



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

Mission Impossible? Motivating Hospitality Managers in Cyprus

Zopiatis, Anastasios and Constanti, Panikkos

Cyprus University of Technology, Intercollege

4 August 2006

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/25386/>

MPRA Paper No. 25386, posted 24 Sep 2010 15:16 UTC

MISSION IMPOSSIBLE? MOTIVATING HOSPITALITY MANAGERS IN CYPRUS

Anastasios Zopiatis

Cyprus University of Technology

Panikkos Constanti

Intercollege

The hospitality industry is renowned for its 'pressure cooker' environment of long hours and high turnover, particularly among front line staff. However, there have been relatively few investigations into the life of supervisors and managers in the industry. Utilizing surveys, the study set out to identify the motivational factors that directly impact on this category of employees. Factors such as appreciation, interesting job, good working conditions, career opportunities and loyalty by the organization were ranked as the top five motivators. The findings challenge a long-standing perception of Cypriot hospitality stakeholders who suggest that money is the major motivator. It was also found that the motivators are the same irrespective of gender, and age. However, these are likely to change as one moves within the management hierarchy. The findings are primarily intended for companies within a Cyprus framework, and therefore the research is focused on the needs for these organizations. However, there are likely to be parallels for hospitality organizations outside Cyprus.

Keywords: *motivation, motivational factors, hospitality managers, motivational working environment*

INTRODUCTION

Give employees a voice and they do not talk about 'performance' or 'best practice HRM'. Instead they will tell you how the three R's of respect and recognition from managers, and good relationships at work, can affect their motivation and generate long-term commitment. (Pass, 2005:38)

Motivation is a topic that has captured the attention of hospitality stakeholders over the last 40 years. Just like learning, motivation (the

strength of a drive towards an action) is a very personal phenomenon. Robbins (1989: 121) defines motivation as “a willingness to exert high levels of effort toward organization goals, conditioned by the effort’s ability to satisfy some individual needs.” It is essential for every employer to be aware of the factors that motivate their employees in order to develop such an organizational environment in which individuals are driven in order to achieve organizational objectives.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the factors that motivate hospitality managers in Cyprus. The research attempts to provide answers to the following:

- What are the work factors that motivate hospitality managers in Cyprus?
- Are there any age and gender differences between hospitality managers in Cyprus?
- Are there any motivational differences according to managerial level?

LITERATURE REVIEW

The motors are switched on, waiting. Employees have three action choices – drive, neutral or reverse. Managers are paying for the fuel and all running costs. (Rabey, 2001: 28)

Organizations seek to find and then implement effective motivational strategies in order to improve productivity and achieve customer satisfaction. Hollyforde and Whiddett (2002) inform us that motivation cannot be seen because it comes from the individual, adding that people cannot be motivated to do something if there is nothing in it for them. Many authors have attempted to classify motivation theories in a number of ways; Achievement Theory (McClelland, 1951; Atkinson, 1964) and Expectancy Theory (Vroom, 1964) which focus on cognitive processes involved in decision making; Existence-Relatedness-Growth and Hierarchy of Needs Theories (Maslow, 1954; Alderfer, 1969) emphasize the role of personality and values; Goal-Setting Theory (Locke, 1968) which focuses on the motivational processes underlying goal-directed behaviours; Drive Theory and Equity Theory (Hull, 1943; Adams, 1963) attempt to answer the question of how behaviour is energized, channeled and continued; Herzberg and his colleagues (1959) developed their Hygiene Theory which challenges the definition that ‘job satisfaction’ is not the opposite of ‘job dissatisfaction.’

Tietjen and Myers, in their critique of Locke, Maslow and Herzberg conclude that:

Enhanced, sustained performance on the job results not so much from the fully furnished office or the temperature of the environment, but the basic duty assigned in the job description and all those intrinsic feelings that produce positive attitudes about that duty. (Tietjen and Myers, 1998:231)

In essence what they are saying is that those charged with managing people should be focusing on the intrinsic aspects of the job and ensuring that their people are achieving a sense of satisfaction from what they are doing. Providing perks and benefits will not motivate without the previous proviso. Simons and Enz inform us that:

When trying to motivate workers, managers often forget that the desire to do the job must come from within the employee and not from the supervisor... if you really want to facilitate the motivation of a particular individual, we recommend that you ask them what they want, and then set up a path for them to satisfy that desire. (Simons and Enz, 1995:27)

