



www.sjm06.com

Serbian Journal of Management 5 (1) (2010) 59 - 76

Serbian
Journal
of
Management

FACTORS THAT AFFECT HOTEL EMPLOYEES MOTIVATION THE CASE OF BODRUM

Said Kingir^{a*} and Muammer Mesci^b

^aHealth School, Siirt University, Siirt, Turkey

^bSchool of Tourism and Hotel Management, Düzce University, Düzce, Turkey

(Received 5 December 2009; accepted 12 February 2010)

Abstract

Today it is clear that businesses give importance to factors that increase employee's motivation. Recent years researches show that there is a direct proportion between employers who value its employee's motivation and business performance and productivity raising. In a hotel which is a service business, it is very important for business profit and productivity to identify factors that increase motivation, to its employees. The aim of this research is to examine what are the factors that affect employee's motivation. Also it is another aim of this research to measure whether employees, according to their demographic characteristics, show differences in evaluating factors that affect motivation. Study is based on quantitative research method. Data of this research is obtained by using questionnaire technique. The area of this research is five star hotel businesses that have 200 or over rooms and open the whole year in Bodrum. Three of these hotel businesses were selected with simple coincidence sampling technique and research data have been obtained from these businesses employees. This obtained data were analyzed with SPSS 15.0 program. At the end of the research, there identified four important dimensions and these dimensions have been assessed in terms of demographic variables.

Keywords: Motivation, hotel business, employees.

1. INTRODUCTION

Today, to remain standing in competitive world, hotel businesses need both to increase their employees motivation and to be in effort of continuous development of their businesses facilities provided for their

customers (Aksu, 2000). One of the most important and having the most variables sources of hotel businesses that are in service sector is employees. Employees' performance and efficiency is among the factors that affect the success of these businesses. Employees showing high rate of

* Corresponding author: saidkingir@hotmail.com

performance and working efficiently relates to their enough satisfaction of their jobs (Toker, 2007). Especially in service sector, employee's motivation is very important in terms of ensuring the continuous of service quality (Hays & Hill, 1999). Ensuring the continuous of service quality is closely related to employee's satisfaction. Employee's motivation isn't thought without considering motivation.

While in classical management approach the idea "Manager knows the work best" is dominant, in modern management "who knows the work best is the one who does it" idea is dominant. Today business of modern management approach's being indiffernt to their employees motivation will be very big mistake especially for service businesse. That's why for service businesses views about motivation will go on maintaining its currency is gaining power day by day.

While classifying means that motivate employees, researcher parted them into two groups; external and internal factors (Jones et al., 2005). In the first of them, external factors, there are motivation means such as working condition, waging, company's image, job guaranty, promotion, social environment, and status (Dündar et al., 2007). In terms of hotel businesses, when considering external environmental factors rapid change and difficulty to be controlled, being in a hard national and international rivalry, these businesses taking decisions will have a profound effect in businesses' keeping up its existence (Aksu, 2000). Internal factors can briefly be defined as providing employees satisfaction over businesses responsibility. Moreover internal factors not only providing employee's satisfaction but also its ensuring oppurtunities for career shows that it has

important effect on employee's motivation (Karatepe & Uludağ, 2007). In this context, in our rsearch it is aimed to identfy what are the factors that affect hotel businesses employeers' motivation and how these factors are important for employees. It is examined that what the factors that motivate the employees who are in the scope of this research can be, are examined.

2. LITERATURE SURVEY

According to some previous researches, it is seen that factors that affect the employees of hotel industry in a negative way are, insufficient wage and job security, limited training programme, new oppurtunities' not developing, business managers being deprived of manager qualifications and high job transfer speed (Cheng & Brown, 1998; Wong et al., 1999; Zhang & Wu, 2004). In addition to these factors it is known that employees have problems with their working hours and social conditions (Karatepe & Uludağ, 2007). That's why in hotel businesses there are different researches made by researchers to determine what are the factors that motivate the employees in a pozitive way and as a result of these researches too many factors have been found (Mak & Sockel, 2001; Velo & Mitta, 2006). For example, in the middle of 1990s Smith, Kendal and Hulin found a scale named "Job Descriptive Index" in their researches and developed in in later years. Hackmen and Oldham (1996) developed "Job Characteristics Approach" that explain the reasons of factors that have effects on employees job satisfaction. This approach includes dimensions of skill variety, task unity, task importance, autonomy and feedback. These features are important in motivating employees and providing

employees job satisfaction. In ‘Job Characteristics Model’ it is aimed to increase employees’ quality, replanning of the work and increase employee’s efficiency by making changes in accordance with its job experience (Kaşlı, 2007). Toward the end of the 1990s it is seen that there is an important increase in researches about motivation in hotel businesses. For example, in these years Lindner (1998) classified factors, affecting employees motivation according to importance degree, as attractive job, good wage, being praised, good working conditions, promotion opportunities, taking part in decisions and manager-staff relations. Lindner’s research draw some parallels with Kovach’s (1999) research. Difference between these two researches based on importance degree of classifying. For example in Lindner’s research good wage is at the second place according to importance degree while in Kovach’s research there comes appreciation of the work in the second place. In addition to this Nelson (1996), in his research about what are the factors that motivate employees in view of managers, determined that to be appreciated and performance reward are at the first place among the motivation means. When comes to 2000s years, factors that motivate employees are seen to be changed and in this situation technological developments, rapid increase of competition factor among businesses and changes in employees needs are seen to be effective. For example, in his research to determine what are the factors that affect working staff Ölçer (2005) determined that factors, affect service employees motivations are job security, good relations with superiors, wage and appreciation based on fair performance, trustful and cooperative relations with workmates, appropriate working

environment, ensuring opportunities for social development, doing group work, giving important and appropriate works in accordance with employee’s skills and work rotation. Ölçer stressed that there is a meaningful relation in a positive way between motivation level and performance level. In their research Tayfun and Kösem (2005) found evidences about

The business-featured model which was developed by Ross, Hackman and Oldham (1998) was carried out on seasonal and full-time hotel employees. According to findings, it was determined that this model was reliable and valid and could be carried out in hotel businesses. In the following years Ross carried out this model in 2005 in hotel businesses located in Australia and Mauritius. According to research findings, it was found that this model which was developed by Hackman and Oldham (1975) could be carried out in regions out of west culture. In terms of organization-based applications these outputs such as being pleased with job, commitment, security, and productivity have an important effect in motivating employees.

