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Abstract

This dissertation explores the job satisfaction level of employees in the hotel sector, and in particular in hotels located in the area of Thessaloniki. The literature review of the study includes a description of the definition of job satisfaction, a reference to its most important predictors as well as relevant theories surrounding the term, followed by a brief analysis of tourism and the hotel sector, the importance of human resources in tourism as well as examples of similar research that has been made on job satisfaction both in Greece and on an international level. The following chapters of the dissertation present the findings of the research which was conducted by the distribution and completion of a questionnaire by 117 participants which in this case were all hotel employees in the region of Thessaloniki.

The results of the research have shown that the participants describe their job satisfaction level as approximately neutral, which corresponds to them feeling neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with their job. It has also been discovered that the gender of hotel employees as well as their job position in the organization appear to be characterised by statistical significant difference, with male employees appearing more satisfied than their female colleagues and housekeeping personnel presenting less job satisfaction than employees occupied in supervisor or managerial positions. Moreover, the job satisfaction facets of pay, promotion and organization as a whole are variables that have the greatest impact on the overall level of job satisfaction. Additional research could be conducted in the future on a broader geographical section of the country, or in general the research could be repeated using a larger sample of participants at a future date when social, economic or other important environmental conditions could have been altered in the country affecting also the employees in the hotel sector.
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Preface

In such a competitive but profitable sector as the hotel industry, it is crucial for any organization’s management to be aware of its personnel’s job satisfaction rates, as the term has been directly linked by researchers and academics to job performance as well as the possible positive impact it can have on organizations. Through the process of an effectively developed survey on an organization’s employees, the management may benefit from the interpretation of the accumulated data as it can become a useful tool which after the assessment of information and conclusions derived, it could lead to the value maximization of its human capital.

The reason behind the preparation of this dissertation is an effort to examine the job satisfaction of the personnel occupied in the hotel industry, and in particular in hotels of Thessaloniki, Greece. By conducting an investigation in order to record the employees’ personal opinions with regards to the factors which affect their job satisfaction, this research aims to conclude in findings in relation to job satisfaction for employees in the hotel industry.

In a city like Thessaloniki with one of the country’s top five airports in international tourist arrivals, (a total of 1,929,916 in 2017 according to the Hellenic Civil Aviation Authority) as part of the region of Central Macedonia with the country’s top percentage of international visitors (23.4% of the country’s total visits and 40,782 overnight stays in 2017 resulting in a revenue of 1,852 million Euros, according to the Bank of Greece and INSETE’s study, 2018), the hotel sector professionals ought to be informed regarding their personnel’s job satisfaction rates in order to eventually achieve the best possible service and satisfaction for their customers.
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Introduction

More and more hotel industry professionals decide to investigate job satisfaction in organizations since they are aware of the importance of such factor for the customers’ overall satisfaction. Employees play a key role in the success of all businesses and in the hotel industry in particular, as dedication, effort, and commitment of employees are essential factors in ensuring customer satisfaction. The decision on whether a customer would wish to repeat their visit to the same hotel accommodation premises often relies on the satisfaction they have obtained from their latest visit.

Previously conducted research mentions the importance of job satisfaction for an organization’s operation and functionality. In addition, one of the most important ways to achieve positive word-of-mouth effects, such as reviews and personal preferences can also be enhanced through properly trained and satisfied personnel able to suitably provide effective services to consumers and assist the hotel’s profitability objectives. The importance of tourism and hospitality as an employment sector lies to the fact that it has managed to provide a large but also diverse number of jobs on a worldwide level (Nickson, 2013). The creation of future job positions even in challenged from the financial crisis countries, such as Greece, and in general in both developed and developing countries, is attested to by the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC). According to WTTC, travel and tourism related activities support 313 million jobs, generating 10,4% of global GDP.

The hospitality industry in Greece and all of the sectors in connection to such have been - and still are - a major source of income generation according to the yearly respective demand. According to the Greek Tourism Confederation’s (SETE) latest statistical data, during 2017, Greece welcomed 27,2 million international passengers with each of them spending around 522 Euros, leading to a grand total of 14,2 billion Euros of international visitors’ tourism receipts (Bank of Greece, 2018). Greek tourism not only has a total contribution of 27,3% to the country’s GDP (INSETE, 2018), it also constitutes an important employment contributor in a country where unemployment rates have been significantly high over the last few years (21,41% in 2017, according to Statista, 2018). A total of 934,500 individuals are employed in the country’s tourism
sector, which leads to 24.8% of the country’s total employment percentage (World Travel & Tourism Council, 2018).

This dissertation aims to explore the job satisfaction level of employees in Thessaloniki hotels through recording and analyzing their views on a number of key job satisfaction predictors they experience in their work environment. By taking into consideration various demographic characteristics as well as a number of job satisfaction variables and examining the relations between them and in proportion to the employees’ job satisfaction, the research will eventually lead to conclusions regarding the overall job satisfaction level of employees in the hotel sector.
Chapter 1: Literature Review

1.1 Introduction

The following subsections will be analysing the different definitions of job satisfaction as a term as well as the theories developed around it, in an effort to cover the term’s meaning and importance. In addition, there will be a brief description of the various available instruments that can be applied for the measurement of job satisfaction.

1.2.1 Job Satisfaction Definition

As one of the main goals in most organizations’ everyday practice, profitability is often identified as success. However, this particular goal of pursuing the maximum profit in an organization, would not be successful in absence of other significant influencing factors such as satisfaction of the organization employees. As Heskett et al. (1994) suggested through the service profit chain, customer loyalty stimulates profit and growth as a result of customer satisfaction where satisfaction is influenced by the value of services. Employees who are satisfied, loyal and productive are the crucial factor which will enhance customer loyalty and therefore customer satisfaction. Even though job satisfaction is widely used in scientific research as well as daily life, it is yet to be agreed what job satisfaction could receive as an accurate definition. Different authors have various approaches towards the term. Some of the most commonly definitions on job satisfaction are going to be mentioned in the following text.

There are numerous job satisfaction definitions available. Two of the most frequently found definitions would describe job satisfaction as: “the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one’s job values” and “the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs” (Spector, 1997).

The term job satisfaction is also connected to people’s feelings and attitudes about their work which in this case, positive feelings or attitudes may indicate job satisfaction and negative indicate job dissatisfaction (Armstrong, 2006). The above could explain to
an extent the reason why job satisfaction or dissatisfaction could appear in any work situation.

In similar terms, Aronson (2014) defines job satisfaction as the set of employees’ emotions and beliefs for their work. In a broad meaning, job satisfaction is the collection of feelings and beliefs people have regarding their current job while the degree of satisfaction could be in a range from extreme satisfaction to extreme dissatisfaction. The levels of job satisfaction may vary from complete satisfaction to complete dissatisfaction. According to Hayes et al. (2015), job satisfaction is a positive or negative value judgement an individual performs for their job and not an emotional reaction to an emotional situation.

Job satisfaction is a complex concept, one that could have a different meaning to each person. Usually it is linked to motivation; however the nature of this relationship is not exactly clear. Satisfaction is not an identical term to motivation. Job satisfaction is more of an attitude, or an internal state. It could for example take the form of a personal feeling of achievement, either quantitative or qualitative (Mullins, 2005). According to Hamermesh (2001), “job satisfaction is the resultant of the worker's weighting in his/her own mind of all the job's aspects”.

Job satisfaction has been defined as an employee’s sense of achievement and success on their job. It is generally perceived to be directly linked to productivity as well as to personal well-being. It is a term which implies enthusiasm and happiness for an employee doing their job. It could also be said that job satisfaction is the key ingredient which can lead to recognition, income, promotion, and even achieving goals that add to the creation of a feeling of fulfilment (Kaliski, 2007).

It can be inferred that satisfaction relates to the individual’s opinion regarding to what they expect from their job and what they eventually receive. By means of this logical path, the more the needs of the individuals covered, the greater the satisfaction levels obtained from their job. Consequently, it would be needless to say that job satisfaction represents a combination of positive or negative feelings that employees experience towards their job.

Locke (1969) defines job satisfaction as «the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one’s job values». Judge, Hulin and Dalal (2009) refer to job satisfaction as multidimensional
psychological responses to one’s job, with evaluative and emotional components while Judge et al. (2009) also defines job satisfaction using the plural form in order to include satisfaction with specific job aspects and not only overall job satisfaction (Judge et al., 2009).

Fisher (2003) notes that job satisfaction is “arguably a fairly stable evaluation of how the job meets the employee’s needs, wants, or expectations”. A more simple definition describing job satisfaction from Khan et al. (2014), argues that it indicates the extent to which employees like or dislike their job. The term of job satisfaction has also been linked to the extent to which a worker is content with the rewards he or she gets out of their job, particularly in terms of intrinsic motivation (Statt, 2004).

Job satisfaction can be considered as one of the main factors when it comes to efficiency and effectiveness of a business organization. In other terms, a satisfied employee is a happy employee - a happy employee is a successful employee.

There is no doubt that employees’ job satisfaction directly and indirectly affects the organization’s success. In general, most definitions aim to cover the affective feeling an employee has towards their job. This could be the job in general or their attitudes towards specific aspects of it, such as their colleagues, pay or working conditions. However, job satisfaction is not only about how much an employee enjoys work. Job satisfaction refers to an individual’s general attitude towards his or her job according to Robbins (2000). In the case of an unsatisfied with his job employee, negative attitudes and possibly problems might occur within the workplace and therefore that could also affect the organization’s clients.

