

EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION IN ORGANIZATIONS USING OUTSOURCING: AN INVESTIGATION IN 5-STAR HOTELS IN ISTANBUL

Orhan AKOVA¹, Erkan TAŞKIRAN²

¹Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sakarya, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Yardımcı Doçent Dr.

²Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Araştırma Görevlisi

EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION IN ORGANIZATIONS USING OUTSOURCING: AN INVESTIGATION IN 5-STAR HOTELS IN ISTANBUL

Abstract: Outsourcing has become a commonly preferred management strategy in hotel industry like other industries. Employee motivation is also important for organizations since it directly effects the productivity of organizations. Within this frame, this article aims to identify and measure the importance levels and satisfaction levels of motivators of the employees working as permanent staff and via outsourcing in 5-star hotels in Istanbul. Also, it is investigated if there is a significant relation between demographic characteristics of two categories of employees and importance level of motivators and satisfaction level of motivators.

The results of the research indicated that the satisfaction levels of permanent staff are completely higher than outsourcing staff while the importance level of each groups is mostly the same. This study is important since it contributes to the literature on outsourcing and employee motivation. It is also expected that the present study helps other academics and researches who examine this topic.

Keywords: Motivation, Outsourcing, Employee, Hotel Organizations

DIŞ KAYNAK KULLANAN İŞLETMELERDE İŞGÖREN MOTİVASYONU: İSTANBUL'DAKİ BEŞ YILDIZLI OTEL İŞLETMELERİNDE BİR ARAŞTIRMA

Özet: Dış kaynak kullanımı, diğer endüstrilerde olduğu gibi, otel endüstrisinde de yaygın olarak tercih edilen bir yönetim stratejisi haline gelmiştir. İşgören motivasyonu ise, doğrudan işletmelerin üretkenliğini etkilediği için ayrıca önemlidir. Bu çerçevede hazırlanan bu araştırma, İstanbul'daki 5 yıldızlı otel işletmelerinde dış kaynak kullanımı yoluyla ve kadrolu olarak çalışan işgörenleri motive eden faktörleri belirlemeyi ve bu faktörlerin önem ve tatmin derecelerini saptamayı amaçlamaktadır. Ayrıca, bu iki farklı işgören grubunun demografik özellikleri ile onları motive eden faktörlerin önem ve tatmin dereceleri arasında bir ilişki olup olmadığı araştırılmıştır.

Araştırma sonuçları, her iki işgören grubunun faktörlere verdikleri önem düzeylerinin hemen hemen aynı olduğunu gösterirken, tatmin düzeyleri bakımından kadrolu çalışanların dış kaynak yoluyla çalışanlara oranla daha yüksek olduğu ortaya koymuştur. Bu araştırma, dış kaynak kullanımı ve motivasyon literatürüne katkıda bulunduğu için önemlidir. Ayrıca, bu konuda çalışacak akademisyen ve araştırmacılara da yararlı olması beklenmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Motivasyon, Dış Kaynak Kullanımı, İşgören, Otel İşletmeleri.

I. INTRODUCTION

Employees who are ambitious to put his or her best efforts towards the achievement of organizational goals are of vital important for success of the organization. From this point of view, motivation has recently become one of the most important concepts for the organizations since fostering employee motivation is essential in achieving organizational success [1]. As a hypothetical construct, motivation usually stands for that which energizes, directs and sustains behaviour [2]. Analoui [3] sees motivation as an internal drive necessary to guide employee's actions and behaviours towards the achievement of some goals. Psychologists state that work effort of employees reflects motivation. Economists also recognize that motivation differs across individuals and is likely to influence their productivity [4]. Mitchell [5] also pointed out that motivation of the employees is an important contributor to influence performance. According to Kovach [6], management must understand

what motivates employees within the context of the roles they perform. Such an understanding is absolutely crucial to improve productivity. Thus, motivation is of interest in the work environment since it influences work performance and productivity [7]. So, as long as the motivation levels of employees increase, their individual performance enhances and thus organization could achieve its goals. On the other hand the literature on motivation does not offer a consensus on the definition and the relationship between motivation, productivity and performance is a highly contested arena.

In recent years, a new interest in the relationship between the economics of labor markets and the psychology of worker motivation has developed [8]. Organizations go towards new trends with the effect of the factors such as new technologies, fierce competition and changings in the social and work environment. Outsourcing is agreed as the one of these trends. Outsourcing, having been predicted that it will continue to pick up and go forward at

huge growth rates in the new millenium [9], can be defined as “the reliance on external sources for manufacturing components and other value-adding activities” [10]. The main reasons for outsourcing are: reducing and controlling operating costs, improving company focus, gaining access to world-class capabilities, free internal sources for other purposes, access to external sources and share risks [11].

Within this frame, it can be clearly remarked that while employee motivation is essential for the success of the organization, the trend to outsource will go further. This means that the number of employees who work in an organization via outsourcing supplier will increase. Thus to search for motivation levels of these employees and to analyze what motivates them in organization becomes an important issue. However, existing literature on motivation and outsourcing lacks researches which examine the relationship between motivation and outsourcing. For this reason, we firstly aim to focus on determining the factors that motivate employees who work in organizations as permanent staff and via outsourcing supplier and to expose if there is a differentiation between motivation and satisfaction levels of these employees. Also, it is investigated if there is a significant relations related to their demographic characteristics of the importance level of motivators and satisfaction level of motivators among employees working as permanent and via outsourcing.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Before analyzing the results of the study and discussing the research, it will be useful to examine the literature. Therefore, this section consists of a view of the topics that are motivation, outsourcing and outsourcing in hotel organizations.

II.1. Motivation

Motivation is a highly complicated phenomenon that influences and is influenced by a large number of factors in the organisational environment [12]. Locke [13] remarks that this interaction results from the fact that many theories are constituent parts of a wider motivational sequence [14]. Although it has been well studied there still persists a strong disagreement upon what is meant by motivation [15]. Therefore, a great amount of definitions are proved by literature. For instance, Westerman and Donoghue [16] define motivation as “a set of processes which energize a person's behaviour and direct him or her towards attaining some goal, or put more simply getting people to do willingly and well those things which have to be done”. According to Mitchell [5] motivation can be described as “the degree to which an individual wants and tries hard to do well at a particular task or job”. Lindner's [17] definition is “the inner force that drives individuals to

accomplish personnel and organizational goals”. Franco et al. [18] also defines motivation as “an individual's degree at willingness to exert and maintain an effort towards organizational goals”. As it can be seen, the issue of motivation is essentially concerned with individuals' *i)* needs and expectations, *ii)* goals *iii)* behaviours and *iv)* feed-backs [19]. Researchers clearly do not have the same phenomenon in mind when referring to motivation. Often, different qualifications are used interchangeably. In order to avoid any confusion among scholars and in order to build a valuable foundation for further discussion, we will use in this study the definition of motivation as an individual's degree at willingness to exert and maintain an effort towards organizational goals. This definition covers both the willingness to exert and maintain effort and the organisational goals. In our study we will try to explore the willingness to exert and maintain effort towards the organisational goals. In this study we are not going to mention and discuss about the theories of motivation as it is not in concern of our research.