In order to verify the validity of expectation theory and to put an expectation theory for employees working in hotels, Chiang and Jang (2008) carried out a research in medium-sized hotels in the United States. According to research findings, researchers asserted that five basic elements generate expectation theory, and they pointed out that these basic elements are expectation, external araçsallık, internal araçsallık, external value and internal value. Within highlighting that these basic elements are the best factors that motivate employees, Chiang and Jang (2001) also stressed that internal motivation factor is more effective than external motivation factor.

Örücü and Esenkal (2005) tried to find out what are the factors that affect satisfaction of employees who work in accommodation businesses by comparing city and coastal hotels in a research of different study. At the end of this research, they highlighted that among the factors that affect employees motivation, family relations and job commitment are effective in city and coastal hotels and although reward factor is seen to be effective in city hotels, it isn't effective in coastal hotels and physical conditions and professional development are effective in coastal hotels but not in city hotels.

Whittaker (2008) pointed out in his research, carried out in England that important key factors for motivation are market pressure, to develop the value of partners, to reveal Money funds for growth, to change strategic activities, to develop Money funds, to develop effectiveness in authenticity of management, presence of money funds and merging the companies.

In their research, comprising hotel businesses in Hong Kong, Chan and Wong (2006) gather elements affecting motivation in hotel businesses into eight factors. In researcher's researches, these factors are the government's cooperation, ISO's benefits, top management, laws, market trend, trade barriers, customers, and rivalry. Chan and Wolso (2006) also indicated that these factors should be used to determine internal power rather than external power. In another research carried out in parallel with this knowledge, according to findings of research carried out in thermal hotels Dünder and others (2007) found that internal motivation means effect on employees motivation is much more important than that of external motivation means effect on employees motivation. In this research, it is also stressed that in determining business

strategies managers should consider employees needs. In another research on employees working in hotel industry in Hong Kong, Wong and Pang (2003) found that training programs and development, motivation coming from top management and support, policies being clear, to be defianable and autonomy and flexibility are five basic elements that motivate employees. In addition to these researches; in his research carried out in five-star hotel business in Antalya region, Aksu (2005) found that before giving training programs employees need, they should be motivated.

In today's business environment, in the first place of elements necessary for organizational success are innovat, on, necessity of new products, managing change speed and provide oppurtunities for employees to reveal their skills. For accomodation a business who wants surviving in hard competition world, it should be provided oppurtunities for them to be sensitive about what are the factors that motivate employees and to give necessary value to its employees (Wong & Pang, 2003). In paralel to this, it is very important for employees who work in accomodation industry to give oppurtunities for them to build carrier after work hour in their work place (Jauhari, 2006) In their reserach on satisfaction and motivation of international Telecom union members, Bauer and his friends highlighted that in the first place of factors that motivate employees are giving work and network oppurtunities. As in other researches, it is found out that position, infrastructure elements and reliability haven't any effect in decision-making.

Wong and his friends (1999) developed a survey, considering 10 motivation factors, developed by Kovach, that motivate employees. In total 1245 usable survey has

been distributed to 64 hotels of 72 hotels listed by Hong Kong hotel directors and data were collected from employees working in these hotels. As indicated by the staff, working in these hotels, three important motivation factors were found out. These factors are opportunities for development, to show loyalty to employees and good wage. In this research, as a result of MANOVA analysis, there isn't found out any relationship between singles, marrieds and these three free variables which are level of positions. According to result of ANOVA analysis, it is tried to find out whether there is a difference between different demographic variables that are considered in selecting factors that motivate hotel employees. As a result of analysis it is found out that there are three factors that are effective among demographic variables. These factors are attractive work, opportunities to develop and progress and emotional consciousness.

In many motivation theories, many researches were carried out to find out what are the factors that motivate employees but its employees values rarely appeared in these researches. The value of employees, working in appropriate measures, can be suggested while speculating motivation factors, this measurement parts can't be considered as a risk. In a survey close to measurement issues, an important deficiency was found in employee's personality, organizational culture and socialization factor issues. In today's some motivation models, because of not considering the value employees have, some limitations appeared. This dynamic triangle motivation theory includes needs and values needed to motivate employees. At the same time, this model includes tools necessary to measure employee's personality, organizational culture and

socialization. As a result, when considering employees values in motivation theories, it contributes greatly in the process of motivation increase (Osteraker, 1999).