As per Luthans (1989), absenteeism or grievances may as well indicate whether job satisfaction or dissatisfaction exists inside an organization. In the case or poor job satisfaction rates this may result in increased absenteeism as well as employee turnover. As a consequence, a company is in risk of losing valuable skilled manpower, not to mention the cost of losing newly recruited and trained personnel. Thus, the organization might incur various loses due to absenteeism quitting or poor job performance if employees suffer from job dissatisfaction, indicating the necessity for identifying the reasons behind job dissatisfaction as well as taking measures against it accordingly.
In addition, Khalid et al. (2012) argue that job satisfaction is not something fixed, which would mean that it is not possible to discover an employee with absolute job satisfaction, since even if there was one, there would also be the possibility for job satisfaction to reverse directly due to all the different factors that determine it.

1.3 Job Satisfaction Theories and Employee Motivation

As the human capital is the most important factor for the increase of an organization’s productivity, it could be of significant assistance for any company to become more competitive when its personnel is both satisfied and motivated. As per Salesiotis (1999), motivation is a series of procedures and interlinked relations since when a need has been created, a motive is then produced and this motive can determine a goal. Therefore, in order for an individual to try and successfully satisfy this need, new needs will be created and this time in a greater volume or extent. The conceptual frame of employee motivation in an organisation usually describes the needs, goals and attitude of employees expressing the way the employees feel in their work environment. In order for an employee to satisfy their needs and therefore feel overall satisfied in their work, motivational actions could be initialised by management such as for example pay or bonuses.

Job satisfaction theories have a strong overlap with theories explaining human motivation. Employee motivation is an important, however problematic criterion for administrators to utilize effectively. As firms are called to deal with increasing employment diversity appearing across sectors and the globe, modernized and more applicable theories are required for the managers to assist them in every aspect of management, including employee motivation (Lloyd et al., 2018).

1.3.1 Spector’s three features of job satisfaction

As per Spector (1997), there are three important features of job satisfaction. Firstly, an organization needs to be guided by human values. This characteristic of an organization is aimed at fair treatment to the employees along with respect and understanding.
Secondly, how employees behave based on their job satisfaction level is bound to have an impact on the organization’s functions and activities. Therefore, job satisfaction has as a result an overall positive behaviour while job dissatisfaction results to negative behaviour.

Lastly, investigating the levels of existing job satisfaction in an organization can become a tool in order to discover what kind of organizational unit changes and reforms need to be made in order to eventually boost the organization’s performance.

1.3.2 The theory of Maslow’s human needs prioritization

Need theories help in explaining the value a person places out of certain outcomes. A need is defined as a deficiency that a person is experiencing at any point in time motivating the person to behave in a manner to satisfy such deficiency (Raymond N., 2010).

One of the most important motivation theories with its roots in psychology but also wide appearance in economics and its undeniable value through its contribution to social sciences, is Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. According to Maslow, people become active in any way in order to satisfy their needs, one of which would be work.

This is a five-level hierarchy of an individual’s needs theory as per Figure 1 below. It was one of the first theories examining the important factors contributing to job satisfaction. The theory suggests that there are human needs which are essential and are required to be met first, such as the physiological (a decent salary in organizational terms) and safety needs (job security and insurance), before other needs can be satisfied. Belongingness, as in having an efficient work environment with supportive employers and co-workers, esteem, which is about the individual’s need to be recognized for their hard work through promotions or other types of awards and the hardest to achieve, self-actualisation (the person’s dreams, ambitions, expectations).
1.3.3 Alderfer’s Existence-Relatedness-Growth Theory (ERG)

Similarly to Maslow, another theory also focusing on the individual’s needs is Alderfer’s ERG theory. ERG theory is a conceptual and empirical system for understanding, explaining, and predicting the satisfaction and desire properties of human needs (Alderfer, 1972).

Although both Maslow and Alderfer believed that individuals begin their satisfaction of needs journey by trying to satisfy at first specific needs located at the lowest level and then progress up the hierarchy as lower-level needs are satisfied, the main difference between the two theories is that Alderfer allows the possibility that in case higher-level needs are not satisfied, employees will then refocus on lower-level needs.

1.3.4 Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory

Psychologist Frederick Herzberg developed his own motivation theory in 1959, a theory which was based on conclusions deriving from a research regarding job related trends. His motivation-hygiene theory had a great impact in business management practice, since it introduced new ideas and managed to eliminate perceptions like the suggestion that improving the employees’ salaries would lead to higher job satisfaction.
Herzberg added a new dimension to Maslow’s theory of needs by proposing a two-factor model of motivation. His theory suggests that the factors which cause satisfaction – named as motivators – act independently from the ones causing dissatisfaction (the so called hygiene factors) to the point that these two concepts are two separate and, at times even unrelated terms (Herzberg, 1959). This perception however that only motives can cause job satisfaction and hygiene factors may lead to dissatisfaction, caused quite severe criticism as according to Shultz (1982), there are certain hygiene factors which could also act as motives.

Herzberg explains that when hygiene factors are low (such as job security, salary and fringe benefits, insurance or vacations) the employee is dissatisfied. However, when these factors are high it would mean that the employee is not dissatisfied (or in other words, neutral), but not necessarily satisfied either (Figure No. 2 below).

![Figure 2: Herzberg’s Description of Satisfiers and Dissatisfiers](Source: Oshwiki, 2018)

### 1.3.5 Vroom’s Expectancy Theory

Vroom’s theory is based on the belief that employee effort will lead to performance and performance will lead to rewards. Motivation according to Vroum is defined as “a process governing choices made by persons or lower organisms among alternative forms of voluntary activity”(Vroom, 1964). He describes motivation force (MF) as a product of expectancy, instrumentality, and valence. Vroom’s theory has been widely debated and empirically tested by academicians and scholars. The motivational force that causes behaviour is a product of three variables: expectancy, instrumentality, and valence which are represented by the equation: $Motivation = Expectancy \times Instrumentality \times Valence$. 

Motivation = Expectancy * Instrumentality * Valence.
According to Lloyd R. et al (2018), a fourth variable would perhaps be important to be included into the equation, the social variable, in order to determine employee motivation in additional detail.

**1.3.6 Job Characteristics Theory**

In 1976, two organizational psychologists, Hackman & Oldham developed the job characteristics theory (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). As according to this theory job design has an effect on motivation, work performance and job satisfaction, the way certain characteristics may affect the outcomes of jobs can be identified through this model. In particular, the theory examines a number of factors which make a job satisfying (job characteristics) not only for the organization but also for the person that is performing the job (individuals’ responses) and the relationship between them. There are five core job dimensions as the theory suggests which prompt three psychological states resulting or affecting five work-related outcomes. Skill variety, task identity, task significance (work meaningfulness as per Champoux, 1991), autonomy and feedback are the five core job characteristics which if possessed by an individual, they might lead to three critical psychological states. According to Hackman & Oldham (1980) serving as an incentive for continued good performance, all three psychological states must be present to get the largest positive response in the outcome variables.

**1.4 Measurement of job satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is determined through investigating the individuals’ feelings, regarding their work. This is usually done by using the tool of conducting an interview to the employees, or distributing a questionnaire through which the person is asked to state the level of their satisfaction or dissatisfaction regarding the various aspects of their employment position in the organization they work for.

Over the years, significant effort has been made in order for a theoretical basis to be created regarding the study of job satisfaction. The reason for the non existence of succeeding so could be lying under the researchers’ disagreement on what would be the right device for assessment of job satisfaction. Researchers such as Wanous and
Lawler (1972) came to the conclusion that, “As far as the measurement of satisfaction is concerned, the data suggest that there is no best way to measure it”.

1.4.1 The global and the facet approach

Although in past researches job satisfaction was investigated from the satisfaction of needs’ point of view, two different approaches were later adopted in the job satisfaction measurement field.

Job satisfaction can be considered as a general feeling in connection to employment (called global approach) or a combination of attitudes against different employment dimensions (facet approach) (Spector, 1997). The global approach is quite useful in the case where the general job satisfaction of employees is being examined. As per Spector, there are four main axes that could describe the job dimensions. Organizations may utilise this particular method in order to examine whether their personnel feels satisfied or not in their job on one of the four main axis, such as rewards, colleagues, nature of work and organizational frame.

1.4.2 Other significant approaches

Apart from the single question method during which only one question is being asked to the participants, there is a number of various other techniques such as the Job Descriptive Index, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire or the Job Satisfaction Survey, appearing as commonly used techniques assisting the scientific community to measure job satisfaction.

1.4.2.1 The single question technique

The single question technique relies to the belief that since employees generally know how happy they are, there is not much need in asking them multiple questions about the same thing.

The method includes asking only one question as an indication of how satisfied an employee is at work, a technique which may be used when a large survey needs to take place. Taking into consideration that when more than one question are being asked during a survey may lead to a more accurate result, it has also been shown that asking a single question can be proven effective to the same level.
1.4.2.2 The Job Descriptive Index (JDI)

The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) was an innovative investigation programme for the measurement of job satisfaction. The method which introduced the impressively and carefully detailed job satisfaction measurement tool of Job Descriptive Index was developed by Smith and her collaborator researchers in 1969. It is often described as the most used and researched measure of job satisfaction.

It relies on the measurement of five job satisfaction sectors (facets): work, pay, promotion, supervision and co-workers. Each of the five facets which are being utilised is measured using words or short phases to determine if the word or phase matches the respondent’s assessment of the job satisfaction of that particular facet. Using questions or items for different areas questioned provides one final score to represent each area. The total final score measures total job satisfaction; however, it is a method that has been questioned due to the restriction of the research on only five sectors.

