most influential factor on turnover intention=, the work environment and opportunities for promotion or communication with the head of management are the most influential factors. In contrast to the above research, the research in Vietnam shows that the salary, including basic salary and other incomes, is the most influential factor on the turnover intention of hotel employees. This is a new finding in this paper of research in Vietnam because, in a developing country, per capita income is not high, on the other hand, hotel employees are mainly in young age, so they need to earn more money to live, also to take care of their family, so a good salary is vital for them. In addition, from 2020 to now, due to the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic, hotel employees often have to attend non-permanent work schedules, leading to unstable income, so salary is a prerequisite factor to live. Stress in work is the second most influential factor on turnover intention mentioned above (rank 2; gm 0.3). According to experts, working in a hotel has high psychological pressure leading to exhaustion, but during this period, hotel employees are not only stressed by their work but also stressed prevention COVID-19 pandemic, and taking care of their family under the pressure of income. That is the reason why income and stress from work are factors that have the highest influence on turnover intention. Job insecurity is the third influencing factor (rank 3; gm 0.29) and works itself is the fourth influencing factor (rank 4; gm 0.28) to the turnover intention. Job insecurity is the third influencing factor (rank 3; gm 0.29) and works itself is the fourth influencing factor (rank 4; gm 0.28) to the intention of leaving hotel staff. From 2020 to now, the impact of COVID-19 on the hotel business and moreover on employees working in the hotel industry. The influence of job insecurity and work itself on the turnover intention has reflected the current situation of the hotel itself. The relationship between work itself and job insecurity is very close, according to the experts, work itself reflects the level of job insecurity with contents such as the characteristic of the job, the advantages or disadvantages of the job, the risk of job during the COVID-19 quarantine period inside hotels, the risk of serving quarantined guests at hotels allowed by the government, impact of hotel closures on employees working in hotels in areas affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. Based on research data, it has been shown that job insecurity and work itself in Vietnam have a strong influence on turnover intention; this is different for some research such as Darvishmotevali and Ali (2020) said that job insecurity has the strongest impact in the research, most of the employees feel insecure at work. However, the authors have not shown the influence of job insecurity on turnover intention. Job insecurity research is based on two groups that are the severity of the threat and powerlessness of six observed variables (Koo et al., 2021).

In this study, the authors only show the negative impact of severity of threat and powerlessness on job engagement and thereby affect the turnover intention, it only examined the impact of artificial intelligence on hotel employees through job insecurity perspectives. Job insecurity had negative effects on job engagement (Presti and Nonnis, 2012; Karatepe et al., 2020), and job insecurity and engagement affect turnover intention (Jung et al., 2021), in this research, the author only researched the influence of three factors without specifying the level of influence of each factor. The remaining four factors have a low impact in descending order on the intention of leaving hotel personnel; perceived risk (rank 5; gm 0.28), co-worker relationship (rank 6; gm 0.14), supervision (rank 7; gm 0.13), career opportunities (rank 8; gm 0.12) showed that there was a difference for the study of Stamolampros et al. (2019). The remaining four factors have a low impact in descending order respectively on the turnover intention; perceived risk (rank 5; gm 0.28), co-worker relationship (rank 6; gm 0.14), supervision (rank 7; gm 0.13), career opportunities (rank 8; gm 0.12) showed that there were differences to the research of Stamolampros et al. (2019), these are new points of the research shows the different impact of factors on the turnover intention of hotel employees before and after the COVID-19 pandemic.

5. Conclusion

The aim of this study is to construct a fuzzy AHP and fuzzy TOPSIS model to evaluate the dimensions of the hotel employee turnover intention model. The performance evaluation for employee turnover intention includes Work Itself, Supervision, Coworkers Relationship, Salary and Benefit, Career Opportunities, Job Stress, Perceived Risk, and Job Insecurity. These dimensions generate a final evaluation for ranking priority among the employee turnover intention of the proposed model. The importance of dimensions is evaluated by experts, and decision-making is processed through the fuzzy concept and fuzzy environment. From the steps of fuzzy AHP and fuzzy TOPSIS, this study finds out that the most important dimensions in the hotel employee turnover intention model are Salary and Benefit. Moreover, the results indicate that the least important dimensions are the Co-workers Relationship, Supervision, and Career Opportunities, the second group dimensions that impact employee turnover in the context of the COVID-19 epidemic are Work Itself, Job Stress, Perceived Risk, and Job Insecurity. In addition, this study's results show that Three-star hotel has the highest value of turnover intention; the second is the Four and Five-star hotel and the third is the Below Three-star hotel.