In their study of Caribbean hotel employees, Charles and Marshall (1992) found that even though monetary rewards were considered the prime motivator, good working conditions, appreciation for work done and doing interesting work were the next three most important items for this particular group of employees. Employee motivation should effect employee behaviours and thus provide quality customer service; customer service is every organization's 'raison d'être,' without which there can be no organization, as Reis and Peña put it:

*Dissatisfied teachers cannot satisfy their students.
Dissatisfied flight attendants cannot satisfy their passengers.
Dissatisfied parents cannot satisfy their children...conviction comes from within... understanding is the only thing holding an organization together when line control is taken away. It is understanding, not training, or coaching or teaching.
Managers need to try to understand the people they work with and vice versa. (Reis and Peña, 2001:674)*

Even though the paper presents the findings of how supervisors are motivated it is significant to mention that the hotel industry is primarily staffed by what are termed hourly workers (Weaver, 1988), and consequently have different motivational needs, an observation which echoes the views of authors mentioned previously who warn against the introduction of one motivational programme in the hope that it will suit

all employees. According to Weaver’s Theory ‘M’ (1988) hourly workers are motivated by monetary rewards and he advises managers to take this into account when tackling the issue of motivation for this sector of the hotel’s employees. Furthermore, he is adamant that the programme should be properly structured and not ‘ad-hoc’ and to ensure that hourly workers’ wages are closely tied to their level of output (Weaver, 1988).

Motivation efforts will only work if feedback about performance is received in a timely manner (McConnell, 2005). Carolyn Wiley’s seminal work ‘What motivates employees according to over 40 years of motivation surveys’ provides invaluable insight for those seeking enlightenment about motivation. According to Wiley (1995: 266), “exploring the attitudes that employees hold concerning factors that motivate them at work is important to creating an environment that fosters employee motivation.” In other words if wish to discover what motivates our employees we should ask them.

She adds that the responses to the surveys are particularly applicable to the content motivation theories (McClelland, 1951; Maslow, 1954; Atkinson, 1964; Rotter, 1966), whose focus is on what it is about the individual and/or about his environment that attracts his attention; what incites and sustains his behaviour (Hollyforde and Whiddett, 2002). According to Wiley’s analysis, what motivates people today may not motivate them tomorrow, and, in addition, different demographic traits exhibit different motivational needs. Table 1 below indicates the most and least important motivational factors according to the surveys for 1946-1992.

Table 1. Most and least important motivational factors

Motivational Factors		
Year	Most Important	Least Important
1946	Appreciation	(Tactful) Discipline
1980	Interesting work	(Tactful) Discipline
1986	Interesting work	(Sympathetic help with) Personal problems
1992	Good wages	(Sympathetic help with) Personal problems

Source: Wiley, 1995:267

The economic circumstances of the early nineties were an influencing factor, especially in the most important category where concern about the recession was a driver in the population’s choice of good wages as the number one item (Wiley, 1995). However, employees place a great value on the appreciation of work which is well done, as well as having to

perform interesting work. According to the 1992 survey (Wiley, 1995: 276) the five most important motivators were:

1. Good wages
2. Full appreciation for work done
3. Job security
4. Promotion and growth in the organization
5. Interesting work

Motivation research in what might be termed 'non-western' cultures, such as the study of managers in Romania affirmed that the major motivators for this particular group of employees included responsibility; nature of the job; appreciation; recognition; and the need for achievement (Analoui, 2000). This was reaffirmed by the work of Umashankar and Kulkarni (2002) in India.

Rabey informs us that there are self-starters in organizations who are able to motivate themselves without any need for their boss or supervisor to motivate them directly:

The highly motivated self-starters who stand out will succeed anyway – but they are few in number. Their drive and determination will ensure that they will ensure this and they will carve their paths toward their higher goals...you probably will not hold them and the quest for potential leaders must be maintained... (Rabey, 2001: 28)

Consequently, organizations adopt a 'laissez faire' attitude to motivation of employees due to this influence, i.e. the existence of these self-starters with potential harmful outcomes for the organization in the long run:

The cement which holds, or fails to hold, an organization together lies in the trust and cooperation which exists and is demonstrated between employees and their immediate managers – at all levels, sharing information, seeking improvement. If this linkage is not strong the weakness here will inevitably inhibit and reduce performance and effectiveness. (Rabey, 2001: 28)

In essence motivation is more than just the provision of tangible rewards which are usually manifested in financial terms. It goes far deeper, is more complex, and requires sound policies which are valued by those to whom the motivation strategies are aimed, and which in turn can have a profound impact on morale and productivity. Rabey is insistent that those charged with motivating others must also be motivated if their task is to be effective, or as he so eloquently espouses, "morale is the aggregation of individual motivations – and can be stimulated by the

initiative of managers who themselves must be motivated from the top.” (Rabey, 2001: 28)

In summary, the plethora of literature surrounding the issue of motivation in the workplace suggests that employees are motivated primarily from the intrinsic aspects of their work; provides them with a sense of achievement, and is enhanced by the explicit recognition extolled on them by their managers and supervisors. And, whereas the extrinsic motivator of financial reward is also considered important, a comparison of studies indicates that the factors that motivate employees are not stable, having a tendency to change as circumstances also change.

Within the Cypriot Hospitality Industry, to our knowledge at least, there has not been a comprehensive study of what motivates line managers. A major aim of this paper was to bridge that research gap and what follows is an overview of the methodology adopted for this purpose.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Our sample consisted of the 200 hotels of 5, 4, and 3 star categories, currently operating in Cyprus. Consequently, our study involved 200 individuals currently holding managerial level positions within those establishments. A quantitative questionnaire was developed and mail distributed to each one, and contained three sections; one of which included items investigating the factors that motivate hospitality managers in Cyprus. Utilizing the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (*SPSS*), we analyzed the collected data using both descriptive and inferential statistics. In addition, by analyzing the demographic data gathered the authors were able to:

- Investigate age and gender differences between hospitality managers in Cyprus in regards to the factors that motivate them;
- investigate probable differences between hospitality managers according to their managerial level.

Hospitality managers were asked to rank ten work-related factors according to their perceived importance and role in their motivation. The ten factors were good wages, tactful discipline, job security, interesting work, feelings of being ‘in on things’, sympathetic help with personal problems, opportunities for advancement and development, good working conditions, personal loyalty to employees, and appreciation for accomplishments. These factors were used in a number of related studies since the year 1946 (Kovach, 1987; Charles and Marshall, 1992). Before

administering the survey instrument it was tested for reliability and validity by using the test re-test method and a panel of experts.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The questionnaires were mail-distributed to 200 hospitality professionals currently working in managerial positions in Cyprus. Seventy-five were completed and returned to the researchers. Of these, two survey questionnaires were incomplete, and thus excluded from the study, reducing the number of usable surveys to seventy-three. The overall response rate of 36.5% was viewed as satisfactory considering the low response rates experienced by the many other hospitality studies.

Table 2 displays the demographic profile of the participants in relation to four different variables: sex, age, current employer and managerial level. It is important to note the high number of upper level managers participating, as well as the participation of female managers, bearing in mind the smaller proportion of female managers in Cyprus.

Table 2. Demographic and professional profile of the respondents (*N=73*)

	Frequency	Valid Percentage
<u>Sex</u>		
Male	53	72.6
Female	20	27.4
<u>Age</u>		
20 – 30	20	27.4
31 – 40	34	46.6
41 – 50	16	21.9
Over 50	3	4.1
<u>Current employer</u>		
Hotel – 5 Star	30	41.1
Hotel – 4 Star	27	37.0
Hotel – 3 Star	16	21.9
<u>Managerial Level</u>		
Entry level – Supervisory	10	13.7
Mid-Level	31	42.5
Upper Level	32	43.8

The primary objective of the study was to identify the most important factors that motivate managerial level employees in their workplace environment. Appreciation, interesting job, good working conditions, career opportunities, and loyalty by the organization were ranked by respondents as the top five motivators. Interestingly, good wages was ranked eighth out of the ten factors. The findings challenge a long-

standing perception of Cypriot hospitality stakeholders who suggest that money is the top motivator in the Hospitality Industry. Work factors such as tactful discipline and sympathetic personal help were ranked low by the respondents. Overall, the findings suggest that Cypriot hospitality managers would like to work in an organizational environment that fosters appreciation, characterized by good working conditions, and career advancement opportunities while doing an interesting job. The findings reinforce the perception shared by many motivational experts that in positive organizational environments money is not the most important motivator for employees. The following Table 3 exhibits the ranking of motivational work factors of hospitality managers in Cyprus.