1.4.2.3 The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)

Another quite popular job satisfaction measurement method which has been widely studied and validated is the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Fields, 2002). It was developed by Weiss, Dawis, England and Lofquist in 1967 to measure the individual’s satisfaction with twenty different aspects of the work environment (100 items in its long form, 5 items per facet). Due to its ease of completion and general acceptance as a research instrument, it ranks as the second most popular job satisfaction measurement method (Hancer et al., 2003).

The MSQ is based on the following rationale:

a) employees have a set of expectations concerning their work environments that are derived from their histories, individual abilities, and interests;

b) employees have a set of work attitudes that emerge from the fulfilment of those expectations, and

c) these attitudes make up employees’ evaluation of their work environment or job satisfaction.

The theory behind this questionnaire is based on the assumption that work fit is dependent on the correspondence between the individual skills and the reinforcements that exist in the work environment (Weiss et al., 1967).
The long form of the MSQ contains 100 items which measure twenty job facets and the responses can be converted to respondent’s satisfaction on each of the facets. The short form uses the same response format but contains twenty items that better represented each of the twenty original subscales included in the long version of 100 items (Ahmadi and Alireza, 2007). The items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 “very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job”, 2 “dissatisfied with this aspect of my job”, 3 “can’t decide if I’m satisfied or dissatisfied with this aspect of my job - neutral”, 4 “satisfied with this aspect of my job” and 5 “very satisfied with this aspect of my job”) (Martins & Proença, 2012). The lower the total score summed in the end from all questions, the lower the level of job satisfaction.

1.4.2.4 The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS)

During a systematic review which was conducted in 2003, twenty-nine instruments which appeared on publications between 1988 and 2001 for measuring job satisfaction were examined, out of which only seven had adequate reliability and construct validity. One of these seven job satisfaction instruments was the Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1985), a multidimensional instrument that uses a six-point Likert scale for the response format ranging from «disagree very much» (1) to «agree very much» (6) (Saane et al, 2003). This instrument includes nine sub-scales namely salary, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, co-workers and work and communication.

1.4.3 Possible Job Satisfaction Measurement Issues

Each organization aiming to conduct a research in order to discover its personnel’s job satisfaction needs to decide which method is best fit for the investigation in order to lead to the relevant useful results for the employer. This needs to be also accompanied by consideration regarding a number of possible matters that might arise and could have an impact on the final results of the research. Despite the wide number of possible questions and tools in the job satisfaction assessment procedure, there are certain issues that could affect the reliability or validity of the results. Due to the numerous measures created and used by many academics or practitioners, it has been found that they do not have adequate validity
or reliability. This leads to the fact that additional care and attention needs to be utilised so as to ensure that the used measure is both valid and reliable.

Another issue that might arise is the one regarding cross cultural differences. That is usually a matter that needs to be taken into consideration when a research is being conducted on a multinational or even worldwide level. Different workforces depending on the country’s civilisation and culture may lead to problematic results since different people might interpret the same question in a different manner. That is mostly a situation created due to the language factor. Rating scales, translation, and the use of different language according to the individuals’ residence region are all significant issues that must be taken into consideration in the case of a research across different national or cultural areas.

Similarly, as it is described by Koustelios & Bagiatis (1997), as the vast majority of research in the multidimensional term that is job satisfaction has been carried out in the United States, there is a possibility of American cultural bias (for example profit sharing for the pay factor, or the use of Spector’s factor model from researchers in India).
Chapter 2: Job Satisfaction in the Tourism and Hotel Sector

2.1 Introduction

The following sections will be describing the importance of human resources in tourism and the hotel sector along with a brief presentation of the industry characteristics and definitions. Moreover, previously conducted research findings both in Greece and on an international level are mentioned below, presenting certain significant predictors of job satisfaction.

2.2 Human Resources and the importance of employees in tourism’s quality of services

Today companies are consistently interested in intangible assets and human capital as a way to gain an advantage over competitors. Special focus is given to intangible assets such as human capital, as they provide the company with a competitive advantage that is difficult to be imitated by their competition. *Human capital refers to the sum of the attributes, life experiences, knowledge, inventiveness, energy and enthusiasm that the company’s employees invest in their work* (Noe, 2010).

Tourism appears as a quite demanding professional sector when it comes to its human resources capital, as various occupations being part of several departments in diversity among them are put together in order to provide the final result to customers. Travel agencies, tour operators, accommodation, transportation services, attractions and food and beverage are only a few examples of the divisions being part of the overall industry. Therefore, human capital of this industry constitutes a challenging characteristic for all people involved or investigating it.

In fact, since the characteristic of personal service via high level of human involvement while delivering the actual service is so important and irreplaceable, the labour insensitivity factor is undoubted as human resources are referred as one of the most important assets of tourism and hospitality organizations (Kusluvan et al., 2010).

The industries of hospitality and tourism are worldwide dynamically-growing industries. As highly labour-intensive industries, tourism and hospitality organizations often stress how their people are «their greatest asset» (Nickson, 2013). They belong
to service industries as their core product is a service characterised by intangibility, where the quality of provided services depends on the performance of employees. In order to achieve high performance, continuous training and knowledge along with interactive skills are essential factors for the industry’s employees (Grotte, 2015). Two quite important factors that could have an impact on employees in general and in particular tourism and hotel employees, as they could affect the financial results of a hotel, would be motivation and job satisfaction of employees (O’Gorman, 2007). The term of service quality can be explained in customer research literature as a way to identify how well the service level that is being delivered is able to match the expectations of customers – with that usually happening in a consistent frequency. In other words, it is a customers’ perception of how well a service provided to them is able to meet or even exceed their expectations. That is often based on the customer’s own viewpoint, expectations or personal experiences and resources. Assuming that the customers’ expectations are fulfilled, the quality could be considered as either ideal or sufficient and when the opposite scenario occurs, it could be characterised as deficient. According to a study conducted in 2009 between employees and clients of 30 hotels on the Ionian and Adriatic coast of Albania, it was concluded that what the clients considered as the most important criterion regarding the provided services was the kindness of personnel or in other words – the human side of the service (Gaspari & Taga, 2011). The great importance of the workforce and therefore the human resources, in managing to ensure the commercial success of the hospitality industry is an undoubted fact as from a financial perspective, the hospitality workforce payroll is in many occasions the single largest cost item that affects and is being compared to sales. But most importantly, from the service sector’s, human resources are usually the first point of interpersonal contact between a hospitality enterprise and its customers. Therefore, an important matter the industry is required to face effectively is to control labor cost, whilst trying to maximize the quality of service provided to the customer, the principal focus of the business (Boella et al., 2013). Similarly to Locke’s research in 1976 which pointed out that the employee’s job satisfaction significantly affects their positive affectivity in the job, it is important for
hotel management to recognize the connection between the service workers role with the quality of service provided to clients as the key factor for clients’ satisfaction and thereby loyalty. As service quality can be influenced by the hotel employees’ attitude and affectivity as outcomes of their job satisfaction, it is important to investigate the employees’ job satisfaction in an effort to improve service performance (Lee et al, 2012).

2.3 Tourism and the Hotel sector

Tourism is a multi-dimensional phenomenon which managed to achieve significant results in development particularly during the twentieth and twenty-first century, leading to an increased interest for many researchers. Hotels and the hotel industry respectively, are important structural elements of tourism destinations as without these, no destination could be competitive or complete. Without hotels and especially those of high quality standards, tourism destinations would not have any upholding power and tourists would travel through them or they would mean a place to visit for a one-day trip only, resulting to significantly lower incomes and decreased employment opportunities for the region residents and the industry’s overall profitability (Attila, 2016).

2.3.1 Definition of Tourism

Many academics, industrialists and policy-makers have attempted to provide a definition for the tourism industry, as well as the sub-sector of hospitality within a broader conceptualization. However, the two terms are not yet acceptably defined as there are many definitions to describe tourism, mostly due to the various aspects of scientific approaches to the term. Tourism as a social phenomenon is a movement of people to meet tourist needs. From its economic aspect, it is seen as a type of consumer movement in order to meet the specific needs of a person, namely the tourist needs. Cultural, social as well as political are all meanings that can be added in order to describe tourism as the complex phenomenon that it is.
As a conclusion, even though at the moment there is not a single definition to describe tourism as various definitions exist in literature, it is quite useful to note the unique characteristics of the term from its economic conceptual determination. The heterogeneity of tourism’s structure, the demand elasticity and inelasticity, the non-production nature of work but most importantly the seasonality of business in tourism are those specific features which make the term different from other economic activities (Gligorijević Z. et al., 2012).

2.3.2 The Hotel unit as a business

This research focuses on hotel units in Thessaloniki, therefore analyses hotels as organizations which have a financial benefit assisting eventually to the promotion and sales of hospitality. In such a competitive sector like the hospitality industry offering homogeneous services to its customers, individual hoteliers need to be able to satisfy their customers better than their counterparts (Choi T. et al., 2001). A way to achieve such a result is the effort to provide high quality services and improving the satisfaction of customers. Hotels that do provide good service quality and manage to maintain their old customers but most importantly attract new ones, will eventually improve the business’ highly wanted profitability.

The level of competition in the tourism industry has also shifted because of the economic crisis, technological innovation but also the noticeable changes in the social and cultural norms. Greece as a country whose tourism industry plays such an important role to its economy (15.2 percent of the nation’s gross national product depends on tourism – Tsiotras et al., 2012) could not have stayed unaffected by all these changes. Hotels are undoubtedly the most prominent industry as part of the tourism sector in the country.