A key factor to any organization's success is the people it employs [20]. Motivation has the potential to energize people not by pushing them in the right direction as control mechanisms do but by satisfying basic human needs for achievement, a sense of belonging, recognition, self-esteem, a feeling of control over one's life, and the ability to live up to one's ideals [21]. As suggested by Lock [22], there is a strong correlation between motivation and achievement, and motivated employees are nearly achievers. Process theories of motivation [23], [24] generally predict increased performance with increased motivation [25]. Lawler [26] that being able to influence the motivation of employees is crucial in the effective management of organizations. Employees who are more motivated tend to work harder and smarter, and have better performance in their jobs [27], [28]. Locke's goal-setting model [29], in particular, predicts that both performance and motivation will be increased when individuals have clear goals [25]. Managers cannot force their employees to be motivated, but if they know what their employees want and expect from work, they can create a coordinated work environment that includes coaching, skill development, and rewards helps employees to motivate themselves [30]. To be effective, managers need to understand what motivates employees within the context of the roles they perform [17]. Therefore a successful manager should harmonize the organizational and individual purposes that are composed of employee's needs and wants. The important point is that employees should believe that they will reach their goals when the organization reaches its own goals and thus make themselves highly motivated. As a result of this process, employee would come to a condition that could be more satisfied [31]. Hiam [32] points out that people who are highly motivated are self-motivated, and they have a strong will to achieve, to succeed, to learn and to perform. Hence, hotel managers should also direct their

employees towards the achievement of the determined organizational objectives. Motivated employees who have a clear vision of the importance of service quality to the firm should provide superior service [33]. On the other hand, Locke [13] has attempted to avoid static and subjective argument, between satisfaction and performance maintaining that such a relationship can never be proved or disproved. The objective, therefore, has been to look at individual needs, values, goals, intentions and rewards, and, in so doing, to develop a more holistic view of the motivational process [14].

There have been many researches about searching and examining what motivate employees. For instance, Kovach [6] investigated the factors that motivate employees. The ranked order of motivating factors were stated as (a) interesting work, (b) full appreciation of work done, (c) feeling on being in on things, (d) job security, (e) good wages. According to the results of a research, conducted on hotel employees in USA and Canada, in 1995, top-five factors that motivate employees are good wages, job security, opportunities for advancement and development, good working conditions and interesting work [34]. Similarly but not in the same turn, in another survey, conducted in Hong-Kong to find out what motivates hotel employees, it was determined that opportunities for advancement and development, loyalty to employees, good wages, job security and good working conditions as the top-five factors that motivate people [35]. Bent and Freathy [14] examined the motivators and their level of satisfaction experienced by employees in the independent retail sector. After their research conducted through interviews with 121 employees, they exposed that the day-to-day interaction with customers, the level of responsibility held and working with fellow colleagues are all seen as positive aspects of the job. Alternatively, rude customers and unappreciative employers were held to be amongst the most negative factors. Lindner [17] also investigated the factors that motivate employees. The ranked order of motivating factors were stated as (a) interesting work, (b) good wages, (c) full appreciation of work done, (d) job security, (e) good working conditions. Bent et al. [36] also conducted a research to examine the factors which affect staff motivation and satisfaction in 38 small food processing and manufacturing companies in Scotland. Results of the study emphasised the importance of the management style of the manager/owner particularly when it comes to factors such as lack of appreciation, poor communication and training. In their study Goldsmith et al. [4] revealed that moral, intrinsic, peer pressure and positive intensives are the motivating factors.

Parsons and Broadbridge [62] investigated the role of job characteristics and communication in relation to job motivation and satisfaction amongst UK charity shop managers. Analysis was based on 22 interviews with shop

managers and a nationwide survey of 826 charity shop managers. They found that managers exhibit low levels of satisfaction with factors such as pay, job status and working conditions. However, in exploring communication they found a form of ‘altruism payoff’ whereby managers’ dissatisfaction is ameliorated by the fulfillment gained from interpersonal relationships with other staff members and the knowledge that their efforts are benefiting a charitable cause.

Huddleston and Good [63] conducted a survey of job motivators in Russian and Polish retail firms. Survey data collected from 675 Russian and Polish retail workers in 1995. Among their respondents, pay and friendliness of co-workers dominated the motivators, with respect and job security following in the second and third positions.

Linz [64] conducted a survey to analyze the extent of gender and generational differences in organizational commitment and worker motivation, using survey data collected from 1200 employees in three regions of Russia. In the result of study; women are more likely than men to say that pay is very important, the chance to do something that makes them feel good as a person is very important, job security is very important, receiving respect from co-workers is very important, receiving praise from supervisor is very important and the friendliness of co-workers is very important. Individually, each of these motivators is more important to women than to men.

II.2. Outsourcing

According to Gilley and Rasheed [37], there seems to be confusion in the management literature about what is meant by the term “outsourcing”. Traditionally, outsourcing is an abbreviation of “outside resource using” [38]. With a simple expression, outsourcing refers to a management pattern where a company combines and utilizes the specialized resources of outside agents [39]. In another definition, outsourcing is “an outside company’s provision of the products or services previously carried out within the company” [40]. For services, this usually involves the transfer of operational control to the supplier. In the current environment of right-sizing, with a renewed focus on core business activities, companies can no longer assume that all organizational services must be provided and managed internally. Competitive advantage may be gained when products or services are produced more effectively and efficiently by outside suppliers. The advantages in outsourcing can be operational, strategic, or both. Operational advantages usually provide for short-term trouble avoidance, while strategic advantages offer long-term contributions in maximizing opportunities [41].

Outsourcing is an historical well-established practice [42]. As a management practice, it has probably been in existence for over 200 years but during the last 15 years, with the support of academics, consultants and

industry forums, it has developed into a popular strategic management initiative [43]. Many observers mark the beginning of the contemporary surge of company outsourcing with Eastman Kodak's decision in 1989 to source out its entire information management to IBM, Businessland and Digital Equipment Corp. [44]. In Europe, many small and open economies are recently engaged in outsourcing activities [45].

Outsourcing is one of the most common practices adopted by general contractors in sharing project risks and surviving in the volatile business cycle [46]. There are several circumstances which drive the decision to outsource. For instance, Baden-Fuller et al. [47] asserted four reasons for outsourcing: (1) catch-up competitors, (2) changing value chains of customers, (3) changing technological conditions (new Technologies) and (4) new markets. Kakabadse and Kakabadse [48] also report that the main reasons for outsourcing are; (1) economics-economy of scales, (2) quality- access to skills and (3) innovation- improvements and developments in quality. The other reasons to outsource are cost reduction and having a vision and flexibility [49].

