

An Investigation of Potential MICE Sector Employees' Work Values

Kivanc Inelmen and Özen Kirant-Yozcu

Abstract— This study presents the results of an empirical study with the Turkish version of Lyons Work Values Survey (LWVS-T). The importance of young generations is discussed as they can be both an employee and customer for MICE industry. As the targeted research universe was tourism administration students, the sample consists of 98 respondents who were enrolled in four universities of Istanbul. Moreover, a second data set was obtained from 14 sector professionals to constitute the reference group. The resulting total sample of 112 respondents was employed for the tests. Besides the questionnaires' reliability, validity and standardization tests, an investigation on the potential employees' work related values and a comparison with MICE professionals' views about value priorities were conducted.

Keywords— Work values; Generational differences; MICE industry

I. INTRODUCTION

MEETINGS industry or as frequently called MICE, i.e. meetings, incentives, conventions, and exhibitions, experienced tremendous growth and became truly global in nature [12]. The rapid growth of MICE tourism, globally and regionally, can bring some challenges to tourism organizations [6]. One such challenge this paper will focus, the need to tackle the value differences of current managers and those of the potential workforce. The importance of young generations in MICE industry is obvious, as they can be both an employee and also customer. Researchers and industry organizations have taken an interest in the behaviors of the different generational cohorts in regards to meetings and conventions [11] and reported that although generations were alike in some respects, they were statistically significantly different in others. For instance, it was found that Millennials value flexibility, incentive, engagement, and a sense of purpose more than the other generational groups [1][2].

There is much discussion -both in daily conversations and in academic work- about the new generation of employees are being characteristically different than the earlier generations. It is often emphasized that this group of employees arrives with different work related attitudes and work values in many country contexts [7]. Recent research on Turkish employees found that Millennial employees are indeed

distinct in terms of their organizational attitudes compared with the Xers Generation employees [4]. Investigations of generational differences in regard to work values could provide a fruitful venue for both academic and practitioner use, but there is need for up-to-date tools that could be employed in such endeavor. In the past decade, investigations on work values have gained momentum in organizational behavior field [5].

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Sampling and Procedure

The present study targeted the sampling universe of tourism administration students of Istanbul universities. Parallel to this aim, data was collected from students of four universities that have tourism administration undergraduate programs; two of these are public and two are foundation universities to improve representativeness of the sample. The final student sample consists of a total of 98 respondents, and of those 46 were female and 52 were male, and largely in their third and fourth study years (78%). The birthdates ranged between 1982 and 1995 showing that the sample consisted of Millennials. The data collection method was convenience sampling as participation was based on acceptance of the invited students to fill a self-administered questionnaire. During the questionnaire administration, either the project team members or one of their confederates were available to answer questions of the respondents. A second sample was attained to represent current work values of MICE professionals. This was done by approaching the MICE professionals in the most important annual meeting in Turkey. A total of 14 questionnaires were collected, with a project team member being present during the questionnaire administration, to answer questions.

B. Measure

The LWVS was chosen to be tested for testing psychometric properties, because it has been shown to measure four types of theorized work values (i.e. intrinsic, extrinsic, social and prestige values) as measured by Lyons et al. [5]. Although other validated measures exist, research suggests that none of these measures fully captures the full domain of the work values [9]. For the purposes of comparing work values of Turkish Millennial tourism administration students, and other groups of interest to researchers, the LWVS was first translated and adapted to Turkish. As this phase of the study also aimed testing the psychometric properties of the LWVS-T, the data collected from the 98 tourism administration

Kivanc Inelmen¹ Department of Tourism Administration, Bogazici University, Turkey. (e-mail:inelmenk@boun.edu.tr, inelmenk@hotmail.com).

Özen Kirant-Yozcu², Department of Tourism Administration, Bogazici University, Turkey.

students were used. The full version of the LWVS contains 37 items. As per the LWVS instructions, respondents were asked to rate the degree to which each work outcome would be a ‘top priority’ when selecting a potential job or deciding to remain in their job on a six-point scale (1 highly unlikely; 6 highly likely). The internal consistency reliability of the 37 item scale was calculated with the split-half reliability by examining the correlation between the parts. This analysis provided a strong correlation between the parts of the form ($r=.820$), and the result was deemed to be satisfactory.