2.3.3 Thessaloniki area hotels statistical information

According to the latest statistical information available from the Hellenic Chamber of Hotels, in 2017, the regional unit of Thessaloniki consisted of a total of 137 hotel units, resulting in an availability of 7,699 hotel rooms and 14,402 beds (Appendix 3). In addition, again as the Hellenic Chamber of Hotels reports, during the years 2006 to
2012, Thessaloniki airport received a total of 3,621,723 flights (Table 1 below). In 2018, during the period of January to September of the same year, there has been an increase of more than 10 percent in incoming flights from abroad arriving at Greek airports according to the Civil Aviation Authority of Greece. With approximately 435,658 international and domestic flights in Greek airports, in which 1,756,435 were Thessaloniki airport international arrivals passengers, Thessaloniki’s hotel sector as the second in size city in Greece is urged to be properly prepared in order to welcome its visitors exhibiting its high standard hospitality, aiming for an even higher increase in one of the country’s most significant income industries, the one of tourism.

### Table 1: Airport arrivals of abroad tourists from 2006 to 2012

(Source: Hellenic Chamber of Hotels)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thessaloniki (SKG)</td>
<td>464,908</td>
<td>510,395</td>
<td>560,238</td>
<td>507,038</td>
<td>481,681</td>
<td>532,684</td>
<td>564,779</td>
<td>3,621,723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.4 Job Satisfaction Predictors

#### 2.4.1 Introduction

Tourism is one of the fastest growing economic sectors in the world, affecting many people as being tourists themselves or by being engaged in any kind of an activity in tourism. Over the years, and as the industry continues to grow stronger with the
assistance of technological means, there has been a large size of research on the sector on a worldwide level.

There is no doubt that extensive research has been made regarding job satisfaction and a large share of it has been conducted on job satisfaction in the hospitality industry.

Some of the studies which have been conducted on hospitality in connection to job satisfaction include Lee & Way's (2010) study on individual employment characteristics of hotel employees that play a role in employee satisfaction and worker retention, Fogaratnam & Buchanan's (2004) study which was based on stress of employed hospitality students and Murray-Gibbons & Gibbons' (2007) study on occupational stress in the chef profession. Birdir (2002) also conducted a study on general manager turnover in hotels and holiday villages in Turkey (Coughlan et al., 2014).

2.4.2 Factors predicting Job Satisfaction according to previous international research

Identifying the factors which affect job satisfaction is a challenging task. As the term of job satisfaction has been examined over the years, it has been found through the use of models, theories and surveys that job satisfaction can be identified by a number of factors that determine it. As Drafke (2009) suggested, job satisfaction variables are part of three dimensions, the internal, individual and external job satisfaction. The work itself, namely physical work and workload are intrinsic (Drafke, 2009). The individual variables are connected to the individual and their family so that could include commitment to the job. The external variables are related to the working environment and the work itself, and as they are easier to separate than the internal variables from the work itself they could be defined as job satisfaction relating to the employees' work environment (Coughlan et al., 2014). These variables could include support from supervisors and the relationships with them as well as the company procedures and policies are important for the job satisfaction of employees (Chou & Robert, 2008; Berger & Brownell, 2009).

Drafke (2009) suggests that the feeling of achievement, job security, opportunity for advancement, relationship with co-workers, quality and fairness of supervision, organizational culture and work schedules along with compensation may all influence
overall job satisfaction. Similarly, the status of employment and the work hours can also be defined as job satisfaction contributors (Booth & Van Ours, 2008).

According to Locke (1976), the job satisfaction facets which were most investigated are work itself, rewards (including pay, promotion, recognition and benefits), working conditions, supervision, co-workers and company or management. The relationship between job satisfaction and performance or productivity has been well established in previous research in diverse settings conditions (Jammarino & Dubinsky, 1987).

**Working conditions and the Job itself**

In an empirical study conducted among 124 employees of five-star hotels in the Western Cape (South Africa), it has been found that supervision, work environment and work itself are all significantly and positively correlated with overall job satisfaction (Coughlan et al., 2014).

In a U.S.A. hotel study, the employee’s status within the organization, the business location and the department of employment were factors which contributed to job satisfaction (Lee & Way, 2010).

As per Taber and Alliger (1995), when the employees of an American educational institute were asked to rate how much they enjoyed individual tasks within their role, final score results were moderately correlated to satisfaction with the work itself, and associated (however not strongly) with the global job satisfaction. The same research also shown that a number of other measures (such as, the level of concentration required for the job, supervision and task importance) had actually no impact on satisfaction. Therefore, it can be concluded that the accumulating enjoyment of work tasks contribute to the overall job satisfaction. However, the low relationship does suggest that other factors, besides enjoyment, result to the level of satisfaction employees feel at work.

**Promotion**

In 2012, a research was conducted by surveying 450 flight attendants of a major global airline. The results presented that job satisfaction of flight attendants apart from its social dimension importance, consists mainly of the important aspects of the job itself (which includes job motivation and characteristics, authority and responsibility), job
environment (including working conditions, supervision and co-workers) as well as organizational characteristics (wage and employment stability, promotion and organizational policy).

Organization
In a study which was performed in Turkey in April of 2014 between 408 employees of 19 thermal and city hotels in the regions of Afyon and Ankara, it was discovered that the job satisfaction of employees increases greatly when their perception of trust towards managers increases, and similarly their job satisfaction will increase normally in proportion to their trust to the organization itself (Gucer & Demirdag, 2014). Job satisfaction has been linked by researchers to many desirable work-related outcomes, such as lower stress levels (Thomas & Dunkerley, 1999), as well as increased organization performance measured by enhanced productivity of employees (Savery & Lucks, 2001). In addition, it has also been shown that when an employee feels satisfied with their job, they will also present lower absenteeism levels while their motivation will appear higher than their respective counterparts (Hwang & Chi, 2005).

In the region of Taiwan in 2005, it was found by Hwang & Chi that when employees were being treated as customers, job satisfaction was positively related to organizational performance (Sledge et al., 2008).

Pay
People who are dissatisfied with their jobs are more likely to leave, however the sources of dissatisfaction are many and varied (Dessler, 2013). Some of the most common reasons employees in tourism industry decide to leave their job contributing to high turnover, would include not feeling appreciated, deciding that this job position is a bad fit for them, not getting along with their co-workers or not liking their supervisors or boss, feeling that their pay is not enough according to their contribution to the organization, disliking their commute to work and of course, the possibility of them being able to earn more in a different job. It is worth mentioning that, according to Boella et al. (2013), even though hospitality industry has proved its economic importance, it has a reputation for low pay to its employees despite specific cases of
key employees in the organization, such as chefs or waiters at leading restaurants or good managers earning high rewards.

In addition to having an attitude about their job, people could also be characterized about various aspects of their job such as their colleagues, their supervisors or subordinates, their pay or the type of job they are required to perform (George et al., 2008).

During a research which was conducted among employees in cultural organizations it was found that the employees were satisfied from their supervisor and the nature of their work but dissatisfied from their pay (Goulimaris et al., 2003).

*Personal Growth, Intelligence & Personality Traits*

In an interesting study of four-star hotel employees job satisfaction conducted in Florida, USA, social and job satisfaction levels were noticed to be higher when the employee was characterised by higher intercultural sensitivity (Sizoo et al., 2005).

An employee who feels unsatisfied with his or her job will have a negative attitude and may occasionally create an issue problems within the company not only with his colleagues but most importantly, with the organization’s clients (Gregoriou, 2008).

Job satisfaction can be seen as a crucial phenomenon for organizations as it leads to the provision of high quality performance by improving the cohesion and morale of individuals. Job satisfaction is closely related to working behaviors such as productivity and efficiency (Masa’deh, 2016). Satisfied employees will have the motivation to improve their work behaviors, resulting into better provided services in the relevant employment sector.

The importance of meaningful work in the lives of individuals will make job environment and job satisfaction even more significant priorities in organizations. Even in periods of deepening recession, the human resources development at the workplace has not ceased to flourish (Wiggins and Steade, 1976).

Research has shown that in the case of jobs that involve high complexity tasks there might be positive relationship between job satisfaction and intelligence, meaning that the complexity of work is more important for highly intelligent people, than it is for less intelligent people. Furthermore, conceptually, the moderating role of intelligence is not very different from the moderating role of growth-need strength in need
theories of job satisfaction, suggesting that people with higher intelligence desire more interesting and challenging work (Ganzach, 1998).

*Demographic characteristics (age, years of experience, gender, job position etc)*

According to Herzberg et al. (1957) job satisfaction was found to be high when people started their first job but subsequently declined until people reached their late twenties or early thirties, when it began to rise. Once satisfaction levels increased they continued to do so for the remainder of the work career. This was due to the non fulfilment of initial high work expectations which resulted in a decrease in job satisfaction. As employees though matured in age and increased their work experience, this leaded to an adjustment to more attainable ambitions and therefore increased job satisfaction (Hunt & Saul, 1975).

Jung et al. (2007) reached to the conclusion that job satisfaction differs according to the gender of employees. In contrast, Hill et al. (1985) suggests that during a research in the banking sector, it was found that women banking employees had similar job dissatisfaction levels to their male colleagues.

Regarding the marital status of employees, Clark et al. (1996) concluded that married and widowed employees appear to be characterised by higher job satisfaction levels than their single colleagues.

In connection to the job position of an employee, it is believed that it is fairly connected to job satisfaction. During the preparation of a study in which job satisfaction among Turkish managers in first-class hotels was examined, it was discovered that generally there were acceptable levels of job satisfaction between managers despite their low salaries, long hours and not enough support from the colleagues (hygiene factors). This was mainly attributed to the fact that their job position along with the nature of the job itself, obtained the characteristics of authority as they were responsible for managing a top class organization (Aksu & Aktas, 2005).