Table 3. Motivational work factors ranked by hospitality managers

Work Factor	Standard Deviation	Mean	Ranking
Appreciation	.684	4.59	1
Interesting Job	.726	4.56	2
Good Working Conditions	.691	4.53	3
Career Opportunities	.729	4.52	4
Loyalty by the organization	.707	4.44	5
Job Security	.837	4.34	6
Feeling of being in on things (<i>participation</i>)	.765	4.33	7
Good Wages	1.041	4.16	8
Tactful discipline (<i>The manner in which I am disciplined</i>)	.933	4.06	9
Sympathetic Personal Help	.998	3.82	10

(*N* = 73) Scale: 1 = Least Important - 3 = No Opinion - 5 = Most Important

When reviewing the findings according to different age groups we can safely argue that hospitality managers below 30 years of age share the same motivators as their older counterparts. The only work factor with significant statistical difference (*Pearson Chi-Square* = .019) between the two groups is job security. It seems that hospitality managers over 30 years of age consider job security as much more important than their younger colleagues. This finding was expected since as people grow older job security is important not only for them but mostly for their families. Job security becomes important when the individual gains more financial and social responsibilities. It is also likely that above a certain age (*over 50*), it is very difficult to either change employers or industries, especially in the Cyprus business environment. Table 4 displays the ranking of work factors according to age and the statistical difference analysis (*Pearson Chi-Square*) between the two groups.

Table 4. Work factors ranked by different age groups

Work Factor	Ranking Hospitality Professionals		Pearson Chi-Square
	< 30	30 +	
Appreciation	1	3	.404
Interesting Job	2	1	.928
Good Working Conditions	4	2	.158
Career Opportunities	3	4	.747
Loyalty by the organization	6	5	.091
Job Security	9	6	.019
Feeling of being in on things	5	7	.665
Good Wages	8	8	.362
Tactful discipline (<i>The manner in which I am disciplined</i>)	7	9	.728
Sympathetic Personal Help	10	10	.989

(N = 73) (N (< 30) = 20; N (30 +) = 53); Scale: 1 = Least Important - 3 = No Opinion - 5 = Most Important. Significance Level .05; (p<.05)

Motivation by Gender

Are men and women motivated differently? According to the findings of the research study there are no significant statistical differences in the motivational profile of male and female hospitality managers. For male hospitality professionals, appreciation is considered the most important work factor, followed by interesting job, career opportunities and good working conditions.

Table 5. Motivation of hospitality managers by gender

Work Factor	Ranking Hospitality Professionals		Pearson Chi-Square
	Men	Women	
Appreciation	1	3	.630
Interesting Job	2	2	.426
Good Working Conditions	4	1	.091
Career Opportunities	3	5	.441
Loyalty by the organization	5	4	.285
Job Security	6	7	.738
Feeling of being in on things (participation)	7	6	.275
Good Wages	8	9	.810
Tactful discipline (<i>The manner in which I am disciplined</i>)	9	8	.718
Sympathetic Personal Help	10	10	.413

N (Men) = 53; N (Women) = 20

The most important work factor for females is good working conditions, followed by interesting job, appreciation and loyalty by the organization.

It is important to note that no significant statistical difference was revealed between the two groups in the way they ranked the 10 work factors. The findings, similar to the Simons and Enz study (1995), suggest that male and female hospitality managers require similar treatment for optimal motivation. Table 5 presents the ranking of motivational work factors according to gender and the statistical difference analysis (*Pearson Chi-Square*) between the two groups.

Are there any motivational differences between individuals working at different levels of the management ladder? Research findings suggest that there are certain differences between low, middle and upper level managers currently working in the Hospitality industry of Cyprus. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) revealed significant differences between the three groups in the following five work factors: career opportunities, working conditions, interesting job, feeling of being in on things, and sympathetic personal help. It is apparent that the level of management individual managers hold have an impact on the factors that motivate them.