II.3. Outsourcing in Hotel Organizations

Globalization and the competitive environment in which today's businesses operate mean that hotels may want to consider outsourcing their service activities [50]. Hotel outsourcing is defined as "a management strategy in which a hotel utilizes a specialized outsourcing supplier, forming strategic alliances with it to have the supplier operate certain hotel functions, in an attempt to reduce costs and risks and improve efficiency" [39]. This allows the hotel to focus on its core competency and strengthen its abilities to adopt in the ever-changing business environment [39].

Outsourcing was firstly started to use in hotel sector 20 years ago in France by contracting out the hotel departments to the specialized firms in their areas [51]. Hotels and its investors managed to gain more profit from outsourcing than today, especially chain-hotels of USA, Germany and UK. %50 of Hilton, Sheraton, Marriot, Holiday Inn and Crown Plaza, located in USA, are being successfully managed by various outsource supplier firms [52]. In Turkey, the use of outsourcing firstly started in 1997 in Atlantis Holiday Village which's located in Seferihisar, İzmir. Outsource suppliers offered so attractive prices to their first partners to be able to have a place in the market and create demand. Hence, first user hotels of outsourcing earned too much money in comparison with today's demand [51].

Hotel organizations are tend to use outsourcing in non-strategic activities [50]. Highly outsource used areas are front-office, F&B, housekeeping, animation, security, technical service and accounting. Service firms are also

outsourcing activities what is not perceived as core such as call centres, billing services, as well as standardised parts of the service delivery chain [47]. Outsource supplier firms recruit hotels. The hotel establishments which plan to get free of personnel appraisal, matters pertaining to personnel, risk of separation pay, trade-union and social responsibilities, want to work with the outsource supplier [51]. The trend to outsourcing has been influenced by management techniques such as business process reengineering which demands that radical solutions be found to business problems to achieve step improvements, downsizing which provide cost savings and flexibility, benchmarking which encourages the organizations to look outward to achieve world class performance and core competence which argues that organizations succeed because they are only able to perform a limited range of core activities to a world class standard [53].

While there is little in the literature analyzing specificity and outsourcing in the service sector, there have not been found in the literature examining the motivation factors and motivation levels of employees who are working in the organizations using outsourcing. This lack of research interest in hotel outsourcing is surprising, as outsourcing has become a significant facet of modern hotel management [54]. However, there are some studies, conducted in hotels related to outsourcing. For example, Hemmington and King [55] pointed out five key dimensions of outsourcing in hotel restaurants as core competencies, brand compatibility, organizational culture, operational tension and systems of review, evaluation and control. Espino-Rodriguez and Gil-Padilla [56] conducted a study to determine the factors affecting outsourcing of information system (IS) activities in hotels from the resource-based view of the firm. The results indicated that the factors determining IS activity outsourcing are related to the creation of valuable resources and to market transaction costs, and the IS area performance does not influence the decision to outsource. Lam and Han [39] investigated outsourcing strategy as perceived by hotel managers and identified some relationships in China and revealed that the outsourcing market is still immature and the incompleteness of laws is hindrance to the adoption of outsourcing. Another research, conducted upon F&B outsourcing in 4-star hotels in Switzerland revealed that although partial or total outsourcing of certain F&B activities are widely used by hotels in North America and increasingly in the UK, it is still fairly uncommon in Switzerland where particularly at the high end of the spectrum 4-star hotels. However, four-star hotels in the Zurich area with regard to potential outsourcing of their F&B activities in an effort to improve their strategic competitiveness [57]. Espino-Rodrigues and Padron-Robaina [58] investigated hotel manager's perceptions of the influence of outsourcing on operations strategy and objectives. The findings revealed that managers consider that outsourcing has great potential to exert influence and

objectives, and that outsourcing significantly is influencing hotel performance. Espino-Rodrigues and Padron-Robaina [50] also studied the characteristics that hotel activities must possess for them to be outsourced. The findings suggest that activity performance, substitutability and transferability are the factors which may determine the decision to outsource. Evidence from that study implies that outsourcing has a positive influence on organizational performance.

The worse an activity's performance is the more it is outsourced. So, the philosophy behind outsourcing an activity is not just cost reduction but, more importantly, acquiring higher quality of performance [50]. In order to outsource rationally the organization must know the benefits and drawbacks of outsourcing and the specific determinants of conflict. But to understand those risks and benefits, the organization must have a clear conceptual framework of the outsourcing decision [59].

III. METHODOLOGY

The context of this study is the employees who work as permanent and via outsourcing in five-star hotel operations, located in Istanbul and using outsourcing. Five-star hotels have been chosen for the sample since this type of hotel operations is more likely to outsource. An investigation on the source [60] revealed that, there were 26 five-star hotels operating in Istanbul in the time period this research took place. According to the pre-interviews with the hotels, it was found out that 15 hotels use outsourcing in their various departments. Therefore, the sample of this study consists of 15 five-star hotels. Pre-interviews show that in these hotels there are approximately working 1500 permanent staff and 350 outsourcing firm staff. Related to the employee numbers that the hotels have as permanent and via outsourcing, totally five hundred questionnaires were dispensed to the target sample through the human resource manager of each participating hotel. The sample size was chosen because hotels have different number of employees working as permanent and via outsourcing. Response rate of %81,6 has accounted for as the returned questionnaire numbered 408. This response rate can be accepted fairly good. This rate can be stemmed from the willingness and interest in research topic of the hotel operations participating in research. Twelve questionnaires were eliminated because of missing data and ambiguous answers. Totally, 396 questionnaires - 220 permanent staff and 176 outsourcing firm staff - were used in this survey. Although all questionnaires were not delivered equally to the hotels, the number of questionnaires replied by employees working via outsourcing was less than permanent staff because the number of permanent staff was higher than outsourcing firm staff. The research was conducted in October and December of 2005 since the occupancy rate of the hotels has been considered to be

relatively lower in these months. Therefore, it can be likely said that staff are not much busy and have time to participate the survey during this period because of lower occupancy rate.

The model of the study is determined as descriptive since the study aims to state the present circumstances. The questionnaire method was used to collect the data. The questionnaire used in the research was adopted from Dilber's study [61]. After reviewing of literature comprehensively, we decided to employ Dilber's study since his approach to motivation has fit to ours. Also, his method was very easy to use and measure the level of importance and satisfaction. The questionnaire comprised three sections. Section I is to gather the demographical data of the respondents such as gender, age, department etc. Section II consisted of twenty close-ended questions appraising the participants' opinions about motivator's importance level. And finally Section III comprised twenty close-ended questions assessing the participants' ideas about motivator's satisfaction level. The response format of the questionnaire was a five-point Likert scale ranging from *not at all important (1)* to *extremely important (5)* for Section II related to motivators' importance level and *not at all satisfactory (1)* to *extremely satisfactory (5)* for Section III related to motivators' satisfaction level. After getting inconsumable factors for the study from the factor analysis employing in SPSS, the questionnaire has been discriminated to five factors by authors to classify the motivators according to the Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs as physiological, safety, belongingness & love, esteem and self-actualization. By making this discrimination within the theoretical evidence, it is aimed to assess the data smoothly. Since we employ the same motivators at Section II and Section III, the factors showing in Table.1 covers the motivators that are established for both sections.