Management and labour both consider improved productivity as a desirable social goal, with work schedule being one of the most important variables with an impact on this job characteristic. Studies have shown that productivity increases and social
problems decrease when workers participate in decisions affecting their working lives but also when their work responsibility and motivation are increased.

**Job Security**

A factor that has been examined a number of times and appears to be affecting job satisfaction, is job security of employees. According to research, it has been found that there is increased positive correlation between job satisfaction and job security; as Barnett & Bremnam (1995) support in their research, job security is strongly associated with job dissatisfaction since *men who think that they face considerable risk of losing their jobs or businesses tend to be somewhat more authoritarian, distrustful, self-deprecating, anxious, and conformist in their ideas than are other men of comparable class position* (Kohn, 1969).

Supervisory support as a perception remains a substantial predictor of job satisfaction not only for individuals but for the organization as a whole as well. Supervisor support level in the organization and individuals is reduced to a point based on the teamwork extent. Therefore, it would be wise to address job redesign strategies that not only increase autonomy, but also enhance the effectiveness of supervisor roles (Griffin et al., 2001).

During a doctoral research which was conducted between campus recreation administrators at public and private institutions (Kaltenbaugh, 2008) it was found that the factor of supervision and the nature of the work itself showed the highest values between the measured job satisfaction factors. In addition, it appeared from the findings of the research that the supervision and nature of work values would increase in proportion to the job satisfaction of employees.

Job satisfaction can be viewed as a reflection of how workers react to the entire panoply of job characteristics. Understanding the way workers perceive their work is important because job satisfaction is likely to affect economic outcomes. In the case of a worker feeling more satisfied, even if it seems that their situation is no better than that of otherwise identical workers, that worker is less likely to leave their job voluntarily leading to low turnover rates for the organization. More satisfied workers who are secure in their jobs have a reduced motive to undertake precautionary saving.
The study of job satisfaction is nonetheless important in order to understand labor-market trends behavior and perhaps economic activity more generally (Hamermesh, 2001).

**2.5 Previous research on Hotel & Tourism Job Satisfaction in Greece**

According to a poll published by Eurobarometer in April of 2014 between 26,571 participants, Greece was the only country among all EU members where fewer than half of its employees claimed to be dissatisfied with the working conditions they experience in their country. This leads to a 16% satisfaction rate compared to an average of over 80% in a number of EU countries, with Denmark rating in the first place with 94% of the workers being satisfied with their work conditions.

A study conducted by Glinia et al. in 2004, was an effort to investigate the high turnover rates of sport and recreation staff experienced by the large hotel chains in Greece, leading to additional training and recruitment costs and poor image for the organization. The study hypothesis however, did not reveal the intention to quit factor for the personnel. Along with similar research in Greece (Kalaitzidis, 2000; Vassiliou, 2000), the study suggests that employees in this sector of hospitality perceive the occupation as temporary which results to negative correlation between organizational commitment and overall job satisfaction (Glinia et al., 2004).

In conclusion, it could be inferred that even though job satisfaction in the hotel sector has been thoroughly examined abroad and on a worldwide level, Greece has little information on this subject. In a country with the size and activity of tourism in such an enhanced level, additional research needs to be done in various sectors in connection to the Greek tourism industry. This dissertation aims to provide with some information regarding the job satisfaction of hotel employees in the area of Thessaloniki, a research which could be enhanced or implemented similarly for many regions in the country and on various sectors as part of the tourism industry. Unfortunately, in our region, job satisfaction has not received yet the proper attention from neither scholars nor managers of various business organizations.
Chapter 3: Research Structure

3.1 Research Methodology

This chapter describes the research methodology that was followed, sources which led to the design of the questionnaire and choosing the research sample, as well as the strategy behind the procedure constructing the research. All of the above are part of the effort to present the recorded opinions of the personnel employed in hotels in the area of Thessaloniki in relation to their job satisfaction.

3.2 Research Method

In order to effectively reach to the conclusions and findings of this dissertation which aims to measure job satisfaction of hotel employees, the research approach that is going to be followed will be implemented by applying a survey research approach, as a primary research will be conducted in order to inspect the participants’ views on the under examination subject. The research method that is going to be followed is a quantitative one. Numerical and statistical measurements on the total population will effectively lead to reliable research results. In the case of this dissertation, this will be achieved by using the research technique of primary data being collected through a questionnaire delivered to the hotels’ personnel, while the secondary data will be collected through a literature research using books, journals or any other useful relevant online source.

The main goal of this research is to examine the job satisfaction of hotel employees in the area of Thessaloniki.

Research Questions

1. To explore the job satisfaction level of employees in the hotel sector
2. To examine whether there is significant diversification between the total satisfaction of employees in proportion to their demographic information (gender, age, marital status, level of education, job position, period of employment)
3. To identify which of the variables (job itself, pay, promotion, supervisor, organization as a whole and working conditions) can forecast and impact the most the total satisfaction of employees *(Regression Analysis)*

The dependent variable in both cases of the last two research questions will be the total job satisfaction, while the independent variables for the second question will be the demographics information and for the third research question the job satisfaction variables working conditions, supervisor, pay, job itself, organization as a whole and promotion (Figure 3).

![Research Model](image)

**Figure 3: Research Model**

**3.3 Research Instrument**

For this research, the selected instrument which was used in order to collect the necessary research data was the one of a questionnaire. In 1997, a multidimensional
scale was developed for the measurement of various job satisfaction aspects in different Greek occupational groups and organizations. This research questionnaire is called the Employee Satisfaction Inventory (ESI) and was created by Koustelios & Bagiatis (1997) in an effort to create a job satisfaction measurement instrument that could represent the Greek work situation, avoiding the possibility of cultural bias from researches that have been done in the past on a worldwide level. This measurement instrument was also successfully applied in other previous research (Koustelios, 1991; Koustelios & Bagiatis, 1997; Koustelios & kousteliou, 1998; Koustelios, 2001; Koustelios et al., 2003, Amaran tidou et al., 2009; Sdrolias et al., 2014; Gkolia et al., 2014; Goulimalis & Genti, 2010, Belias & Koustelios, 2015) and examines six dimensions of job satisfaction with the assistance of a total of twenty-four questions:

1. Working conditions (five questions),
2. Immediate supervisor (four questions),
3. Pay (four questions),
4. Nature of work (Job itself) (four questions),
5. The organization as a whole (four questions) and
6. Promotion (three questions)

The answers given to the questionnaire are in a Likert 5-scale method, where 1 corresponds to «strongly disagree» and 5 to «strongly agree».

3.4 Research Sample

This research’s objective focuses on the exploration of the level of job satisfaction of employees occupied in hotels in the area of Thessaloniki. For this reason, the research questionnaire was constructed and distributed in the Greek language, as well as in a version in the English language for the international hotel employees’ convenience. The hotels to which the questionnaire was distributed were all located within the area of Thessaloniki, the majority of which stands in the centre of the city. The questionnaire was delivered to hotels characterised from one up to five stars of
services, the majority of which included two or three star hotels. Apartments or any such relevant other type of accommodation facilities were deliberately not selected for the research, as the goal was to include only hotels in the Thessaloniki area, preferably accommodation facilities that were characterised by a reception position on a 24 hour basis. The number of questionnaires which were returned complete to the researcher reached 117 participants. All participants were employees of the aforementioned hotels in Thessaloniki occupied in positions such as reception, food and drinks or service, housekeeping, managerial and supervisor or other hotel positions. The questionnaire was distributed only to the hotels where the researcher requested and obtained permission from the hotel representatives to deliver the questionnaire and therefore obtain the employees’ participation for the completion of the research.

3.4 Reliability Analysis

The questionnaire chosen for the collection of the primary data of the research was examined for its reliability. A popular way to measure reliability is Cronbach’s alpha coefficient (a). The reliability analysis conducted for this research questionnaire resulted to an alpha coefficient value of 0.782=78,2% for the total satisfaction and total number of items which according to De Vaus (2002) is considered as acceptable since it is a reliability value higher than 0.70, allowing the remaining results of the a coefficient for each of the examined facets to be in most cases acceptable as well (Table 2 below).

Table 2: Reliability Analysis (Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facet</th>
<th>Cronbach a</th>
<th>N items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job itself</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization as a whole</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Satisfaction</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4: Research Results

4.1 Descriptive Statistics Section 1: Demographics

- Gender

Table 3 and Figure 4 below present the frequencies and percentages for each gender participating in the research. Male participants were 54.7% of the total participants while female participants reached a total of 45.3% of the total research respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Gender

- Age

Regarding the participants’ age and according to Table 4 and Figure 5 below, the majority of participants with 35% belonged to the age range of 26 to 35 years old,
while the lowest percentage was observed in the age range of 60+ with a percentage of 2.6%.