Once the existing differences among the means of the three groups were revealed, post hoc multiple comparison tests were utilized to determine which means differ. The Tukey Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) test was used since it is a very conservative pair-wise comparison test, which minimises the possibility for Type I errors.² The following Table 6 exhibits the results of the one-way ANOVA comparison and the Post Hoc Multiple Comparison Tests (Tukey HSD).

Careful analysis of the multiple comparison results showed a number of differences between the groups. In particular, for the career opportunities variable differences exist between middle and upper level managers. For upper level managers, career opportunities are considered the most important motivator, maybe because they have reached a point in their career where promotional advancement moves are limited, especially in an environment characterized by family-owned businesses, whereas, middle line managers, who have a lot of career opportunities to advance to upper level positions, do not consider this as their most important motivator.

A number of significant differences exist between entry and middle level managers. In particular, entry-level managers give more importance to the interest in their job compared to middle level managers. In addition, entry-level managers view sympathetic personal help as much more important for them compared to their middle level colleagues. It is

² A Type I error occurs when a true null hypothesis is rejected by a statistical test.

apparent that entry-level managers would like to have an interesting job and sympathetic personal help since they are at the first stages of their career. In contrast, middle line managers with more industry experience seem to rank such work factors lower.

Table 6. Management level differences: One-way ANOVA and Post Hoc Multiple Comparison Tests (*Tukey HSD*)

Source	D. F.	Sum of squares	Mean of squares	F Ratio	F Probab. (Sig.)	Mean	Post Hoc Analysis (Tukey HSD)
							EL ML UL
VAR: Good Wages							
Between Groups	2	.343	.171	.154	.857	EL: 4.30	
Within Groups	70	77.685	1.110			ML: 4.10	
Total	72	78.027				UL: 4.19	
VAR: Job Security							
Between Groups	2	3.145	1.572	2.327	.105	EL: 4.80	
Within Groups	70	47.294	.676			ML: 4.16	
Total	72	50.438				UL: 4.38	
VAR: Career Opportunities							
Between Groups	2	4.731	2.366	4.945	.010	EL: 4.80	
Within Groups	70	33.488	.478			ML: 4.23	*
Total	72	38.219				UL: 4.72	*
VAR: Good Working Conditions							
Between Groups	2	5.359	2.680	6.468	.003	EL: 5.00	*
Within Groups	69	28.585	.414			ML: 4.23	*
Total	71	33.944				UL: 4.66	*
VAR: Interesting Job							
Between Groups	2	3.980	1.990	4.098	.021	EL: 5.00	*
Within Groups	70	33.993	.486			ML: 4.32	*
Total	72	37.973				UL: 4.66	
VAR: Appreciation							
Between Groups	2	1.125	.563	1.210	.304	EL: 4.90	
Within Groups	70	32.546	.465			ML: 4.55	
Total	72	33.671				UL: 4.53	
VAR: Loyalty by the Organization							
Between Groups	2	1.723	.862	1.761	.179	EL: 4.80	
Within Groups	70	34.249	.489			ML: 4.32	
Total	72	35.973				UL: 4.44	
VAR: Feeling of being in on things							
Between Groups	2	3.839	1.919	3.511	.035	EL: 4.60	
Within Groups	70	38.271	.547			ML: 4.06	*
Total	72	42.110				UL: 4.50	*
VAR: Tactful Discipline							
Between Groups	2	2.000	1.000	1.154	.321	EL: 4.30	
Within Groups	69	59.777	.866			ML: 3.87	
Total	71	61.778				UL: 4.16	
VAR: Sympathetic Personal Help							
Between Groups	2	7.543	3.772	4.124	.020	EL: 4.40	*
Within Groups	69	63.110	.915			ML: 3.48	*
Total	71	70.653				UL: 3.97	

Note: EL = Entry Level (N=10); ML = Middle Level (N=31); UL = Upper Level (N=32)

* Indicates a significant difference between the entry, middle and upper level managers. Post Hoc Analysis (Tukey test): *Significance Level .05 (p < .05)*

The issue of good working conditions was the only variable where significant differences existed between all three groups. Research findings revealed that for entry-level managers good working condition is considered more important compared to their middle or upper level colleagues. Surprisingly, statistical difference also exists between middle and upper level managers. Upper level managers seem to give more importance to the nature of their working conditions compared to their middle level colleagues.