As analytical method; the frequencies and percentages related to the respondents' demographic characteristics were analyzed. Also, *the independent-samples t-test* was used to assess the significant relation between the employees who work as permanent and via outsourcing in five factors about the importance and satisfaction level of the motivators. In addition, the *t-test* was used to determine the significant differences between employees who work as permanent and via outsourcing related to their demographic characteristics. A scale reliability analysis was set for Section II and III respectively and the Cronbach's alpha was measured at 0.88 for Section II and at 0.84 for Section III. According to these results, it can be said that the Cronbach's Alpha is quite high, and sections are internally consistent and reliable. The significant correlations were set at p-level less than 0,05 and 0,01. The SPSS for Windows program (Version 10.0) was used for statistical analysis of the data.

Table.1. Factors

Factor1- Physiological	Factor2- Safety Needs	Factor3- Belongingness&Love	Factor4- Esteem Needs	Factor5- Self-Actualization
- Income (Q13) - Time (Q14) - Working conditions (Q19)	- Job security (Q1) - Social security (Q2) - Membership of union (Q12)	- Relationship with colleagues (Q6) - Relationship with managers (Q9)	- Appraising (Q3) - Promotion (Q5) - Participate in decisions (Q7) - Status (Q8) - Responsibility (Q16) - Creating oppurtunity (Q15)	- Proffesional training (Q4) - Freely thinking (Q10) - Personnel power and authority (Q11) -Psychological satisfaction (Q17) - Using of own methods (Q18) -To be successful (Q20)

Q: Question

IV. RESULTS

IV.1. Demographical Characteristics of the Respondents

Table.2 is presented to give the demographical characteristics of the respondents. So that it could be compered with if there is a significiant relationship between the demographical characteristics of the respondents and their satisfaction level and importance level of motivators.

Table.2. Demographical Characteristics

	N=396	%
Gender		
Male	256	64,6
Female	140	35,4
Age		
25 and below	48	12,1
26-35	192	48,5
36-45	136	34,3
46 and above	20	5,1
Graduation		
Uneducated	4	1,0
Middle School	32	8,1
High School	212	53,5
University	148	37,4
Working Statement		
Via outsourcing	148	37,4
As permanent	248	62,6
Department		
Housekeeping	168	42,4
F&B	140	35,4
Security	32	8,1
Front Office	56	14,1

According to this results; 256 (64,6%) of the respondents are male. One hundred and ninety two (48,5%) are from 26-35 age group, 136 (34,3%) from 36-45, 48 (12,1%) from 25-below and twenty (5,1%) from 46 and above. 53,5% of the respondents are from high school, 37,4% from university, 8,1% from middle school

and also 1,0% of the participants are uneducated. Permanent employees accounted for 62,6% (248) versus 37,4% (148) for employees via outsourcing. The number of parmanent employees is higher than employees via outsourcing. This may be because of the number of parmenent staff working in hotel managements are higher then via outsourcing staff. When we look at the departmant of the respondents, 168 (42,4%) are from housekeeping, 140 (35,4%) from F&B, 56 (14,1%) from front office and finally 32 (8,1%) from the department of security. It is obvious that the participants are mostly from housekeeping and front office department.

IV.2. The Importance Level and The Satisfaction Level of Motivators

To learn what is the importance level and the satisfaction level of the motivators for both employee groups, the mean of each motivators is calculated. The highest mean score indicates the most important and satisfied motivator. The higher the mean scores, the higher the level of agreement. All means are ranked from the highest to the lowest to facilitate comparison with each group (see Table.3 and Table.4).

The top three motivators according to the importance level for employees working via outsourcing are: **(1)** to do something for someone else (4,35), **(2)** income (4,27), and **(3)** personnel power and authority (4,18); as for employees working as permanent are; **(1)** relationship with colleagues (4,20), **(2)** income (4,20), and **(3)** participate in decisions (4,16) respectively. As we can see in the table the importance level of motivators for both groups are different. Only "income" for both groups is the same level of importance and the others differentiate for both groups. There have been many researches about what motivate employees. For instance, Kovach [6], Simons and Enz [34], Siu et al. [35], Lindner [17], Huddleston and Good [63], Linz [64] found the "income" a motivating factor as in this study for the employees investigated the factors that motivate employees.

Table.3. The Importance Level of Motivators

via Outsourcing			as Permanent		
	Mean	S.D.		Mean	S. D.
To do something for someone else	4,35	0,58	Relationship with colleagues	4,20	1,08
Income	4,27	1,00	Income	4,20	0,95
Personnel power and authority	4,18	0,86	Participate in decisions	4,16	0,93
Relationship with colleagues	4,05	0,87	Job security	4,12	0,90
Appraising	3,97	1,00	Promotion	4,12	1,05
Promotion	3,97	1,15	Personnel power and authority	4,11	0,97
Social security	3,94	0,61	Appraising	4,09	0,94
Freely thinking	3,83	0,94	Social security	4,06	0,82
Relationship with managers	3,81	1,06	To do something for someone else	4,00	0,91
Job security	3,78	0,99	Freely thinking	3,85	0,94
Participate in decisions	3,78	0,93	Professional training	3,83	0,88
Status	3,78	0,74	Relationship with managers	3,82	0,85
Responsibility	3,75	1,12	To be successful	3,82	1,02
To be successful	3,72	1,11	Membership of union	3,67	0,77
Membership of union	3,70	0,89	Status	3,62	0,92
Using of own methods	3,70	0,80	Working conditions	3,62	0,88
Creating opportunity	3,67	0,99	Responsibility	3,56	0,79
Professional training	3,59	1,10	Time	3,50	0,93
Working conditions	3,59	0,82	Creating opportunity	3,43	0,83
Time	3,51	0,82	Using of own methods	3,40	0,81