Table 4: Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Age

- Marital Status

Another demographic question which was part of the research questionnaire examined the marital status of the participants. According to Table 5 and Figure 6 below, the results have shown that 46.2% of the people that participated in the research are single, followed by married individuals with 35.9%.
Table 5: Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow/er</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Marital Status

- Education

As per the educational level of the individuals that took part in the research, more than half of the participants are high school graduates, with 60.7% being higher education graduates along with Gymnasium education presenting similar percentages of 17.9% and 18.8% respectively. Finally, primary school or MSc, MA, MBA and PhD or relevant educational level appear to have the lowest participation in the final results (Table 6 and Figure 7 below).
Table 6: Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc, MA, MBA, PhD or relevant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Education Bar Chart](image)

Figure 7: Education

- Job Position

The employees taking part in the research were also requested to answer which was their job position in the hotel they currently work for. As a result, as it can also be observed in the following Table 7 and Figure 8 that 29.9% of employees are part of the reception services department while 28.2% of the total participants work as housekeeping employees.
Table 7: Job Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial / supervisor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food / Drinks service or preparation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: Job Position

- Period of Employment

The last demographic question the employees were asked to provide their answer to (Table 8 and Figure 9 below), was about the period they have been working for the organization. Out of 117 research participants, 32.5% appear to have been employed for three to five years followed by the employees working for the hotel from six months to one year (30.8%).
Table 8: Period of Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of Employment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Six months or less</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From six months to one year</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From one year to three years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From three years to five years</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than five years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: Period of Employment

4.2 Descriptive Statistics Section 2: Job Satisfaction Facets

- Working conditions

Table 9 and Figure 10 below present the agreement or disagreement of respondents on “working conditions” statements. Specifically, overall satisfaction with working conditions is considered as approximately average (M = 2.88). The respondents agree
the most that their job environment is pleasant (M = 3.58) and the working conditions in their job are the best they have ever experienced (M = 3.20). On the contrary, less agreement appears regarding the statement that the working conditions are dangerous for the employees’ health (M = 2.11).

Table 9: Working Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Conditions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The working conditions in my job are the best I have ever experienced</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My job environment is pleasant</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My job’s working conditions are dangerous for my health</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There is inadequate ventilation in my workplace</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In my workplace there is inadequate lighting</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Working conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10: Working Conditions
• Supervisor

The overall satisfaction of employees with their supervisor (Table 10/Figure 11) approaches the average level (M = 2.91) with respondents depicting their agreement with the statement of their supervisor understanding their problems (M = 3.88) and standing up for them when necessary (M = 3.52) while the majority of participants seem to disagree with the statement that their supervisor is irritating (M = 2.05).

Table 10: Supervisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My supervisor stands up for me when necessary</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My supervisor understands my problems</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I have an impolite supervisor</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My supervisor is irritating</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11: Supervisor
Table 11 and Figure 12 present the overall satisfaction of employees in connection to their pay (M = 2.97). The participants agree the most with the statement «I feel insecure with the amount of money I earn from my job» (M = 3.46) followed by «I get paid less than what I deserve» (M = 3.24) while they seem to agree the least with the statement «I can barely survive with the amount of money I earn from my job» (M = 2.42).

Table 11: Pay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. I get paid enough for what I do</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I get paid less than what I deserve</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I feel insecure with the amount of money I earn from my job</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I can barely survive with the amount of money I earn from my job</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12: Pay
• **Job Itself**

Participants appear slightly higher satisfied than the average level with the job itself as the mean for the total facet is $M = 3.20$ with all four statements presenting a mean index higher than the neutral index response (Table 12 and Figure 13 below).

**Table 12: Job Itself**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. My job feels worthwhile doing it</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My job is satisfying for me</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My job makes me feel routine</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My job is boring</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Job Itself</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 13: Job Itself**

• **Organization as a Whole**

The participants were also requested to show their agreement or disagreement regarding statements about the organization as a whole. While employees appear to agree that the hotel they work for looks after its employees ($M = 3.78$), the
appearance of favouritism in the organization (M = 2.34) as well as the existence of distinction between employees (M = 2.35) seem to be statements the employees disagree with (Table 13, Figure 14).

Table 13: Organization as a Whole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e. Organization as a Whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The hotel I work for looks after its employees</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. This hotel is the best I have ever worked for</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. There is too much favouritism in the organization</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. There is a lot of distinction between the employees</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Organization as a Whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14: Organization as a Whole

- Promotion

Promotion was the final job satisfaction dimension examined by the research questionnaire, with a total mean of M = 2.94 and employees tending to disagree that while their experience increases their prospects for promotion (M = 2.70), it seems to
be an approximately agreed statement between the participants that the actual promotion prospects are quite limited (M = 3.80). (Table 14, Figure 15).

### Table 14: Promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. There are good opportunities for me to get a promotion</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. My experience increases my prospects</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Prospects for a promotion are quite limited</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 15: Promotion](image)

- Overall Job Satisfaction

The overall job satisfaction level of the research participants presents a mean value of 2.96, which corresponds to the belief that the hotel employees are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with their current jobs in the hotel they work for (Table 15 below).
Table 15: Total Job Satisfaction (Descriptive Statistics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total satisfaction</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.9679</td>
<td>.27337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Inferential Statistics

- Regression analysis (Overall satisfaction / working conditions, supervisor, pay, job itself, organization as a whole and promotion)

A multiple linear regression with six independent variables was carried out in order to determine the strength of the association between “overall satisfaction” and working conditions, supervisor, pay, job itself, organization as a whole, promotion, as well as in order to identify the relative importance of each of the factors in predicting the employee satisfaction.

Assumed level of significance is at 5% throughout.

From the $R^2$ value it can be seen that the model predicts approximately 100% of overall satisfaction, as it was expected since overall satisfaction was created based on the assessment of the other variables (Table 16).

Table 16: Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Adjusted R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000a</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), working conditions, supervisor, pay, job itself, organization as a whole, promotion

From the ANOVA table (Table 17) it can be concluded that the $R^2$ is greater than zero and that not all regression coefficients are zero.
Table 17: ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>8.669</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.445</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.669</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Overall satisfaction  
b. Predictors: (Constant), working conditions, supervisor, pay, job itself, organization as a whole, promotion

We proceed to examine each of the regression coefficients.

Table 18: Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.776E-15</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Itself</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as a Whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Overall satisfaction

The p. of all variables is less than alpha (level of significance: 0.05). Thus, it can be concluded that the regression coefficients for all factors (or independent variables) are not zero. In conclusion, the results indicate that the variables that have greater impact on overall satisfaction are pay (b = .451), followed by promotion (b = .403) and organization as a whole (b = .380) (Table 18 above).
• Overall satisfaction by gender

One-way ANOVA test was performed to show the differences between male and female respondents regarding overall satisfaction. The p. associated with the ANOVA one-way test is 0.008 (< a = 0.05) and as a result the findings suggest that there is statistical significant difference between male and female respondents (Table 19).

Table 19: ANOVA One-way test (Gender)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total satisfaction</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>7.213</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>8.157</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.669</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specifically, according to Table 20 and Figure 16 below, male respondents present higher levels of job satisfaction (M = 3.02, SD = .251) than female respondents (M = 2.89, SD = .283).

Table 20: Total Satisfaction by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total satisfaction</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.0281</td>
<td>.25157</td>
<td>.03145</td>
<td>2.9653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.8953</td>
<td>.28317</td>
<td>.03890</td>
<td>2.8172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.9679</td>
<td>.27337</td>
<td>.02527</td>
<td>2.9179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Overall satisfaction by job position

One-way ANOVA was performed to show the differences between the various job positions regarding the overall satisfaction of the respondents (Table 21). The p. associated with the ANOVA one-way test is 0.010 (< α = 0.05) and as a result the findings suggest that there is statistical significant difference between the various job positions.

Table 21: ANOVA One-way test (Job Position)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total satisfaction</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>3.485</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>7.709</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.669</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specifically, the respondents who work as managers or supervisors present the highest levels of job satisfaction (M = 3.17, SD = .252) followed by those who provide their services on food / drinks or preparation department (M = 3.04, SD = .263). On the contrary, less satisfaction appears between employees in housekeeping services (M = 2.87, SD = .242) (Table 22 and Figure 17 below).
Table 22: Descriptive Statistics (Job Position)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial / supervisor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.1759</td>
<td>.25212</td>
<td>.07278</td>
<td>3.0157</td>
<td>3.3361</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.9590</td>
<td>.27759</td>
<td>.04692</td>
<td>2.8637</td>
<td>3.0544</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.8791</td>
<td>.24213</td>
<td>.04215</td>
<td>2.7933</td>
<td>2.9650</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food / Drinks service or preparation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.0428</td>
<td>.26362</td>
<td>.05620</td>
<td>2.9259</td>
<td>3.1597</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.9080</td>
<td>.27445</td>
<td>.07086</td>
<td>2.7560</td>
<td>3.0600</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.9679</td>
<td>.27337</td>
<td>.02527</td>
<td>2.9179</td>
<td>3.0180</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, there are no significant differences on the levels of job satisfaction regarding the educational level of the respondents, their age, marital status and the years of the employment period.
Chapter 5: Conclusions

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present in brief the results of the research combined with the theoretical analysis in an effort to answer the research questions as mentioned in previous section of this dissertation, subsequently concluding to the final findings of the research.

5.2 Research Conclusions and Recommendations

The first research question of this research was an effort to explore the job satisfaction level of hotel employees in the area of Thessaloniki. The results of the research have shown that employees describe their job satisfaction from the organization they work for as neither satisfactory nor dissatisfactory. With a job satisfaction level presenting an indication approaching the neutral level, it appears that while the research respondents do not feel dissatisfied with their job they also do not state that they feel satisfied. This is a situation that needs to be considered carefully as according to Spector (1997) investigating ways to increase the job satisfaction of employees by discovering the organizational changes that need to be made can eventually lead to the improvement of performance of the organization. Additional effort must be made for a hotel to obtain the highest possible performance levels from its employees in order to achieve positive financial results for the organization. For this to be achieved, the hotel industry must consider providing new innovative procedures of training and interactive skills provision of knowledge practices implemented among their employees (Grotte, 2015) in an effort to motivate and increase the job satisfaction level of its personnel. A more satisfied employee will appear more polite, helpful and communicative with a hotel guest, leading to satisfied clients and therefore increased hotel earnings and future hotel reservations.