3. THE AIM OF THIS RESEARCH AND ITS METHODOLOGY

The aim of this research is to determine what are the factors that affect employees motivation and in which level these factors are important for them. Data have been collected within this research will provide an important source in terms of bringing up factors that motivate hotel businesses employees, managers applying these factors on employees working in workplace to provide productivity and effectiveness. Research is based on quantitative research method. Survey data collection is the most preferred data collection technique in quantitative research method. That's why in this research data obtained with survey technique. Also survey technique was preferred because of being the most useful criterion for attitude measurement, its presenting numeric and it making it easy both for people who fill the survey and for researchers (Usal & Kuşlivan, 1998). In order to provide content validity of research survey, within this research in literature national and international researches were looked for. Within this context, an attitude survey was developed by taking Öztürk and Dündar's (2003) researches as basis. While the survey was in draft, it was examined by expert academican and necessary arrangements were done on it. Before conducting the survey, a pre-application was done, and considering employees views the survey was given final shape and started to be conducted.

The questionnaire used in this research consists of two parts. Questions to find demographic characteristics of participants were included in the first part while in the second part, there is an attitude scale consists of 17 statements to determine factors that motivate hotel businesses' employees. In every statement's left side is a Likert scale with five statements (1= Definitely unimportant, 2 =Unimportant 3= Indecisive, 4=Important, 5=Very important). Also in every statement's right side, there is also a Likert scale with five statements which make it possible for hotel employees to evaluate the statements.(1=Definitely don't agree, 2=Do not agree, 3=Indecisive, 4=Agree, 5=Totally agree)

Questionnaire forms were distributed to employees of 20 hotels with five stars in Muğla city's Bodrum district between 01 February 2008 and 15 February 2009 for pre-application of it. The reason for choosing this district is that Bodrum is one of the developed and very important tourism centers. Questionnaires were provided to be filled by employees and a few statements were changed according to views of managers. The validity of the questionnaires obtained from pre-application was measured and its Cronbach alpha was calculated as 0.86.As a result of test, obtained data's general Cronbach Alpha were calculated as Nunnally stated over 0.7 level. This means that in survey's evaluation, internal compliance is acceptable and validity is high, after pre- application, research studies started.

The research lasted four months in 2008 year's February and March months. The area of the research is five star hotels which have 20 rooms and over and work all year. The reason of limitations of this research with these hotels is; these hotels being bigger than

the other hotels in terms of bed capacity, sales volume and the abundance of employees. Also, research is conducted in Bodrum because of financial facilities, being close in terms of geography and its transportation facilities being enough. In this mentioned period, these hotels's numbers were 17 and hotels' names were written on a piece of paper and put into a box. Those with simple coincidence sampling method, three hotel businesses were selected from this box. As a result, employees of three five star hotels which are open the whole year, were determined as a sampling group of this research. According to data obtained from these sampling group hotels, the number of employees working full time in these hotels are 500. Having been distributed in hand, questionnaires were provided to be filled by employees and then these questionnaires were collected from employees. Some hotel employees within the research didn't want to participate in questionnaire and some others went abroad for their special affairs. At result 180 of the distributed questionnaires were gathered and this proportion constitutes 36 % of the research's area.

In analyzing gathered data, SPSS (Statistical Program For Social Sciences) 15.0 statistic program was used. In this regard, arithmetic average, Standard deviation, frequency and percentage values of employee's participation and importance level of statements and data of demographic characteristics were calculated.

4. FINDINGS AND EVALUATIONS

4.1. Demographic Findings of Research Participants

Employees' data about demographic questions was evaluated by using frequency

and percentage analyses. Findings related to evaluation are presented fully in Table 1. When looked at the table it is understood that 74.4 % of employees taking part in the research are male while the remain percentage 25.6 % are woman.

When employees education level is evaluated, it is found that 20 of employees (11.1 %) have received primary school, 80 of employees (44.4 %) have received high school, 73 of employees (40.6 %) have received university and 7 of employees (3.9 %) have received master education. When the question "Have you ever taken any tourism and hotel management education?" was evaluated, it was found out

that 80(44.4 %) employees have received tourism education and 100 employees haven't received this kind of education. When employees departments were analyzed; it was found that 13 employees (7.2 %) work in human resource department, 20 employees (11.1 %) work in financial affairs department, 23 employees (12.8 %) work in front Office; 9 employees (5 %) work in technique service; 15 employees (15 %) work in market and sale department; 64 employees (35.6 %) work in food and drink department; 36 employees (20 %) work in other departments. When the question "How long have you been working in hotel businesses?" was analyzed; it is found out

Table 1. Demographic Findings of Research Participants

| Group | Variable | f | % | Group | Variable | f | % |
|------------|----------------------|-----|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----|------|
| Sex | Voman | 46 | 25.6 | Have you ever taken tourism management or hotel management education? | Yes | 80 | 44.4 |
| | Man | 134 | 74.4 | | No | 100 | 55.6 |
| | Total | 180 | 100 | | Total | 180 | 100 |
| Education | Primary School | 20 | 11.1 | Have you receive any education about motivation? | Yes | 37 | 20.6 |
| | High School | 80 | 44.4 | | No | 143 | 79.4 |
| | University | 73 | 40.6 | | Total | 180 | 100 |
| | Master | 7 | 3.9 | | | | |
| | Total | 180 | 100 | | | | |
| Department | Human Resources Pri. | 13 | 7.2 | Your duty duration in this hotel | 0-1 year | 74 | 41.1 |
| | Financial Affairs | 20 | 11.1 | | 2-4 | 88 | 48.9 |
| | Önbüro | 23 | 12.8 | | 5-7 | 17 | 9.4 |
| | Technique | 9 | 5.0 | | 8-13 | 0 | 0 |
| | Market and sale | 15 | 8.3 | | 13 years and over | 1 | 0.6 |
| | Food-Drink | 64 | 35.6 | | Total | 180 | 100 |
| | Other | 36 | 20.0 | | | | |
| | Total | 180 | 100 | | | | |

that 74 of employees (41.1 %) work between 0-1 year; 88 of employees (48.9 %) work between 2-4 years; 17 of employees (9.4%) work between 5-7 years; 1 of employees (0.6 %) works 13 years or over. Finally; When employees answers of the question "Have you ever received any motivation education?" were analyzed, it is found that 37 of employees (20.6 %) have received education, 143 employees (79.4 %) haven't received any education about motivation.