In summary, the findings suggest that:

- Appreciation, interesting job, good working conditions, career opportunities, and loyalty by the organization were ranked by respondents as the top five motivators.
- Job security becomes an important motivator for the over 30's.
- According to the findings of the research study there are no significant statistical differences in the motivational profile of male and female hospitality managers.
- The individual manager's status level within the organizational structure influences his/her motivational factors.

The next section of the paper provides a more in-depth discussion of the findings, including the likely implications of the findings for the major stakeholders within the Cyprus Hospitality Industry.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

In every healthy organization management has the responsibility to create, develop and maintain a positive environment in which individual employees are able to motivate themselves. Research which has been conducted over the past 50 years has tended to focus primarily on first line employees with little regard to what motivates the upper levels of the organizational pyramid. The primary objective of this research activity was to investigate the factors that motivate hospitality managers in Cyprus and whether age, gender, and managers' position in the hierarchy are influencing factors.

Our findings tend to echo those revealed by Wiley (1995) which relate to the content motivation theories (McClelland, 1951; Maslow, 1954; Atkinson, 1964; Rotter, 1966) whose focus is on what it is about the individual, i.e. valuing appreciation for doing a good job, which is also interesting to perform. An organization with good working conditions and which provides career opportunities are related to the environment that attracts the employee's attention. These factors incite

and sustain the employee's behaviour to seek greater goals of success and achievement (Hollyforde and Whiddett, 2002). Motivational factors such as appreciation; performing an interesting job; having good working conditions and career opportunities; and loyalty by the organization, precede monetary rewards.

To our knowledge at least, it is probably the first time that such an investigation of what motivates hospitality managers confirms the long standing assumption that money is not the most important motivator, even in an environment like Cyprus. Such an assumption has been frequently scrutinized by a number of hospitality stakeholders who have argued that in the "unique" environment of the hospitality industry of Cyprus money is by far the most important motivator. And, this may come as a surprise for many in the Cyprus Hospitality Industry; the promise of monetary rewards did not make the top five as an important motivational factor for this group of individuals.

Furthermore, our findings affirm earlier research which suggests that motivational factors are likely to change as demographics change (Weaver 1988; Wiley 1995), as was illustrated by our data which implied that job security becomes an important motivator for the over 30's, and the individual's managerial level within the organizational structure influences his/her motivational factors. Interestingly, according to the findings of the research study, there are no significant statistical differences in the motivational profile of male and female hospitality managers.

The top four motivators, revealed through this study define the quality of the organizational environment, and, do not require a financial outlay. Employees' feelings of being appreciated for their contributions, even in a fast paced, highly volatile environment was considered a crucial factor for the individuals scrutinized here. The ability to contribute and be involved with interesting job tasks that not only utilize skills and capabilities but also help employees to re-discover their potential and which also benefit the organization require no financial outlay. Good working conditions which can be achieved with some reorganizing and restructuring initiatives, with employee input would again require little or no financial outlay. Opportunities for career advancement would not only benefit the individual through the realization of his/her ambitions for personal grow and professional excellence, but the individual's value-added contribution would also benefit the organization.

The organization's personal loyalty towards the employees was the fifth most important motivator for hospitality managers in Cyprus and is consistent with Alderfer's ERG (Existence-Relatedness-Growth) Theory

(1969). The manifestation of the organization's loyalty to its employees, by way of sharing and mutuality of goals and needs, can influence their motivation and subsequent loyalty to the organization. It's no secret to those in the hospitality industry that turnover levels are higher than in other industries; imagining the potential benefits of having loyal employees who align their personal goals and objectives with those of the organization, shouldn't be too demanding a task, even for the less enlightened.

In summary, the findings from this study show that the major motivators for middle managers in the Cyprus Hospitality Industry are not financial in nature, but rather are related to the intrinsic factors of the job. Those responsible for managing and thus motivating this group of people can draw some conclusions from this, as we have. These are outlined in the next section.

CONCLUSION

We set out to find out what motivates line managers within the Cypriot Hospitality Industry. Just like learning, motivation is a very personal phenomenon and it has very little to do with money. It's about a positive organizational environment that fosters fairness, trust, respect, appreciation, career advancement opportunities and loyalty. While many consider motivation as an expensive quest with uncertain outcomes, research findings suggest that developing a positive organizational environment in which the 'right' people can motivate themselves is not expensive. We believe, for example, that, the organization, by showing its appreciation towards its members or by fostering loyalty to those that contribute towards the achievement of organizational goals, should not incur any financial outlay.