The rapidly evolving COVID-19 situation is posing many new challenges in terms of job security. The emergence of the epidemic has completely changed the perspective and normal operation of the structure of global production and trade, in which

the service industries are the heaviest impacted. As a country with great potential for tourism, Vietnam has been making great efforts to realize the dual goal of disease control and economic development, including the hospitality industry. However, the research results show that the anxiety and stress of tourism employees towards their work are clearly expressed. The research results also show that insecurity and reduced income are the most important factors impacting employee turnover. Previous studies such as Jung et al. (2021) also showed similar results when studying the intention to leave the job of hotel employees. However, the results of these studies come from traditional causes, the observed variables (concepts) in the study are not directly associated with the COVID-19 epidemic.

The results of the study will help businesses in the fields of hospitality have a more comprehensive view of human resource management activities. By having a clearer and deeper understanding of the employees' thoughts, managers shall make more appropriate policies, and make employees sympathize and be willing to share the difficulties that the business is facing, at the same time retain employees, especially highly skilled workers. Hotels need to take steps to give employees a stable mentality, peace of mind to work, love their job and believe in the future development of the tourism industry after the pandemic, thereby limiting the intention to leave. Businesses and workers need to grasp the labor demand of the economy in the context of transforming production methods to meet new requirements. Enterprises need to change the way they arrange work to protect the health of workers and create a safe mentality for employees while working. It is necessary to strictly adhere to the 5K+ Vaccine message, actively sourcing vaccines, and encourage employees to fully and timely vaccinate.

By integrating the fuzzy AHP and fuzzy TOPSIS method to evaluate the hotel employee turnover intention model, this study provides implications for hotel managers in understanding employee behavior and their turnover intention during the context of the COVID-19 epidemic based on 8 proposed dimensions. Moreover, this study also provides the turnover degree and gap degree to improve the aspiration level and achieve the best strategy to maintain good employees in the hotel industry. In addition to the implications, there are some limitations in this research, including the dimension selected in this proposed model and the hotel class. Therefore, for future research, the same model can be used for other case studies by considering different dimensions. Moreover, other methods of MCDM, such as VIKOR and ELECTRE, should be used to generate this study result.

Regarding the methodology, FAHP is utilized to determine the influential weights of criteria that are utilized in TOPSIS for preference values among alternatives. We demonstrate the applicability of the proposed methods to solving an MCDM problem of assessing the factors affecting the intention of

leaving hotel employees. The computational experiment results of our hybrid FAHP-TOPSIS model support the efficacy of incorporating fuzzy values concerning influential weight criteria. The framework can help managers better evaluate the systematic influential relation structure among factors influencing employee turnover intention in the hotel industry.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

Akova O, Cetin G, and Cifci İ (2015). The relation between demographic factors and the turnover intention in pre-opening hotel businesses. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 207: 377-384. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.177

Ali A, Abbas L, Shafiq M, Bashir AK, Afzal MK, Liaqat HB, Siddiqi MH, and Kwak KS (2019). Hybrid fuzzy logic scheme for efficient channel utilization in cognitive radio networks. IEEE Access, 7: 24463-24476. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2900233

Amin Z and Akbar KP (2013). Analysis of psychological well-being and turnover intentions of hotel employees: An empirical study. International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies, 3(3): 662-671.

Ariza-Montes A, Hernández-Perlines F, Han H, and Law R (2019). Human dimension of the hospitality industry: Working conditions and psychological well-being among European servers. Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 41: 138-147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2019.10.013

Aykan E (2014). Effects of perceived psychological contract breach on turnover intention: Intermediary role of loneliness perception of employees. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 150: 413-419. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.09.040

Belete AK (2018). Turnover intention influencing factors of employees: An empirical work review. Journal of Entrepreneurship and Organization Management, 7(3): 1-7.