4.2. The Evidence Concerning the Research Variables

The data which is obtained from the behaviour scale of employees and which also constitutes the second section of the inquiry from is summarized in Table 2. Significance level of the employees who answered the survey, concerning the statements have been shown on the table in frequency and percent. Also arithmetic mean and standard deviation of data is submitted in the following table.

In Table 2, the significance level of employees concerning the assessment of statements is given. Accordingly the statements employees care about at the highest level is follows:

1. Employees must be provided social facilities (housing, transportation, local etc.) at the highest standards. (Arithmetic mean: 4.5278).
2. Appreciation motivates the employees. (Arithmetic mean: 4.5000).
3. Fair payments is very crucial for employees (arithmetic mean: 4.4556).
4. Amount of payment effects the motivation positively. (Arithmetic mean: 4.4333).
5. Optimum time of work in businesses affects the motivation. (Arithmetic mean:

4.3444).

The statements which employees pay the most attention is pointed out above. On the contrary side, the statements which employees give the least attention is ranged below:

1. Working is natural like games or entertainment for people. (Arithmetic mean: 3.7167).
2. Employees like to be given responsibility. (Arithmetic mean: 3.8222).
3. I'd choose this company, If I had to start working again. (Arithmetic mean: 3.8500).
4. Determination of promotions according to the merits boosts motivation. (Arithmetic mean: 4.0000).

5. Participant management approach affects positively (arithmetic mean: 4.0611).

Reliability test is applied to 180 question forms to find out whether data is useful according to the answers employees had given. Data is checked with Kolmogorov-Smirnov test to find out. If it deviates normally or not. As a result of analysis, we realized that data didn't deviate normally as the sign values are below 0.05. Because of this analysis carried out with non-parametric techniques. At the same time, factor analysis is used determining the reliability, generating factors and creating research variables according to the answers.

Within the factor analysis, the results are follows: Barlett test result 724.628 and with the $p < 0.000$ level Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) sampling value is 0.796. In the factor analysis high correlation relevance is looked for within variables. The more, the correlation between variables decreases, the less to the results of the factor analysis are trusted. As result of Barlett test is reasonable. That is, there are high correlations within variables and it means that data derives from multi normal diversity.

Table 2. Results of the Significance Level of Employees Concerning the Statements (s=180)

| Statements | Very important | Important | Indecision | Unimportant | Certainty Unimportant | Description Statistics | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|------------|------------|-------------|-----------------------|------------------------|---------|
| | f % | f % | f % | f % | f % | Mean | Std. D. |
| 1. Employees must be provided social facilities (housing, transportation, local etc.) at the highest standards. | 114 63.3 | 53 29.4 | 8 4.4 | 4 2.2 | 1 0.6 | 4.52 | .73 |
| 2. Appreciation motivates the employees. | 117 65.0 | 48 26.7 | 9 5.0 | 0 0 | 6 3.3 | 4.50 | .86 |
| 3. Fair payments is very crucial for employees | 100 55.6 | 65 36.1 | 13 7.2 | 1 0.6 | 1 0.6 | 4.45 | .70 |
| 4. Amount of payment effects the motivation positively. | 105 58.3 | 60 33.3 | 8 4.4 | 2 1.1 | 5 2.8 | 4.43 | .85 |
| 5. Optimum time of work in businesses affects the motivation. | 89 49.4 | 71 39.4 | 15 8.3 | 3 1.7 | 2 1.1 | 4.34 | .79 |
| 6. Team work adds more to the motivation. | 92 51.1 | 62 34.4 | 16 8.9 | 8 4.4 | 2 1.1 | 4.30 | .89 |
| 7. Rewards motivate employees at a higher level. | 95 52.8 | 58 32.2 | 13 7.2 | 9 5.0 | 5 2.8 | 4.27 | .99 |
| 8. Success of the employees should be appreciated at all times. | 84 46.7 | 66 36.7 | 23 12.8 | 2 1.1 | 5 2.8 | 4.23 | .91 |
| 9. Perception of the significance level in the job being done affects the motivation positively. | 75 41.7 | 73 40.6 | 25 13.9 | 6 3.3 | 1 0.6 | 4.19 | .83 |
| 10. Juniors should have the opportunity to discuss with seniors at any time in any matter. | 77 42.8 | 76 42.2 | 16 8.9 | 7 3.9 | 4 2.2 | 4.19 | .91 |
| 11. Participation of employees in taking the decisions becomes incentive. | 61 33.9 | 88 48.9 | 24 13.3 | 6 3.3 | 1 0.6 | 4.12 | .80 |
| 12. Employees give importance to moral incentives (appreciation, respect, etc) as well as physical incentives. | 70 38.9 | 70 38.9 | 29 16.1 | 7 3.9 | 4 2.2 | 4.08 | .95 |
| 13. Participant management approach affects positively | 63 35.0 | 74 41.1 | 37 20.6 | 3 1.7 | 3 1.7 | 4.06 | .87 |
| 14. Determination of promotions according to the merits boosts motivation. | 68 37.8 | 60 33.3 | 43 23.9 | 2 1.1 | 7 3.9 | 4.00 | 1.05 |
| 15. I'd choose this company, if I had to start working again. | 66 36.7 | 50 27.8 | 44 24.4 | 11 6.1 | 9 5.0 | 3.85 | 1.13 |
| 16. Employees like to be given responsibility. | 50 27.8 | 74 41.1 | 36 20.0 | 14 7.8 | 6 3.3 | 3.82 | 1.03 |
| 17. Working is natural like games or entertainment for people. | 38 21.1 | 85 47.2 | 36 20.0 | 10 5.6 | 11 6.1 | 3.71 | 1.05 |

Principal component analysis is applied to the data and in this analysis, varimax option is used and according to the obtained scree plot diversity, data whose self-value is over one is put to the evaluation process. Four

factors whose self-values are over one emerged out of this process. These four factors are shown in Table3.