Furthermore, because motivation is a very personal phenomenon, it calls for diverse management strategies which take into account the motivational needs of individuals. Organizations should take this into account when consideration is given to the issue of motivation, so that the emphasis is on finding out what motivates the individuals in the organization (Wiley, 1995), and by ensuring that timely feedback is provided to employees if the motivation initiative is to yield the desired results (McConnell, 2005).

Motivation is a very complex process that directly impacts the development of all members of the organization, regardless of position and authority. As the hospitality industry becomes more sophisticated, so

do the needs of those who work within it. Management holds the key in developing an environment conducive to the type of motivation that will enable both front-line employees and managers to perform to the best of their ability. Thus all members of the organization should be exposed to an environment that offers both meaningful intrinsic and extrinsic incentives. In order to gain a broader perspective of motivation in the hospitality industry, future studies should investigate the motivational commonalities and/or differences between front-line employees and managers.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of equity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol.67, No.5, pp.422-436.
- Alderfer, C. P. (1969). An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, Vol.4, pp.142-175.
- Analoui, F. (2000). What motivates senior managers? The case of Romania. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol.15, No.4, pp.324-340.
- Atkinson, J. W. (1964). *An Introduction to Motivation*. Princeton, Van Nostrand.
- Charles, K. R. & Marshall, L. H. (1992). Motivational preferences of Caribbean hotel workers: an exploratory study. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol.4, No.3, pp.24-29.
- Herzberg, F. A., Mausner, B. & Sherwitz, L. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*. New York, Wiley.
- Hollyforde, S. & Whiddett, S. (2002). *The Motivation Handbook*. London, CIPD.
- Hull, C. L. (1943). *Principles of Behaviour*. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Kovach, K. (1987). What motivates employees? Workers and supervisors give different answers. *Business Horizons*, Vol.30, No.5, pp.58-65.
- Locke, E. A. (1968). Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, Vol.3, pp.157-189.
- McClelland, D. C. (1951). *Personality*. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- McConnell, C. R. (2005). Motivating your employees and yourself: how different is the manager from the staff? *The Health Care Manager*. Vol.24, No.3, pp.284-293.
- Pass, S. (2005). On the line. *People Management*. Vol.11, No.18, p.38.
- Rabey, G. P. (2001). Motivation is response. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, Vol.33, No.1, pp.26-28.
- Reis, D. & Peña, L. (2001). Reengineering the motivation to work. *Management Decision*, Vol.39, No.8, pp.666-675.
- Robbins, S. (1989). *Organizational Behaviour*. 3rd ed., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall.

- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, Vol.80, No.1(609), pp.1-28.
- Simons, T. & Enz, C. A. (1995). Motivating hotel employees: beyond the carrot and the stick. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, Vol.36, No.1, pp. 20-27.
- Tietjen, M. A. & Myers, R. M. (1998). Motivation and job satisfaction. *Management Decision*, Vol.36, No.4, pp.226-231.
- Umashankar, V. & Kulkarni, A. (2002). Employee motivation and empowerment in hospitality, rhetoric or reality – some observations from India. *Journal of Services Research*, Vol.2, No.1, pp.31-53.
- Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York, Wiley.
- Weaver, T. (1988). Theory M: motivating with money. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, Vol.29, No.3, pp.40-45.
- Wiley, C. (1995). What motivates employees according to over 40 years of motivation surveys. *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol.18, No.3, pp.263-280.

SUBMITTED: AUGUST 2006

REVISION SUBMITTED: DECEMBER 2006

ACCEPTED: JANUARY 2007

REFEREED ANONYMOUSLY

Anastasios Zopiatis (anastasios.zopiatis@cut.ac.cy) is a Lecturer at the Cyprus University of Technology, Department of Hotel and Tourism Management, Archbishop Kyprianou 31, P.O. Box 50329, 3036 Limassol, Cyprus.

Panikkos Constanti (constanti.p@intercollege.ac.cy) is a Senior Lecturer at Intercollege, Department of Hospitality and Tourism, 46 Makedonitissas Ave, P.O. Box 24005, 1700 Nicosia, Cyprus.