Çalık A (2021). A novel Pythagorean fuzzy AHP and fuzzy TOPSIS methodology for green supplier selection in the Industry 4.0 era. Soft Computing, 25(3): 2253-2265. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00500-020-05294-9

Chen CT (2000). Extensions of the TOPSIS for group decision-making under fuzzy environment. Fuzzy Sets and Systems, 114(1): 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-0114(97)00377-1

Chen MF and Tzeng GH (2004). Combining grey relation and TOPSIS concepts for selecting an expatriate host country. Mathematical and Computer Modelling, 40(13): 1473-1490. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mcm.2005.01.006

Chen X, Cheng ZF, and Kim GB (2020). Make it memorable: Tourism experience, fun, recommendation and revisit intentions of Chinese outbound tourists. Sustainability, 12(5): 1904. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12051904

Cho YJ and Lewis GB (2012). Turnover intention and turnover behavior: Implications for retaining federal employees. Review of Public Personnel Administration, 32(1): 4-23. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X11408701

Darvishmotevali M and Ali F (2020). Job insecurity, subjective well-being and job performance: The moderating role of psychological capital. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 87: 102462. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102462

Emiroğlu BD, Akova O, and Tanrıverdi H (2015). The relationship between turnover intention and demographic factors in hotel businesses: A study at five star hotels in Istanbul. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 207: 385-397. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.108

Goyal S, Garg D, and Luthra S (2021). Sustainable production and consumption: Analysing barriers and solutions for maintaining green tomorrow by using fuzzy-AHP–fuzzy-TOPSIS hybrid framework. Environment, Development and Sustainability, 23(11): 16934-16980. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-021-01357-5

Gumus AT (2009). Evaluation of hazardous waste transportation firms by using a two step fuzzy-AHP and TOPSIS methodology. Expert Systems with Applications, 36(2): 4067-4074. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2008.03.013

Haldorai K, Kim WG, Pillai SG, Park TE, and Balasubramanian K (2019). Factors affecting hotel employees' attrition and turnover: Application of pull-push-mooring framework. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 83: 46-55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.04.003

Hassanzadeh MR and Valmohammadi C (2021). Evaluation and ranking of the banks and financial institutes using fuzzy AHP and TOPSIS techniques. International Journal of Operational Research, 40(3): 297-317. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJOR.2021.114301

Hemdi MA and Nasurdin AM (2006). Predicting turnover intentions of hotel employees: The influence of employee development human resource management practices and trust in organization. Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business, 8(1): 21-42. https://doi.org/10.22146/gamaijb.5625

Hsieh AT, Yen CH, and Chin KC (2004). Participative customers as partial employees and service provider workload. International Journal of Service Industry Management, 15(2): 187-199. https://doi.org/10.1108/09564230410532501

Jung HS, Jung YS, and Yoon HH (2021). COVID-19: The effects of job insecurity on the job engagement and turnover intent of deluxe hotel employees and the moderating role of generational characteristics. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 92: 102703. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102703 PMid:33041428 PMCid:PMC7538393

Kahraman C, Öztayşi B, Sarı İU, and Turanoğlu E (2014). Fuzzy analytic hierarchy process with interval type-2 fuzzy sets. Knowledge-Based Systems, 59: 48-57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2014.02.001

Karatepe OM, Rezapouraghdam H, and Hassannia R (2020). Job insecurity, work engagement and their effects on hotel employees' non-green and nonattendance behaviors. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 87: 102472. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102472

Khan N, Hassan AU, Fahad S, and Naushad M (2020). Factors affecting tourism industry and its impacts on global economy of the world. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3559353

Kitchenham B, Brereton OP, Budgen D, Turner M, Bailey J, and Linkman S (2009). Systematic literature reviews in software engineering: A systematic literature review. Information and Software Technology, 51(1): 7-15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2008.09.009

Koo B, Curtis C, and Ryan B (2021). Examining the impact of artificial intelligence on hotel employees through job insecurity perspectives. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 95: 102763. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102763

Kulachai W and Amaraphibal A (2017). Developing a causal model of turnover intention of police officers in the eastern region of Thailand. International Journal of Arts and Sciences, 10(1): 473-486.

Labrague LJ, Gloe D, McEnroe DM, Konstantinos K, and Colet P (2018). Factors influencing turnover intention among registered nurses in Samar Philippines. Applied Nursing Research, 39: 200-206. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnr.2017.11.027 PMid:29422159

Li C, Ashraf SF, Shahzad F, Bashir I, Murad M, Syed N, and Riaz M (2020). Influence of knowledge management practices on entrepreneurial and organizational performance: A mediated-moderation model. Frontiers in Psychology, 11: 577106. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.577106 PMid:33343453 PMCid:PMC7744290

Li JJ, Bonn MA, and Ye BH (2019). Hotel employee's artificial intelligence and robotics awareness and its impact on turnover intention: The moderating roles of perceived organizational support and competitive psychological climate. Tourism Management, 73: 172-181. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.02.006