TABLE I.
ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX

	Factor			
	1	2	3	4
CRE				,384
ABI		,303		
IST			,394	
INT				,382
VAR				,487
CLN				,371
CHA				,656
ADV				,358
FRE				,544
IMP			,679	
IFL			,449	
PRE	,450			
AUT				,302
Ach			,356	
MVL	,403			
COS			,550	
HLP		,382		
COW		,801		
FUN		,801		
SOC		,382		
Trv		,492		
FAR		,538		
SSU	,692			
INF	,520			
TRG	,380			
HRS			,700	
FBK		,339		
CSU	,774			
BAL			,627	
REC	,477			
BEN	,468			
SAL		,362		
SEC	,842			
IND	,395			
Cor	,494			
Ffl	,424			
Woe	,549			

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.

Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization.

To ensure the validity of the LWVS-T, its underlying structure was examined through exploratory factor analysis. Common factor analysis with principal axis factoring with Promax rotation, which allows the factors to be correlated with one another, was used [3]. As it can be seen in Table 1, factors with eigenvalues greater than two was examined as Lyons et

al. [5] suggested a four-factor structure. Exploratory factor analysis of the 37 work values produced a meaningful and interpretable solution that explained 48.8% of total variance. All items had loadings greater than 0.30 and mostly fitted to the factor structure obtained by Lyons et al. [5], providing some evidence of convergent validity. The 37 items are shown with the following abbreviations: Fairness (FAR), Supportive Supervisor (SSU), Information (INF), Training (TRG), Feedback (FBK), Hours of work (HRS), Competent Supervision (CSU), Balance (BAL), Recognition (REC), Benefits (BEN), Salary (SAL), Job security (SEC), Independence (IND), Competence Rewarded (cor), Fulfilling (ffl), Work Environment (woe), Creativity (CRE), User Abilities (ABI), Intellectually Stimulating (IST), Interesting work (INT), Variety (VAR), Continuously Learn (CLN), Challenge (CHA), Advancement (ADV), Freedom (FRE), Moral Values (MVL), Contribution to Society (COS), Help People (HLP), Co-workers (COW), Fun (FUN), Social Interaction (SOC), Travel (trv), Impact (IMP), Influence (IFL), Prestigious (PRE), Authority (AUT), Achievement (ach).

The 37 work values were listed under four factors by Lyons et al. [5] (see Table 2). In their categorization, the first factor contained 16 work aspects related to instrumental work values, and in the present study 11 of the work values were placed to the same factor (match: 68.75%). The second factor was composed of seven items expressing social/altruistic work values, and in the present study five of the work values were placed to the same factor (match: 71.43%). The third factor includes five items that relate to status and prestige, and in the present study three of these work values were placed to the same factor (match: 60.00%). The fourth factor included nine items related to cognitive work values, and in the present study seven of these work values were placed to the same factor (match: 77.78%). Thus, it could be suggested that the scale has convergent validity.

TABLE II
THE LIST OF 37 ITEMS AS A FOUR-FACTOR, ONE-DIMENSIONAL STRUCTURE

Instrumental	Cognitive
Fairness (FAR)	Creativity (CRE)
Supportive Supervisor (SSU)	User Abilities (ABI)
Information (INF)	Intellectually Stimulating (IST)
Training (TRG)	Interesting work (INT)
Feedback (FBK)	Variety (VAR)
Hours of work (HRS)	Continuously Learn (CLN)
Competent Supervision (CSU)	Challenge (CHA)
Balance (BAL)	Advancement (ADV)
Recognition (REC)	Freedom (FRE)
Benefits (BEN)	
Salary (SAL)	
Job security (SEC)	
Independence (IND)	
Competence Rewarded (cor)	
Fulfilling (ffl)	
Work Environment (woe)	
Social/ Altruistic	Prestige
Moral Values (MVL)	Impact (IMP)
Contribution to Society (COS)	Influence (IFL)
Help People (HLP)	Prestigious (PRE)
Co-workers (COW)	Authority (AUT)
Fun (FUN)	Achievement (ach)
Social Interaction (SOC)	
Travel (trv)	

Note: The items placed to the same dimensions of Lyons et al. [5] by the factor analysis of the student data are shown in bold typeface.