Table.4. The Satisfaction Level of Motivators

via Outsourcing			as Permanent		
	Mean	S.D.		Mean	S.D.
Time	2,86	1,21	Relationship with colleagues	3,38	0,74
Membership of union	2,62	1,19	To do something for someone else	3,20	0,86
To do something for someone else	2,59	1,08	Membership of union	3,19	0,80
Relationship with colleagues	2,56	0,88	Using of own methods	3,08	0,99
Responsibility	2,51	1,15	Working conditions	3,03	0,98
Social security	2,45	0,92	Time	3,00	0,95
Using of own methods	2,40	0,94	Creating opportunity	3,00	0,71
Professional training	2,35	1,02	To be successful	3,00	0,80
Relationship with managers	2,32	0,96	Freely thinking	2,97	0,93
Job security	2,29	1,01	Status	2,83	0,97
Freely thinking	2,29	0,73	Income	2,83	1,08
Creating opportunity	2,29	0,80	Job security	2,82	0,68
Appraising	2,18	0,92	Social security	2,82	0,90
Promotion	2,18	1,19	Relationship with managers	2,82	0,99
Participate in decisions	2,18	0,83	Personnel power and authority	2,82	1,15
Income	2,16	0,82	Responsibility	2,77	0,83
Working conditions	2,16	0,68	Participate in decisions	2,67	1,04
Personnel power and authority	2,13	1,02	Appraising	2,66	0,64
To be successful	2,10	0,72	Professional training	2,64	1,06
Status	1,91	0,78	Promotion	2,59	1,10

In the study of Huddleston and Good [63] friendliness of co-workers dominated the motivators and Linz [64] found that receiving respect from co-workers and the friendliness of co-workers is very important. In this study, the “relations with colleagues” is the most important for the permanent staff and they want to participate decisions. On the other hand for outsourcing employee it is mostly “to do something for someone

else”, and “personnel power and authority” is important. This may be explained as because the needs of both groups are different so, the important levels of motivators are different.

Similarly, the top three motivators according to the satisfaction level for employees working via outsourcing are: (1) time, (2) membership of union, and (3) to do

something for someone else; as for employees working as permanent are; (1) relationship with colleagues, (2) to do something for someone else, and finally (3) membership of union, respectively. For employees working via outsourcing “time” is the most seriously considered satisfaction level. As it differentiate in the rank and as the means are lower for via outsourcing employees “the membership of union” and “to do something for someone else” has the top three satisfaction level for both groups. In the study of Bent and Freathy (1997) working with colleagues is positive factor of job. In this study also “Relationship with colleagues” is the most seriously considered satisfaction level for permanent employees. This can be explained as being a member of a outsourcing firm, the outsourcing employees may not get a efficient relationship with other employees and permanent employees. As it can be seen from both tables of importance level and satisfaction levels of motivators. There are important difference between the importance level and satisfaction level according to means and their rank for both groups. Especially “income” get low means in the table of satisfaction level as in the study of Parsons and Broadbridge [62]. And as an important point the means are differentiate for both groups. Satisfaction level means of permanent staff are higher than via outsourcing

staff. Permanent employees are mostly satisfied in many of the motivator factors such as “relation with colleagues”, “to do something for someone else”, “membership of union”, “using of own methods”, “working condition”, “time”, “creating opportunity”, “to be successful”, “freely thinking” and “status”. For the outsourcing employee motivator factors of “creating opportunity”, “to be successful”, “freely thinking” and “status” get the lowest rank for their satisfaction level. It is seen via outsourcing employee are not enough motivated and satisfied. On the other hand permanent employees are more motivated and satisfied than via outsourcing employee.

IV.3. Comparison of Motivators According to The Working Statement of Employees

Reduction in variables resulted in five factors as it is shown in Table.1. To find out if there is significant relation between employee groups in those factors related to their working statement, the independent-samples t-test was used. Table.5 indicates the results of comparison of employees working via outsourcing and as permanent in terms of importance level of motivators.

Table.5. Comparison of Motivators According The Importance Level

FACTORS	Working Statement	N	Mean	s.d.	t	p
Physiological - Income - Time - Working conditions	via Outsourcing	148	3,79	0,67	0,18	0,85
	as Permanent	248	3,77	0,69		
Safety Needs - Job security - Social security - Membership of union	via Outsourcing	148	3,81	0,56	-2,3	0,02*
	as Permanent	248	3,95	0,62		
Belongingness&Love - Relationship with colleagues - Relationship with managers	via Outsourcing	148	3,93	0,83	-0,99	0,32
	as Permanent	248	4,01	0,79		
Esteem Needs - Appraising - Promotion - Participate in decisions - Status - Responsibility - Creating opportunity	via Outsourcing	148	3,82	0,57	-0,19	0,84
	as Permanent	248	3,83	0,59		
Self-Actualization - Professional training - Freely thinking - Personal power and authority - Psychological satisfaction - Using of own methods - To be successful	via Outsourcing	148	3,90	0,62	0,96	0,33
	as Permanent	248	3,83	0,62		

*p<0,05

Table.6. Comparison of Motivators According The Satisfaction Level

FACTORS	Working Statement	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	t	p
Physiological - Income - Time - Working conditions	via Outsourcing	148	2,39	0,48	-8,94	0,00**
	as Permanent	248	2,95	0,66		
Safety Needs - Job security - Social security - Membership of union	via Outsourcing	148	2,45	0,58	-8,17	0,00**
	as Permanent	248	2,94	0,56		
Belongingness&Love - Relationship with colleagues - Relationship with managers	via Outsourcing	148	2,44	0,79	-8,45	0,00**
	as Permanent	248	3,10	0,72		
Esteem Needs - Appraising - Promotion - Participate in decisions - Status - Responsibility - Creating opportunity	via Outsourcing	148	2,21	0,52	-9,36	0,00**
	as Permanent	248	2,75	0,57		
Self-Actualization - Professional training - Freely thinking - Personal power and authority - Psychological satisfaction - Using of own methods - To be successful	via Outsourcing	148	2,31	0,60	-10,7	0,00**
	as Permanent	248	2,95	0,55		

** $p < 0,01$

These findings show that there is only one significant difference between groups in safety need. Employees working as permanent consider safety needs more important in comparison with employees working via outsourcing. In the study of Kovach [6], Simons and Enz [34], Siu et al. [35], Lindner [17], Huddleston and Good [63], Linz [64] job security is perceived as an important motivator for the workers. Here in this study the difference between two groups can be explained as employees working via outsourcing are not so insistent about job security as permanent staff as because they are not working as permanent staff. No significant difference is established in other factors.

The results of comparison of employees working via outsourcing and as permanent in terms of satisfaction level of motivators are also presented in Table.6. It was found that there was significant difference in each factor between working groups. Evidence from the results implies that the satisfaction level of the employees working as permanent is higher than the employees working via outsourcing. When the satisfaction level of physiological, safety needs, belongingness and love, esteem needs and self-actualization is examined, the satisfaction level of employees working via outsourcing is especially lower than permanent staff. So, it can be said that permanent employees are more motivated and satisfied than via outsourcing employees.