Another question that this research aimed to examine was the process of comparing the demographic details of the participants with their total job satisfaction in order to explore whether there is significant diversification between them. According to the
results of the participants’ input, male employees seem to present higher levels of job satisfaction compared to their female colleagues which comes to an agreement with Jung et al.’s (2007) conclusion that job satisfaction will differ according to the employees’ gender. Regarding the job position of employees, the research has shown that while managers and supervisors feel the highest levels of job satisfaction, significant difference appears with participants employed in housekeeping positions, research findings concluding that the various job positions of participants are characterised by significant difference in proportion to the job satisfaction level of employees confirming the findings of a study conducted among Turkish managers by Aksu & Aktas in 2005.

The educational level of respondents, their age, marital status or their employment period in the organization did not present significant differences in connection to the total levels of job satisfaction, which contrasts with the relevant research findings of Clark et al. (1996) who concluded that married or widowed employees presented higher job satisfaction than their single colleagues and Herzberg et al. (1957) and Hunt & Saul (1975) who discovered that age is an important job satisfaction impact factor.

Finally, the last research question of the study was to identify by using a linear regression analysis the variables that can forecast and impact the most the total job satisfaction level of the research participants. The results indicate that pay, promotion and organization as a whole are the variables that present the greatest impact on the overall level of satisfaction, verifying Herzberg’s motivation theory which suggested that higher levels of satisfaction could be achieved by improving the salaries of employees and are also in line with the results from the global airline research in 2012, presenting that the job satisfaction of employees mainly depends on important aspects of the organization, such as the element of promotion. In addition, the results of this research also match the findings of the Turkish hotels study in 2014, which presented that the employees’ job satisfaction will increase in proportion to the trust they have to the organization itself.

In conclusion, in case the hotel management wished to increase the personnel’s satisfaction, a number of measures could be implemented on the basis of the results of this research in order to successfully achieve the particular target.
In an effort to increase the job satisfaction level of female employees, the management could consider the possibility of providing additional motivation to its personnel by offering extended parental leaves for new mothers, or even both parents as well (St. Martin et al, 2009). In addition and as an enhancement to the personnel’s salaries since pay is one of the most significant variables impacting job satisfaction of hotel employees (George et al., 2008; Forbes, 2002), the organization could introduce a form of day-care services for the personnel, either in the premises of the hotel or at a location where the parents could have the proximity to visit their children at convenient times during or before and after their working hours. A third party provider agreement could also be pursued with exterior day-care stations in case the hotel decides that is not a possible realistic activity arranged inside their own premises. This measure could not only lower the financial burden of employees, it could also result to a more relaxed and content work force in the hotel.

As another indicative motive for the personnel, the hotel management could consider offering to the employees the possibility of using the hotel premises for their own use. For example, allowing them to use the spa facilities of the hotel would add to the personnel’s health and well being or even enhance the relationships with their colleagues leading to a more positive work environment. Offering periods of complementary accommodation in fellow hotel premises in other locations of the country or even abroad in the form of holidays for the personnel would be valued by the employees since not only it would act as recognition from the organization, it would also enhance the salary value of the individuals. Additional days of leave during the off peak periods for the hotel or complementary leave due to exceptional level of work productivity such as the employee of the month example could also be effective measures for the job satisfaction enhancement of the personnel. Providing agreement for the use of the hotel premises for the employees’ personal occasions, events or similar activities could make the employees feel more comfortable in their work environment and as if they were part of the hotel itself, resulting to individuals feeling recognized and therefore more satisfied, motivated employees.

In addition, in an effort to increase the working conditions and job environment of the personnel the hotel management could conduct an investigation consulting the employees for their opinion prior to proceeding to any possible renovations or the
premises. In this way, not only the working conditions for the employees could be improved such as the lighting or ventilation of the job environment in their favour, the personnel would also feel like their opinion is valuable and the organization considers them as important part of its activities and overall well being for the future as well. The organization itself along with its culture has been characterised as an important factor in the pursuit of satisfied workforce. By providing a clearly stated purpose for the hotel and presenting its vision, the employees could offer their services in a more productive and efficient manner for the achievement of goals and future success of the organization (Alfus, 1994). By organizing events or appointments between the hotel supervisors and the employees, they would then be offered the opportunity to determine their career visions and agree in collaboration what would be the best possible promotional advancements that could keep both ends satisfied. In certain cases, an employee’s satisfaction could perhaps increase through the transfer between departments for certain periods in a way to keep them interested and motivated in their work. By retaining an open line between the employees and the hotel management not only possible matters that might arise regarding the hotel and employees’ overall well being could be confronted effectively in advance, the personnel would also feel recognized and valued from the employer (Maroudas et al., 2008), leading to their increased job satisfaction and increased quality of services maintaining the hotel’s prosperity and advancement in the highest possible level.

5.3 Limitations and Future Research

A common characteristic among most studies is the element of limitations. In this study in particular, a possible limitation example could be the conditions under which the participants were asked to complete the questionnaire of the research. Having been requested to participate in the research while being in their work environment and under perhaps a stressful amount of time they had available to complete the questionnaire such as their break during a working day, could lead to a questionable result of their answers.
The main limitation of this research though, lies to the fact that only a small sample of employees in the hotel sector is used for the study, and not all of the hotel employees in the area of Thessaloniki. Although the sample that was used for this research can be characterised as sufficiently representative (a total of 117 participants), it still allows the possibility for additional research by using larger research samples for any future similar studies. That would mean that any new research could be focused on examining job satisfaction for a larger sample of hotel employees in Thessaloniki but most importantly, to investigate other areas of the country and the level of job satisfaction of hotel employees in those areas as well. A research that could be conducted on a national level of the country would be another expanded alternative research version as well. Another research alternative could be to explore the level of job satisfaction of employees in different hotel categories. For example, a specific research could be chosen to be conducted on five star hotels in a specific area of Greece, or even for the whole country, in case there was a specific research requirement to examine the job satisfaction level of employees according to the category of hotel they are employed. Apart from using a different area research sample or a larger sample overall, it could be useful and effective to consider conducting a similar research on hotel employees’ job satisfaction during a future period of time. Due to the economic crisis Greece has been facing during the last few years, the job satisfaction of employees could be impacted differently in case the economy of the country further improves in future, which could also have a positive affect for instance on the employees’ pay. For this reason a future repetition of the research might produce useful conclusions for the research community.
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Appendix 1: Questionnaire (English Version)

This questionnaire is part of the dissertation of a postgraduate student of International Hellenic University in an effort to complete her studies in the MSc in Management programme. This survey aims to understand and analyse the reasons and factors that contribute to the satisfaction of personnel employed in the Hotel sector in the region of Thessaloniki. In particular, the under examination topics will be focused on the opinions of personnel employed in Thessaloniki hotels regarding their job satisfaction in connection to their general working conditions and the job itself, their pay, the possibilities for promotion, their supervisor and the organization as a whole.

All the information and personal details you may provide by completion of this questionnaire shall in no way be disclosed to any third party and any personal information will remain confidential and anonymous.

Please be so kind to answer all questions spontaneously, by choosing the answer which fits in the best way to your personal views and opinions.

Thank you in advance for your highly important input.
PART A: DEMOGRAPHICS

Please mark using an X symbol the box next to the answer which describes you best:

1. Gender:
   Male □
   Female □

2. Age:
   18-25 years □
   26-35 years □
   36-45 years □
   46-60 years □
   60+ years □

3. Marital Status:
   Single □
   Married □
   Divorced □
   Widow/er □

4. Level of Education:
   Primary School □
   Gymnasium □
   High school □
   Higher Education (BA or relevant) □
   MSc, MA, MBA, PhD or relevant □

5. Current hotel employment position:
   Managerial/Supervisor Position □
   Reception □
   Housekeeping □
Food/Drinks Service or preparation □
Other □

6. Period of employment at your present job:

Six months or less □
From six months to one year □
From one year to three years □
From three years to five years □
More than five years □
PART B: JOB SATISFACTION FACTORS

The purpose of this questionnaire is to give you the opportunity to express how you feel about your present job, which aspects of it you are satisfied with and which ones you are not satisfied with.

Please choose the answer that best corresponds to your agreement or disagreement with each statement of your job aspects described, by using an X symbol inside the box under the most suitable answer.

In a scale from 1 to 5, each of them corresponding to:

1: Strongly Disagree, means that you completely disagree with the particular statement
2: Disagree, means that you do not agree with this statement described
3: Neutral corresponds to you feeling in between agreement or disagreement with the statement
4: Agree, means that you agree with this statement about this aspect of your job
5: Strongly Agree, means that you agree completely with the statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Conditions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The working conditions in my job are the best I have ever experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My job environment is pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My job’s working conditions are dangerous for my health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There is inadequate ventilation in my workplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In my workplace there is inadequate lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My supervisor stands up for me when necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My supervisor understands my problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I have an impolite supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My supervisor is irritating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pay</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I get paid enough for what I do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I get paid less than what I deserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I feel insecure with the amount of money I earn from my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I can barely survive with the amount of money I earn from my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Itself</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My job feels worthwhile doing it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My job is satisfying for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My job makes me feel routine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My job is boring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization as a Whole</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The hotel I work for looks after its employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. This hotel is the best I have ever worked for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. There is too much favouritism in the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. There is a lot of distinction between the employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. There are good opportunities for me to get a promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. My experience increases my prospects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Prospects for a promotion are quite limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Το παρόν ερωτηματολόγιο αποτελεί τμήμα της πτυχιακής εργασίας μεταπτυχιακής φοιτήτριας του Διεθνούς Πανεπιστημίου της Ελλάδος, κατά την προσπάθεια ολοκλήρωσης της φοίτησής της στο πρόγραμμα MSc in Management. Η συγκεκριμένη έρευνα στοχεύει στην κατανόηση και ανάλυση των αιτιών και παραγόντων σε συνάρτηση με την εργασιακή ικανοποίηση των εργαζομένων του Ξενοδοχειακού κλάδου στην περιοχή της Θεσσαλονίκης. Συγκεκριμένα, τα υπό εξέταση θέματα επικεντρώνονται στις απόψεις του προσωπικού το οποίο απασχολείται σε ξενοδοχεία της Θεσσαλονίκης σχετικά με την εργασιακή τους ικανοποίηση σε σχέση με τις γενικές συνθήκες εργασίας και το αντικείμενο της εργασίας τους, την αμοιβή που λαμβάνουν από αυτή, τις πιθανότητες προαγωγής τους, τον προϊστάμενό τους και τέλος, τον οργανισμό στον οποίον απασχολούνται.