Li JJ, Kim WG, and Zhao XR (2017). Multilevel model of management support and casino employee turnover intention. Tourism Management, 59: 193-204. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.08.006

Limyothin P and Trichun C (2012). The structural equation model of factors influencing the hotel staff in Thailand's intention to quit. International Journal of Human Resource Studies, 2(3): 22-35. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v2i3.2078

Lyu HM, Zhou WH, Shen SL, and Zhou AN (2020). Inundation risk assessment of metro system using AHP and TFN-AHP in Shenzhen. Sustainable Cities and Society, 56: 102103. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2020.102103

Mittal S and Dhar RL (2016). Effect of green transformational leadership on green creativity: A study of tourist hotels. Tourism Management, 57: 118-127. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.05.007

Mohamed LM (2016). Assessing the effects of transformational leadership: A study on Egyptian hotel employees. Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 27: 49-59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2016.04.001

Murata K, Wakabayashi K, and Watanabe A (2014). Study on and instrument to assess knowledge supply chain systems using advanced Kaizen activity in SMEs. Supply Chain Forum: An International Journal, 15(2): 20-32. https://doi.org/10.1080/16258312.2014.11517339

Nădăban S, Dzitac S, and Dzitac I (2016). Fuzzy TOPSIS: A general view. Procedia Computer Science, 91: 823-831. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2016.07.088

Park J and Gursoy D (2012). Generation effects on work engagement among US hotel employees. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 31(4): 1195-1202. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.02.007

Park J and Min HK (2020). Turnover intention in the hospitality industry: A meta-analysis. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 90: 102599. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102599

Peng X, Lee S, and Lu Z (2020). Employees' perceived job performance, organizational identification, and pro-environmental behaviors in the hotel industry. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 90: 102632. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102632

Pramanik D, Haldar A, Mondal SC, Naskar SK, and Ray A (2017). Resilient supplier selection using AHP-TOPSIS-QFD under a fuzzy environment. International Journal of Management Science and Engineering Management, 12(1): 45-54. https://doi.org/10.1080/17509653.2015.1101719

Presti AL and Nonnis M (2012). Moderated effects of job insecurity on work engagement and distress. Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology, 19(2): 97-113.

Rasheed MI, Okumus F, Weng Q, Hameed Z, and Nawaz MS (2020). Career adaptability and employee turnover intentions: The role of perceived career opportunities and orientation to happiness in the hospitality industry. Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 44: 98-107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.05.006

Saaty TL and Vargas LG (1980). Hierarchical analysis of behavior in competition: Prediction in chess. Behavioral Science, 25(3): 180-191. https://doi.org/10.1002/bs.3830250303

Shaw K, Shankar R, Yadav SS, and Thakur LS (2012). Supplier selection using fuzzy AHP and fuzzy multi-objective linear programming for developing low carbon supply chain. Expert Systems with Applications, 39(9): 8182-8192. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2012.01.149

Sirisawat P and Kiatcharoenpol T (2018). Fuzzy AHP-TOPSIS approaches to prioritizing solutions for reverse logistics barriers. Computers and Industrial Engineering, 117: 303-318. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2018.01.015

Stamolampros P, Korfiatis N, Chalvatzis K, and Buhalis D (2019). Job satisfaction and employee turnover determinants in high contact services: Insights from employees' online reviews. Tourism Management, 75: 130-147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.04.030

Sun CC (2010). A performance evaluation model by integrating fuzzy AHP and fuzzy TOPSIS methods. Expert Systems with Applications, 37(12): 7745-7754. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2010.04.066

Sun S, Lee PC, Law R, and Hyun SS (2020). An investigation of the moderating effects of current job position level and hotel work experience between technology readiness and technology acceptance. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 90: 102633. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102633

Wang C, Xu J, Zhang TC, and Li QM (2020). Effects of professional identity on turnover intention in China's hotel employees: The mediating role of employee engagement and job satisfaction. Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 45: 10-22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.07.002

Yaghoobi T (2018). Prioritizing key success factors of software projects using fuzzy AHP. Journal of Software: Evolution and Process, 30(1): e1891. https://doi.org/10.1002/smr.1891

Yang JT, Wan CS, and Fu YJ (2012). Qualitative examination of employee turnover and retention strategies in international tourist hotels in Taiwan. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 31(3): 837-848. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2011.10.001

Zadeh LA (1965). Electrical engineering at the crossroads. IEEE Transactions on Education, 8(2): 30-33. https://doi.org/10.1109/TE.1965.4321890