IV.4. Comparison of Motivators Related to Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The independent-samples *t-test* analysis was used to examine the significant difference between the employees working as permanent and via outsourcing and respondents' demographic characteristics in terms of motivators' importance level that the employees consider serious. No data about some sub-groups such as security, uneducated or middle-school were presented in Table.7 since there weren't enough data to analyze. Also, the age groups that are (1) "25 and below" and "26-35"; (2) "36-45" and "46 and above" were combined with each others so as to analyze this variable. As shown in Table.7, two significant differences were found in education and age groups while there were no differences in department and gender. Firstly, it is established that there is a significant difference between university graduates related to their working statement ($p < 0.01$). This result can be explained as graduates working as permanent consider the motivators more seriously in comparison with graduates working via outsourcing. Secondly, the significant difference was found in both "26-35" ($p < 0.01$) and "36-45" ($p < 0.05$) age groups. This result shows that "26-35" age group employees working via outsourcing consider the motivators more seriously than "26-35" age group employees working via outsourcing. However, "36-45" age group employees working as permanent consider the motivators more seriously in comparison with "36-45" age group employees working via outsourcing.

Table.7. Comparison of Motivators Related to Demographic Characteristics of Respondents in terms of Importance Level

	Department	Working Statement	N	\bar{X}	S. D.	t	p
Importance Level of Motivators	Housekeeping	via Outsourcing	64	3,99	0,56	0,68	0,49
		as Permanent	104	3,92	0,89		
	F&B	via Outsourcing	48	3,66	0,42	-1,25	0,21
		as Permanent	92	3,76	0,47		
	Front Office	via Outsourcing	36	3,84	0,46	-0,60	0,54
		as Permanent	52	3,90	0,44		
	Graduation	Working Statement	N	\bar{X}	S. D.	t	p
	High School	via Outsourcing	88	3,94	0,48	0,31	0,75
		as Permanent	124	3,92	0,59		
	University	via Outsourcing	24	3,41	0,48	-3,89	0,00**
		as Permanent	124	3,80	0,44		
	Age	Working Statement	N	\bar{X}	S. D.	t	p
	26-35	via Outsourcing	72	4,02	0,29	2,59	0,01**
		as Permanent	168	3,84	0,53		
	36-45	via Outsourcing	76	3,68	0,64	-2,23	0,02*
		as Permanent	80	3,89	0,51		
Gender	Working Statement	N	\bar{X}	S. D.	t	p	
Male	via Outsourcing	116	3,80	0,58	0,03	0,96	
	as Permanent	140	3,79	0,57			
Female	via Outsourcing	32	4,03	0,13	1,08	0,28	
	as Permanent	108	3,95	0,44			

**p<0,01 *p<0,05

In this study, it was established that age and graduation factors differentiated related to the importance level of motivators. However, no difference found in terms of importance level of motivators between departments and gender of respondents. When we look at the means of demographic characteristics it is seen that both permanent employee and via outsourcing employee working in housekeeping department consider the motivators more seriously in comparison with other departments. Also, female workers of both permanent and via outsourcing firm consider the motivators more seriously than the male workers. In the study of Linz [64] each of the motivators is more important to women than to men; that is, the mean value is significantly higher.

Results of additional *t-test* analysis to examine the significant difference in terms of satisfaction level that the employees get from motivators were depicted in Table.8 Same data reduction and combination was set in this analysis as Table.8. It was found that there were significant difference (at $p<0,01$) in each demographic characteristics of respondents. According to the results, it can be said that the satisfaction levels that the employees working via outsourcing get from motivators are generally lower than the employees working as permanent in each demographic characteristics and their sub-groups. When we analysis the means of demographic characteristics it is seen that the satisfaction level of employees via outsourcing working in housekeeping department is less satisfied in comparison with other departments. As an interesting finding, permanent

employees working in housekeeping department is the most satisfied workers in comparison with other department. Also, Female workers of via outsourcing firm are more satisfied than male workers of via outsourcing firm. On the other hand, permanent female workers are less satisfied than permanent male workers.

V. CONCLUSION

Motivation can be regarded as the necessary drive towards achievement of some goals. The desire to satisfy needs and the intensity of the drive to achieve a given, perceived or assumed goal determines the total effort invested in work (Analoui, 2000). As long as the motivation levels of employees increase, their individual performance enhances and thus organization could achieve its goals. Motivation of the employees is an important contributor to influence performance (Mitchell 1982). Management must understand what motivates employees within the context of the roles they perform. (Kovach 2001) Such an understanding is absolutely crucial to improved productivity. Thus, motivation is of interest in the work environment since it influences work performance and productivity (Huddleston and Good, 1999). In spite of the literature on relationship between motivation, productivity and performance is a highly contested arena. It can be said that the lower the motivation is the worse the productivity and performance.

Table.8. Comparison of Motivators Related to Demographic Characteristics of Respondents in Terms of Satisfaction Level

	Department	Working Statement	N	\bar{X}	S. D.	t	p	
Satisfaction Level of Motivators	Housekeeping	via Outsourcing	64	2,13	0,36	-10,7	0,00*	
		as Permanent	104	2,96	0,54			
	F&B	via Outsourcing	48	2,58	0,46	-4,17	0,00*	
		as Permanent	92	2,89	0,39			
	Front Office	via Outsourcing	36	2,35	0,50	-4,54	0,00*	
		as Permanent	52	2,83	0,46			
		Graduation	Working Statement	N	\bar{X}	S. D.	t	p
	High School	via Outsourcing	88	2,35	0,45	-8,46	0,00*	
		as Permanent	124	2,94	0,52			
	Üniversity	via Outsourcing	24	2,33	0,34	-5,80	0,00*	
		as Permanent	124	2,87	0,43			
		Age	Working Statement	N	\bar{X}	S. D.	t	p
	26-35	via Outsourcing	72	2,31	0,26	-10,1	0,00*	
		as Permanent	168	2,95	0,50			
	36-45	via Outsourcing	76	2,35	0,61	-5,62	0,00*	
		as Permanent	80	2,81	0,40			
		Gender	Working Statement	N	\bar{X}	S. D.	t	p
	Male	via Outsourcing	116	2,31	0,50	-9,98	0,00*	
as Permanent		140	2,95	0,50				
Female	via Outsourcing	32	2,40	0,34	-5,45	0,00*		
	as Permanent	108	2,85	0,43				

**p<0,01

Rapid growth of tourism in Turkey in the last two decades made the competition so high among hotels in Istanbul. And many of them started to use outsourcing firms mostly considering to enhance the productivity of the firm by wishing to lower transaction costs and to contract out some facilities to the expert firms in their works. However, the opportunities that employees have within the company, working via outsourcing and as permanent, are different. Being utilized from the different opportunities of both employee groups who have the similar needs constitutes the difference in their motivation levels. So, many questions occurred in mind such as whether the motivation between permanent employee and via outsourcing employee are different.

Within this context, this paper investigated the importance levels of motivators that employees consider serious and the satisfaction level that they get from motivators. In addition, it is examined if there are significant relations related to employees' demographic characteristics. According to the results, findings on income motivator concur with previous researches [6], [34], [35], [17]. In the study of Bent and Freathy [14], it was established that working with colleagues is the positive factor of job. In this study also "relationship with colleagues" is the most seriously considered satisfaction level for permanent employees.