As a result of factor analysis in Table 3, we see that the scale consists of 16 items and

Table 3. Recurring Factor Loads and Total Variance Ratios

| Factors | Factor loads | Eigen values | Explained variance % | Total variance % | Cronbach Alpha |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Factor 1: Social opportunities | | | | | |
| Amount of payment effects the motivation positively.(S1) | .750 | 2.900 | 18.128 | 18.128 | 0.759 |
| Participant management approach affects positively.(S2) | .701 | | | | |
| Participant management approach affects positively. (S3) | .686 | | | | |
| Optimum time of work in businesses affects the motivation.(S4) | .537 | | | | |
| Determination of promotions according to the merits. boosts motivation.(S5) | .521 | | | | |
| Employees must be provided social facilities (housing, transportation, local etc.) at the highest standards.(S6) | .510 | | | | |
| Fair payments is very crucial for employees.(S7) | .469 | | | | |
| Factor 2: Immaterial incentives | | | | | |
| Perception of the significance level in the job being done affects the motivation positively.(M1) | .690 | 2.236 | 13.977 | 32.105 | 0.507 |
| Employees give importance to moral incentives (appreciation, respect, etc) as well as physical incentives.(M2) | .620 | | | | |
| Participation of employees in taking the decisions becomes incentive.(M3) | .493 | | | | |
| Factor 3: Responsibility and being appreciated | | | | | |
| Employees like to be given responsibility.(ST1) | .799 | 1.901 | 11.879 | 43.984 | 0.576 |
| Juniors should have the opportunity to discuss with seniors at any time in any matter.(ST2) | .572 | | | | |
| Success of the employees should be appreciate at all times.(ST3) | .515 | | | | |
| Factor 4: Team work | | | | | |
| Rewards motivates employees at a higher level.(T1). | .749 | 1.721 | 10.758 | 54.742 | 0.507 |
| Team work adds more to the motivation.(T2). | .663 | | | | |
| Working is natural like games or entertainment for people.(T3). | .483 | | | | |

Barlett test result: 724,628 and p 0,000 level with Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin(KMO) sampling value 0,796

four dimensions. By using transformational factor loads, and considering the meaning of the items in factors, **Factor 1: Social opportunities, Factor 2: Immaterial incentives, Factor 3: Responsibility and being appreciated, Factor 4: Team work is entitled.** Furthermore when Table 3 is examined we see that first factor explains 18.128 %, second factor 13.977 %, third factor 11.879 %, and fourth factor 10.758%, of the total variance. The cumulative variance quantity that self-values explain, constitutes 54,742 of total variance. Lastly, a Cronbach Alpha value of factors explains as follows: first factor, 759, second factor, 507, third factor, 576 fourth factors, 507 of total variance.

In following tables, according to the demographic features of employees we'll try to find out whether there's a difference in

their evaluation of the factors that affects the motivation. In this frame, some analysis will be carried on following topics; we'll try to find out whether there's a change in the statements of the employees who join the research on motivation and whether variances such as sex, educational status, departments, working periods, possession of information about motivation and attendance of tourism education make discrepancies.

In the analysis, sign values are over 0.05 which shows employees agree on the ideas concerning behavioural statements. It is stated that according to Table 4 generally in discrepancy analysis sign values are over 0.05. Accordingly, employees made approximate evaluations about the behavioral statements which measures motivation. Furthermore, it appears that sign

Table 4. Mann Whitney U and Kruskal-Wallis analysis on whether there's a different perception on behavioural hypothesis concerning social opportunities factor in terms of demographic variable

| | | Variable S1 | Variable S2 | Variable S3 | Variable S4 | Variable S5 | Variable S6 | Variable S7 |
|--------------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Sex | Mann-Whitney U | 2607.500 | 2883.500 | 2855.500 | 2867.500 | 2855.500 | 2926.000 | 2939.000 |
| | Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .072 | .444 | .427 | .425 | .427 | .541 | .588 |
| Education | Kruskal-Wallis | 2.115 | 2.710 | 2.556 | 12.442 | 3.615 | 3.982 | 2.636 |
| | Asymp. Sig. | .549 | .438 | .465 | .006 | .306 | .263 | .451 |
| Departments | Kruskal-Wallis | 7.868 | 7.941 | 5.044 | 1.532 | 13.102 | 1.468 | 12.312 |
| | Asymp. Sig. | .248 | .242 | .538 | .957 | .041 | .962 | .055 |
| Working periods | Kruskal-Wallis | 5.686 | 14.380 | 2.250 | .984 | 4.226 | 10.981 | 3.066 |
| | Asymp. Sig. | .128 | .002 | .522 | .805 | .238 | .012 | .382 |
| Possession of information about motivation | Mann-Whitney U | 2429.000 | 2633.500 | 2239.000 | 2580.500 | 2474.000 | 2362.500 | 2490.500 |
| | Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .375 | .960 | .124 | .794 | .515 | .231 | .526 |
| Attendance of tourism education | Mann-Whitney U | 3646.500 | 3609.000 | 3551.000 | 3914.500 | 3500.000 | 3885.000 | 3460.500 |
| | Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .239 | .185 | .167 | .780 | .123 | .692 | .073 |

values of “Variable S2 with Working Period” is, .002; “Variable S4 with Education” is, .006; “Variable S5 with Department” is, .041; “Variable S6 with Working Period” is, .012. These values being lower than 0.05 shows that employees have different opinions concerning the behavioural statements. Therefore, concerning the behavioral statement of employees, it is determined that there are different opinions between, “Variable S1 with Working Period”, “Variable S4 with Education”, “Variable S5 with Working Department”, “Variable S6 with Working Period”.