For the standardization test of the LVWS-T, an alternative form of the questionnaire was given to 14 tourism sector professionals to establish the norm scores of a relevant reference group. In this alternative form, it was aimed to establish the opinions of MICE professionals, in regard to their ideal employee’s work values profile. The professionals were sampled judgmentally from MICE sector to achieve some level of uniformity of the sample. Through the comparison of the student and professional samples, it was expected that work value differences would be revealed in most items. This expectation was based on the fact that the professionals have possibly assumed the work value norms of their sector due to immersion in business life over long years, unlike the student group. Moreover, this second group was substantially older, and belonged to Generation Xers and Baby Boomers Generations, compared with the student group that consisted of Millennials. To illustrate the overall results of the comparisons, it could be reported that the conducted Independent Samples t-tests (see Table 3 for the summarized results) showed that on slightly more than half of the items (19 out of 37) there was a statistically significant difference. The comparison of the student and professional samples partly supported the expectation that the scale discriminates the groups who are known to be different. This result provided some evidence for concurrent validity [10] of the scale and there were some marked differences between the managers’ and Millennial samples’ values. In all variables (e.g. contribution to the society, importance of freedom, value of workplace benefits, etc.) that showed a significant difference the averages of Millennials were higher.

TABLE III.

SUMMARY RESULTS OF THE INDEPENDENT SAMPLES T-TESTS ON ALL 37 ITEMS

Significantly Different	Not Significantly Different
COS*, FRE***, BEN***, FAR*, FUN***, IND*, INT***, BAL***, SSU**, fl***, woe**, ADV*, SAL***, PRE***, VAR*, SOC***, IFL*, trv*, HLP**	AUT, CHA, cor, CRE, FBK, COW, CLN, HRS, IMP, IST, SEC, CSU, REC, ABI, MVL, ach, INF, TRG

Note: The items marked (*) are significantly different at 0.05, marked (**) are significantly different at 0.01 and marked (***) are significantly different at 0.001 levels.

III. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In view of economic contributions of MICE activities to the destination, identifying essential competences for professionals, many destinations around the world have invested in the industry [8]. The congruence of future event manager’s work values with those desired in the MICE industry can be deemed essential. The present results provided support to Severt, Fjelstul, and Breiter [11] who reported that although generations were alike in some respects, they were substantially different in others. In fact importance attributed to the work related values were higher in the Millennial group as suggested by Ng. et al. [7], compared with the MICE professionals’ view about whether those values should be of first priority for a prospective employee.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This study was realized at the Applied Tourism Administration and Research and Center of Bogaziçi University. Project Code AUP-2016/01

REFERENCES

- [1] Bair, B. (2008). The Rule of cool: Strategies for attracting Gen Y delegates to your meetings. *Medical Meetings*, Retrieved from <http://meetingsnet.com/cmeregs/rule-cool>.
- [2] Jones, P. (2007). The iPod and the phone: Wired and mobile, characteristics of the Millennium Generation. *Orion Journal of International Hotel Management*, 2, 11-14.
- [3] Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L., Black, W.C. (2007). *Multivariate Data Analysis with Reading*, 7th Edition, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- [4] Inelmen, K., Zeytinoglu, I.U. and Uygur, D. (2012). Are Millennials a different breed? Turkish hospitality sector frontline employees’ intention to stay. In E. Ng, S.T. Lyons and L. Schweitzer, *Managing the New Workforce: International Perspectives on the Millennial Generation*, 181-203. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publ. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9780857933010.00014>
- [5] Lyons, S. T., Higgins, C. and Duxbury, L. (2010). Work values: Development of a new three dimensional structure based on confirmatory smallest space analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 969–1002.
- [6] Mistilis N. and Dwyer L. (2000). Information Technology and Service Standards in MICE Tourism, *Journal of Convention & Exhibition Management*, 2:1, 55-65. https://doi.org/10.1300/J143v02n01_04
- [7] Ng, E.S.W, Schweitzer, L. and Lyons, S.T. (2010). New generation, great expectations: A field study of the Millennial generation. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 25, 281-292. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9159-4>
- [8] Oppermann, M. (1996). Convention cities—images and changing fortunes. *Journal of Tourism Studies* 7(1): 10-19.
- [9] Papavasileiou, E.F. and Lyons, S.T. (2015). A comparative analysis of the work values of Greece's ‘Millennial’ generation, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26, 2166-2186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2014.985325>
- [10] Sekaran, U. and Bougie, R. (2013). *Research Methods for Business*, 6th Ed., NY: John Wiley and Sons.
- [11] Severt, K., Fjetstul, J., and Breiter, D. (2009). A comparison of motivators and inhibitors for association meeting attendance for three generational cohorts. *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, 10(2), 105-119 <https://doi.org/10.1080/15470140902949695>
- [12] Weber, K. and Ladkin, A. (2003). The convention industry in Australia and the United Kingdom: Key issues and competitive forces, *Journal of Travel Research*, 42, 125-132. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287503257489>