As the result of this study, motivations of employees, working via outsourcing, are lower than the employees, working as permanent in all needs such as physiological, safety, belongingness&love, esteem and

self-actualization. So, It may be necessary to be taken into consideration why outsourcing employees satisfaction levels are lower than permanent employees and the opportunities that via outsourcing employees have within the company may need to be reevaluated. When the satisfaction levels and the importance levels of the employees, working as permanent, compare with each other, it is observed that the satisfaction levels are lower than the importance levels. This means that also permanent staff's motivator factors may need to be taken into consideration. Also it was found significant differences related to employees' demographic characteristics. These significant differences are between age groups and between education levels. Findings on income motivator concur with previous research (Kovach 1987, Simons and Enz 1995, Siu et al. 1997, Lindner 1998). In the study of Bent and Freathy (1997) working with colleagues is positive factor of job. In this study also "Relationship with colleagues" is the most seriously considered satisfaction level for permanent employees. The other important finding is employees working via outsourcing and permanent in housekeeping department consider the motivators more seriously, while via outsourcing employees are less satisfied, permanent employees are most satisfied than the other departments. Also female employees both permanent and via outsourcing consider the motivators more seriously, while female employees via outsourcing are more satisfied than male employees and female employees working permanent are less satisfied than male employees. Motivating employee is a complicated matter and managers need to focus on it. We think that if outsourcing

firm and hotel management care about employees needs and wants (even if not all need are met) employee motivation will be greater in both part. If nothing else, leaders should make effort to find out what their employees want from their job.

The boundaries of this study are limited with 5-star hotel operations in the area of Istanbul. The results of this study as it is a descriptive one, contributes the literature on motivation levels of hotel employees working via outsourcing. Also it is considered to be beneficial with its results for scholars and hotel managements. Different results can be obtained depending the size of hotel, organization culture, wage ranking and institutional differences. In this study these variables were not taken into consideration. In next studies, these variables can be taken into consideration and the other establishments in tourism sector can be handled. Also, it would be beneficial to explore comprehensive the firms, providing outsourcing services to the hotel operations in terms of motivation and management.

REFERENCES

- [1] Davis, M.B. (2004). The Impact of Leadership on Employee Motivation. *Unpublished Master Thesis*. Royal Roads University.
- [2] Perry, L.J. & Porter, W.L. (1982). Factors Affecting the Context for Motivation in Public Organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 7(1), 89-98.
- [3] Analoui, F. (2000). What Motivates Senior Managers? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(4), 324-340.
- [4] Goldsmith, A.H.; Veum, J.R. & Darity, W.J. (2000). Working Hard for the Money? Efficiency Wages and Worker Effort. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 21(4), 351-385.
- [5] Mitchell, T.R. (1982). Motivation: New Directions for Theory, Research and Practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 7(1), 80-88.
- [6] Kovach, A.K. (1987). What Motivates Employees? Workers and Supervisors Give Different Answers. *Business Horizons*, 30(5), 58-65.
- [7] Huddleston, P. & Good, L.K. (1999). Job Motivators in Russian and Polish Retail Firms. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 27(9), 383-393.
- [8] Leete, L. (2000). Wage Equity and Employee Motivation in Non-Profit and For-Profit Organizations. *Journal of Economic Behaviour & Organization*, 43(4), 423-446.
- [9] Bendor-Samuel, P. (2000). *Outsourcing in the New Millenium*. (<http://outsourcing-journal.com/jan2000-insight.html>). [20.08.2005].
- [10] Lei, D. & Hitt, M. (1995). Strategic Restructuring and Outsourcing: The Effects of Mergers and Acquisitions and LBOs on Building Firm Skills and Capabilities. *Journal of Management*, 21(5), 835-859.
- [11] The Outsourcing Institute, (2001). *Executive Survey – The Outsourcing Institute’s Annual Survey of Outsourcing End Users*. (<http://www.outsourcing.com>). [02.09.2005].
- [12] Bassy, M. (2002). *Motivation and Work – Investigation and Analysis of Motivation Factors at Work*. (<http://www.ep.liu.se/exjobb/eki/2002/fek/009/exjobb.pdf>). [20.08.2005].
- [13] Locke, E.A. (1991). The Motivation Sequence, The Motivation Hub, and The Motivation Core. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 50(3), 288-299.
- [14] Bent, R. & Freathy, P. (1997). Motivating the Employee in the Independent Retail Sector. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 4(3), 201-208.
- [15] Mak, B.L. & Sockel, H. (2001). A Confirmatory Factor Analysis of IS Employee Motivation and Retention. *Information & Management*, 38(5), 265-276.
- [16] Westerman, J. & Donoghue, P. (1989). *Managing the Human Resource*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- [17] Lindner, R.J. (1998). Understanding Employee Motivation. *Journal of Extension*, 36(3). (<http://www.joe.org/joe/1998june/rb3.html>). [07.08.2005].
- [18] Franco, L.M.; Bennett, S.; Kanfer, R. & Stubblebine, P. (2004). Determinants and Consequences of Health Worker Motivation in Hospitals in Jordan and Georgia. *Social Science & Medicine*, 58(2), 343-355.
- [19] Koçel, T. (2001). *İşletme Yöneticiliği: Yönetim ve Organizasyon, Organizasyonlarda Davranış, Klasik – Modern – Çağdaş ve Güncel Yaklaşımlar*. 8.Baskı. İstanbul: Beta Yayıncılık.
- [20] Vignali, C. (1997). Motivation Factors that Force a Sales Training Programme and the Experience Within the Brewing Industry. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 29(1), 10-15.
- [21] Kotter, J. (1999). *What Leaders Really Do*. Boston: Harvard Business Review Book.
- [22] Lock, C. (2001). *How to Motivate Yourself and Stay Motivated*. (http://projectmagazine.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=144&Itemid=39). [22.08.2005].
- [23] Porter, L.W. & Lawler, E.E. (1968). *Managerial Attitudes and Performance*. Homewood, IL: Irwin (Richard D.).
- [24] Vroom, V.H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: Wiley.