In analysis, sign values are over 0.05 which shows that employees share the same thoughts about behavioral statements. According to Table 5, it's determined that sign values are 0.05 in discrepancy analysis. This shows that, employees have similar evaluations on behavioral statements which are used to measure motivation. But sign value of “Variable M2 with Department” (.001) being lower than 0.05 shows that employees have a different opinion than this behavioral statement.

In the analysis sign values being bigger than 0.05 shows that employees agree with behavioral statements. According to Table 6 it's found out that in discrepancy analysis, sign values are over 0.05. Accordingly it shows that employees made close evaluations in behavioral statements which are used to measure motivations. However, sign value of “Variable ST3 with Education” being (.043) lower than 0.05 shows that employees don't share the same idea with this behavioral statement.

In the analysis, sign values being over 0.05 shows that employees have the same opinion with behavioral statements. According to Table 7 it's found that sign

values are bigger than 0.05 in discrepancy analysis. According to it shows that employees made close evaluation in behavioral statements which are used to measure motivations. However sign value of “Variable T2 with Working Periods” (.022) being lower than 0.05 shows that employees don't agree with this opinion.

5. GENERAL EVALUATION AND CONCLUSION

When we examined the educational status of employees, we saw that, along with high school and such school graduates, there is a majority of university graduates. About the education of tourism management and hotel administration, we found out 44.4 % of employees had tourism educations and the others didn't. Of course we'd like this proportion increase. Yet, we see that there's no effect in statistical sense for the employees between their aspects to the independent variable and their educational status. When the departments, the employees work in are examined, we found that they mostly work in food-beverage department. We see that hotel businesses need more employees in this department.

About the length of time employees work in a hotel, it appears that 41.1 % of employees work between 0-1 year and 48.9 % of employees work between 2-4 year. This shows that in hotel businesses there's a high ratio of employee circulation. A lot can be said to explain this situation. Most obviously, this is because this hotel business have a seasonal character and also busy working hours and also always being face to face with unexpected problems. Because of all of these factors employees seem to change their jobs frequently.

Table 5. Mann Whitney U ve Kruskal-Wallis analysis on whether there's a different perception on behavioral hypothesis concerning the immaterial variable

| | | Variable M1 | Variable M2 | Variable M3 |
|--------------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Sex | Mann-Whitney U | 2814.000 | 2906.500 | 3057.500 |
| | Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .339 | .531 | .929 |
| Education | Kruskal-Wallis | 2.188 | 2.025 | 6.179 |
| | Asymp. Sig. | .534 | .567 | .103 |
| Departments | Kruskal-Wallis | 12.130 | 21.963 | 2.587 |
| | Asymp. Sig. | .059 | .001 | .859 |
| Working periods | Kruskal-Wallis | 2.660 | 5.482 | 1.933 |
| | Asymp. Sig. | .447 | .140 | .586 |
| Possession of information about motivation | Mann-Whitney U | 2400.500 | 2471.500 | 2561.000 |
| | Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .345 | .503 | .742 |
| Attendance of truism education | Mann-Whitney U | 3776.500 | 3736.500 | 3617.000 |
| | Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .484 | .409 | .225 |

Table 6. Mann Whitney U and Kruskal-Wallis analysis on whether there's a different perception about behavioral hypothesis concerning the responsibility and being appreciated factor in term of demographic variable

| | | Variable ST1 | Variable ST2 | Variable ST3 |
|--------------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Sex | Mann-Whitney U | 2938.500 | 2941.000 | 2660.500 |
| | Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .625 | .613 | .131 |
| Education | Kruskal-Wallis | 3.696 | .598 | 8.149 |
| | Asymp. Sig. | .296 | .897 | .043 |
| Departments | Kruskal-Wallis | 8.286 | 11.523 | 10.940 |
| | Asymp. Sig. | .218 | .074 | .090 |
| Working periods | Kruskal-Wallis | 4.060 | 3.192 | 3.844 |
| | Asymp. Sig. | .255 | .363 | .279 |
| Possession of information about motivation | Mann-Whitney U | 2565.500 | 2562.500 | 2627.000 |
| | Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .768 | .748 | .943 |
| Attendance of turism education | Mann-Whitney U | 3603.000 | 3415.500 | 3484.000 |
| | Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .235 | .065 | .104 |

When we analyzed the topic of education of employees about motivation, we determined that 20.6 % of them had the education while 79.4 % didn't have any education about motivation. This shows that no importance is given to this matter and so a great mistake is being made. However it's obvious that human factor is among the most

important factors and it's intolerable to undervalue the matter of motivation in hotel administrations.