Όλες οι πληροφορίες και προσωπικές λεπτομέρειες τις οποίες πιθανόν θα παρέχετε μέσω της συμπλήρωσης αυτού του ερωτηματολογίου δεν θα αποκαλυφθούν με κανένα τρόπο σε κανένα τρίτο μέρος και κάθε είδους προσωπική πληροφορία θα παραμείνει εμπιστευτική και ανώνυμη.

Παρακαλείσθε να απαντήσετε όλες τις ερωτήσεις αυθόρμητα, επιλέγοντας την απάντηση που αντιστοιχεί στον καλύτερο τρόπο για να περιγράψει τις προσωπικές σας αντιλήψεις και απόψεις.

Σας ευχαριστώ εκ των προτέρων για την άκρως σημαντική συνεισφορά σας.
ΤΜΗΜΑ Α΄: ΔΗΜΟΓΡΑΦΙΚΕΣ ΠΛΗΡΟΦΟΡΙΕΣ

Παρακαλείσθε να συμπληρώσετε χρησιμοποιώντας το σύμβολο X το κουτάκι δίπλα από την απάντηση που σας περιγράφει με τον καλύτερο δυνατό τρόπο:

1. Φύλο:
   Άνδρας □
   Γυναίκα □

2. Ηλικία:
   18-25 ετών □
   26-35 ετών □
   36-45 ετών □
   46-60 ετών □
   60+ ετών □

3. Οικογενειακή Κατάσταση:
   Ελεύθερος/η □
   Παντρεμένος/η □
   Διαζευγμένος/η □
   Χήρος/α □

4. Επίπεδο Εκπαίδευσης:
   Δημοτική Εκπαίδευση □
   Γυμνάσιο □
   Λύκειο □
   Ανώτερη Εκπαίδευση (Προπτυχιακό κ.α.) □
   MSc, MA, MBA, Phd ή σχετικό □

5. Παρούσα θέση απασχόλησης στην ξενοδοχειακή μονάδα που εργάζεστε:
   Θέση Διεύθυνσης/Προϊσταμένου □
   Υποδοχή □
6. Περίοδος απασχόλησης στην παρούσα εργασίας σας:

- Έξι μήνες ή λιγότερο
- Από έξι μήνες έως ένα έτος
- Από ένα έως τρία έτη
- Από τρία έως πέντε έτη
- Περισσότερο από πέντε έτη
ΤΜΗΜΑ Β: ΠΑΡΑΓΟΝΤΕΣ ΕΡΓΑΣΙΑΚΗΣ ΙΚΑΝΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ

Στόχος αυτού του ερωτηματολογίου είναι να σας προσφέρει τη δυνατότητα να εκφράσετε πώς αισθάνεστε για την παρούσα θέση εργασία σας, ποια είναι τα στοιχεία αυτής με τα οποία νιώθετε ικανοποιημένοι και ποια όχι.

Παρακαλείσθε να επιλέξετε την απάντηση η οποία αντιστοιχεί καλύτερα στον συμβάλλοντα στον αν συμφωνείτε ή όχι με κάθε μία από τις προτάσεις που περιγράφουν χαρακτηριστικά της εργασίας σας, χρησιμοποιώντας το σύμβολο Χ στο πεδίο κάτω από την καλύτερη για εσάς δυνατή απάντηση.

Σε κλίμακα του 1 έως 5, κάθε αριθμός εκ των οποίων αντιστοιχεί σε:

1: Διαφωνώ Απόλυτα, το οποίο σημαίνει πως διαφωνείτε απολύτως με τη συγκεκριμένη πρόταση
2: Διαφωνώ, το οποίο σημαίνει πως δεν συμφωνείτε με τη συγκεκριμένη πρόταση
3: Δεν είμαι βέβαιος/η, το οποίο σημαίνει πως δεν συμφωνείτε αλλά ούτε και διαφωνείτε με αυτή την πρόταση
4: Συφωνώ, το οποίο σημαίνει πως συμφωνείτε με τη συγκεκριμένη πρόταση
5: Συμφωνώ Απόλυτα, το οποίο σημαίνει πως συμφωνείτε απολύτως με τη συγκεκριμένη πρόταση

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Διαφωνώ Απόλυτα</th>
<th>Διαφωνώ</th>
<th>Δεν είμαι βέβαιος/η</th>
<th>Συφωνώ</th>
<th>Συμφωνώ Απόλυτα</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Εργασιακές Συνθήκες

1. Οι συνθήκες εργασίας στη δουλειά μου είναι οι καλύτερες που είχα ποτέ
2. Το περιβάλλον εργασίας μου είναι ευχάριστο
3. Οι συνθήκες εργασίας μου είναι επικίνδυνες για την υγεία μου
4. Ο εξαερισμός στο χώρο εργασίας μου δεν επαρκεί
5. Στο χώρο εργασίας μου ο φωτισμός είναι ανεπαρκής
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Προϊστάμενος</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Έχω υποστήριξη από τον προϊστάμενό μου όποτε χρειαστεί</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ο προϊστάμενός μου κατανοεί τα προβλήματά μου</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ο προϊστάμενός μου είναι αγενής</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ο προϊστάμενός μου είναι εκνευριστικός</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λοιπά</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Πληρώνομαι αρκετά για τη δουλειά που προσφέρω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Πληρώνομαι λιγότερο από όσο αξίζω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Αισθάνομαι Ανασφάλεια με το μισθό που κερδίζω από τη δουλειά μου</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 'Ισα-'ισα που μπορώ και επιβιώνω μ’ αυτό το μισθό</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Η εργασία μου</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Αισθάνομαι πως η δουλειά μου είναι αξιόλογη</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Η δουλειά μου με ικανοποιεί</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Η δουλειά μου μου προκαλεί αίσθημα ρουτίνας</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Η δουλειά μου είναι βαρετή</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ο Οργανισμός συνολικά</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Το ξενοδοχείο για το οποίο εργάζομαι φροντίζει τους εργαζομένους του</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Αυτό το ξενοδοχείο είναι το καλύτερο που έχω δουλέψει ποτέ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Υπάρχει ευνοιοκρατία στον οργανισμό</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Υπάρχουν διακρίσεις ανάμεσα στους εργαζομένους</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Προσαγωγή</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Υπάρχουν αρκετές ευκαιρίες για να πάρω προσαγωγή</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Η εμπειρία που απέκτησα αυξάνει τις προοπτικές μου για προσαγωγή</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Οι προοπτικές προσαγωγής είναι αρκετά περιορισμένες</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Hotel Capacity in Central Macedonia Region (2017)

Table: Hotel Capacity in Central Macedonia Region (2017),

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIFERIEIAKH ENOTHTA HMAIOS</th>
<th>MONADES</th>
<th>5*</th>
<th>4*</th>
<th>3*</th>
<th>2*</th>
<th>1*</th>
<th>GEVNIKO ADROMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOWMAITA</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>727</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KLYNES</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERIFERIEIAKH ENOTHTA THESSALONIKHIS</td>
<td>MONADES</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOWMAITA</td>
<td>1,661</td>
<td>2,007</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>7,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KLYNES</td>
<td>3,067</td>
<td>3,689</td>
<td>4,381</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>14,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERIFERIEIAKH ENOTHTA KILIKIS</td>
<td>MONADES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOWMAITA</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KLYNES</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERIFERIEIAKH ENOTHTA PELLA</td>
<td>MONADES</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOWMAITA</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KLYNES</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>2,864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERIFERIEIAKH ENOTHTA PIERIAS</td>
<td>MONADES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOWMAITA</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>1,568</td>
<td>3,515</td>
<td>3,587</td>
<td>10,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KLYNES</td>
<td>1,234</td>
<td>1,967</td>
<td>3,241</td>
<td>6,816</td>
<td>6,972</td>
<td>20,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERIFERIEIAKH ENOTHTA SERRON</td>
<td>MONADES</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOWMAITA</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KLYNES</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>2,056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERIFERIEIAKH ENOTHTA XALKIDIKHES</td>
<td>MONADES</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOWMAITA</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>5,201</td>
<td>4,591</td>
<td>4,388</td>
<td>3,855</td>
<td>24,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KLYNES</td>
<td>13,468</td>
<td>10,273</td>
<td>9,195</td>
<td>8,576</td>
<td>7,375</td>
<td>48,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYNOLO PERIFERIES</td>
<td>MONADES</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>1,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOWMAITA</td>
<td>8,560</td>
<td>8,731</td>
<td>10,392</td>
<td>9,624</td>
<td>8,518</td>
<td>45,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KLYNES</td>
<td>17,769</td>
<td>17,128</td>
<td>20,719</td>
<td>18,704</td>
<td>16,407</td>
<td>90,727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Πηγή: Ξενοδοχειακό Επιμελητήριο Ελλάδος
Appendix 4: Job Satisfaction Predictors