- [25] Hays, J.M. & Hill, A.V. (2001). A Preliminary Investigation of the Relationships Between Employee Motivation/Vision, Service Learning, and Perceived Service Quality. *Journal of Operations Management*, 19(3), 335-349.
- [26] Lawler, E. (1994). *Motivation in Work Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- [27] Katerberg, R. & Blau, G.J. (1983). An Examination of Level and Direction of Effort and Job Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(2), 249-257.
- [28] Lau, T. G. & Huang, B. S. (1999). The Influence of Task Characteristics and Job-Related Characteristics on Retail Salesperson Selling Orientation. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 6(2), 147-156.
- [29] Locke, E.A. & Latham, G.P. (1984). *Goal Setting: A Motivational Technique That Works*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- [30] Vroom, V. H. (1990). *Managing People, Not Personnel: Motivation and Performance Appraisal*. England: Harvard University Press.
- [31] Oral, S. (2001). *Otel İşletmeciliği ve Otel İşletmelerinde Verimlilik Analizleri*. 4.Baskı. İzmir: Kanyılmaz Matbaası.
- [32] Hiam, A. (1999). *Streetwise Motivating and Rewarding Employees*. MA: Adams Media Corporation.
- [33] Bowen, D.E. & Lawler III, E.E. (1992). The Empowerment of Service Workers: What, Why, How and When. *Sloan Management Review*, 33(3), 31-39.
- [34] Simons, T. & Enz, C.A. (1995). Motivating Hotel Employees. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 36(1), 20-27.
- [35] Siu, V.; Tsang, N. & Wong, S. (1997). What Motives Hong Kong's Hotel Employees?. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 38(5), October, 44-49.
- [36] Bent, R.; Seaman, E.A. & Ingram, A. (1999). Staff Motivation in Small Food Manufacturing Enterprises. *British Food Journal*, 101(9), 654-667.
- [37] Gilley, M.K. & Rasheed, A.A. (2000). Making More by Doing Less: An Analysis of Outsourcing and its Effects on Firm Performance. *Journal of Management*, 26(4), 763-790.
- [38] Arnold, U. (2000). New Dimensions of Outsourcing: A Combination of Transaction Cost, Economics and the Core-Competencies Concept. *European Journal of Purchasing & Supply Management*, 6(2), 23-29.
- [39] Lam, T. & Han, M.X.J. (2005). A Study of Outsourcing Strategy: A Case Involving the Hotel Industry in Shanghai, China. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 24(1), 41-56.
- [40] Berggren, C. & Bengtsson, L. (2004). Rethinking Outsourcing in Manufacturing: A Tale of Two Telecom Firms. *European Management Journal*, 22(2), 211-223.
- [41] Lankford, M.W. & Parsa, F. (1999). Outsourcing: A Premier. *Management Decision*, 37(4), 310-316.
- [42] Kakabadse, A. & Kakabadse, N. (2002). Trends in Outsourcing – Contrasting USA and Europe. *European Management Journal*, 20(2), 189-198.
- [43] McCarthy, L. & Anagnostou, A. (2004). The Impact of Outsourcing on the Transaction Costs and Boundaries of Manufacturing. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 88(1), 61-71.
- [44] Bryce, D.J. & Useem, M. (1998). The Impact of Corporate Outsourcing on Company Value. *European Management Journal*, 16(6), 635-643.
- [45] Egger, P.; Pfaffermayr, M. & Wolfmayer-Schnitzer, Y. (2001). The International Fragmentation of Austrian Manufacturing: The effects of Outsourcing on Productivity and Wages. *North American Journal of Economics and Finance*, 12(3), 257-272.
- [46] Perng, Y.H.; Chen, S.J. & Lu, H.J. (2005). Potential Benefits for Collaborating Formwork Subcontractors Based on C-operative Game Theory. *Building and Environment*, 40(3), 239-244.
- [47] Baden-Fuller, C.; Targett, D. & Hunt, B. (2000). Outsourcing to Outmanoeuvre: Outsourcing Re-defines Competitive Strategy and Structure. *European Management Journal*, 18(3), 285-295.
- [48] Kakabadse, N. & Kakabadse, A. (2000). Critical Review-Outsourcing: A Paradigm Shift. *Journal of Management Development*, 19(8), 670-728.
- [49] Brandes, H.; Lilliecreutz, J. & Brege, S. (1997). Outsourcing-Success or Failure? Findings From Five Case Studies. *European Journal of Purchasing & Supply Chain Management*, 3(2), 63-75.
- [50] Espino-Rodriguez, F.T. & Padron-Robaina, V. (2005). A Resource-Based View of Outsourcing and Its Implications for Organizational Performance in the Hotel Sector. *Tourism Management*, 26(5), 707-721.
- [51] Yurtsever, İ. (2004). *Otelcilik Outsourcing'e Teslim*. (<http://www.turizm gazetesi.com/articles/article.aspx?id=18810>). [02.09.2005].
- [52] Kohen, S. (2005). *Türkiye otelleri Outsourcing'e hazır mı?*. (<http://www.turizm gazetesi.com/articles/articles.aspx?id=18365>). [29.08.2005].
- [53] Bailey, W.; Masson, R. & Raeside, R. (2002). Outsourcing in Edingburgh and the Lothians. *European Journal of Purchasing & Supply Chain Management*, 8(1), 83-95.

- [54] Lamminmaki, D. (2005). Why Do Hotels Outsource? An Investigation Using Asset Specificity. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 17(6), 516-528.
- [55] Hemmington, N. & King, C. (2000). Key Dimensions of Outsourcing Hotel Food and Beverages Services. *International Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 12(4), 256-261.
- [56] Espino-Rodriguez, T. F. & Gil-Padilla, M.A. (2005). Determinants of Information Systems Outsourcing in Hotels from the Resource-Based View. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 7(1), 35-47.
- [57] Jenefsky, R. & Knobel, U. (2001). *F&B Outsourcing in 4-Star Hotels*. (<http://www.ehlite.ch/april03/15e.asp>). [30.09.2005].
- [58] Espino-Rodriguez, F.T. & Padron-Robaina, V. (2004). Outsourcing and Its Impact on Operational Objectives and Performance: A Study of Hotels in the Canary Islands. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 23(3), 287-306.
- [59] Vinning, A. & Globerman, S. (1999). A Conceptual Framework for Understanding the Outsourcing Decision. *European Management Journal*, 17 (6), 645-654.
- [60] (www.hotelguide.com.tr). [24.08.2005].
- [61] Dilber, M. (1981). *Türk Özel Kesim Endüstrisinde Yönetmel Davranış*. İstanbul : Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, İdari Bil. Fak. Gözlem Matbaası.
- [62] Parsons E. & Broadbridge A. (2006). Job Motivation and Satisfaction: Unpacking the Key Factors for Charity Shop Managers, *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 13(1), 121– 131.
- [63] Huddleston, P. & Good, L.K., (1999). Job Motivators in Russian and Polish Retail Firms. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 27(9), 383-393.
- [64] Linz S. J. (2004). Motivating Russian Workers: Analysis of age and gender differences. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, (33)3, 261-289.

Orhan AKOVA (akovaorhan@hotmail.com) is an Assistant Professor Doctor in Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences, Department of Tourism Management at Sakarya University. His research areas are contemporary management techniques, ethics, trust, and motivation.

ErkanTAŞKIRAN (etaskiran@marmara.edu.tr) is a Research Assistant in Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences, Department of Management and Organization at Marmara University. His research areas are contemporary management techniques, human resources management and organizational behaviour.