In examing the factor analysis in this study varimax is chosen in principal compenent analysis which is applied to date and according to the obtained scree plot deviation the date whose self-value is over

one is examined. There are four factors whose self-values are over one: These factors:

- *Social opportunities (Factor 1);*
- *Immaterial incentives (Factor 2);*
- *Responsibility and being appreciated (Factor 3);*
- *Team work (Factor 4).*

It's examined whether there's a difference in evaluations of employees in evaluating the factors that affects the motivations according to the demographic features. In this context, Analysis have been made on "behavioral statements (that try to evaluate motivation)" of employees who have joined the research. The analysis have been conducted on the employees to understand whether there's a difference demographic variable such as status, departments time periods, having motivation information and joinin tourism education of these employess. According to the analysis result, it's understood that

among the variables in the following variables there are different opinions between the employees in terms of behavioral statements. These are; "wage level of employ affecting motivation positively with education", "optimal working time affecting motivation positively with education", "merits must be chosen according to qualification with work department", social opportunities (houssing, transportation, local etc) providing at the highest level with working period

Among the variables of immaterial incentives factor "employess giving immaterial incentives (appreciation, respet etc) as much as materiel incentives with working department" shows that employ don't agree with this behavioral statement. With this result, it can be stated that employs being employed in different can affect their opinions in different levels.

Among the variable of responsibilty and

Table 7. Mann Whitney U and Kruskal-Wallis analysis on whether there's a different perception about behavioral hypothesis concerning the teamwork factor in term of demographic variable

| | | Variable T1 | Variable T2 | Variable T3 |
|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Sex | Mann-Whitney U | 757.500 | 2603.000 | 2995.500 |
| | Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .683 | .082 | .764 |
| Education | Kruskal-Wallis | .824 | 3.568 | .090 |
| | Asymp. Sig. | .844 | .312 | .764 |
| Departments | Kruskal-Wallis | 6.863 | 5.221 | 9.423 |
| | Asymp. Sig. | .334 | .516 | .151 |
| Working periods | Kruskal-Wallis | 1.046 | 9.637 | 1.559 |
| | Asymp. Sig. | .790 | .022 | .669 |
| Possession of information about motivation | Mann-Whitney U | 2606.000 | 2603.500 | 2575.500 |
| | Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .878 | .869 | .793 |
| Attendance of tourism education | Mann-Whitney U | 3423.500 | 3421.000 | 3515.000 |
| | Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .068 | .065 | .140 |

being appreciated factor it's understood that in "succes of employers always be appreciated with education" variable employees have different opinions in this behavioral statement. The more effective quality and practicality of education employees have the more contribution they will have to businesses. However, it can be said that there's a relation between compatibilty of the education that is given to employees to the sector and education's efficiency itself.

Among the variable in team work factor, it's found out that employess have different opinions in "team work being more effective in terms of motivation and time periods" variable according to this behavioral statement. It shows that they think differnetly between "employees team work being more effective in terms of motivation" and the periods employ "having activity"

In the content of study, it's determined that there's no difference for men and women in evaluating the factors that affects the motivation. Furthermore in the results of analysis it's determined that there's also no diffenence in their evaluating of "employees joining education about motivation and "factors that affect the motivation according to demographic features. So, it can be said that education about motivation doesn't make any meaningful effect or rather doesn't make intended changes. On the other hand, it's found out that in evaluation of employees there's no difference in their evaluating employees joining the educations on motivations according to demographic features. So it can be said that there's no difference between employees who have the education and who haven't.

Five statements employees give the least importance beginning by the last is as follows:

- Working is naturel like games or entertainment for people;
- Employees like to be given resposibility;
- I'd choose this company, If I had to start working again;
- Determination of promotions according to the merits, boosts motivation,
- Participant management approach affects positively.

The statemets above factors which affects motivation the least shows that hotel employees give more importance material rewards than immaterial and psychological rewards. It can be said that among the factors that affects this situation can be the levels of necessities people are in. Nomely it's seen that employesses haven't put their physiologic and safety needs to the intended level.

These are the statements employees give the most importance in evaluating same of the statements:

- Employees must be provided social facilities (housing, transportation, local etc.) at the highest standards;
- Appreciation motivates the employees;
- Fair payments is very crucial for employees;
- Amount of payment effects the motivation positively;
- Optimum time of work in businesses affects the motivation.

According to the employ among the factors which are considered to affect the motivation. The factors such as social opportunities feeling of appreciation fair wage wage level and optimal working time doesn't show up incidentally. An employee caring about these factors tells that it can be perceived in a way, they can't be satisfield. Hence, entrepreneur's managers and the

people likewise shouldn't fail to notice the issues their employees care about, if they want to motivate them. It should be kept in mind that in order for the businesses to crown with success reach their objectives. They should be given a goal, and this is only possible by satisfying and motivating their employees.

ФАКТОРИ КОЈИ УТИЧУ НА МОТИВАЦИЈУ ОСОБЉА ХОТЕЛА У СЛУЧАЈУ БОДРУМА

Said Kingir^{a*} and Muammer Mesci^b

^a*Health School, Siirt University, Siirt, Turkey*

^b*School of Tourism and Hotel Management, Düzce University, Düzce, Turkey*

Извод

Данас је јасно да пословање даје важност факторима који повећавају мотивацију запосленима. Истраживања претходних година показују да постоји директна пропорција између послодаваца који сматрају значајним мотивацију запослених и пословних показатеља компаније, у првом реду раста продуктивности. У случају хотела, који спадају у категорију услужних делатности, од високог је значаја на профит пословања и продуктивност да се идентификују фактори који повећавају мотивацију особља. Циљ овог истраживања је да се процени који су то фактори који утичу на мотивацију запослених. Још један од циљева је измерити да ли демографске карактеристике запослених утичу на њихову евалуацију мотивационих фактора. Студија је заснована на квантитативном истраживачком методу. Подаци су сакупљени коришћењем упитника. Област истраживања су хотели са пет звездица који имају 200 и више соба и раде током целе године у Бодруму (Турска). Три таква хотела су одабрана по методи случајног узорка и истраживачки подаци су сакупљени од њиховог особља. Сакупљени подаци су анализирани употребном SPSS 15.0 софтвера.

Кључне речи: Мотивација, хотелијерство, запошљени

References

Aksu, A. A. (2000). Otel işletmelerinin başarısını etkileyen dış çevre faktörleri. Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 3 (4):269-281.

Aksu, A.A. (2005). Defining training

needs of five-star hotel personel: an application in the Antalya region of Turkey. Managerial auditing journal, 20 (9):945-953.

Bauer, T, Law, R., Tse, T., & Weber, K. (2008). Motivation and satisfaction of mega-business event attendees the case of ITU Telecom World 2006 in Hong Kong.

International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 20 (2):228-234.

Chan, S.W E., & Wong, S. C.K. (2006). Motivations for ISO14001 in the hotel industry. *Tourism Management*, 27 (3): 481-492.

Cheng, A., & Brown, A. (1998). HRM strategies and labor turnover in the hotel industry: a comparative study of Australia and Singapore. *International journal of human resource management*, 9 (1):136-154.

Chiang, C.F., & Jang, S.C. (2008). An expectancy theory model for hotel employee motivation. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27: 313-322.

Dündar, S, Özutku, H., & Taşpınar, F. (2007). İçsel ve dışsal motivasyon araçlarının işgörenlerin motivasyonu üzerindeki etkisi: ampirik bir inceleme. *Ticaret ve Turizm Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2:105-119.

Hays, M. J, & Hill, V. A. (1999). Gaining competitive service value through performance motivation. *Journal of strategic performance measurement*, (Oct./Now.): 36-40.

Jauhari, V. (2006). Competencies for a career in the hospitality industry: an Indian perspective. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 18 (2):123-134.

Jones, P. H., Chisalita, C., & Gerrit, C. (2005). Cognition, technology, and work: special issue on collaboration in context: cognitive and organizational artefacts. *Cognition, Technology & Work*, 7 (2):70-75.

Karatepe, M. O., & Uludağ, O. (2007). Conflict, exhaustion and motivation: a study of frontline employees in Northern Cyprus hotels. *Hospitality Management*, 26: 645-665.

Kaşlı, M. (2007). İş özellikleri modelinin otel işletmelerinde uygulanabilirliğine

yönelik bir araştırma. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 8 (2):159-174.

Kovach, K.A. (1995). Employee motivation: addressing a crucial factor in your organization's performance. *Employee Relations Today*, 22 (2):93-105.

Linder, J.R. (1998). Understanding Employee Motivation. *Journal of Extension*, 36(3):28-43.

Mak, B. L., & Sockel, H. (2001). A confirmatory factor analysis of IS employee motivation and retention. *Information & Management*, 38 (5): 265-276.

Nelson, B. (1996). Dump the Cash, Load on The Praise. *Personel Journal*, 75 (7): 65-70.

Nunnally, C. J. (1957). *Psychometric Theory*. New York, MacGraw-Hill.

Oldham, G.R., Hackman, J.R., & Pearce, J.L. (1975). Conditions Under Which Employees Respond Positively to Enriched Work, Approved For Public Release.

Osteraker, M C. (1999). Measuring motivation in a learning organization, *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 11 (2): 73-77.

Ölçer, F. (2005). Departmanlı mağazalarda motivasyon üzerine bir araştırma. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25 (Tem.-Ark.): 1-26.

Örücü, E. ve Esenkal, F. (2005). Konaklama işletmelerinde iş gören tatminini etkileyen faktörler (Bandırma ve Erdek örneği). *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 8 (14):141-166.

Öztürk, Z., & Dündar, H. (2003). Örgütsel motivasyon ve kamu çalışanlarını motive eden faktörler. *C.Ü. İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4 (2): 57-67.

Ross, D. L. (1998). An examination of the validity and rationale of Hackman and Oldham's Job Diagnostic Survey and Job

- Characteristics Model among seasonal hotel workers. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 17 (4): 391-406.
- Ross, D. L. (2005). Perceived job characteristics and internal work motivation: An exploratory cross-cultural analysis of the motivational antecedents of hotel workers in Mauritius and Australia. *Journal of management development*, 24 (3): 253-266.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L.(1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Tayfun, A., & Kösem, H. A. (2005). Katımlı yönetim üzerine otel işletmelerinde bir araştırma. *G.Ü. Ticaret ve Turizm Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2: 122-138.
- Toker, B. (2007). Demografik değişkenlerin iş tatminine etkileri: İzmir'deki beş ve dört yıldızlı otellere yönelik bir uygulama. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 8 (1): 92-107.
- Usal, A., & Kuşluvan, Z.(1998). *Davranış Bilimleri Sosyal Psikoloji*, 2. Baskı, Barış Yayınları, İzmir.
- Velo, V., & Mittaz, C. (2006). Breaking into emerging international hotel markets Skills needed to face this challenge and ways to develop them in hospitality management students. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 18 (6), 495-508.
- Whittaker, C. (2008). Hotel operator motives in UK sale and leaseback/management-back transactions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27 (4): 641-648.
- Wong, S., & Pang, L. (2003). Motivators to creativity in the hotel industry-perspectives of managers and supervisors. *Tourism management*, 24: 551-559.
- Wong, S., Siu, V., & Tsang, N. (1999). The impact of demographic factors on Hong Kong hotel employees' choice of job-related motivators. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 11 (5): 230-241.
- Zhang, H. Q., & Wu, E. (2004). Human resources issues facing the hotel and travel industry in China. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 16 (7):424-428.